30

U. S. Congress

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

1.717
4013
Pat 1

CONTAINING

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FIFTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION,

ALSO

SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SENATE.

VOLUME XL.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1906.

3d. set

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

ENTICATED
OVERNMENT
ORMATION
GPO

J11
.R5
3d set

AUG 30 1906
D. of D.

SURPLUS - 1
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
DUPLICATE

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS

VOLUME XL, PART I.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SENATE,

AND

FIFTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE FIFTY-NINTH CONGRESS.

SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SENATE.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *March 4, 1905.*

CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS, Vice-President of the United States, to whom the oath was administered at the close of the last regular session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, took the chair.

PRAYER.

Rev. EDWARD E. HALE, Chaplain of the Senate, said:

I will multiply my people, they shall not be few.
I will glorify them, and they shall not be small.
Their congregation shall be established before me;
And I will punish all that oppress them.
Their nobles shall be from themselves and their governor from the midst of them.
I will cause him to draw near
And he shall approach unto me.
And ye shall be my people and I will be your God.
The Law shall not depart from them.
Be thou strong and of good courage;
Be not afraid, neither be discouraged.
For the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest.

Let us pray.

Father of Life, Father of Love, the work is done—for better, for worse—which Thou hast given this Congress to do. Grant Thy blessing to our endeavors. Thou wilt crown with Thine own success every good effort. Thou wilt forgive every mistake of ours. The past is gone, and we will forget the things behind. To-morrow is Thine, and we trust it to Thee.

For the homes and the country we pray again and again and always that they may come into Thy kingdom of love and hope and faith, pure as Thine own light, peaceable as Thine own purpose, and alive with Thy life. Give to Thy servants wherever they may go of Thine own strength that they may be fellow-workers together with God.

Almighty God, this nation is in Thy care, and this people seeks Thee to-day. We are in prayer for the country, that it may be more and more the happy nation which seeks Thee and finds Thee, as they find Thee who seek for Thee with all their hearts.

Thou hast made this people master of its own destiny. This people has chosen its leaders and its Congress for these years before them. And they ask, and we ask, Thy consecration on these years, for every father and mother, for every son and daughter, for every home, the help and blessing of the living God.

For the President, for the Vice-President, for the Congress, for the judges, and for the people we ask the blessing every hour of the living God.

For purity in their homes, for peace, for health, for strength, for all that God can give, for all that men can use in the service which is perfect freedom.

Hear us, answer us, and bless us as Thine own children in Christ Jesus.

Join me audibly in the Lord's prayer.

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is done in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

ADDRESS OF VICE-PRESIDENT FAIRBANKS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Senators, I enter upon the discharge of the duties of the position to which I have been called by my countrymen with grateful appreciation of the high honor and with a deep sense of its responsibilities.

I have enjoyed the privilege of serving with you here for eight years. During that period we have been engaged in the consideration of many domestic questions of vast importance, and with foreign problems of unusual and far-reaching significance. We submit what we have done to the deliberate and impartial judgment of history.

I can never forget the pleasant relations which have been formed during my service upon the floor of the Senate. I shall cherish them always as among the most delightful memories of my life. They warrant the belief that I shall have in the discharge of the functions which devolve upon me under the Constitution, the generous assistance and kindly forbearance of both sides of the Chamber.

We witness the majestic spectacle of a peaceful and orderly beginning of an Administration of national affairs under the laws of a free and self-governing people. We pray that Divine favor may attend it and that peace and progress, justice and honor may abide with our country and our countrymen.

The Secretary of the Senate will now read the proclamation of the President of the United States convening the Senate in extraordinary session.

PROCLAMATION.

The Secretary (CHARLES G. BENNETT) read the proclamation, as follows:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas public interests require that the Senate of the United States be convened at 12 o'clock on the 4th day of March next to receive such communications as may be made by the Executive;

Now, therefore, I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Senate of the United States to convene at the Capitol, in the city of Washington, on the 4th day of March next, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as members of that body are hereby required to take notice.

Given under my hand and the seal of the United States at Washington, the 23d day of February, in the year of our Lord 1905, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-ninth.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

By the President:
JOHN HAY, *Secretary of State.*

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO SENATORS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the names of Senators-elect to whom the oath is to be administered. They will come forward as their names are called.

The Secretary called the names of—

Mr. ALDRICH, Mr. BATE, Mr. BEVERIDGE, Mr. BULKELEY, and Mr. BURKETT.

These Senators (with the exception of Mr. ALDRICH), escorted by Mr. CARMACK, Mr. CULLOM, Mr. PLATT of Connecticut, and Mr. MILLARD, respectively, advanced to the Vice-President's desk, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice-President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. BURROWS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLAPP, and Mr. CLARK of Wyoming.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. ALGER, Mr. CLARK of Montana, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. WARREN, respectively, advanced to the Vice-President's desk, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice-President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DEPEW, and Mr. DICK.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BAILEY, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. PLATT of New York, and Mr. FORAKER, respectively, advanced to the Vice-President's desk, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice-President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. FLINT, Mr. HALE, Mr. KEAN, and Mr. KNOX.

These Senators (with the exception of Mr. KNOX) advanced to the Vice-President's desk, escorted by Mr. PERKINS, Mr. FRYE, and Mr. DRYDEN, respectively, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice-President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. HEMENWAY, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MCCUMBER, Mr. MONEY, and Mr. NIXON.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BEVERIDGE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HANSBROUGH, Mr. MCLAURIN, and Mr. NEWLANDS, respectively, advanced to the Vice-President's desk and the oath was administered to them by the Vice-President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. PILES, Mr. PROCTOR, Mr. SUTHERLAND, and Mr. TALIAFERRO.

These Senators advanced to the Vice-President's desk, escorted by Mr. ANKENY, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. MALLORY, respectively, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice-President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. SCOTT and Mr. RAYNER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. ELKINS and Mr. GORMAN, respectively, advanced to the Vice-President's desk, and the affirmation was administered to them by the Vice-President.

SENATORS PRESENT.

The Senators-elect having been sworn and taken their seats in the Senate, the following Senators were present:

Alabama—John T. Morgan and Edmund W. Pettus.
Arkansas—James H. Berry.
California—Frank P. Flint and George C. Perkins.
Colorado—Thomas M. Patterson and Henry M. Teller.
Conecticut—Morgan G. Bulkeley and Orville H. Platt.
Delaware—J. Frank Allee.
Florida—Stephen R. Mallory and James P. Taliaferro.
Georgia—Augustus O. Bacon and Alexander S. Clay.
Idaho—Fred T. Dubois and Weldon B. Heyburn.
Illinois—Shelby M. Cullom and Albert J. Hopkins.
Indiana—Albert J. Beveridge and James A. Hemenway.
Iowa—William B. Allison and Jonathan P. Dolliver.
Kansas—Chester I. Long.
Kentucky—Joseph C. S. Blackburn and James B. McCreary.
Louisiana—Samuel D. McEnery and Murphy J. Foster.
Maine—William P. Frye and Eugene Hale.
Maryland—Arthur P. Gorman and Isador Rayner.
Massachusetts—Winthrop M. Crane and Henry Cabot Lodge.
Michigan—Russell A. Alger and Julius C. Burrows.
Minnesota—Moses E. Clapp and Knute Nelson.
Mississippi—Anselm J. McLaurin and H. D. Money.
Missouri—William J. Stone.
Montana—Thomas H. Carter and William A. Clark.
Nebraska—Elmer J. Burkett and Joseph H. Millard.
Nevada—Francis G. Newlands and George S. Nixon.
New Hampshire—Henry E. Burnham and Jacob H. Gallinger.
New Jersey—John F. Dryden and John Kean.
New York—Chauncey M. Depew and Thomas C. Platt.
North Carolina—Lee S. Overman and Furnifold M. Simmons.
North Dakota—Henry C. Hansbrough and Porter J. McCumber.
Ohio—Charles Dick and Joseph B. Foraker.
Oregon—Charles W. Fulton.
Pennsylvania—Boies Penrose.
Rhode Island—George P. Wetmore.
South Carolina—Asbury C. Latimer.
South Dakota—Robery J. Gamble and Alfred B. Kittredge.
Tennessee—William B. Bate and Edward W. Carmack.
Texas—Joseph W. Bailey and Charles A. Culberson.
Utah—Reed Smoot and George Sutherland.
Vermont—William P. Dillingham and Redfield Proctor.
Virginia—John W. Daniel and Thomas S. Martin.
Washington—Levi Ankeny and Samuel H. Piles.
West Virginia—Stephen B. Elkins and Nathan B. Scott.
Wisconsin—John C. Spooner.
Wyoming—Clarence D. Clark and Francis E. Warren.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Sergeant-at-Arms will now execute the order of the Senate for the inauguration of the President of the United States.

The President-elect, Theodore Roosevelt, accompanied by the Chief Justice of the United States, the Committees on Inaugural Ceremonies of the two Houses of Congress, the associate justices of the Supreme Court, and followed by the ambassadors and ministers of foreign countries, the members of the Senate, preceded by the Vice-President and Secretary, the Members of the House of Representatives, preceded by the Speaker and Clerk, the heads of Executive Departments, and the other guests of the Senate, proceeded to the inaugural platform at the east front of the Capitol.

The oath of office having been administered to the President-elect by the Chief Justice of the United States, he delivered the following

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

MY FELLOW-CITIZENS: No people on earth have more cause to be thankful than ours, and this is said reverently, in no spirit of boastfulness in our own strength, but with gratitude to the Giver of Good who has blessed us with the conditions which have enabled us to achieve so large a measure of well-being and of happiness. To us as a people it has been granted to lay the foundations of our national life in a new continent. We are the heirs of the ages, and yet we have had to pay few of the penalties which in old countries are exacted by the dead hand of a bygone civilization. We have not been obliged to fight for our existence against any alien race; and yet our life has called for the vigor and effort without which the manlier and hardier virtues wither away. Under such conditions it would be our own fault if we failed; and the success which we have had in the past, the success which we confidently believe the future will bring, should cause in us no feeling of vainglory, but rather a deep and abiding realization of all which life has offered us; a full acknowledgment of the responsibility which is ours; and a fixed determination to show that under a free government a mighty people can thrive best, alike as regards the things of the body and the things of the soul.

Much has been given to us, and much will rightfully be expected from us. We have duties to others and duties to ourselves; and we can shirk neither. We have become a great nation, forced by the fact of its greatness into relations with the other nations of the earth, and we must behave as beseems a people with such responsibilities. Toward all other nations, large and small, our attitude must be one of cordial and sincere friendship. We must show not only in our words, but in our deeds that we are earnestly desirous of securing their good will by acting toward them in a spirit of just and generous recognition of all their rights. But justice and generosity in a nation, as in an individual, count most when shown not by the weak but by the strong. While ever careful to refrain from wronging others, we must be no less insistent that we are not wronged ourselves. We wish peace, but we wish the peace of justice, the peace of righteousness. We wish it because we think it is right and not because we are afraid. No weak nation that acts manfully and justly should ever have cause to fear us, and no strong power should ever be able to single us out as a subject for insolent aggression.

Our relations with the other powers of the world are important; but still more important are our relations among ourselves. Such growth in wealth, in population, and in power as this nation has seen during the century and a quarter of its national life is inevitably accompanied by a like growth in the problems which are ever before every nation that rises to greatness. Power invariably means both responsibility and danger. Our forefathers faced certain perils which we have outgrown. We now face other perils, the very existence of which it was impossible that they should foresee. Modern life is both complex and intense, and the tremendous changes wrought by the extraordinary industrial development of the last half century are felt in every fiber of our social and political being. Never before have men tried so vast and formidable an experiment as that of administering the affairs of a continent under the forms of a democratic republic. The conditions which have told for our marvelous, material well-being, which have developed to a very high degree our energy, self-reliance, and individual initiative, have also brought the care and anxiety inseparable from the accumulation of great wealth in industrial centers. Upon the success of our experiment much depends, not only as regards our own welfare, but as regards the welfare of mankind. If we fail, the cause of free self-government throughout the world will rock to its foundations, and therefore our responsibility is heavy, to ourselves, to the world as it is to-day, and to the generations yet unborn. There is no good reason why we should fear the future, but there is every reason why we should face it seriously, neither hiding from ourselves the gravity of the problems before us nor fearing to approach these problems with the unbending, unflinching purpose to solve them aright.

Yet, after all, though the problems are new, though the tasks set before us differ from the tasks set before our fathers who founded and preserved this Republic, the spirit in which these tasks must be undertaken and these problems faced, if our duty is to be well done, remains essentially unchanged. We know that self-government is difficult. We know that no people needs such high traits of character as that people which seeks to govern its affairs aright through the freely expressed will of the freemen who compose it. But we have faith that we shall not prove

false to the memories of the men of the mighty past. They did their work, they left us the splendid heritage we now enjoy. We in our turn have an assured confidence that we shall be able to leave this heritage unwasted and enlarged to our children and our children's children. To do so we must show, not merely in great crises, but in the everyday affairs of life, the qualities of practical intelligence, of courage, of hardihood, and endurance, and above all the power of devotion to a lofty ideal, which made great the men who founded this Republic in the days of Washington, which made great the men who preserved this Republic in the days of Abraham Lincoln.

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., and the President pro tempore took the chair.

HOUR OF MEETING.

On motion of Mr. ALLISON, it was

Ordered, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian, until otherwise ordered.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 6, 1905, at 12 o'clock m.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *March 6, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Chair to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of the Senate is assembled, and that the Senate is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed Mr. ALLISON and Mr. GORMAN as the committee.

RECESS.

Mr. FORAKER. I move that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 1 o'clock p. m., at which hour it reassembled.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. ALLISON and Mr. GORMAN, the committee appointed to wait upon the President of the United States, appeared; and

Mr. ALLISON said: Mr. President, the committee appointed to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make have performed that duty, and the President in reply informed us that he would immediately communicate to the Senate in writing.

[Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of the secretaries of the President of the United States, communicated to the Senate several messages in writing.]

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and twenty-six minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 7, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 6, 1905.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

John Hay, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of State. (Reappointment.)

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Leslie M. Shaw, of Iowa, to be Secretary of the Treasury. (Reappointment.)

SECRETARY OF WAR.

William H. Taft, of Ohio, to be Secretary of War. (Reappointment.)

ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

William H. Moody, of Massachusetts, to be Attorney-General. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

George B. Cortelyou, of New York, to be Postmaster-General, vice Robert J. Wynne, resigned.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Paul Morton, of Illinois, to be Secretary of the Navy. (Reappointment.)

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Ethan A. Hitchcock, of Missouri, to be Secretary of the Interior. (Reappointment.)

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

James Wilson, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Agriculture. (Reappointment.)

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Victor H. Metcalf, of California, to be Secretary of Commerce and Labor. (Reappointment.)

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

Francis M. Cockrell, of Missouri, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term ending January 12, 1911, vice James D. Yeomans, resigned.

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Whitelaw Reid, of New York, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Great Britain, vice Joseph H. Choate, resigned.

Robert S. McCormick, of Illinois, now ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Russia, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to France, vice Horace Porter, resigned.

George v. L. Meyer, of Massachusetts, now ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Italy, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Russia, vice Robert S. McCormick, nominated to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to France.

Edwin H. Conger, of Iowa, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to China, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Mexico, vice Powell Clayton, resigned.

Henry White, of Rhode Island, now secretary of the embassy at London, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Italy, vice George v. L. Meyer, nominated to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Russia.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

William Woodville Rockhill, of the District of Columbia, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to China, vice Edwin H. Conger, nominated to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Mexico.

David J. Hill, of New York, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Switzerland, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to the Netherlands, vice Stanford Newell, resigned.

Henry Lane Wilson, of Washington, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Chile, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Belgium, vice Lawrence Townsend, resigned.

William Miller Collier, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Spain, vice Arthur S. Hardy, resigned.

Brutus J. Clay, of Kentucky, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Switzerland, vice David J. Hill, nominated to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Netherlands.

Thomas J. O'Brien, of Michigan, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Denmark, vice Laurits S. Swenson, resigned.

Samuel R. Gummeré, of New Jersey, now consul-general at Tangier, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Morocco, to fill an original vacancy.

Charles H. Graves, of Minnesota, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Sweden and Norway, vice William W. Thomas, resigned.

Edward C. O'Brien, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Paraguay and Uruguay, vice Wiliam R. Finch, resigned.

John B. Jackson, of New Jersey, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Greece, Roumania, and Servia, and diplomatic agent in Bulgaria, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Greece and Montenegro, and diplomatic agent in Bulgaria, to fill an original vacancy.

John W. Riddle, of Minnesota, now agent and consul-general at Cairo, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary

of the United States to Roumania and Servia, to fill an original vacancy.

CONSULS-GENERAL.

Robert J. Wynne, of Pennsylvania, to be consul-general of the United States at London, England, vice H. Clay Evans, resigned.

Frank H. Mason, of Ohio, now consul-general at Berlin, to be consul-general of the United States at Paris, France, vice John K. Gowdy, resigned.

T. St. John Gaffney, of New York, to be consul-general of the United States at Dresden, Saxony, vice Charles L. Cole, resigned.

Henry B. Miller, of Oregon, now consul-general at Niuchwang, to be consul-general of the United States at Yokohama, Japan, vice Edward C. Bellows, resigned.

J. Linn Rodgers, of Ohio, to be consul-general of the United States at Shanghai, China, vice John Goodnow, resigned.

Alexander M. Thackara, of Pennsylvania, now consul at Havre, to be consul-general of the United States at Berlin, Germany, vice Frank H. Mason, nominated to be consul-general at Paris.

Hoffman Philip, of New York, to be consul-general of the United States at Tangier, Morocco, vice Samuel R. Gummeré nominated to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Morocco.

Thomas Sammons, of Washington, to be consul-general of the United States at Niuchwang, China, vice Henry B. Miller, nominated to be consul-general at Yokohama.

Stanley Stoner, of Missouri, to be consul-general of the United States at Calcutta, India, vice Robert F. Patterson, resigned.

George W. Roosevelt, of Pennsylvania, now consul there, to be consul-general of the United States at Brussels, Belgium. A change in the grade of the office.

CONSULS.

Robert J. Thompson, of Illinois, to be consul of the United States at Cienfuegos, Cuba, vice Max J. Baehr, resigned.

Alphonse Gaulin, of Rhode Island, to be consul of the United States at Havre, France, vice Alexander M. Thackara, nominated to be consul-general at Berlin.

William R. Estes, of Minnesota, now consul at Antigua, to be consul of the United States at Solingen, Germany, vice Joseph J. Langer, resigned.

Francis B. Keene, of Wisconsin, now consul at Florence, to be consul of the United States at Milan, Italy, vice Harlan W. Brush, resigned.

John L. Griffiths, of Indiana, to be consul of the United States at Liverpool, England, vice James Boyle, resigned.

Frederic MacMaster, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Zanzibar, Zanzibar, vice Mason Mitchell, transferred to Campbellton, New Brunswick.

Clarence Rice Slocum, of New York, now consul at Warsaw, to be consul of the United States at Weimar, Germany, vice Thomas Ewing Moore, nominated to be secretary of the legation and consul-general to Roumania and Servia.

George B. Anderson, of the District of Columbia, now consul at Guadeloupe, to be consul of the United States at Antigua, West Indies, vice William R. Estes, nominated to be consul at Solingen.

George L. Dobson, of Iowa, to be consul of the United States at Nottingham, England, vice Frank W. Mahin, resigned.

Hunter Sharp, of North Carolina, to be consul of the United States at Kobé, Japan, vice Samuel S. Lyon, deceased.

Robert S. Chilton, jr., of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Toronto, Ontario, Canada, vice Edwin N. Gunsaulus, nominated to be consul at Cork.

Edwin N. Gunsaulus, of Ohio, now consul at Toronto, to be consul of the United States at Cork, Ireland, vice Daniel Swiney, resigned.

Thomas H. Norton, of Ohio, now consul at Harput, to be consul of the United States at Smyrna, Turkey, vice Rufus W. Lane, resigned.

John W. O'Hara, of Indiana, to be consul of the United States at Montevideo, Uruguay, vice John E. Hopley, resigned.

John B. Richardson, of Kansas, now consul at Utilla, to be consul of the United States at Port Deitrick, Nicaragua, to fill an original vacancy.

Oscar Malmros, of Minnesota, now consul at Colon, to be consul of the United States at Rouen, France, vice Thornwell Haynes, transferred to Vladivostock.

William W. Wedemeyer, of Michigan, to be consul of the United States at Georgetown, Demerara, Guiana, vice George H. Moulton, resigned.

Frederick M. Ryder, of Connecticut, to be consul of the United States at San Juan del Norte, Nicaragua, vice John Todd Hill, deceased.

Arthur J. Clare, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Barbados, West Indies, vice David F. Wilber, appointed consul-general at Singapore.

Robert Brent Mosher, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Collingwood, Ontario, Canada, vice William Small, resigned.

SOLICITOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Edward Walter Sims, of Illinois, to be Solicitor of the Department of Commerce and Labor, vice William Miller Collier.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Robert T. Devlin, of California, to be United States attorney for the northern district of California, vice Marshall B. Woodworth, whose term expired March 1, 1905.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES.

Joseph V. Quarles, of Wisconsin, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, vice William H. Seaman, appointed circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit.

James Wickersham, of Alaska, to be judge of the district court of the district of Alaska, and assign him to division No. 3. A reappointment, his term having expired June 5, 1904.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander John C. Wilson to be a captain in the Navy, from the 12th day of February, 1905, vice Capt. Thomas H. Stevens, retired.

Commander George P. Colvocoresses to be a captain in the Navy, from the 21st day of February, 1905, vice Capt. Albert S. Snow, promoted.

Commander Uriah R. Harris to be a captain in the Navy, from the 21st day of February, 1905, vice Capt. George P. Colvocoresses, an additional number in grade.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Francis S. Nash to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 23d day of February, 1905, to take rank next after Surg. Henry B. Fitts, and to be an additional number in grade, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 23, 1905.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

First Lieut. Macker Babb to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of October, 1903, vice Capt. Robert M. Gilson, resigned.

First Lieut. Samuel A. W. Patterson to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of November, 1903, vice First Lieut. George H. Mather, who failed to qualify for promotion and was suspended for one year.

First Lieut. Herbert J. Hirshinger to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of December, 1903, vice First Lieut. Leof M. Harding, who failed to qualify for promotion and was suspended for one year.

Lieut. Col. William P. Biddle to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of February, 1905, vice Col. Percival C. Pope, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 6, 1905.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

John Hay, of the District of Columbia.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

Leslie M. Shaw, of Iowa.

SECRETARY OF WAR.

William H. Taft, of Ohio.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

William H. Moody, of Massachusetts.

POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

George B. Cortelyou, of New York.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Paul Morton, of Illinois.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Ethan A. Hitchcock, of Missouri.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

James Wilson, of Iowa.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Victor H. Metcalf, of California.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

Francis M. Cockrell, of Missouri.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Joseph V. Quarles, of Wisconsin, for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *March 7, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. BURROWS. The Journal is very brief. Let it be read.

Mr. PENROSE. I understand there is a message from the President of the United States in the Journal. I withdraw the request, however.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. When there is objection, the Journal must be read.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal; and it was approved.

A message in writing was received from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

Mr. FRYE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Will the Senator from Maine withdraw the motion for a moment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. FRYE. I will yield to the Senator.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion is withdrawn.

RULE FOR PRESENTATION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that, in accordance with the provision of Rule XI, I propose to move an amendment to the rules, which will modify Rule VII. For that purpose I submit the following resolution and ask that it be read, printed, and referred to the Committee on Rules.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota submits a resolution, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the Senate be amended by adding thereto the followng:

"Senators having petitions or memorials or bills of a private nature to present may deliver them to the Secretary of the Senate, indorsing upon them their name and the reference or disposition to be made thereof; and said petitions, memorials, and bills of a private nature shall, with the approval of the Presiding Officer, be entered on the Journal with the names of the Senators presenting them, and the Secretary of the Senate shall furnish a transcript of such entries to the Official Reporter of Debates for publication in the RECORD. Reports of private pension bills from the Committee on Pensions may be delivered to the Secretary of the Senate and by him, with the approval of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, be placed upon the Calendar and entered on the Journal with the names of the Senators reporting them, and the Secretary of the Senate shall furnish a transcript of such entries to the Official Reporter of Debates for publication in the RECORD."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules, and printed.

Mr. BAILEY. If we could have unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota did not ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. BAILEY. But if it could be obtained——

Mr. LODGE. Under the rule, notice has to be given of an amendment of the rules.

Mr. BAILEY. Unanimous consent, of course, could suspend that in this, as in all other cases.

Mr. LODGE. Of course.

Mr. BAILEY. Having served in the other House, where the proposed rule prevails, I have found it so satisfactory that I hope to see it adopted by the Senate, still reserving to every Senator the right to present memorials and petitions, and to introduce bills according to the present practice whenever he desired to follow it.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. This is merely permissive in its terms.

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly. I venture to say that if that could be made a part of our rules, within twelve months Senators would only take the floor for the purpose of introducing important matters.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Precisely. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. BAILEY. If this amendment is carefully drawn, and I have no doubt it is, it ought to be adopted at once, and without debate or objection.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. FRYE. I renew my motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 8, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 7, 1905.

PROMOTIONS IN THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

William Phillips, of Massachusetts, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States at Peking, China, vice Henry P. Fletcher, nominated to be secretary of the legation at Lisbon.

Thomas Ewing Moore, of the District of Columbia, now consul at Weimar, to be secretary of legation and consul-general of the United States to Roumania and Servia, to fill an original vacancy.

Henry P. Fletcher, of Pennsylvania, now second secretary of the legation at Peking, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Lisbon, Portugal, vice William Blumenthal, nominated to be third secretary of the embassy at Paris.

Charles S. Wilson, of Maine, now secretary of legation to Greece, Roumania, and Servia, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to Greece and Montenegro and of the diplomatic agency in Bulgaria, with residence at Athens, to fill an original vacancy.

William Blumenthal, of New York, now secretary of the legation at Lisbon, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at Paris, France, vice Lewis Einstein, nominated to be third secretary of the embassy at London.

Lewis Einstein, of New York, now third secretary of the embassy at Paris, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at London, England, vice Craig W. Wadsworth, nominated to be second secretary of the embassy at London.

Craig W. Wadsworth, of New York, now third secretary of the embassy, to be second secretary of the embassy of the United States at London, England, vice John Ridgely Carter, nominated to be secretary of the embassy at that place.

John Ridgely Carter, of Maryland, now second secretary of the embassy, to be secretary of the embassy of the United States at London, England, vice Henry White, nominated to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Italy.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Alston G. Dayton, of West Virginia, to be United States district judge for the northern district of West Virginia, vice John J. Jackson, whose resignation has been accepted to take effect March 15, 1905.

TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

Charles H. Treat, of New York, to be Treasurer of the United States, to succeed Ellis H. Roberts, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Charles W. Anderson, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of New York, to succeed Charles H. Treat, resigned.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Jerome Martin, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Las Cruces, N. Mex., vice Nicholas Galles, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE PORTO RICO PROVISIONAL REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants with rank from March 3, 1905.

Henry C. Rexach, of Porto Rico.
Pedro Juan Parra, of Porto Rico.
Eduardo Iriarte, of Porto Rico.
Teofilo Marxuach, of Porto Rico.
Eugenio Carlos de Hostos, of Porto Rico.
Louis S. Emmanuelli, of Porto Rico.
Pascual Lopez, of Porto Rico.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Samuel B. Thomas to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1905, to fill a vacancy created in that grade by the act of Congress approved March 3, 1903.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clark H. Woodward to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 28th day of December, 1904, vice Lieut. Glennie Tarbox, promoted.

LIST OF OFFICES TO WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE MADE AND NOT CONFIRMED AND FILLED DURING THE THIRD SESSION OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, ENDING MARCH 4, 1905.

Consul-general of the United States at Buenos Aires, Argentine Republic.—Person nominated, Daniel Mayer.

Consul of the United States at Windsor, Ontario, Canada.—Person nominated, Roland J. Hemmick.

Judge of the district court of the district of Alaska.—Person nominated, James Wickersham.

United States district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.—Person nominated, Joseph V. Quarles.

POSTMASTERS.

At Fort Payne, Ala., Robert W. Frazier.
At Brewton, Ala., George F. Schad.
At Mountain View, Cal., George S. Parkinson.
At Jefferson, Ga., J. B. Dunagan.
At Burnside, Ky., J. L. Grissom.
At South St. Joseph, Mo., William M. Tygart.
At Northeast, Pa., Perry A. Sandborn.
At Commerce, Tex., Dallas Harbert.
At Dallas, Tex., D. A. Robinson.
At Hubbard, Tex., G. W. Cash.
At Blacksburg, Va., William C. Ellett.
At Vancouver, Wash., Daniel Crowley.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *March 8, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

A. H. LAZARE.

Mr. BLACKBURN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested to reopen the claim of A. H. Lazare against the Republic of Haiti.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and twenty-eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 9, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8, 1905.

FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

Frank H. Hitchcock, of Massachusetts, to be First Assistant Postmaster-General.

CONSULS.

Arthur J. Clare, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Barbados, West Indies, vice David F. Wilber, appointed consul-general at Singapore. This nomination is to be substituted for the nomination of Mr. Clare which was sent to the Senate on the 6th instant.

Jerome A. Quay, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Florence, Italy, vice Francis B. Keene, nominated to be consul at Milan.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

Paul Grand d'Hauteville, of Rhode Island, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Berne, Switzerland, vice Roger Sherman Gates Boutell, nominated to be secretary of legation at The Hague.

Roger Sherman Gates Boutell, of Illinois, now secretary of legation at Berne, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at The Hague, Netherlands, vice John W. Garrett, nominated to be third secretary of the embassy at St. Petersburg.

THIRD SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

John W. Garrett, of Maryland, now secretary of legation at The Hague, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at St. Petersburg, Russia, to fill an original vacancy.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Lawrence Bailliere, of Maryland, to be collector of customs for the district of Annapolis, in the State of Maryland, to succeed John K. Gladden, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY—CAVALRY ARM.

First Lieut. Ward B. Pershing, Fourth Cavalry, to be captain with rank from March 6, 1905, vice Livermore, Tenth Cavalry, retired from active service.

APPOINTMENT UPON THE RETIRED LIST OF THE ARMY WITH THE RANK OF BRIGADIER-GENERAL.

Joseph R. Hawley, formerly a brigadier-general and brevet major-general of volunteers during the civil war.

Peter Josef Osterhaus, formerly a major-general of volunteers during the civil war.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1905.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Joseph R. Hawley to be brigadier-general on the retired list.

AMBASSADORS.

Whitelaw Reid, of New York, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Great Britain.

Robert S. McCormick, of Illinois, now ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Russia, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to France.

George v. L. Meyer, of Massachusetts, now ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Italy, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Russia.

Edwin H. Conger, of Iowa, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to China, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Mexico.

Henry White, of Rhode Island, now secretary of the embassy at London, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States to Italy.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

William Woodville Rockhill, of the District of Columbia, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to China.

David J. Hill, of New York, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Switzerland, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to the Netherlands.

Henry Lane Wilson, of Washington, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Chile, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Belgium.

William Miller Collier, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Spain.

Brutus J. Clay, of Kentucky, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Switzerland.

Thomas J. O'Brien, of Michigan, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Denmark.

Charles H. Graves, of Minnesota, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Sweden and Norway.

Edward C. O'Brien, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Paraguay and Uruguay.

John B. Jackson, of New Jersey, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Greece and Montenegro, and diplomatic agent in Bulgaria.

John W. Riddle, of Minnesota, now agent and consul-general at Cairo, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Roumania and Servia.

Samuel R. Gummeré, of New Jersey, now consul-general at Tangier, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Morocco.

CONSULS-GENERAL.

Robert J. Wynne, of Pennsylvania, to be consul-general of the United States at London, England.

Frank H. Mason, of Ohio, now consul-general at Berlin, to be consul-general of the United States at Paris, France.

Hoffman Philip, of New York, to be consul-general of the United States at Tangier, Morocco.

J. Linn Rodgers, of Ohio, to be consul-general of the United States at Shanghai, China.

CONSULS.

Robert J. Thompson, of Illinois, to be consul of the United States at Cienfuegos, Cuba.

William W. Wedemeyer, of Michigan, to be consul of the United States at Georgetown, Demerara, Guiana.

Frederick M. Ryder, of Connecticut, to be consul of the United States at San Juan del Norte, Nicaragua.

Thomas H. Norton, of Ohio, now consul at Harput, to be consul of the United States at Smyrna, Turkey.

John B. Richardson, of Kansas, now consul at Utilla, to be consul of the United States at Port Deitrick, Nicaragua.

Oscar Malmros, of Minnesota, now consul at Colon, to be consul of the United States at Rouen, France.

Edwin N. Gunsaulus, of Ohio, now consul at Toronto, to be consul of the United States at Cork, Ireland.

John L. Griffiths, of Indiana, to be consul of the United States at Liverpool, England.

Frederic MacMaster, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Zanzibar, Zanzibar.

Clarence Rice Slocum, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Weimar, Germany.

Francis B. Keene, of Wisconsin, to be consul of the United States at Milan, Italy.

Alphonse Gaulin, of Rhode Island, to be consul of the United States at Havre, France.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander John C. Wilson to be a captain in the Navy, from the 12th day of February, 1905.

Commander George P. Colvocoresses to be a captain in the Navy, from the 21st day of February, 1905.

Commander Uriah R. Harris to be a captain in the Navy, from the 21st day of February, 1905.

First Lieut. Macker Babb to be a captain in the Marine Corps, from the 30th day of October, 1903.

First Lieut. Samuel A. W. Patterson to be a captain in the Marine Corps, from the 28th day of November, 1903.

First Lieut. Herbert J. Hirshinger to be a captain in the Marine Corps, from the 7th day of December, 1903.

Lieut. Col. William P. Biddle to be a colonel in the Marine Corps, from the 28th day of February, 1905.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Francis S. Nash to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 23d day of February, 1905, to take rank next after Surg. Henry B. Fitts, and to be an additional number in grade, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 23, 1905.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Robert T. Devlin, of California, to be United States attorney for the northern district of California.

AFFAIRS IN SANTO DOMINGO.

The injunction of secrecy was removed March 8, 1905, from the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate:

I wish to call the attention of the Senate at this executive session to the treaty with Santo Domingo. I feel that I ought to state to the Senate that the condition of affairs in Santo Domingo is such that it is very much for the interest of that Republic that action on the treaty should be had at as early a moment as the Senate, after giving the matter full consideration, may find practicable.

I call attention to the following facts:

1. This treaty was entered into at the earnest request of Santo Domingo itself, and is designed to afford Santo Domingo relief and assistance. Its primary benefit will be to Santo Domingo. It offers the method most likely to secure peace and to prevent war in the island.

2. The benefit to the United States will consist chiefly in the tendency under the treaty to secure stability, order, and prosperity in Santo Domingo, and the removal of the apprehension lest foreign powers make aggressions on Santo Domingo in the course of collecting claims due their citizens; for it is greatly to our interest that all the islands in the Caribbean Sea should enjoy peace and prosperity and feel good will toward this country. The benefit to honest creditors will come from the fact that for the first time under this treaty a practicable method of attempting to settle the debts due them will be inaugurated.

3. Many of the debts alleged to be due from Santo Domingo to outside creditors unquestionably on their face represent far more money than ever was actually given Santo Domingo. The proposed treaty provides for a process by which impartial experts will determine what debts are valid and what are in whole or in part invalid, and will apportion accordingly the surplus revenue available for the payment of the debts. This treaty offers the only method for preventing the collection of fraudulent debts, whether owed to Americans or to citizens of other nations.

4. This treaty affords the most practicable means of obtaining payment for the just claims of American citizens.

5. If the treaty is ratified, creditors belonging to other nations will have exactly as good treatment as creditors who are citizens of the United States, and at the same time Santo Domingo will be protected against unjust and exorbitant claims. If it is not ratified, the chances are that American creditors will fare ill as compared with those of other nations; for foreign nations, being denied the opportuntiy to get what is rightfully due their citizens under the proposed arrangement, will be left to collect the debts due their citizens as they see fit, provided, of course, there is not permanent occupancy of Dominican territory. As in such case the United States will have nothing to say as to what debts should or should not be collected, and as Santo Domingo will be left without aid, assistance, or protection, it is impossible to state that the sums collected from it will not be improper in amount. In such event, whatever is collected by means of forcible intervention will be applied to the creditors of foreign nations in preference to creditors who are citizens of the United States.

6. The correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Minister of Haiti, submitted to the Senate several days ago, shows that our position is explicitly and unreservedly that under no circumstances do we intend to acquire territory in or possession of either Haiti or Santo Domingo, it being stated in these letters that even if the two republics desired to become a part of the United States the United States would certainly refuse its assent.

7. Santo Domingo grievously needs the aid of a powerful and friendly nation. This aid we are able, and I trust that we are willing, to bestow. She has asked for this aid, and the expressions of friendship, repeatedly sanctioned by the people and the Government of the United States, warrant her in believing that it will not be withheld in the hour of her need.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 6, 1905.*

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *March 9, 1905.*

Prayer by Rev. ULYSSES G. B. PIERCE, of the city of Washington.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

DEATH OF SENATOR WILLIAM B. BATE.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, owing to the absence of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK], I am charged with the sad duty of announcing to the Senate the death of Hon. WILLIAM B. BATE, late a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

Mr. BATE died at his rooms at the Ebbitt House, in this city, at 6 o'clock this morning. The end came unexpectedly to his family and friends, after a very brief illness.

Mr. President, this is not the time for eulogy, but I may add that he met the dread messenger with the same calmness and Christian fortitude that characterized his conduct throughout a long and eventful career.

Mr. President, I offer the following resolutions, for which I ask present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland submits resolutions, and asks that they be presently considered. The Secretary will read the resolutions.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM B. BATE, late a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

Resolved, That a committee of twelve Senators be appointed by the Vice-President to take order for superintending the funeral of Mr. BATE, which shall take place in the Senate Chamber at 2 o'clock p. m. on Friday, March 10, instant, and that the Senate will attend the same.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect his remains be removed from Washington to Nashville, Tenn., for burial, in charge of the Sergeant-at-Arms, attended by the committee, who shall have full power to carry these resolutions into effect, and that the Sergeant-at-Arms be directed to invite the Representatives from the State of Tennessee to join the committee appointed by the Senate to escort the remains of the deceased to his place of burial.

Resolved, That invitations be extended to the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, the Chief Justice and associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the diplomatic corps (through the Secretary of State), and such Members of the House of Representatives as may be in the city of Washington, the Admiral of the Navy, and the Chief of Staff of the Army to attend the funeral in the Senate Chamber.

The resolutions were considered by unanimous consent and unanimously agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT, under the second resolution, appointed as the committee Mr. CARMACK, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. PROCTOR, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. ALGER, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BERRY, Mr. FORAKER, Mr. MALLORY, Mr. SPOONER, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. MALLORY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, March 10, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1905.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

Thomas Sammons, of Washington, to be consul-general of the United States at Niuchwang, China.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *March 10, 1905.*

Prayer by Rev. ULYSSES G. B. PIERCE, of the city of Washington.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reading of the Journal will be dispensed with. It stands approved.

COMMITTEE ON FUNERAL CEREMONIES.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] requested me to ask that he be relieved from service on the special committee to accompany the remains of the late Senator from Tennessee to Nashville, and it is suggested that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS] be appointed in his place. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] also desires to be relieved from service upon the committee, and it is suggested that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] be appointed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Kentucky desiring to be excused, the Chair appoints the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN].

[A message in writing from the President of the United States was delivered to the Senate by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries.]

FUNERAL EXPENSES.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay the necessary expenses in connection with the funeral of Hon. WILLIAM B. BATE, late a Senator from the State of Tennessee, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the foregoing resolution without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

INDEBTEDNESS OF DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following paper; which was ordered to be printed as a document and in the RECORD:

[From the Thirty-first Annual Report of the Council of the Corporation of Foreign Bondholders (established under special license of the Board of Trade August, 1873; incorporated by act of Parliament July, 1898), for the year 1903–4. Issued August, 1904.]

SANTO DOMINGO.

Obligations or de St. Domingue 2½ per cent (Brussels issue)[a]	£2,736,750
Dominican unified 4 per cent bonds[a]	[b]1,148,600
	3,885,350

[a] The interest on these loans went into default on April 1, 1899. On November 4, 1901, the coupon due October 1, 1901, was paid at the rate of 4 francs, and in February, 1903, the coupon due April, 1902, at 3.85 francs per £20 bond to holders accepting the settlement negotiated by the French and Belgian committees (see history of the debt below). The council are not aware of the amount of bonds upon which this payment was made.

[b] The authorized issue was £1,500,000, of which amount it is stated that £351,400 has been canceled. It is also understood that there are outstanding about £300,000 "French-American reclamation consols," which have not been presented for exchange into scrip of the 4 per cent unified loan.

Santo Domingo Committee.—Rt. Hon. Lord Avebury, chairman; Hon. Sir C. W. Fremantle, K. C. B.; P. Galindez, esq.; T. E. Hurst Hodgson, esq.; W. Johnson, esq.; J. Sorley, esq.; W. Trotter, esq.; Gen. Sir Luther Vaughan, K. C. B.; V. Watney, esq.; T. Wood, esq.; James P. Cooper, esq., secretary.

Area, 18,045 square miles.

Population (1888), estimated at 610,000.

Capital, Santo Domingo (population, 1892, 14,150).

External debt per head (exclusive of arrears), £6 7s. 5d.

President of the Provisional Government, Don Carlos F. Morales.

Consul-general of Great Britain to Santo Domingo, resident at Port au Prince, Hayti, Arthur G. Vansittart, esq.

Consul-general of Santo Domingo in Great Britain, Don Miguel Ventura.

HISTORY OF THE DEBT (FOREIGN).

1869.—Six per cent loan for £757,700. The Government of Santo Domingo entered into a contract with Mr. E. H. Hartmont, by which the latter agreed to provide a sum of £420,000 for the construction of roads and railways, of which £100,000 was to be retained by him as compensation, the nominal amount of the loan to be fixed by the contractor. The Government on their part undertook to pay, for the service of the interest and sinking fund, an annuity of £58,900 in half-yearly installments for twenty-five years, or a total of £1,472,500. Messrs. Peter Lawson & Co., acting for Mr. Hartmont, accordingly issued in London £757,700 in bonds secured upon a first charge on the customs duties of the ports of Santo Domingo and Puerto Plata, the Guano royalties, and the revenues arising from the forests and mines of the province of Samana.

The bonds were redeemable in twenty-five years by a 1¾ per cent accumulative sinking fund. The issue price was 70 per cent, but at this price the loan received little support from the public, and was subsequently disposed of, at rates ranging from 55 to 50 per cent, to Messrs. Bischoffsheim & Goldschmidt and others, by whom they were later disposed of to the public. The Government only acknowledges receipt of £38,000. Mr. Hartmont, however, asserted that he tendered personally to the Government £211,110, but that it was not accepted, owing to negotiations for annexation in progress at that time with the United States. Interest on this loan was paid for three years, but it was stated that these payments were made by the contractor and not by the Government.

1872.—Default took place, and the loan became, in 1875, the subject of a parliamentary inquiry.

1888.—Six per cent loan for £770,000 for the conversion of the 1869 loan, for which £142,860 was reserved, and the consolidation of the internal debt, which required £151,660. The balance of £475,480 was offered for public subscription at 83½ per cent by the Capital and Counties Bank and by agencies on the Continent. The bonds were secured by a first charge on the entire revenues of the Republic, including a special charge on the customs revenues, and were redeemable in thirty years by half-yearly drawings.

The terms for the conversion of the 1869 loan were £20 of the new stock in exchange for £100 of the old. Bonds to the nominal amount of £591,900 were exchanged by the Capital and Counties Bank. Bonds which had been drawn for redemption but which had remained unpaid, as well as bonds from which coupons were missing, were excluded from the conversion. The council at the time addressed a remonstrance to the government on this point, but without effect. (See below, 1897 and 1899.)

1890.—Six per cent Central Dominican Railway loan. Authorized issue, £900,000. Of this amount £575,000 bonds were offered for subscription on the Continent at 77 per cent in November, 1890. Few bonds, if any, are held in England. The objects of the loan were to develop the internal resources of the country, to form a reserve fund, to extinguish the internal floating debt, and to build a railway from Puerto Plata to Santiago. The loan was guaranteed generally by the government, and specially by (1) an annual subvention of £24,000 during fifty-six years; (2) the receipts on the first section of the line, and a mortgage on the second section and rolling stock.

1892.—Default took place on the external loans of 1888 and 1890.

1893.—A new 4 per cent consolidated gold debt for £2,035,000 was created, to be applied to the conversion of the 6 per cent loans of 1888 and 1890 (the outstanding amounts being £731,000 and £571,000, respectively), with arrears of interest amounting to 12 per cent, the whole to be converted at par. This, with expenses, absorbed £1,610,000 of the new stock, and the balance, viz, £425,000, was to be applied to completing the construction of the first section of the Central Dominican Railway.

The new bonds were redeemable in sixty-six years, with an accumulative sinking fund of one-half of 1 per cent per annum,

and the loan was guaranteed by the whole of the customs duties of the Republic (less $93,000 per month to be retained by the Government for administrative expenses) and by a first mortgag on the line and its revenues and accessories. The collection of the customs dues was vested in a regie, controlled by the San Domingo Improvement Company, of New York. By the terms of the arrangement it was provided that should any suspension take place in the service of the loan, a financial commission, composed of representatives nominated by the Governments of Great Britain, the United States, France, Belgium, and Holland, was to be appointed forthwith to collect and distribute the above-mentioned dues.

1895.—Four per cent loan denominated "French-American reclamation consols." Authorized issue, $4,250,000 (£850,000). Of this amount $1,000,000 (£200,000) was publicly issued in Paris by the Banque Nationale de St. Dominigue at 302 francs per 515 francs bond (58.64 per cent). These bonds were redeemable at par in sixty-six years by means of a sinking fund of one-half per cent. The service was to be a first charge on the budget, and was secured on certain port dues and import duties, any deficiency to be made up by the Government out of general revenue. As in the case of the 1893 loan, in the event of a default, an international commission was to be appointed to collect and distribute the above-mentioned revenues.

1897.—The coupons due January 1 on the 1893 bonds were not paid owing to the regie not having received sufficient funds for the purpose.

A new arrangement was made during the year under which the bonds of 1893 and 1895 were converted into a new unified loan for £4,236,750, divided into £1,500,000 4 per cent bonds and £2,736,750 2¾ per cent bonds, apportioned as follows: £850,000 4 per cent bonds to the conversion at par of the French-American reclamation consols and £2,136,750 2¾ per cent bonds to the conversion of the 1893 bonds, with interest in arrear up to October 1, 1897, at par, the balance of the new issue to be applied to the conversion of the foreign and domestic floating debts of the Republic and to the expenses of the operation.

Both classes of bonds to be secured by a first charge on the general customs duties of the Republic and the special revenues assigned to the various debts included in the arrangement. These revenues to be collected by the régie under conditions similar to those above specified in the case of the 1893 and 1895 loans. The 4 per cent bonds were redeemable not later than October 1, 1980, and the 2¾ per cent bonds by October 1, 1999, by an accumulative sinking fund commencing October 1, 1901.

If the assigned revenues exceeded in any year the sum of £325,000 the surplus up to £34,200 to go to increase of interest on the 2¾ per cent bonds up to 4 per cent. Any further surplus to be applied to amortization of the same bonds up to a maximum of £6,495 per annum. Of the above issue £1,500,000 4 per cent unified bonds were offered to the public at 66. (In 1901 £351,400 of the unified bonds were canceled and returned to the Government.)

An arrangement was also made between the council and the St. Domingo Improvement Company for the settlement of the claims of the 1869 bondholders excluded from the conversion of 1888. The outstanding bonds of 1888 were also to be converted into bonds of the 1897 issue.

1899.—Default was made by the improvement company in the payment of the interest due April 1, 1899.

The bill given by the company for the settlement of the claims of the 1869 bondholders, in accordance with the arrangement made with the council on their behalf, were not paid at maturity, and the 1897 bonds to be given in exchange for the outstanding 1888 bonds were not delivered.

1900.—In March, 1900, an arrangement was made between the Government of Santo Domingo and the improvement company for the settlement of the debt. This arrangement provided for the funding of the interest on the 2¾ per cent and 4 per cent bonds of 1897 up to April 1, 1903, scrip certificates to be issued in exchange, bearing 4 per cent interest from January 1, 1901.

The interest on the 2¾ per cent bonds to be fixed at 3 per cent from October 1, 1899.

The 4 per cent unified bonds belonging to the Government (about £350,000) to be canceled.

From April 1, 1900, to April 1, 1903, the customs revenues up to the amount of $2,000,000 gold annually (exclusive of the export duties assigned to the redemption of bank notes) to be divided and applied as follows: 49 per cent to the budget; 3 per cent to the expenses of collection; 5 per cent to the payment of special "apartados."

The 43 per cent remaining to be apportioned as follows during the first year: 17 parts to the payment of the interior floating debt; 15 parts to the payment of the exterior floating debt contracted by the improvement company; 5 parts to the Government as an addition to the budget; 6 parts to the Government for the payment of claims and revolutionary expenses. During the second and third years the interior floating debt was to receive 21 parts, the exterior floating debt 16 parts, and the remaining 6 parts were to go to the payment of revolutionary expenses.

All existing securities and guaranties to the bondholders to be continued.

The Government, through the Régie, to cancel in three years the debased silver coinage and redeem the outstanding paper currency.

The improvement company to obtain the consent of a majority of the bondholders to the funding of the interest.

This arrangement fell through, as the improvement company were not able to obtain the requisite consent of a majority of the bondholders.

1901.—By a decree dated January 12, 1901, the Government of Santo Domingo took the collection of the revenues out of the hands of the improvement company. A commission was appointed by the Government to receive the proportion of the revenues assigned to the bondholders under the arrangement of March, 1900.

In June an arrangement was made with the French and Belgian bondholders, of which the following were the chief provisions:

1. The Government "during such time as the Dominican Republic is unable to settle in a favorable manner the existing financial crisis" to remit 15 per cent of the customs receipts, calculated on a minimum return of $2,000,000 gold per annum, for the service of the external debt, represented by the 4 per cent unified bonds and the 2¾ per cent obligations.

2. Identical interest, commencing on October 1, 1901, to be paid on both series of bonds.

3. The coupons due April 1, 1899, to April 1, 1901, to be redeemed by a payment of $50,000 gold.

4. Fifteen per cent of any possible excess over $2,000,000 gold in the customs receipts to be applied partly to interest and partly to amortization.

5. The service of the debt to be secured on the customs receipts of the port of Santo Domingo, and the associations representing the bondholders to appoint agents to receive the amounts due from the financial administration of that city.

6. A further 20 per cent of the customs receipts to be assigned to the payment of the floating debt and of the claims of the improvement company and its allied companies. On the extinction of one or the other of these descriptions of debt, the Government to apply the said 20 per cent to the integral payment of the service of the external debt.

The coupon due November 1, 1901, on bonds stamped as adhering to the Brussels arrangement was paid at the rate of 4 francs per £20 bond, but the next coupon went into default.

The above arrangement was not approved by the committee associated with the council, who declined to recommend the English bondholders to send in their bonds for stamping.

1903.—Under a protocol dated January 31, 1903, between the United States Government and the Government of Santo Domingo, it was arranged that the claims of the improvement company and its affiliated companies should be referred to international arbitration.

In February the coupon maturing April, 1902, on bonds whose holders had adhered to the Brussels arrangement of June, 1901, was paid at 3.85 francs per £20 bond.

1904.—In July the award in the above-mentioned arbitration was given. (See report below.)

REPORT.

In the council's annual report for last year only a summary was given of the terms of the protocol of January 31, 1903, providing for the reference to international arbitration of the matters in dispute between the Dominican Government and the improvement company. The full text of this important document is now appended:

Protocol of an agreement between the United States of America and the Dominican Republic, for the submission to arbitration of certain questions as to the payment of the sum hereinafter agreed to be paid by the Dominican Government to the Government of the United States on account of the claims of the San Domingo Improvement Company, of New York, a corporation under the laws of the State of New Jersey, and a citizen of the United States and its allied companies.

[Signed at Santo Domingo City, January 31, 1903.]

Whereas differences exist between the Dominican Government and the "San Domingo Improvement Company" and its allied companies; and

Whereas as the result of those differences the interests of the improvement company and its allied companies, viz, "The San

Domingo Finance Company, of New York," "The Company of the Central Dominican Railway," both being corporations created under the laws of New Jersey, and the National Bank of San Domingo, a company originally organized under a French charter, the two latter companies being owned and controlled by the San Domingo Finance Company, are seriously affected; and

Whereas it is agreed, as the basis of the present settlement, that the improvement company and its allied companies shall withdraw from the Dominican Republic, and that they shall be duly indemnified by the latter for the relinquishment of their rights, properties, and interests.

The United States of America and the Dominican Republic, through their respective representatives, W. F. Powell, chargé d'affaires, and Juan Fco. Sánchez, secretary of state for foreign relations, have agreed upon the following articles:

I. It being hereby agreed that the Dominican Government shall pay to the Government of the United States the sum of $4,500,000 (four million five hundred thousand dollars), in American gold, on terms to be fixed by the arbitrators, said payment to be made and accepted as full indemnity for the relinquishment by the companies above mentioned of all their rights, properties, and interests, and in full settlement of all accounts, claims, and differences between the Dominican Government and the said companies; the terms on which the indemnity thus agreed upon shall be paid shall be referred to a board of three arbitrators, one to be named by the President of the United States, one by the President of the Dominican Republic, and the third by the President of the United States and the President of the Dominican Republic jointly; but if within sixty days after the signature of the present protocol the third arbitrator shall not have been so named, he shall then be selected by the Dominican Government from members of the United States Supreme Court or the United States circuit court of appeals from names presented.

In case of the death, absence, or incapacity of any arbitrator, or in the event of his ceasing or omitting to act, the vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment, the period of sixty days to be calculated from the date of the happening of the vacancy.

II. The arbitrators shall meet in the city of Washington within sixty days after the date of the appointment of the third arbitrator.

The vote of the majority shall suffice for the decision of all questions submitted to the tribunal, including the final award.

III. Within six months after the signature of this protocol, each party shall present to the other and to its agent, and also to each of the arbitrators, two printed copies of its case, accompanied with the documents and evidence on which it relies, together with the affidavits of their respective witnesses.

Within a further period of two months either party may, in like manner, present a counter case, with additional documents and evidence and affidavits, in reply to the case, documents, and evidence of the other party.

If the other party shall in its case or counter case refer to any document in its exclusive possession without annexing a copy, it shall, upon the request of the other party, furnish the latter with a copy; and either party may call upon the other through the arbitrators to produce the originals or certified copies of any papers adduced as evidence.

IV. Within two months after the expiration of the term allowed for the filing of counter cases each Government may, by its agent, as well as by additional counsel, argue its cause before the arbitrators, both orally and in writing. Each side shall furnish to the other copies of any written arguments, and each party shall be at liberty to make a written reply, provided that such reply be submitted within the two months specified.

V. The companies above mentioned shall cede and transfer to the Dominican Government, and the latter shall acquire from the companies, the properties mentioned herein, the times, terms, and conditions of the delivery of which shall be fixed by the arbitrators:

1. All the rights and interests which they may possess in the section of the Central Dominican Railway already constructed as well as all rights and interests which they may have in the extension of the railways from Santiago to Moca and from Moca to San Francisco de Macoris.

2. All rights and interests which they may have in the National Bank.

3. All bonds of the Republic of which they may be the holders, the amount of which shall not exceed £850,000, nominal (eight hundred and fifty thousand sterling pounds, nominal), and shall be no less than £825,000 (eight hundred and twenty-five thousand sterling pounds, nominal).

It is understood that all these bonds are of the class bearing 4 per cent annual interests, excepting as to the £24,000 (twenty-four thousand sterling pounds) 2½ per cent bonds, which shall be accepted at the rate of sixteen 2½ per cent bonds for eleven 4 per cent bonds. A list of the bonds shall accompany the case of the United States.

VI. It is agreed, as the basis of the award to be made by the arbitrators, that the sum specified in Article I hereof shall be paid in monthly installments, the amount and manner of collection of which shall be fixed by the tribunal. The award shall bear interest from the date of its rendition at the rate of ———.

The Dominican Government having in its recent negotiations with the American companies proposed to pay on account of its indebtedness to them a minimum sum of $225,000 (two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars) per annum, which was to be increased on a sliding scale, it is agreed that the Dominican Government shall, pending the present arbitration and beginning with the 1st of January, 1903, pay to the Government of the United States for the use of the American companies the sum of $225,000 (two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars) per annum in equal monthly installments, the aggregate amount so paid at the date of the award to be taken into account by the arbitrators.

VII. The award of the tribunal shall be rendered within a year from the date of the signature of the present protocol. It shall be in writing, and shall be final and conclusive.

VIII. Reasonable compensation to the arbitrators for their services and all expenses incident to the arbitration, including the cost of such clerical aid as may be necessary, shall be paid by the Governments in equal moieties.

Done in quadruplicate, in English and Spanish, at San Domingo City, this thirty-first day of January, 1903.

[SEAL.] JNO. FCO. SÁNCHEZ,
Ministro de Relaciones Exteriores.

[SEAL.] W. F. POWELL,
Chargé d'Affaires.

AGREEMENT TO THE NAMING OF ARBITRATORS.

It is hereby agreed, on the part of the Dominican Government, through Juan Francisco Sánchez, secretary of state for foreign relations, and the chargé d'affaires of the United States of North America, in the person of W. F. Powell, each acting for his respective Government, that neither of the signatory parties to this protocol for international arbitration, to which has been referred certain disagreements existing between the Dominican Government on the one side and the Santo Domingo Improvement Company on the other, shall name its arbitrator as stated in said protocol, until after a period of ninety days from the date of signing the same, in order to allow the Dominican Government to come to an agreement with the Santo Domingo Improvement Company, and the date referred to in the appointment of the third arbitrator shall bear same as that expressed above.

To the above we agree, and with good faith to carry the same into effect have hereunto affixed our names and attached thereto the seals of our respective offices.

Done this thirty-first day of January, 1903.

[SEAL.] JNO. FCO. SÁNCHEZ,
Secretary of State for Foreign Relations of the Republic of San Domingo.

[SEAL.] W. F. POWELL,
Chargé d'Affaires of the United States of North America.

The Hon. J. G. Carlisle, having been named as arbitrator by the United States Government, and Señor M. de J. Galvan by the Dominican Government, the honorable Justice Gray was appointed umpire. Some delay occurred owing to further revolutionary troubles in the island, the government of Gen. Woss y Gil being overthrown by General Morales. The award of the arbitrators was delivered on the 14th of July.

The text of the award is as follows:

Award of the commission of arbitration under the provisions of the protocol of January 31, 1903, between the United States of America and the Dominican Republic, for the settlement of the claims of the San Domingo Improvement Company, of New York, and its allied companies.

Whereas by a protocol of agreement between the United States of America and the Dominican Republic, concluded at Santo Domingo City, January 31, 1903, it was agreed that the Dominican Government should pay to the Government of the United States the sum of four million five hundred thousand dollars ($4,500,000) in American gold, as full indemnity for the relinquishment by The San Domingo Improvement Company, of New York, The San Domingo Finance Company, of New York, The Company of the Central Dominican Railway, and the National Bank of San Domingo, of all their rights, properties, and interests, and in full settlement of all accounts, claims, and differences between the Dominican Government and the said companies, and that the terms on which the in-

demnity thus agreed upon should be paid should be referred to a board of three arbitrators, one to be named by the President of the United States, one by the President of the Dominican Republic, and the third by the President of the United States and the President of the Dominican Republic jointly, or, in case they should fail so to name him, by the President of the Dominican Republic from certain specified members of the United States Supreme Court or the United States circuit court of appeals:

Whereas for the purpose of carrying into effect the said protocol the undersigned arbitrators were appointed, viz: By the President of the United States, John G. Carlisle; by the President of Dominican Republic, Don Manuel de J. Galvan; and, as third arbitrator, by nomination of the President of the Dominican Republic, George Gray, one of the specified members of the United States circuit court of appeals; and

Whereas the said arbitrators, duly organized under the said protocol as a board of arbitration, have received and considered the cases and counter cases and the arguments filed thereunder by the contracting parties through their respective agents and counsel;

The board of arbitration does now adjudge and award, as the terms on which the indemnity above mentioned shall be paid, and the times, terms, and conditions on which the aforesaid company shall relinquish all their rights, properties, and interests mentioned in Article V of said protocol, and withdrawn from the Dominican Republic, thus constituting a full settlement of all accounts, claims, and differences between the Dominican Government and the said companies, the following:

ARTICLE 1.

TIME OF DELIVERY OF PROPERTIES.

(*a*) Within ninety days from the making of this award all rights and interests which the said companies have in the National Bank of San Domingo, consisting of six thousand three hundred and thirty-eight (6,338) shares of the capital stock thereof, shall be delivered by said companies to the Dominican Government on said Government giving to the companies a release by the bank of all claims against them.

(*b*) When the Dominican Government shall have paid the United States the sum of one million five hundred thousand dollars ($1,500,000), part of the said principal debt, the said companies shall deliver to the Dominican Government all the shares of the company of the Central Dominican Railway, which shall represent, include, and carry all the rights and interests in said railway referred to in paragraph 1 of Article V of said protocol, and will simultaneously deliver over the full possession of said railway, which shall be free of all debts, fixed or floating, of the said companies, and which shall be at least in as good condition, physically, as it now is, less wear and tear and damage by accident or acts of God or public disturbance or the foreign enemy.

The cost of restoring the railway from damage occurring in the meantime from any of such causes shall be first chargeable upon the net profits of the year, and any excess of such cost shall be paid by the Dominican Government out of its treasury in the same manner as hereinafter described in article 4.

If such payment of one million five hundred thousand dollars ($1,500,000), or any part thereof, shall be made by the Government, other than by the monthly installments hereinafter provided, such monthly installments shall, nevertheless, continue as herein provided.

(*c*) When the principal of said debt of four million five hundred thousand dollars ($4,500,000) shall have been reduced to two million seventy-six thousand six hundred and thirty-five dollars ($2,076,635), then shall begin the delivery of the bonds of the Dominican Republic, mentioned in paragraph 3 of Article V of the protocol, of the amount of eight hundred and thirty thousand six hundred and fifty-four pounds sterling (£830,654).

The bonds to be delivered shall not include any of the three hundred and fifty-one thousand four hundred pounds sterling (£351,400) of unified scrip admitted by the companies to be the property of the Dominican Republic and heretofore tendered by the companies to the Dominican Government under the provisions of article 6 of the contract of April 18, 1900; and the said three hundred and fifty-one thousand four hundred pounds sterling (£351,400) of unified scrip shall be delivered to the Dominican Government within thirty days from the date of this award.

With regard to the delivery of the amount of eight hundred and thirty thousand six hundred and fifty-four pounds sterling (£830,654) of bonds, exclusive of the three hundred and fifty-one thousand four hundred pounds sterling (£351,400) admitted to be the property of the Dominican Republic, this is understood to constitute a guaranty on the part of the companies that there are outstanding not more than one million one hundred and forty-eight thousand six hundred pounds sterling (£1,148,600) of 4 per cent obligations, including French-American reclamation consols (stamped and unstamped), unified 4 per centum scrip, and the 4 per centum bonds embraced in the eight hundred and thirty thousand six hundred and fifty-four pounds sterling (£830,654) of bonds to be delivered under this award, and that if any bonds of the issues of 1888, 1890, or 1893 shall hereafter be presented for conversion the companies will protect the Dominican Government.

The delivery of the bonds by such companies to the Dominican Government shall be in monthly installments pro rata to the payments of principal made to the U. S., so that one thousand dollars ($1,000) or two hundred pounds sterling (£200) of bonds shall be delivered for each five hundred dollars ($500) or principal debt paid.

ARTICLE 2.

RATE OF INTEREST.

The principal sum of four million four hundred and eighty-one thousand two hundred and fifty dollars ($4,481,250) and any and all balances thereof due and payable to the United States by the Dominican Government shall bear interest from the date of this award at the rate of 4 per centum per annum. All payments made shall be applied first to the interest accrued.

ARTICLE 3.

AMOUNT OF MONTHLY INSTALMENTS.

Said principal and interest shall be payable in monthly instalments of thirty-seven thousand five hundred dollars ($37,500) each during the first two years, and of forty-one thousand six hundred and sixty-six dollars and sixty-six cents ($41,666.66) each thereafter, to the financial agent of the United States on the first day of each month, beginning with the month of September, 1904, and shall be made in gold coin or currency of the United States or in such good bills of exchange as shall be acceptable to said agent. In the former case the cost of shipment to New York, and in the latter case the discount to maturity and charges incident to the collection of such bills of exchange, shall be added to the amount of the monthly instalment.

The net profits of the operations of said railway, until its delivery under article 1 hereof, during each year, beginning from the first day of July, 1904, as shall annually be stated by its general manager, shall be and constitute a further credit upon said principal debt.

ARTICLE 4.

SECURITY AND MODE OF COLLECTION.

Security.—The said debt and interest and the monthly payments thereof, as herein determined, shall be secured as follows:

The customs revenues and port dues of the ports of entry or custom-houses of Puerto Plata Sánchez, Samaná, and Montecristy, and of all other ports of entry or custom-houses now existing or which may hereafter be established on the coast or in the interior north of eighteen degrees and forty-five minutes of north latitude and east of the Haitian boundary, are hereby assigned and designated as security for the payment of the debt and interest herein mentioned.

Until payment of the said debt and interest the tariff of customs duties and port dues now prevailing shall not be reduced in any case or to any person more than twenty per centum without the consent of the United States.

The said debt and interest shall also constitute a first lien upon the Central Dominican Railway until its delivery to the Dominican Republic, as provided in this award.

Mode of collection.—The United States shall appoint a financial agent, who shall establish an office in the Dominican Republic.

In case of failure to receive during any month the sum then due, the said financial agent shall have full power and authority, by himself or by his appointees, to forthwith enter into possession of the custom-house at Puerto Plata in the first instance and to assume charge of the collection of the customs duties and port dues at that port, and to that end shall fix and determine those duties and dues, and enforce their payment, possessiong and exercising all the present powers of the "interventor de aduana" and of the "administrador de hacienda" and of all other officials authorized by law to participate in the collection and determination of duties and dues and the enforcement of their payment.

Said financial agent shall have power from time to time to appoint subordinate officials and employees. The customs duties and port dues shall be paid to him or to his appointees directly by the exporters and importers, or other persons liable therefor, in cash or in pagarés drawn to the order of said financial agent or his appointees, and such payment, and such payment alone, shall operate as a release of the goods and as a discharge of such importers and exporters and other persons

from the liability for payment of such customs duties and port dues.

The Dominican Government may appoint such officials as it may deem proper for the purpose of inspecting the collection of duties.

Out of the sums collected by the financial agent and his appointees the said agent shall pay in the following order:

(*a*) The expenses of collection.

(*b*) The special apartados, as follows:

Port of Puerto Plata: Wharf concession; freight concession; personal duties; old foreign debt, one and one-half (1½) per centum of import duties; Colon, one-half (½) per centum of import and export duties.

Port of Samana: Wharf concession; old foreign debt, one and one-half (1½) per centum of import duties; Colon, one-half (½) per centum on import and export duties.

Port of Sanchez: Wharf concession; Samana-Santiago Railway concession, seven (7) per centum of import duties; Macoris Branch Railway concession, two (2) per centum of customs receipts; old foreign debt, at one and one-half (1½) per centum of import duties; Colon, one-half (½) per centum import and export duties.

Port Montecristy: Improvement river Yaque concession; "Gobernación;" old foreign debt, one and one-half (1½) per centum of import duties; Colon, one-half (½) per centum of import and export duties.

(*c*) The sums due under this award.

(*d*) "Deuda Flotante Interior" and "Deuda Flotante Vicini," each five (5) per centum.

The excess, if any, after said payments, shall be paid over by said financial agent to the minister of hacienda of the Dominican Government at the time recognized by the United States or to his order. And the said financial agent shall render monthly an account of his collections and disbursements to the said minister of hacienda. He shall not be obstructed in the peaceful exercise of his duties under this award.

In case the sums collected at Puerto Plata shall at any time be insufficient for the payment of the amounts due hereunder, or in case of any other manifest necessity, or if the Dominican Government shall so request, the said financial agent or his appointees shall have and exercise at Sanchez, Samana, and Montecristy, and at any or all of the ports of entry or custom-houses within the territorial limits above described, all the rights and powers vested in him or them by this award in respect of the port of Puerto Plata.

This possession, power, and duty shall continue until six months after all arrears hereunder shall have been paid, and further, until the Dominican Government requests the restoration of the status quo ante. But said financial agent and his appointees shall reenter said custom-houses and resume the exercise of all the powers and authority as above described at any subsequent time when a like default in payment shall be made by the Dominican Government.

To the end that the capacity of the Dominican Republic punctually to make the payments required by this award shall not hereafter be impaired, the financial agent herein mentioned shall act as financial adviser to the Dominican Government in all matters affecting its ability to pay this award.

ARTICLE 5.

In the month of January of each year the Dominican Government shall make up, in accord with the financial agent herein mentioned, a statement showing the total fiscal revenues of the Republic for the preceding year.

ARTICLE 6.

The salaries and necessary travelling and other expenses of the financial agent and his appointees shall be paid by the Dominican Government in monthly instalments, in the same manner and with the same security as the monthly instalments of debt provided herein by article 4.

ARTICLE 7.

In addition to the monthly instalment of thirty-seven thousand five hundred dollars ($37,500) provided for in article 3, there shall be paid to the financial agent, during the month of August, 1904, a sum sufficient to pay an equal moiety of the compensation of the arbitrators and an equal moiety of all expenses of this arbitration, being the amount for which the Dominican Republic is liable under Article VIII of the protocol, which amounts shall be certified to the Dominican Government by the Department of State of the United States of America.

And in case of the failure to pay said amount or any part thereof during the said month of August the financial agent shall have and exercise in the collection thereof the same powers as hereinbefore conferred upon him in case of default in the payment of the said monthly instalments on the principal and interest of said debt.

This award is given and rendered at Washington on this fourteenth day of July, in the year one thousand nine hundred and four.

In witness whereof we have hereunto affixed our hands and seals.

GEO. GRAY, *President.* [SEAL.]
JOHN G. CARLISLE. [SEAL.]
MANUEL DE J. GALVAN. [SEAL.]

It will be seen that the award is entirely favorable to the improvement company and that the security to be given by the Dominican Government is of a very stringent character. It is hoped that a settlement with the bondholders, the representation of whose interests has been confided to the council, may be shortly effected.

The council understand that owing to the disturbed state of the country throughout the period which has elapsed since the publication of their last report no official information has been published with regard to the financial or economic situation of the Republic.

The following information is extracted from the "Case of the United States," submitted to the arbitration commission:

1900–1901:

Estimated revenue	$1,704,500
Estimated expenditure	1,704,500

On the side of revenue these estimates included $1,700,000 in respect of customs receipts, while under expenditure the assignment for the service of debts amounted to $782,000.

This budget was originally promulgated for the year ending April 30, 1901, but was subsequently extended up to June 30, 1901.

The actual receipts during the whole period of fourteen months amounted to $2,938,676.

No information is available concerning expenditure beyond the fact that in the fourteen months a sum of $552,678 was paid on account of the service of debts.

According to the report of the finance minister, this budgetary period closed with a deficit of $73,151.

1901–2:

Estimated revenue	$2,038,440
Estimated expenditure	2,038,440

Of the revenue receipts those to be derived from the customs were estimated at $2,000,000, and under the head of expenditure the appropriation for the debt service was fixed at $800,000.

This budget was afterwards limited to the eleven months from July 1, 1901, to May 31, 1902.

During this period the actual receipts amounted to $1,584,566, of which the Government kept $1,339,014 for its own purposes. This budgetary period is said to have closed with a deficit of $184,623.

1902–3:

Estimated revenue	$1,910,000
Estimated expenditure	[a] 1,910,000

The estimated product of the customs for this year amounted to $1,854,000, and the proposed expenditure included $988,917 for the debt service.

The actual receipts during this financial year are given at $1,663,575, of which the Government kept $1,435,875 for its own purposes.

The document from which the above information is derived also contains an approximate statement of the total indebtedness of Santo Domingo, which is reproduced below in a condensed form:

	Gold.
Foreign bonds (less those to be delivered to the Dominican Government under the protocol, say £825,000), £3,060,350, say	$14,842,697
Improvement company debt	4,500,000
General internal floating debt	1,674,644
Special internal floating debt	1,552,900
Bills of the national bank; about $1,500,000 nominal at average redemption price	215,000
International claims	373,146
Unclassified internal debt, estimated at	1,000,000
Arrears of interest under French-Belgian contract, about	475,000
Arrears of installments under protocol with United States for benefit of improvement company	225,000
Total	24,643,387

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

On motion of Mr. CULLOM, it was

Ordered, That when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

[a] According to the budget published in the Gaceta Oficial of May 31, 1902, and reproduced on page 351 of the council's report for 1901–2, the estimated expenditure amounted to $1,721,500.

RECESS.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m., at which time it reassembled.

FUNERAL OF SENATOR WILLIAM B. BATE.

At 2 o'clock the casket containing the body of the dead Senator was brought into the Senate Chamber by pallbearers selected from the Capitol police.

Rev. EDWARD E. HALE, Chaplain of the Senate; Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, and Rev. S. H. GREENE occupied seats at the Secretary's desk.

A few minutes after 2 o'clock the diplomatic corps, the Chief Justice and associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Chief of Staff of the Army entered the Chamber and were conducted to the seats provided for them. They were soon followed by the President of the United States and his Cabinet ministers, who were escorted to the seats assigned them. The family of the deceased Senator entered the Chamber and were shown to the seats reserved for them.

The committee of arrangements appointed by the Senate was accompanied by Representatives SIMS, BROWNLOW, and GAINES as members of the committee on the part of the House of Representatives.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The clergy will conduct the funeral ceremonies.

Rev. S. H. GREENE read the following Scriptural selections:

II Timothy iv, 6–8; I Corinthians xv, 49–58; John xiv, 1–7; Colossians iii, 1–4.

Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN delivered the following address:

A truly great and good man has passed away from the activities of our national life. To-day we have met to mourn his loss and to bury him. His name will not be lost in American history. His achievements will form a large part of the marvelous story of our national progress, linked as they are with those varied scenes of war and peace that make up the thrilling narrative of our short but eventful national career. I will not attempt at this sad hour to rehearse the tragic scenes upon many a hard-fought battlefield of two wars or the no less dauntless conflicts in the sphere of statesmanship. It is enough to give expression to a universal sentiment that through it all, in war and in peace, in victory and in defeat, he maintained a high and unimpeachable integrity, and to-day his death is lamented by our common and united country. At the proper time, according to the custom of this Senate, suitable expression will be given by his colleagues to the high esteem in which he was held in this Chamber, and without doubt a voice from both sides of this Senate will be raised to witness to the universal regard in which he was held. It may be in keeping with the solemn duties of this hour to speak of the peculiar reverence in which the loftiest characters of the generation to which he belonged ought to be held by those of us who have received the priceless inheritance of their lives. Our fathers lived amid scenes unknown to the present generation. A youth entering the service of his country as a private in the Mexican war, then forging his way ahead during the formative period which followed, again at the call to arms entering the bloodiest conflict of the century—such a youth was forged in a furnace unknown to modern times. And what matchless men they were! Valor and honor were mingled in their blood.

The low stoop to personal aggrandizement or preferment at the cost of their personal integrity and of their country's fair name was to them an utter impossibility. The eternal principles of right and duty had been defended at too large a sacrifice to be bought or sold. Such men have been the guardians of our national honor, and they are to-day our safest guides to future greatness and glory. Such an one was this honorable Senator. The wit of genius and the imagination of the poet may strive to put into fine art form the sentiments of some lives, but for one so simple and sincere a homelier phrase seems more appropriate, and perhaps none would better suit than simply this, "An honest man." It is my sacred privilege to speak one other word. The testing of his character in the varied conflicts of life accentuated perhaps too much his abhorrence of hypocrisy. A profession was to him more to be guarded than life itself. It was doubtless this that kept him many years from the formal profession of his religious belief. So that it was not until recent years that he gave his name to the Christian Church and received the holy rite of baptism according to the tradition of the faith of his fathers. But through all his life he was a man of prayer. He never taught himself to doubt, but with the sincerity of the normal mind of a child he sought the forgiveness and guidance and blessing of his heavenly Father. And this is our chief concern to-day. Whatever may have been his record in citizenship, we thank God for the assurance that in his innermost life he knew God, and to know Him is eternal life.

His last uttered prayer was one which was taught him by a faithful Christian mother. It is the prayer that has pushed back the horizon of time and sense to the very borders of the infinite and eternal—the inspiration of centuries, the key to life's mysteries, the passport to the spiritual and heavenly. When he came to that sublime expression of the loving surrender of the creature to the Creator there was a pause and a peculiar emphasis, "Thy will be done." So in his last moments, with the same high faith of our martyred President, he looked forward to the same guiding hand that had led him all the way, and he passed beyond our view in loving comradeship with his Lord.

Our heroes of other days are being gathered home. We thank God for their splendid achievements, and in the precious memory of their example we take courage for the battles yet to win.

Rev. EDWARD E. HALE, the Chaplain of the Senate, offered the following prayer:

Father of life, Father of love, we come to Thee. We do not pray for him. He prays for us in the larger life. No, Father, but for ourselves, for those who loved him best and knew him best, for the State which he served and for the country which he served, we, children of our God, are here in prayer to Thee. To ask that blessing which none can give but Thee, and that strength which comes from Thee alone. Not as if we could teach each other anything, but Thou, Father, Thou canst teach us everything, and Thou wilt teach us if we will listen; not as if we had any strength of our own, but we have infinite strength if we trust ourselves to Thee.

So we ask for these who can not minister to him longer in sickness in that happy home, that Thou wilt come to them as only a Father can come; that Thou wilt listen to their wish and strengthen them in every moment of weakness; that Thou wilt come to them as a loving father to his children.

And as we bear this body to the State which he loved and which he served, Father, we pray that Thou wilt be with those people there who wait to bless him and to thank Thee that they have had such service in their days of weakness and in their days of strength, in their days of trial and in their days of prosperity. Thou hast given to us those men who served Thee thus and who worked with Thee in their Father's vineyard and to go about Thy present business. Be with those who mourn the most as Thou hast been with those who served Thee in other days.

Father, for the country we pray, that as one by one these servants of Thine are removed to higher service the country may know how to train her boys and her girls into men and women who shall serve Thee as the living Father; that this may be that happy nation whose God is the Lord. And as we return to so many different homes and different duties this day we shall not be alone; the Holy Spirit is with us to be comfort, to be strength, and to be blessing.

For to-day and to-morrow and in all these new days teach us by the examples of courage and bravery which we have had for these days that are past—teach us as only Thine own living children can teach us—what is the worth of Thy Word and of Thy perfect Law. Give to us more of faith, Father, that we may see Thee as the pure in heart see Thee, that we may enter into that service which is perfect freedom. Give us more knowledge of this world which is before us and a keener sense of that larger life to which Thou hast been pleased to call him in Thy perfect mercy. Give us more of Hope.

And for this we pray also, that we may all bear our brother's burdens and so fulfill the whole law of Christ; that we may live in the common life; that we may serve in the common strength, each for all and all for each.

Not in vain for us are the examples of Thy children who have served Thee bravely and well; not in vain for us are this Gospel and the words which have come down to us century after century and generation after generation, if only we consecrate ourselves anew to Thy service. If only even at the moment of death and at the open grave we determine here and now and to-day that we will serve the living God, that we will walk in Thy pathway, and that Thy law shall be our law.

Hear us, answer us, and bless us, in Him who is the resurrection and the life, with that blessing which is for ever and ever.

Join me all, audibly, in the Lord's prayer.

Our Father who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is done in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And

lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

So may the very peace of God which passeth all understanding go with us and bless us. So may the Lord Jesus Christ, who is our resurrection and our life, show to us this heavenly Word, yes, and this present Holy Spirit. He is the Comforter; He is the only comforter. May he go with us always. Amen.

The family of the deceased Senator and the invited guests having retired from the Senate Chamber,

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 13, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 10, 1905.

SOLICITOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Edwin Walter Sims, of Illinois, to be solicitor of the Department of Commerce and Labor, vice William Miller Collier, resigned.

This nomination is to be substituted for the nomination of Mr. Sims which was sent to the Senate on the 6th instant.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Edward Whitson, of Washington, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Washington. An original appointment under the provisions of the act approved March 2, 1905, entitled "An act to divide Washington into two judicial districts."

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Col. Allen Smith, Sixth Cavalry, to be placed on the retired list of the Army with the rank of brigadier-general from the date on which he shall be retired from active service.

Cavalry Arm.

Second Lieut. William C. Gardenhire, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, with rank from March 6, 1905, vice Pershing, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Second Lieut. James J. Meade to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 24th day of May, 1904, vice Second Lieut. Raymond W. Dikeman, resigned, before qualifying for promotion.

Second Lieut. Charles J. E. Guggenheim to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 4th day of June, 1904, vice Benjamin B. Woog, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Carpenters William E. Powell, McCall Pate, and Thomas W. Richards to be chief carpenters in the Navy, from the 12th day of December, 1904, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 10, 1905.

CONSULS.

Robert Brent Mosher, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Collingwood, Ontario, Canada.

Hunter Sharp, of North Carolina, to be consul of the United States at Kobé, Japan.

Robert S. Chilton, jr., of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

George B. Anderson, of the District of Columbia, now consul at Guadeloupe, to be consul of the United States at Antigua, West Indies.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSY.

John Ridgley Carter, of Maryland, now second secretary of the embassy, to be secretary of the embassy of the United States at London, England.

Craig W. Wadsworth, of New York, now third secretary of the embassy, to be second secretary of the embassy of the United States at London, England.

Lewis Einstein, of New York, now third secretary of the embassy at Paris, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at London, England.

William Blumenthal, of New York, now secretary of the legation at Lisbon, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at Paris, France.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

Thomas Ewing Moore, of the District of Columbia, now consul at Weimar, to be secretary of legation and consul-general of the United States to Roumania and Servia.

William Phillips, of Massachusetts, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States at Peking, China.

Henry P. Fletcher, of Pennsylvania, now second secretary of the legation at Peking, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Lisbon, Portugal.

Charles S. Wilson, of Maine, now secretary of legation to Greece, Roumania, and Servia, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to Greece and Montenegro and of the diplomatic agency in Bulgaria, with residence at Athens.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Samuel B. Thomas to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of January, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clark H. Woodward to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 28th day of December, 1904.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Jerome Martin, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Las Cruces, N. Mex.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *March 13, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last.

Mr. KEAN. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the Journal be read, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection. The Journal will be read.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

[Several messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries.]

CONSTITUTION OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a translation into the English from the Spanish text of the constitution of the Dominican Republic promulgated on the 12th of June, 1896, and again put in force May 21, 1903. It was translated in the Bureau of American Republics by Mr. Rodriguez, a very able Spanish scholar and a very fine law writer, too. I move that it be printed as a document for the use of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

On motion of Mr. CULLOM, it was

Ordered, That when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After three hours and fifty-two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 14, 1905, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 13, 1905.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Joseph Cross, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey. An original appointment under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1905, entitled "An act to provide for an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the district of New Jersey."

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Kenneth McAlpine to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 3d day of March, 1905, to take rank as No. 1 on the list of lieutenants, and to be an additional number in grade, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1905, entitled "An act to reinstate Kenneth McAlpine as a lieutenant in the Navy."

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Pay Inspector Mitchell C. McDonald to be a pay director in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1905 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Pay Director Henry T. B. Harris, retired.

Paymaster Henry E. Jewett to be a pay inspector in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1905 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Pay Inspector Mitchell C. McDonald, promoted.

P. A. Paymaster Edward E. Goodhue to be a paymaster in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1905 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Paymaster Henry E. Jewett, promoted.

Assistant Paymaster Edwards S. Stalnaker to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1905 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice P. A. Paymaster Edward E. Goodhue, promoted.

James G. Field, a surgeon in the Navy not in the line of promotion, to be a surgeon in the Navy in the line of promotion from the 3d day of March, 1905, to take rank next after Surg. Eugene P. Stone and to be an additional number in grade, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1905, entitled "An act restoring James G. Field, naval surgeon, to the line of promotion."

Carpenter Alonzo Burke to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 12th day of December, 1904, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Littleton W. T. Waller to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 11th day of March, 1905, vice Col. Henry C. Cochrane, retired.

Second Lieut. William A. McNeil to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 11th day of March, 1905, vice First Lieut. Harry R. Lay, promoted.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Arthur M. Free to be postmaster at Mountain View, in the county of Santa Clara and State of California, in place of George G. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

Flora B. Reynolds to be postmaster at Mill Valley, in the county of Marin and State of California, in place of Louise C. Tyler, removed.

IOWA.

George A. Poff to be postmaster at What Cheer, in the county of Keokuk and State of Iowa, in place of Irvin Ogden. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1905.

MINNESOTA.

Charles G. Spaulding to be postmaster at Mapleton, in the county of Blue Earth and State of Minnesota, in place of Charles G. Spaulding. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1905.

Robert S. Tucker to be postmaster at Lake Benton, in the county of Lincoln and State of Minnesota, in place of Robert S. Tucker. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1905.

MISSOURI.

Henry L. Eads to be postmaster at Pattonsburg, in the county of Daviess and State of Missouri, in place of Henry L. Eads. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1905.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John B. Dickey to be postmaster at Mars, in the county of Butler and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Andrew C. Ziegler, removed.

Perry A. Sandborn to be postmaster at North East, in the county of Erie and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Perry A. Sandborn. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1903.

WASHINGTON.

George E. Hartson to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, in the county of Skagit and State of Washington, in place of George E. Hartson. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

WISCONSIN.

Christian A. Hansen to be postmaster at Stoughton, in the county of Dane and State of Wisconsin, in place of Christian A. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1905.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13, 1905.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

Alexander M. Thackara, of Pennsylvania, now consul at Havre, to be consul-general of the United States at Berlin, Germany.

FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

Frank H. Hitchcock, of Massachusetts, to be First Assistant Postmaster-General.

CONSUL.

Jerome A. Quay, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Florence, Italy.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *March 14, 1905.*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alger	Clapp	Fulton	Morgan
Allison	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Nelson
Ankeny	Crane	Gorman	Nixon
Bacon	Culberson	Hale	Perkins
Bailey	Cullom	Hansbrough	Piles
Berry	Dick	Hemenway	Rayner
Bulkeley	Dubois	Heyburn	Simmons
Burkett	Elkins	Kean	Spooner
Burnham	Flint	McCreary	Stone
Burrows	Foraker	McCumber	Sutherland
Carter	Foster	Money	Teller

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Forty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After six hours and five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 15, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 14, 1905.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

George Barclay Rives, of New Jersey, now second secretary of the embassy at Vienna, to be secretary of the embassy of the United States at Vienna, Austria, vice Chandler Hale, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Francis M. Wright, of Illinois, now serving as judge of the Court of Claims, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois.

JUDGE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

Fenton W. Booth, of Illinois, to be judge of the Court of Claims, vice Francis M. Wright, nominated to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Louis P. Summers, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Virginia, to succeed Park Agnew, resigned.

Clarence L. Hobart, of Washington, to be collector of customs for the district of Alaska, in the Territory of Alaska, to succeed David H. Jarvis, resigned.

PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. Thomas Mason to be a captain on the "permanent waiting orders" list of the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, in accordance with the act of Congress approved February 25, 1905.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Samuel J. Call, of California, to be a surgeon, with the rank, pay, and allowance of a first lieutenant, in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, in accordance with the act of Congress approved March 3, 1905.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

General officers.

Col. Alfred C. Girard, assistant surgeon-general, to be brigadier-general, vice Moore, to be retired from active service April 6, 1905.

Lieut. Col. William H. Beck, Third Cavalry, to be brigadier-general, vice Girard, to be retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Frank U. Robinson, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be brigadier-general, vice Beck, to be retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Frank Taylor, Nineteenth Infantry, to be brigadier-general, vice Robinson, to be retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Samuel W. Fountain, Fourth Cavalry, to be brigadier-general, vice Taylor, to be retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Edward Davis (Artillery Corps), military secretary, to be brigadier-general, vice Fountain, to be retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Charles W. Hobbs, Artillery Corps, to be brigadier-general, vice Davis, to be retired from active service.

Maj. John L. Bullis, paymaster, to be brigadier-general, vice Hobbs, to be retired from active service.

Col. James A. Buchanan, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be brigadier-general, vice Bullis, to be retired from active service.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Pay Inspector Eustace B. Rogers to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 13th day of March, 1905 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Pay Director Ichabod G. Hobbs, retired.

Paymaster Frank T. Arms to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 13th day of March, 1905 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Pay Inspector Eustace B. Rogers, promoted.

P. A. Paymaster William R. Bowne to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 13th day of March, 1905 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Paymaster Frank T. Arms, promoted.

Asst. Paymaster Chester G. Mayo to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 13th day of March, 1905 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice P. A. Paymaster William R. Bowne, promoted.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

To be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 10th day of March, 1905.

Edward W. Sturdevant, jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania;
Andrew B. Drum, a citizen of Virginia;
Victor I. Morrison, a citizen of New York;
Maurice E. Shearer, a noncommissioned officer of the Marine Corps;
Ward Ellis, a citizen of Kansas;
Harry G. Barlett, a citizen of Maryland;
Charles A. Lutz, a citizen of Illinois;
Calhoun Ancrum, a citizen of South Carolina;
David M. Randall, a citizen of Kansas;
Holland M. Smith, a citizen of Alabama;
John R. Henley, a citizen of Georgia;
Ralph S. Keyser, a citizen of Virginia;
John D. Nevin, a citizen of Pennsylvania;
Henry S. Green, a citizen of New Jersey;
Valentine V. Sweeney, a citizen of New York; and
Ralph L. Shepard, a citizen of Massachusetts.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 14, 1905.

TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

Charles H. Treat, of New York, to be Treasurer of the United States.

SOLICITOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Edwin Walter Sims, of Illinois, to be Solicitor of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

DISTRICT JUDGES.

Alston G. Dayton, of West Virginia, to be United States district judge for the northern district of West Virginia.

Edward Whitson, of Washington, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Washington.

CONSULS-GENERAL.

T. St. John Gaffney, of New York, to be consul-general of the United States at Dresden, Saxony.

George W. Roosevelt, of Pennsylvania, now consul there, to be consul-general of the United States at Brussels, Belgium.

CONSUL.

John W. O'Hara, of Indiana, to be consul of the United States at Montevideo, Uruguay.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Charles W. Anderson, of New York, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of New York.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Peter Josof Osterhaus, formerly a major-general of volunteers during the civil war, to be a brigadier-general on the retired list.

APPOINTMENTS IN PORTO RICO PROVISIONAL REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

To be second lieutenants with rank from March 3, 1905.

Henry C. Rexach, of Porto Rico.
Pedro Juan Parra, of Porto Rico.
Eduardo Iriarte, of Porto Rico.
Teofilo Marxuach, of Porto Rico.
Eugenio Carlos de Hostos, of Porto Rico.
Louis S. Emmanuelli, of Porto Rico.
Pascual Lopez, of Porto Rico.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Cavalry arm.

First Lieut. Ward B. Pershing, Fourth Cavalry, to be captain with rank from March 6, 1905.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Second Lieut. James J. Meade to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 24th day of May, 1904.

Second Lieut. Charles J. E. Guggenheim to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 4th day of June, 1904.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Carpenters William E. Powell, McCall Pate, and Thomas W. Richards to be chief carpenters in the Navy from the 12th day of December, 1904, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress, approved April 27, 1904.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *March 15, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. TELLER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

AFFAIRS IN SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado offers a resolution, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to send to the Senate, for use in executive sessions, copies of the instructions given to Commodore Dillingham and Minister Dawson, or either of them, regarding Dominican affairs, and copies——

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President——

Mr. TELLER. Let the resolution be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution is being read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. KEAN. It seems to be business for the Senate to consider in executive session.

Mr. TELLER. It does not refer to the executive session except for use, and I insist that it shall be read.

Mr. CULLOM. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. TELLER. The Senator can not deprive me of the right to have it read.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know; the Senator might.

Mr. TELLER. He will not, unless it is by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. The doors can be closed on the request of two Senators.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senate can do some things in spite of the wish of one Senator.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator may object to the consideration of the resolution, but he can not object to its being read.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know that I wish to object either to its consideration or its reading, but the Senator seems to be very vigorous in his declarations, as though we have no right to say anything about it at all.

Mr. TELLER. I do deny the right of a Senator to interrupt the reading of the resolution.

Mr. CULLOM. A Senator has a right to interrupt the reading for the purpose of ascertaining what it is about. It seemed to be a paper that pertains to executive session, and if it is I submit to the Senator himself whether it ought not to be read and considered in executive session.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I have no hesitation in saying that it is a proper resolution for the open session.

Mr. CULLOM. The resolution may be read.

Mr. TELLER. I ask the Secretary to read it from the beginning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to send to the Senate, for use in executive sessions, copies of the instructions given to Commodore Dillingham and Minister Dawson, or either of them, regarding Dominican affairs, and copies of all correspondence and telegrams relating to Dominican affairs, or relating to any proposed agreement, protocol, or treaty between the United States and San Domingo, from July 1, 1904, to the 1st of March, 1905.

Mr. CULLOM. I object to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under objection, the resolution will lie over.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to say that I recognize the right of the Senator to object, but that this is the place, in open Senate and not in secret executive session, for the introduction of resolutions of this character. Then they go on the files with the public documents of the country, and there is a record kept of them. When the Secretary of State, or rather the President, sends here the report, he has a right to say to us, "I desire to have this considered as a secret matter," and then the Senate will, as a matter of course, so consider it.

Mr. President, the information I call for is not in the secret archives of the Government. Every citizen of the United States, so far as I know, has a right to walk in the Department and look at the papers. I know that every Senator and Member of the other House has a right to go and look at them. I have a right to ask for a copy of them for my own use if I choose.

I wish to say that I take this course for the purpose of preserving the traditions and usages of the Senate in obtaining information from the Executive Departments. I recognize the right of the Senator to object; and the resolution must lie over one day, as objection is made to its present consideration.

AMERICAN NATIONAL INSTITUTE AT PARIS, FRANCE.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for leave to introduce a bill and have it read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is the bill touching the American National Institute at Paris. It passed the Senate and was reported favorably in the House, but was not considered in that body. The city of Paris has made a gift of a fine site, costing $100,000, and I simply desire that the bill may be introduced and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations so they may know there that the matter is still alive.

Mr. TELLER. I do not desire to object, but I wish to ask the Senator from Maine why he requests unanimous consent to introduce a matter of this kind?

Mr. FRYE. Because it has not been called in regular order.

Mr. TELLER. Oh!

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be introduced.

Mr. FRYE. In connection with it I present certain papers, to be referred with the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed.

The bill (S. 1) to incorporate the American National Institute (Prix de Paris) at Paris, France, was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, which were ordered to be printed, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In this connection the Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting certain information relative to the incorporation of the American National Institute at Paris, France.

Mr. FRYE. It should be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The letter will be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON BEEF INDUSTRY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, requesting that the Senate authorize the reprint, for the use of his Department, of 5,000 copies of the report of the Commissioner of Corporations on the Beef Industry; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

PROHIBITION IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I present a brief statement giving reasons why the prohibition of the liquor traffic should continue to be the policy in the Indian Territory after the inauguration of statehood. I move that the statement be printed as a document.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five hours and twelve minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 16, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 15, 1905.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

David J. Hill, of New York, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Switzerland, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to the Netherlands and Luxemburg, vice Stanford Newel, resigned.

This nomination is to replace the nomination of Mr. Hill, which was confirmed by the Senate on the 8th instant.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATIONS.

Nelson O'Shaughnessy, of New York, now secretary of the legation at Copenhagen, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at Berlin, Germany, vice Francis G. Landon, nominated to be second secretary of the embassy at Vienna.

Francis G. Landon, of New York, now third secretary of the embassy at Berlin, to be second secretary of the embassy of the United States at Vienna, Austria, vice George Barclay Rives, nominated to be secretary of the embassy at Vienna.

CONSULS.

Jesse B. Jackson, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Alexandretta, Turkey, vice William Ross Davis, resigned.

Hiram J. Dunlap, of Illinois, to be consul of the United States at Cologne, Germany, vice Charles E. Barnes, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Clarence L. Hobart, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for the district of Alaska, in the Territory of Alaska, to succeed David H. Jarvis, resigned. This nomination to take the place of that of March 14, 1905, wherein Mr. Hobart's residence was given as Washington.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John W. Dunkle, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania, vice James S. Young, whose resignation has been accepted to take effect March 17, 1905.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE.

John H. Campbell, of Arizona, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona. An original appointment under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1905, entitled "An act to provide for an additional associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes."

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Infantry Arm.

Second Lieut. James L. Craig, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from December 31, 1904, vice Macnab, Second Infantry, promoted.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Gunner Clifford H. Sheldon to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 27th day of April, 1904, having completed six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

Peter V. DeGraw, of the District of Columbia, to be Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

E. N. Carter to be postmaster at Oakland, in the county of Coles and State of Illinois, in place of Lenny C. Gilbert, resigned.

IOWA.

Harry D. Clinton to be postmaster at Russell, in the county of Lucas and State of Iowa. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

LOUISIANA.

Arthur A. Boudreaux to be postmaster at Thibodaux, in the county of La Fourche and State of Louisiana, in place of Euphemie Aucoin. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1905.

NEVADA.

James A. McDonald to be postmaster at Wadsworth, in the county of Washoe and State of Nevada, in place of Nicholas A. Hummel, removed.

OHIO.

C. W. Dawson to be postmaster at New Richmond, in the county of Clermont and State of Ohio, in place of Frank F. Talley, removed.

John A. Kneisly to be postmaster at Osborn, in the county of Greene and State of Ohio, in place of David M. McConnell. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

Sidney J. Winney to be postmaster at Ohio City, in the county of Van Wert and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1904.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Frank A. Springer to be postmaster at Belle Vernon, in the county of Fayette and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Edgar J. Corwin. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1905.

VIRGINIA.

Albert A. Evans to be postmaster at Mount Jackson, in the county of Shenandoah and State of Virginia. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 15, 1905.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

David J. Hill to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Netherlands and Luxemburg.

CONSUL.

Arthur J. Clare, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Barbados, West Indies.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Lawrence Bailliere, of Maryland, to be collector of customs for the district of Annapolis, in the State of Maryland.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

General officers.

Col. Alfred C. Girard, assistant surgeon-general, to be brigadier-general.

Lieut. Col. William H. Beck, Third Cavalry, to be brigadier-general.

Lieut. Col. Frank U. Robinson, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be brigadier-general.

Lieut. Col. Frank Taylor, Nineteenth Infantry, to be brigadier-general.

Lieut. Col. Samuel W. Fountain, Fourth Cavalry, to be brigadier-general.

Lieut. Col. Edward Davis (Artillery Corps), military secretary, to be brigadier-general.

Lieut. Col. Charles W. Hobbs, Artillery Corps, to be brigadier-general.

Maj. John L. Bullis, paymaster, to be brigadier-general.

Col. James A. Buchanan, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be brigadier-general.

Col. Allen Smith, Sixth Cavalry, to be placed on the retired list of the Army with the rank of brigadier-general from the date on which he shall be retired from active service.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Kenneth McAlpine to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 3d day of March, 1905, to take rank as number one on the list of lieutenants, and to be an additional number in grade, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1905.

James G. Field, a surgeon in the Navy not in the line of promotion, to be a surgeon in the Navy in the line of promotion, from the 3d day of March, 1905, to take rank next after Surg. Eugene P. Stone and to be an additional number in grade, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress, approved March 3, 1905.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Col. Littleton W. T. Waller to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 11th day of March, 1905.

Second Lieut. William A. McNeil to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 11th day of March, 1905.

Pay Inspector Mitchell C. McDonald to be a pay director in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1905.

Paymaster Henry E. Jewett to be pay inspector in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1905.

P. A. Paymaster Edward E. Goodhue to be a paymaster in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1905.

Asst. Paymaster Edwards S. Stalnaker to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1905.

Carpenter Alonzo Burke to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 12th day of December, 1904, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *March 16, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

AFFAIRS IN SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, yesterday, as the Journal shows, I introduced a resolution of inquiry. I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations whether he has any objection to considering that resolution now?

Mr. CULLOM. I think I would prefer that the Senator should withhold it.

Mr. TELLER. I am not disposed to withhold it if I can avoid doing so, because I think we ought to have the information called for by the resolution before we act upon the treaty. If the treaty is to be acted upon at this session, then I think we ought to have the information. If not, of course then it is immaterial.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator will have an opportunity to press the resolution after to-day, if he desires to do so.

Mr. TELLER. Yes; but if we should be called upon to vote on the treaty this week we would have to vote without the information.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not think there is much information to be added to what we already have.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator objects to the resolution I shall not press it this morning, but I wish it to retain its place so that I can call it up to-morrow. I do not wish to have the resolution lose its place.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection to that course.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table, and it will be laid before the Senate to-morrow in regular order.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five hours and thirty-three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, March 17, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16, 1905.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

George Barclay Rives, of New Jersey, now second secretary of the embassy at Vienna, to be secretary of the embassy of the United States at Vienna, Austria.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

Paul Grand d'Hauteville, of Rhode Island, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Berne, Switzerland.

Roger Sherman Gates Boutell, of Illinois, now secretary of legation at Berne, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at The Hague, Netherlands.

John W. Garrett, of Maryland, now secretary of legation at The Hague, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at St. Petersburg, Russia.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Samuel J. Call, of California, to be a surgeon, with the rank, pay, and allowance of a first lieutenant, in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. Thomas Mason to be a captain on the "permanent waiting orders" list of the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, in accordance with the act of Congress approved February 25, 1905.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

To be second lieutenants.

Edward W. Sturdevant, jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania;

Andrew B. Drum, a citizen of Virginia;

Victor I. Morrison, a citizen of New York;

Maurice E. Shearer, a noncommissioned officer of the Marine Corps;

Ward Ellis, a citizen of Kansas;

Harry G. Bartlett, a citizen of Maryland;

Charles A. Lutz, a citizen of Illinois;

Calhoun Ancrum, a citizen of South Carolina;

David M. Randall, a citizen of Kansas;
Holland M. Smith, a citizen of Alabama;
John R. Henley, a citizen of Georgia;
Ralph S. Keyser, a citizen of Virginia;
John D. Nevin, a citizen of Pennsylvania;
Henry S. Green, a citizen of New Jersey;
Valentine V. Sweeney, a citizen of New York; and
Ralph L. Shepard, a citizen of Massachusetts.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Pay Inspector Eustace B. Rogers to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 13th day of March, 1905.

Paymaster Frank T. Arms to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 13th day of March, 1905.

P. A. Paymaster William R. Bowne to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 13th day of March, 1905.

Asst. Paymaster Chester G. Mayo to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 13th day of March, 1905.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Arthur M. Free to be postmaster at Mountain View, in the county of Santa Clara and State of California.

Flora B. Reynolds to be postmaster at Mill Valley, in the county of Marin and State of California.

ILLINOIS.

E. N. Carter to be postmaster at Oakland, in the county of Coles and State of Illinois.

IOWA.

Harry D. Clinton to be postmaster at Russell, in the county of Lucas and State of Iowa.

George A. Poff to be postmaster at What Cheer, in the county of Keokuk and State of Iowa.

NEVADA.

James A. McDonald to be postmaster at Wadsworth, in the county of Washoe and State of Nevada.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John B. Dickey to be postmaster at Mars, in the county of Butler and State of Pennsylvania.

Frank A. Springer to be postmaster at Belle Vernon, in the county of Fayette and State of Pennsylvania.

WASHINGTON.

George E. Hartson to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, in the county of Skagit and State of Washington.

EXTRADITION TREATY WITH NICARAGUA.

The injunction of secrecy was removed March 16, 1905, from a treaty between the United States and Nicaragua for the extradition of criminals, signed at Washington on March 1, 1905.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *March 17, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege, and ask that the paper which I send to the desk may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama rises to a question of personal privilege, and asks that the paper which he sends to the Secretary's desk may be read. Without objection, it will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

MORGAN SEES A PLOT—SENATOR ACCUSES CROMWELL OF COMPLICITY IN TREATY—TELLS OF DOMINICAN AFFAIRS—ALABAMAN SURPRISES THE SENATE IN THE COURSE OF A LONG SPEECH BY DETAILING AN ALLEGED SCHEME BY THE LAWYER WHO NEGOTIATED THE CANAL SALE TO SECURE VALUABLE CONCESSIONS IN REPUBLIC.

Senator MORGAN, of Alabama, held the floor of the Senate all of yesterday. He told of what the Democrats declare to be a sensational plot engineered by William Nelson Cromwell, of New York, to drag the United States into Santo Domingo affairs. Republican Senators were inclined to pooh-pooh the story as a bugaboo, although several of them said there was enough in it, apparently, to warrant an investigation before proceeding any further with the pending treaty.

Mr. MORGAN spoke for four hours, most of the time extemporaneously. He laid before the Senate a number of documents sustaining his contention that William Nelson Cromwell was the mainspring of the whole Santo Domingo situation. He bitterly denounced Mr. Cromwell as the man who has instigated the trouble at Panama for the purpose of selling the New Panama Canal Company to the United States, and declared that he was now at work endeavoring to drag the United States into Santo Domingo for the purpose of making valuable certain concessions which would be worthless without the guaranty of this country.

The material for much of Mr. MORGAN'S talk was furnished to him, he said, by Mrs. Reeder, a former resident of Alabama, whose maiden name was Rawles. She and her husband, operating under the name of the Reeder syndicate, were described as international speculators, who dabbled in the securities of Latin-American Republics, and dealt in concessions for railroads, power plants, and so on.

HAD INFLUENCE WITH MORALES.

Mrs. Reeder, described as a very bright woman, is said to accuse William Nelson Cromwell of originating the plan for the intervention of the United States in Dominican affairs. His scheme, she alleges, brought to naught a number of concessions which she and her husband had obtained from the Morales Government.

Mr. MORGAN alluded repeatedly to a certain proposed "treaty" between the United States and Santo Domingo which the Reeders had negotiated with President Morales. Mr. PLATT of Connecticut suggested that the Senate would be enlightened if the treaty itself should be laid before it. Mr. MORGAN thereupon sent to the Secretary's desk a copy of the document, which was read. It caused laughter among Republican Senators, who described it as a preposterous document, making all sorts of provisions for the protection of Santo Domingo, insuring certain fat concessions for the Reeders, and giving the United States the short end of the arrangement. When this paper was read several Republican Senators described Mr. MORGAN'S exposé as a fiasco. Mr. FORAKER took occasion to defend Mr. Cromwell, describing him as a man of the highest standing at the bar, without a stain upon his professional reputation.

Mr. MORGAN alleged, at least by implication, that after the Reeders had obtained certain concessions from Santo Domingo, and while Mr. Reeder was at Santo Domingo preparing to sign others, a cablegram had been received by Morales from Mr. Cromwell, urging him not to grant the concessions, as the United States had been induced to step in and assume the burden of Santo Domingo's affairs. Morales was assured by Mr. Cromwell, according to Senator MORGAN, that it would be to his advantage to deal directly with the United States, and he was urged to invite the United States to take charge of the financial affairs of that Republic.

PROTECTION FROM THIS GOVERNMENT.

Mr. Cromwell, it was said, pointed out to Morales that he would remain President of Santo Domingo, protected by the strong arm of the United States, and would receive a percentage of the customs revenues without any responsibility on his part. Senator MORGAN intimated that an investigation would prove that Mr. Cromwell had obtained concessions for nearly everything of value in the islands, as well as taking care of the interests of foreign bondholders by inducing the United States to take charge of Santo Domingo.

Mr. LODGE was prepared to make a speech yesterday in support of the treaty, but was unable to get the floor. Mr. FORAKER also intends to speak. No change in the programme is known to have occurred, as a result of the allegations made by Senator MORGAN, and it is still expected that the Senate will adjourn to-morrow without acting on the treaty. The Senate is ready to adjourn now, but is waiting some nominations from the President, among them those of United States judges in Illinois.

A proposition was advanced yesterday by Mr. FORAKER as a possible solution of the Santo Domingo business next winter, in case it is still desired to take charge of the country's finances. It is said to have been approved by President Roosevelt. This proposition is to pass a joint resolution by Congress authorizing the President to take such steps as he sees fit in administering the finances of Santo Domingo. Such a resolution, requiring only a majority vote, could be passed without trouble over Democratic opposition, and it is argued that the joint resolution annexing Hawaii to the United States is a precedent establishing the constitutionality of the proceedings. In this case no treaty would be required. Serious doubts were expressed, however, by Senators to whom Mr. FORAKER outlined his plan, as to its constitutionality.

NEWLANDS RESOLUTION ADOPTED.

The Newlands resolution was agreed to, calling upon the President, if not incompatible with the public interests, to send to the Senate certain information in regard to Dominican affairs.

Despite the fact that it is recognized that there are not enough votes for the ratification of the Santo Domingo treaty, there was a general return yesterday of Republican members who have been absent. Senators LODGE and KITTREDGE, who have been away for a few days, were in their seats, and Senator DOLLIVER is within reach if a vote should be called for.

After the reading of the Journal yesterday Mr. TELLER asked if there were objections to consideration of his resolution of inquiry concerning Santo Dominican affairs. Mr. CULLOM, who had arisen to move an executive session, said that an opportunity would be given to-day for the consideration of the resolution.

"I know that," said Mr. TELLER, "but if we are called to vote on the treaty this week, we would have to act without the information."

"Well, I do not believe the information we would get is worth much, anyway," said Mr. CULLOM.

Mr. TELLER said that he did not want the resolution to lose its place, and it was agreed that he might call it up to-day. The Senate then, at 12.08, went into executive session, which lasted till 5.37 p. m., with a brief interim for luncheon.

READY TO ADJOURN TO-MORROW.

Several prominent Senators had conferences yesterday with President Roosevelt regarding the Santo Domingo treaty. It was the opinion of all of them that nothing could be accomplished by prolonging the session at this time, and it was indicated to the President that the Senate would be ready finally to adjourn to-morrow unless he had further business to bring to its attention.

Even yet, it is understood, no absolute agreement has been reached regarding the treaty, but the disposition is simply to lay it aside without action.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the question of privilege to which I arise is really the privilege of the Senate of the United States. So far as I am personally concerned, I am not in the slightest degree interrupted, or offended, or distraught by anything that the paper has said which I have just had read at the desk. Senators here know that long ago when the Hay-Herran

treaty was under discussion in this body I made a speech, or was supposed to have made a speech, on that treaty, making certain statements with reference to the Government of Colombia and its attitude toward the United States, its misfortunes, and the like of that. Somebody sent by telegraph to the City of Mexico a report of that speech, a false report of it, one that contained just enough of truth to carry the falsehood on its back and give it some credence. In two days from that time General Reyes, who was then minister from Colombia to Mexico, replied by telegraph to what I had been reported as saying, and it was printed in this same newspaper.

Mr. CULLOM. What is the newspaper?

Mr. MORGAN. The Post.

Mr. CULLOM. Of Washington?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. Of course it was impossible in that case that General Reyes could have been informed otherwise than by telegraph, emanating from the Post, I assume, of what was alleged to have occurred in the executive session of the Senate, and his reply was sent by telegraph to the Post, and printed in two or three days after the speech which was imputed to me was made.

I at that time made an open statement in regard to the matter, in which I dealt with some degree of asperity in respect of a minister of a foreign government who would willfully violate the rules of the Senate of the United States by telegraphing matter that concerned the reputation and the honor of one of the members of this body, and I made an intimation at that time that I thought the Senate of the United States ought to protect its membership against such outrages. But I was in a minority, a great minority, upon that question, and no attention was paid to it.

Now, there is a repetition in the same paper of an equally defamatory and an equally outrageous statement in regard to my conduct in the Senate. Senators here know the discussion which took place. I need make no statement to them, no appeal to them at all, in respect to my attitude upon this question. There is not a Senator in this body, I am sure, who makes the slightest impeachment of anything that I have said or done in the discussion of this treaty. There is not one here who can impute to me in any respect a partisan line of conduct in the action I have taken or the discussions I have made upon this treaty.

Whether the statements contained in this paper are true or false I am not permitted to say. I will not violate the rules of the Senate by volunteering any statement upon that subject. The world can take it as true of false, just as they please. But they must take it upon the testimony of a newspaper that resorts to one of two methods to gain information, either of which is entirely unjust to the Senate, to the country, to our relations with foreign governments, and unjust to Senators personally. Those two sources of information are, first, a Senator, and, secondly, some of the people who have access to rooms that lie near to the Senate Chamber.

The paper which has been read appears to be well edited. It contains doubtless some falsehoods. It contains doubtless some truths. But the editor of it is a skillful man. He knows how to mix the lies with the truths, so as to defame the one and support the other. There is no question but that he is a scholarly man. I do not know whether it was made up by actual report made to him or whether it was by some process of wireless telegraph. That is not for me to say, nor do I care. I will state this—I feel authorized to state it: Efforts have been made here to have this debate carried on in public. A majority did not agree with the proposition. Efforts have been made to call in the Official Reporters and swear them, and have a stenographic report made of every word that might be uttered on this floor. That was not agreeable to the majority of the Senate. I do not speak of the political majority.

Failing in these efforts, Mr. President, I am left without any sort of resource in any answer I could make. I can not answer these statements without a violation of the proprieties of the Senate, either to admit them or deny them. It is an unfortunate attitude for any man or body of men to occupy, who are here commissioned as United States Senators, that they must be held bound by honor to secrecy in respect to their own attitude and their own remarks upon this floor in what they bring forward for the good of the country, for its protection against lying, for its protection against undue haste in the consideration of a supreme law of the United States, for these treaties, when they are ratified, become the supreme law of the United States in virtue of the direct requirement or statement of the Constitution. A Senator is here bound by the rules of the Senate to absolute secrecy in what he has said.

Yesterday I was kept on the floor for a long time, as Senators remember, by a current discussion of matters, a mere current discussion among Senators, and I was prevented by that from really completing the speech I intended to make. I had not left my desk, I had not more than taken my seat, when a man who is accustomed to being about the lobbies of the Capitol here, a reporter, rushed up to my desk and asked me to give him a statement about the great imbroglio that had been sprung, or something of that sort. I said to him, "Sir, you have no right to ask me a word about what occurred in the Senate. You will get no information from me." I repelled his advance. That ought to have sufficed. A man who will then do that to a Senator ought to be expelled from that gallery and never permitted to take a seat there again, and his paper ought not to be permitted to be represented in that gallery.

Now, what am I to say? I can only say that the Post got this information from some corrupt source, and a paper that professes to be a great paper, to enlighten the public and to encourage and promote public morals and public decency, has no right to print upon its own authority and to assert to the world that statements are true which must have been derived surreptitiously from a corrupt source. That paper knew that somebody had violated some of the important and obligatory regulations that the Senate of the United States has ever found it necessary to adopt in order to get that information or that assertion.

Well, the man or the paper that makes it a business to go before the world and to utter statements in regard to the private affairs of individuals or of the Senate of the United States upon an authority that he or the newspaper knows to be corrupt, and to cast such a stigma, does violence to its own professions of virtue and decency, and is utterly false to the honor of the country.

This statement in the Post puts me in conflict with certain private persons in the United States. I do not shrink from any conflict that belongs to my duties as a Senator—not at all. I take no shelter under privileged speech or communications, and a man in the Senate can not take shelter under a privileged communication when he is not allowed to speak to the world what he says to the Senate. I take no shelter under any aspect of this matter as a privileged communication, but I am confronted with a necessity which I trust the Senate will indulge me in trying to avail myself of the opportunity to correct.

I have believed always, and I think the country believes, that there is very much connected with the transactions of Santo Domingo for the last few years which is entirely unknown and has the appearance of having been concealed. I make no accusations against any officer of the Government of the United States or anybody else in this matter, except to say that it has the appearance of having been concealed. That appearance has been placed upon the situation by the statements of newspapers, for Senators have not known what the facts are in full. Considering the subject-matter that is before us for consideration and action, it is very necessary, in my judgment, that the best possible means should be employed to ascertain what are the specific and actual facts that surround the situation, which has been made particularly troublesome and vexatious by the assertions of the newspapers here and in Santo Domingo.

I have therefore, Mr. President, found myself compelled to ask unanimous consent of the Senate for action upon a resolution that I have drawn.

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is instructed to examine into and report the facts relating to the protocol of January 31, 1903, alleged to have been entered into between the United States, represented by W. F. Powell, chargé d'affaires, and the Dominican Government, represented by Jno. Fco. Sanchez, ministro de relaciones exteriores, and the facts relating to an award based on said protocol made by George Gray, president, and John G. Carlisle and Manuel De J. Galvan, dated the 14th of July, 1904.

And that said committee will inquire into and report the facts of the transaction upon which said protocol and award are based, and of the conduct of the persons and corporations who were connected with the transactions that led to the making of said protocol and award, and whether any fraud or oppression has been perpetrated in connection therewith, and by whom committed——

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me to suggest that we could all hear much better if the Secretary would read the resolution? We can not hear the reading satisfactorily at all.

Mr. MORGAN. I shall be very glad to have the Secretary read it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary proceeded to read the resolution, and read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is instructed to examine into and report the facts relating to the protocol of January 31, 1903, alleged to have been entered into between the United States, represented by W. F. Powell, chargé d'affaires, and the Dominican Government, represented by Jno. Fco. Sanchez, ministro de relaciones exteriores, and the facts relating to an award——

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, it occurs to me that this subject ought first to be considered in executive session. This is a part evidently of the general discussion and consideration of the treaty that has been before the Senate in executive session for a number of days—for weeks, I may say. Notwithstanding the villainous lot of stuff which has been written by somebody and printed in the Post, it occurs to me that we ought to adhere to our rule in considering these matters in executive session, unless we want to abandon executive sessions entirely.

Mr. MORGAN. There is not one word in the resolution that relates to any executive business before the Senate in any sense. I insist on having my proposition read. I have the floor as a Senator. The Senator from Illinois of course has the majority with him, and he can take the course he suggests, if he wants now to dive into an executive session.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator suspend for a moment?

The Chair holds that the Senator from Alabama has a right to have the resolution read at the desk for the information of the Senate. It is within the province of any Senator to object to its consideration. It is within the power of the Senator from Illinois, if he wishes to interrupt the proceedings of the Senate in legislative session, to move an executive session.

Mr. CULLOM. I think that is correct, Mr. President.

Mr. MORGAN. I was reading the paper, and I have the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the Secretary to send the resolution to me and I will read it.

Mr. CULLOM. I submit to the honorable Senator from Alabama that I sympathize with the efforts he has been making with reference to the violation of the rules of the Senate, but——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state his question of order.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to ask the Chair whether it is not in order at any time, no matter who has the floor, to make the point that the business brought before the Senate shall be considered in secret legislative session or in executive session. It is a question of order, and it is always in order.

Mr. MORGAN. How does the Senator know what is in the paper before it is read?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that it is in order for any Senator at any time to move that the doors be closed, and if there is a second to the motion the doors must be closed.

Mr. CULLOM. As I was saying, I sympathize with the remarks of the Senator pretty fully in regard to the violation of the rules of the Senate by a newspaper man or by any man, a Senator or anybody else, who should give out or pretend to give out such a statement as has been read here in the presence of the Senate this morning. But I do hope that we may have some ordinary business arrangement, according to the rules of the Senate, with reference to closing the doors or going into executive session. I submit the subject the Senator is now beginning to discuss ought to be discussed with closed doors or in executive session.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator from Illinois kindly point out what part of this paper it is that he objects to?

Mr. CULLOM. It bears on a question pertaining to a treaty pending before the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. That can not be shown, and as a matter of privilege I insist that I shall be allowed to proceed, as I have the floor, and to lay the proposition before the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. According to the suggestion of the Chair, if the Senator proceeds, I shall claim the right to interfere and move an executive session.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that the Senator from Alabama is within his rights in reading the resolution to the Senate. The Chair would call the attention of Senators to Rule XXXV:

> On a motion made and seconded to close the doors of the Senate on the discussion of any business which may, in the opinion of a Senator, require secrecy, the Presiding Officer shall direct the galleries to be cleared, and during the discussion of such motion the doors shall remain closed.

In the opinion of the Chair the Senator can not be prevented from reading his resolution except by proceeding under this rule.

Mr. CULLOM. I did not want to do that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama will proceed.

Mr. MORGAN. As I was interrupted, I do not know where I left off the reading. I had read a few lines and I will commence at the beginning.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, if the resolution is to be read, I hope it will be read loud enough so that we can hear it. I do not understand that objection is made to its being read by the Secretary.

Mr. MORGAN. I think the Senate will hear me.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MORGAN (reading):

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations is instructed to examine into and report the facts relating to the protocol of January 31, 1903, alleged to have been entered into between the United States, represented by W. F. Powell, chargé d'affaires, and the Dominican Government, represented by Jno. Fco. Sanchez, ministro de relaciones exteriores, and the facts relating to an award based on said protocol, made by George Gray, president, and John G. Carlisle, and Manuel De J. Galvan, dated the 14th of July, 1904.

And that said committee will inquire into and report the facts of the transaction upon which said protocol and award are based, and of the conduct of the persons and corporations who were connected with the transactions that led to the making of said protocol and award; and whether any fraud or oppression has been perpetrated in connection therewith, and by whom committed.

And that said committee will ascertain and report by what authority of the United States, or of any officer or agent of the Government, if any, said protocol and award was made, and what proceedings have been taken and conducted by the United States, or any officer or agent of the United States, to execute said protocol or to enforce said award, whether by civil or military power; and especially as to the use of the power and authority of the United States in the collection of customs dues in ports or customs-houses of the Dominican Government; and what sums of money, if any, have been so collected, and by whom collected, and the disposition that has been made of such funds.

2. That said committee further inquire and report the facts that attended the making of a protocol signed on January 20, 1905, by Albert C. Dillingham and Thomas C. Dawson for the United States and Juan Fco. Sanchez and Federico Velasquez for the Dominican Republic; and the orders and instructions, if any, under which said protocol was negotiated, concluded, and signed, issued from any officer or Department of the United States Government.

And that said committee ascertain and report what has been done, in pursuance of said protocol, or of any agreement therein contained, to execute or enforce the same by any civil or military officer of the United States, in any port or place in Santo Domingo; and by what authority or by whose order or direction the same has been executed and enforced, and what was done by any such person in the execution or enforcement thereof.

3. That said committee is further instructed to inquire and report what correspondence, if any, has taken place between any officer or Department of the Government of the United States and the Dominican Government or any person claiming to represent such Governments, since 1897, in relation to the creation of any treaty relation with said Government looking to the annexation of the possessions of such Government to the United States, or the lease of any of its possessions to the United States, or to the granting of naval or coaling stations by the Dominican Government to the United States, or for any protectorate over the Dominican Government by the United States, or in any relation to the acceptance by the United States of any trust or fiduciary relation toward the Dominican Government, or its creditors, or any relation between them looking toward the adjustment of the debts of the Dominican Government and the administration of its revenue laws for the payment thereof.

4. That in the execution of this resolution said committee, or a subcommittee thereof, to consist of not less than three members, shall have leave to sit at any place in the United States in the recess of Congress, and to summon witnesses and examine them under oath, and to compel the production of papers at any such investigation.

5. Said committee shall have power to appoint a clerk and a stenographer and the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate is required to detail such deputies as may be needed to assist the committee in the performance of its duties.

I respectfully ask unanimous consent for present action on the resolution.

Mr. CULLOM. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is objection to unanimous consent. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. There is no appropriation whatever in the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did not hear the resolution distinctly. If there is no expense——

Mr. MORGAN. There is no provision for any expense. It is only when an appropriation is made that a reference is required.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama is correct. The Chair understood that the resolution involved an appropriation.

Mr. MORGAN. No; it does not. It was purposely left out.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Then the resolution, under the objection, will not now be considered.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask for information whether the resolution offered by the Senator from Alabama not having been read by the Secretary, it would be considered as properly before the Senate? If not, I ask that it may be read by the Secretary and then go over under the objection. I do not know whether the mere reading by the Senator from Alabama will be deemed sufficient.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It would not be sufficient. The resolution should be read by the Secretary.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask that it be read and then go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland asks that the resolution just read by the Senator from Alabama shall be read by the Secretary, and that it then go over.

Mr. FORAKER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading to which the Senate has listened may be considered as the reading by the Secretary.

Mr. MORGAN. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MORGAN. There is no objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection; and the resolution will be regarded as though read by the Secretary.

EMPLOYMENT OF MESSENGER.

Mr. BURNHAM submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Cuban Relations be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law, in lieu of the assistant clerk now authorized.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—CHARLES E. CONRAD.

On motion of Mr. CLARK of Montana, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of Charles E. Conrad, no adverse report having been made thereon.

AFFAIRS IN SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, yesterday I called up a resolution of inquiry that I had presented, and it went over with the understanding that it should be called up to-day. I ask that it may be laid before the Senate now. It need not be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado calls up the resolution submitted by him on a former day.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution submitted by Mr. TELLER on the 15th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to send to the Senate, for use in executive sessions, copies of the instructions given to Commodore Dillingham and Minister Dawson, or either of them, regarding Dominican affairs, and copies of all correspondence and telegrams relating to Dominican affairs, or relating to any proposed agreement, protocol, or treaty between the United States and San Domingo, from July 1, 1904, to the 1st of March, 1905.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to amend the resolution. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] has suggested to me that it is not in proper form, and that I should call on the President, not by direction but by request, instead of the Secretary of State. I always bow to any suggestion the Senator from Wisconsin makes in a matter of this kind, even when he does not convince me that he is right. Fearing that I may be wrong and being almost certain that he is right, I wish to strike out the words "Secretary of State" and insert "President," and to strike out "directed" and insert "requested."

Mr. President, I wish to say a word as to what I think is the rule. I think we direct all Cabinet officers. The Senator thinks there is an exception, because of the importance of the files relative to foreign affairs in the office of the Secretary of State. I can see some force in that, but my understanding is that we direct the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, or any other Cabinet officer to lay information before us, and when we call upon the President we usually put into the resolution the phrase "if not incompatible with the public interest;" but the President is not bound at all by a failure to put in that phrase. If he thinks it is incompatible with the public interest, it is his right to so state to the Senate, and the Senate has always bowed to such a suggestion from the Executive. If we call upon the head of any Department, and he thinks it is not proper to send the information, if he goes to the President and the President sustains him in the view that it is not proper to send it, that is the end of it.

Mr. President, I do not expect to have this resolution passed, but I want to say a few words about it, and then I suppose there will be some disposition made of it for the remainder of the session. If the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] wants to say something about the form of the resolution I should like to have him say it now, and then I shall proceed.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado, in whom I have the profoundest confidence and for whom I have the greatest respect, has alluded to the fact that I had privately suggested to him that I thought the resolution was not in accordance with the practice of the Senate and that its form should be changed.

Mr. TELLER. And I have changed it accordingly.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator has changed it, doubting whether he ought to do it or not, but putting his action upon a ground that is complimentary, that he does it in deference to my suggestion.

Mr. TELLER. And your superior judgment.

Mr. SPOONER. No; I have no superior judgment. But I am anxious, Mr. President, always that the Senate shall be right in its attitude toward the executive department, as I am anxious always that the Senate shall be right in its attitude toward the House of Representatives, which is the other branch of the legislative department.

I agree entirely with what the Senator from Colorado says: That we are in the habit of passing resolutions directing the heads of all of the Departments except—that is my own qualification of the statement—except the State Department—the Secretary of State—to answer interrogatories and to send to the Senate information indicated in such resolutions. Often I have, where a resolution was in the form "requested," suggested that the word "requested" be stricken out and that the word "directed" be substituted, but I have not known an instance since I have been a member of the Senate in which the Senate has directed the Secretary of State to forward to the Senate copies of diplomatic correspondence, instructions to ministers or to agents appointed by the President to negotiate treaties. It has always been, so far as my memory goes, in form a request to the President to transmit if not, in his judgment, incompatible with the public interest. And there is a reason, Mr. President, for this distinction in the form of directing the Department of State and other Departments. No one will dispute for a moment that the conduct of our foreign affairs is, under the Constitution, entirely in the hands and under the control of the President, and there never has been written a book upon the Constitution—Story, Rawle, Kent, Pomeroy—any book upon the subject which has not emphasized the fact, which is apparent to thoughtful men, that the conduct of our foreign relations, instructions by the President to ministers and other diplomatic agents, require and involve in the interest of the country more or less of secrecy.

The State Department was created early—in 1789—and under the law the Secretary of State, unlike the heads of some of the other Departments, was not required to report to Congress. The law provides that he—

shall perform and execute such duties as shall from time to time be enjoined on or intrusted to him by the President of the United States, agreeable to the Constitution, relative to correspondences, commissions, or instructions to or with public ministers or consuls from the United States, or to negotiations with public ministers from foreign states or princes, or to memorials or other applications from foreign public ministers or other foreigners, or to such other matters respecting foreign affairs—

Entirely in the hands of the President—

as the President of the United States shall assign to the said Department; and, furthermore, that the said principal officer shall conduct the business of the said Department in such manner as the President of the United States shall from time to time order or instruct.

The other Departments of the Government perform very many duties imposed primarily by Congress, dealing entirely with our domestic affairs, and therefore the distinction which, as I understand, has always been observed, and which I think ought to be observed, between the other Departments of the Government and the Department of State, so far as—and I beg my friend from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] to note the limitation which I indicate—so far as it relates to the precise matters which are embraced in his resolution—instructions given to and correspondence with diplomatic agents of the United States, ambassadors, ministers, Senators, if they shall be, improperly, as I think, chosen to negotiate treaties or other pacts with foreign governments.

I agree with the Senator from Colorado that there are some records in the Department of State which are not within the category of purely Presidential, and therefore confidential, archives—commissions, awards that have been made, matters that have been executed, a variety of things; we have drawn the distinction. But as to whether the Senate may properly direct the Secretary of State, who has been rightly called the right hand of the President in conducting the foreign relations of this Government, confided by the Constitution exclusively to him—and of necessity more or less secret—to transmit information relative to them to this body, I think, on reflection and upon examination of the precedents, my friend from Colorado, who has had great experience and whose fidelity in the execution of public duty I always cheerfully confess, will be disposed to agree with me. Mr. President, I made the suggestion which I did to the Senator from Colorado for the reasons I have stated.

The Senator says he does not expect this resolution as amended to pass. For myself I certainly have no objection, as it has been amended, to its passage, and I have not, nor I think has the Senator from Colorado, the slightest thought that the

President of the United States will fail to send to the Senate, in response to this respectful and proper request, any paper which he thinks may, without detriment to the public interest—that is for him to decide—be sent to the Senate.

That is all I wanted to say about this matter, and I have said that only because the Senator referred to me as having made a suggestion to him.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I have changed the form of the resolution as stated, at the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin. My own notion about it is that all resolutions, especially of this character, ought to be addressed to the President, but for convenience of business they are addressed to the head of the Department having control of the subject-matter.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. TELLER. I do.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me one word right there, I wish to say the failure to note the distinction to which I wish to call attention has given rise to an attitude in some Departments toward the legislative branch of the Government which I have sometimes thought to be without warrant. The Cabinet is not the mere retinue of the President; the Cabinet, taken as a body, is not merely the official family of the President. We impose duties every day during the session of Congress by law upon Cabinet officers which it is beyond the power of the President by any instruction of his to pretermit obedience to. The Constitution recognizes Cabinet officers. It deals with them or characterizes them as "heads of Departments." It authorizes us—and when I say "us" I mean Congress—to vest in them the appointment of inferior officers; and in the discharge of that function they are as independent of the order or control of the President, theoretically at least, as if they were entirely independent of the President in other respects. The statute books are full of duties imposed and orders made by the Congress to be executed by this member of the Cabinet or that member or the other. But I draw the line only—and my friend from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who has been here many, many years, and who is thoroughly familiar with the traditions of the Senate in this respect will, I think, agree with me—I draw the line purely as to the Secretary of State, so far as his functions relate to diplomatic correspondence and to that domain of duty in which he acts under the Constitution, and can act under the Constitution only by order of the President, and can not act by order of the Congress; and I limit my suggestion to the Senator to that only.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not care to go into any discussion of this question, except to say that I agree that Cabinet officers are not simply the official family of the President, but they are to perform the duties imposed upon them by law; and a great many duties are imposed upon them specifically. But, Mr. President, it is not in our power here to take away any duty imposed on the President of the United States by the Constitution. So it may be said that every Cabinet officer works subordinately to the President of the United States. An appeal—by custom and usage at least—is allowed from the head of any Department to the President if the President sees fit to entertain it.

Mr. SPOONER. I want to state to the Senator another distinction, if he will permit me, and I will not interrupt him again. Diplomatic correspondence is not a unilateral matter. It embraces instructions to our diplomatic agents; it embraces their conferences with foreign diplomatic agents, and also embraces the correspondence which emanates from other governments, which the President may be, and often is—I do not know but almost universally—in honor bound to maintain confidence in regard to. That establishes the rule, a rule which seems to me to be necessary, for foreign governments would not deal with us if their correspondence is to be published, and our part of the correspondence might only be explicable and be susceptible of thorough understanding if read in conjunction with the various interchanges of correspondence on the subject.

There is nothing that I want to conceal about this business, but I want the Senate to be right about it and to maintain its traditional attitude.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, it may be assumed that a Cabinet officer, such as the Secretary of State or the Secretary of any other Department of the Government, when a matter of this kind comes before him, will sit down and consider whether it is a proper thing for him to comply with the request. It might be an entirely proper thing for the Secretary of State to send to the Senate correspondence with one nation and decline to send correspondence with another. If the Cabinet officer has any doubt about it, as I have said, it has been the practice of the Government from time immemorial, in my judgment, not for him to decline to send the information himself, but to submit the question to the Executive. It is no small matter for a Cabinet officer to decline to honor a resolution of one House or of both Houses, and yet he may do that if, in the judgment of the President of the United States, it is incompatible with the public interest that the information should be sent.

Mr. SPOONER. There are cases in which the Senate has agreed hitherto, as to the other Departments of the Government, that when directed they may give a good reason why the Senate ought not to insist upon the direction——

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. But we have not a right to direct as to this diplomatic correspondence. It would place a Cabinet officer and also the President in an unfavorable attitude to decline, because he could not explain his declination without frustrating the purpose of it; and he would be put in the attitude of attempting to conceal something, which he conceals only out of regard for the public interest.

Mr. TELLER. If the President thinks it is incompatible with the public interest to make the correspondence public, he simply says so. He does not go into an explanation why he refuses to send the information; at least, I have never known him to do so. I remember a number of instances since I have been in public life where the President has sent to this body a statement that he did not think it proper to send the information we requested; and, as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] suggests to me, we have always accepted such a statement without question. We have been always wise enough not to try to question it. There has been some friction, of course, growing out of some cases, not recently, but the distinction that has been made, I think, has been made more because of the difference in the rank of the President as head of the Cabinet than anything else. I think it has been pretty generally conceded that no Cabinet officer would venture to send to us information as to which there is doubt as to whether or not it should be sent.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator will remember that President Washington announced very clearly this doctrine when, in response to a request by the House that he communicate the instructions which he had issued to commissioners who were authorized by Congress, he declined to do it on the ground that it related to foreign affairs, that it was not proper for him to do it, and that neither House had the right to demand it.

Mr. TELLER. I will cut this debate short by saying that in this case, if the resolution had gone to Mr. Hay, and if the President thought it was not proper for him to make a report, that would have been the end of it.

Now, Mr. President, in the expiring hours of this session——

Mr. CULLOM rose.

Mr. TELLER. I am not quite through. I do not care to go into a discussion of anything outside, except to say that I am, as much as any man here, in favor of maintaining the traditions of the Senate. I recognize the distinction between the Secretary of State and the other Cabinet officers, for the reason that he, more than any other officer, deals with questions that demand secrecy, and that he is connected with a Department of the Government which has to deal with very delicate affairs. So I readily accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

As I said, Mr. President, and as I think I am free to say, the Senate is not driven to consider this proposition in great haste. I did say that I did not expect this resolution to pass. I shall be agreeably disappointed if it does. There is another resolution somewhere else, which a newspaper says has been passed. It has not been passed, and it will not be passed, I suppose.

I want to say a word about this resolution not being a question for consideration in executive session. The answer to the resolution may be such an answer as ought to be received in executive session. That is to be determined by the President of the United States, really, or nominally, perhaps, by the head of the Department who sends it in; but this resolution, objected to the other morning by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] on the ground that it was an executive matter, ought to go into the public records. For that reason the open Senate is the proper place for its consideration. It is for the officer who sends the information requested to determine in the first instance whether it ought to be sent to us in open session, and it is for the Senate to determine, if it comes here in open session, whether it ought to be considered in open session or whether it ought to go into the secret archives of the Government.

We only call for what the public have been discussing. We call for the instructions. We are told on the one hand that there were no instructions to Commander Dillingham. We are told that our minister down there proceeded to make a treaty on his own account, without any instructions whatever. Possibly that

is so, Mr. President; but it is disputed, and disputed by some of the great independent newspapers of the country, disputed by what I call, and I think truthfully, the Republican press. The newspapers have been full of the discussion on this question. I am not going to read them.

A question has been raised as to whether the statement made by the Secretary of State was a correct one. I do not hesitate to say that before we proceed very much further with the discussion of this treaty we ought to know exactly what the condition was when the protocol that is in controversy, or the treaty, or whatever you choose to call it, was made. We ought to know whether the minister who was sent down there, or the commissioner who was sent down there, without any authority from anybody in the world, proceeded to make the most extraordinary treaty that has ever been made in the history of this Government. If some one says that that is a question for discussion in executive session——

Mr. CULLOM. I think it is.

Mr. TELLER. With the treaty here before us and newspaper controversies, I will assure the Senate that I know what the rules of the Senate are, and I will not infringe them by exposing the wonderful secrets that exist behind the locked doors day after day here, which only get out when the newspapers in their enterprise surmise or get hold of some one who tells them what has happened here, and often, as in this case, tells them what did not happen.

Mr. President, as a matter simply of right in the future, I want to challenge the statement made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. He said he would not say, in so many words, whether or not the information published was correct, and yet the Senate certainly got the idea that he was complaining of a misrepresentation. I understand if some one should say that I got up here and said certain things that I did not say, I have an unquestioned right when that charge is made to say "that is not true; I did not say it." I have no right to say what I did say, but I have an unquestioned right to say what I did not say.

Suppose some man should come and say, "Did you not assault the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] in the Senate," or print that statement in a newspaper? I do not think I would stop a great while before I would deny a statement of that kind. He might charge me with an offense which, perhaps, in the eye of the law, would not be any worse than that, but might be just as bad; that is to say, that I had charged the senior Senator from Iowa with some gross misconduct, or something of that kind. Would I not have the right to say that I had not done so? No, Mr. President, you can not stick in the bark in that way. It would be sticking in the bark a good deal if you should say that a man should shut his mouth. What redress would he have? He might come here and get the Senate to pass a resolution that he had not said it; but, in the meantime, the Senate might have adjourned and he might be under the opprobrium of having said something or done something that was very improper.

Mr. President, I will not disclose any of the secrets of the executive session, but I do not think the world would come to an end nor would there have been any great danger of a dissolution of this Government if the public could have looked in here every day we have been discussing this treaty and have listened to all we said; but I do not think they would have been very much edified. I think they might, perhaps, have been amused at some features of the discussion of which I am not able to speak because of the sacredness of the proceedings behind closed doors.

I think it would be a good deal better for us to have an official report of these proceedings than to have the kind of report that has been made for the last thirty years, during which I have been familiar with the Senate. It was just as common twenty-five or thirty years ago as it is to-day; and we have made all sorts of efforts to prevent it. I have seen the members of this Senate summoned to hold up their hands and swear that they had not been guilty of divulging the secrets of the Senate when somebody had divulged them in some way and in our anxiety to prevent the publication of these great secrets of ours, not because they were important, not because the public were being injured by their publication, but because we were here under an obligation not to allow the proceedings in executive session to be disclosed. I have seen an executive officer of this Senate dismissed from that desk there who was not any more guilty, in my judgment—and I said so then—than an angel from heaven. The people afterwards sent him to the House of Representatives, and he has always led an honorable and upright life. It was a very great infliction on him and a great crime, I think, for this Senate when it turned out Mr. Young from the position he occupied here as an executive officer under a bare suspicion, and nothing else, I think.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I only want to say——

Mr. TELLER. Let me say another word. The reports of proceedings in executive sessions went right on. There was no difference in them. I used to think if anything they were a little better after Mr. Young got out than they were before. We are yet in the dark as to how such reports get out, and we always shall be. Mr. President, it is the fault of the system. It is the fault of shutting the doors when there is not any real reason for it.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President——

Mr. TELLER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CULLOM. I only wanted to interrupt the Senator long enough to say that while some reports of the proceedings of the executive sessions have been given out occasionally, yet it has seemed to me that the practice has been getting worse of late and that they have been more regularly given out in recent years than they formerly were.

I remember the case of Mr. Young. I remember very well that I never believed the man was guilty at all, and, as the Senator says, we do not yet know who it was who gave out the information that got into the newspapers. But it does seem to me that something will have to be done to protect this Senate when it is in executive session; otherwise we shall have to abandon executive sessions entirely, and sometimes I am inclined to feel that that ought to be done rather than to have these attacks on Senators and false reports of what is going on continually appearing in the newspapers from day to day.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, when we had the Panama treaty under discussion we had the Official Reporters in here; the debate was taken down; and I believe it has been suggested by the Senator from Maryland that there was less publication in the newspapers then than at almost any other time.

Mr. President, I think there are some things in the article which was read entirely foreign to anything that took place here, and I think by those statements injustice is done not only to the Senator from Alabama, but to other Senators. If I heard the article read aright, it would seem there was a sentiment expressed by Senators for the immediate annexation of this island. I recall nothing said yesterday which could be tortured into that, although it may have been said when I was at lunch; but I believe at that time we had a recess, and nothing could have been said. It seems to me the best thing to do would be to open the doors and let the world know on what grounds we act.

I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations if he has any objection to the resolution as amended?

Mr. CULLOM. I think I will move to refer it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TELLER. Let it be read as amended, so that it may appear in the RECORD in its amended form.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado asks that his resolution as modified by himself be read.

Mr. CULLOM. Then I will move to refer it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to send to the Senate, for use in executive sessions, copies of the instructions given to Commodore Dillingham and Minister Dawson, or either of them, regarding Dominican affairs, and copies of all correspondence and telegrams relating to Dominican affairs, or relating to any proposed agreement, protocol, or treaty between the United States and Santo Domingo, from July 1, 1904, to the 1st of March, 1905.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois moves that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the resolution is referred, I ask the Senator from Colorado to modify it still further by saying "if, in his judgment, it is not incompatible with the public interest." I do not know of any case where we have asked the President for information without that qualification.

Mr. TELLER. I have no objection to the amendment, but I have said on this floor many and many a time that that clause is not necessary, as the President has that right without our so instructing him.

Mr. ALLISON. I know that the Senator from Colorado has said that, but it is the usual rule to insert the clause.

Mr. TELLER. We do not have to give the President the right to withhold. That right belongs to him.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TELLER. I think the resolution in its present form is very much better, but if the Senator from Iowa moves to amend it, I shall make no objection.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, that is not a question to be put summarily. Some Senator may wish to speak on the subject.

Mr. LODGE. I rise to the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will regard the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa as before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I believe I was recognized.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in regard to the resolution, not at all as to the merits of the case which it involves, but as to passing resolutions of this character. In my short experience here I have never known a demand for documents relating to foreign affairs to be addressed to the Secretary of State. They have always gone to the President under the formula which has been suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], and I do not think there can be any doubt that that is the universal practice of the Senate. Nor do I think there is any doubt of the President's right to refuse to send in documents which he may think it incompatible with the public interest to send, whether that phrase occurs in the resolution or does not.

But my objection to this resolution goes to the substance of it. The papers asked for here are papers relating to these negotiations, and the negotiation of treaties under the Constitution is wholly in the hands of the President of the United States. He may appoint such agents as he sees fit. He may conduct the negotiations in such manner as he chooses. That is his undoubted right and function.

It is proposed in the resolution to ask the President to send to the Senate the correspondence with which that negotiation has been carried on. We are asking him to disclose the entire process of the negotiation. We are not merely asking him to send here the papers which have emanated from our State Department. We are asking him to send here the correspondence and the telegrams of a foreign government.

Mr. President, no foreign government would feel willing to negotiate if they knew that at any moment their correspondence was likely to be drawn out by a Senate resolution; and that is the reason, of course, for the undoubted right of the President to refuse. But when we ask him for this correspondence, we are asking him for the correspondence of a foreign government. We are asking him to lay before us the letters written by the officers of that foreign government. That in itself is a good and sufficient reason for not sending correspondence of that sort here. If the President says it is incompatible with the public interest, as he ought to say and as he must say, to send in the papers, I do not want him put in the attitude of concealing something, and I for one do not propose to put the President in that attitude when we are dealing with the affairs of a foreign nation. We have no right to put the President in a false attitude of that kind.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. I do not understand the resolution to call for any papers or communications from any foreign government.

Mr. LODGE. It calls for copies of all correspondence and telegrams relating to Dominican affairs. Correspondence, of course——

Mr. TELLER. Correspondence between our officials. It was never intended to ask for anything more than that.

Mr. CARMACK. Of course not.

Mr. LODGE. In the letters of our representatives in that island are statements as to what the representatives of the other government have said. Their communications, of course, state what was said by the officials in charge of the negotiations on the other side, and the papers relating to the negotiations and the correspondence by which the negotiations were carried on have not, in my time, I think, been asked for. We have asked for a great many papers from the State Department. We have asked the President to send them in. Those requests have been complied with or refused, as the case may be.

Mr. President, I do not suppose there is a thing in all this correspondence which the President or anyone in the State Department desires to conceal; but it sets an extremely bad precedent to demand of the President that he send in correspondence involving a foreign government, which, for that reason alone, ought not to be sent in, and put him in the attitude of desiring to conceal something when he has nothing to conceal, and is simply acting with that good faith toward a foreign government which all international negotiations demand.

When we publish our volume of foreign relations and foreign correspondence there are many papers omitted. There is to-day an immense body of archives in the State Department, perhaps fifty, sixty, or a hundred years old, which have never seen the light and never have been printed; and they have been held back from publication, although all interest in them has ceased, for the very sound public reason that correspondence involving the opinions of a foreign government and of officials of a foreign government ought not to be made public.

That is the objection in my mind, and a fundamental objection, to asking for papers of this sort. They will be refused on that ground. They ought not to be asked for for that very reason, and I trust the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss this matter at all except to say incidentally in passing that I can not see where there is any bad precedent in calling upon the President to send to the Senate, which is a part of the treaty-making power, papers with reference to a treaty. As I said, I do not intend to discuss that question at all, Mr. President. I ask the Secretary to read the paper I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Special to the Washington Post.]

DES MOINES, IOWA, *March 15.*

Congressman J. A. T. HULL, of this city, chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, in a sensational interview, declares that the Japanese are even now planning to insist on possession of the Philippines as soon as convenient after the conclusion of their war with Russia.

"I know whereof I speak," said Congressman HULL. "There is every reason to fear that we will be facing just this situation sooner than any of us are willing to realize. The Japanese feel that they could handle the Philippines better than any other nation. They need the commerce and the business opportunities of the islands, and they feel certain now of their ability to defeat any western nation. They are getting ready to enforce a policy of Asia for Asiatics, and that means expulsion of the United States just as soon as they are free in Manchuria.

"The situation is regarded at Washington as menacing; not immediately so, perhaps, but certain to develop dangerous phases as soon as the present war is over. The United States will have to sell the islands or fight to keep them. If we have to fight it will be at a tremendous disadvantage, owing to our distance. We will be in the same situation that Russia is, and the only thing that will save us from defeat will be to possess a navy that Japan will not dare to fight. For this reason I feel that we can not afford to stop naval development, but rather should accept a plan of expansion based on keeping a greater force in the Pacific than Japan can maintain."

Mr. CARMACK. I put that statement in the RECORD simply because I wish to print it in connection with some remarks I had the honor to make during the recent session of Congress on the naval appropriation bill.

The statement of Mr. HULL as to the attitude and feeling of the Japanese toward our experiment in Asiatic colonization, is corroborative of statements that have been made by American naval officers in eastern waters, who bear testimony to the resentment and jealousy of the Japanese because of our intrusion in Asiatic affairs.

A short time ago western nations regarded Japan with a feeling of patronizing admiration. They were disposed to regard her simply as a pawn upon the international chessboard which might be moved about by the hand of western diplomacy. The tremendous energy and the marvelous military genius displayed by that nation during the present war with Russia have been a revelation to the whole world, and Japan has sprung forward at a bound to occupy a place among the very foremost military powers of the world. When she emerges from her victorious war with Russia she will be blown with pride and ambition and ready to try conclusions with any power in the world. The cry of "Asia for the Asiatics," which Mr. HULL says has been raised by Japan, will have a terrible significance. He tells us that the Administration in Washington—and says that he knows whereof he speaks—looks forward to a probable contest with that powerful nation in order to maintain our foothold in the Philippines, and that the great increase of our Navy, the multiplication of our battle ships, is demanded because it is necessary permanently to maintain in eastern waters a naval force large enough to hold our own with Japan and thereby make good our possession of the most worthless territory upon which any nation ever wasted its treasure or shed the blood of its citizens.

In this connection I wish also to have printed in the RECORD a clipping from the Washington Post of this morning, including a letter from Secretary Taft.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator if that is the interview with the Japanese minister?

Mr. KEAN. No; an article which includes a letter from Secretary Taft.

The article referred to is as follows:

In a letter to John M. Blair, of New York, made public yesterday, Secretary of War Taft says that the policy of the Administration is to retain the Philippine Islands indefinitely, and that it is his belief that self-government for the Filipino people is at least a generation away. The letter was written in response to one from Mr. Blair, which said that the idea had become prevalent that this Government would give the Filipinos self-government in a comparatively short time, judging by remarks made by Secretary Taft when he appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means several weeks ago. Accordingly investors have shown, in the opinion of Mr. Blair, timidity in putting their money in Philippine ventures. Secretary Taft says also that he believes that when the Filipinos are fitted for governing themselves, in a generation or more, they will be better satisfied with a relation to the United States Government similar to that of Canada and Australia to England, than absolute independence. The text of Secretary Taft's letter is as follows:

MARCH 16, 1905.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your letter of March 7, in which you say that a common reported interpretation of my remarks before the House Committee on Ways and Means is that it is the purpose of the Administration to give independence to the Filipinos within the next four years, and that this produces great timidity about investments in the Philippines, growing, in great part, out of the undercurrent of doubt as to what the future of those islands is to be.

In reply I beg to say that I can not prevent misconstruction of my remarks, except by repeating to you what I actually think in regard to the matter. The policy of the Administration is the indefinite retention of the Philippine Islands for the purpose of developing the prosperity and the self-governing capacity of the Filipino people. The policy rests on the conviction that the people are not now capable of self-government, and will not be for a long period of time; certainly not for a generation, and probably not for a longer time than that, and that until they are ready for self-government it would be a violation of trust for the United States to abandon the islands.

NO DEFINITE POLICY FOR FUTURE.

The question as to the future, however, is one wholly of conjecture. The important fact is the present policy, which is that of the indefinite retention of the islands. What shall be done in the future, when the people have reached a condition where they can be safely trusted with their own government, is a question which will doubtless have to be settled by another generation than the present, both of the American and of the Philippine people, to whose wisdom and generosity we may safely trust the solution of the problem. Should the Philippine people, when fit for self-government, demand independence, I should be strongly in favor of giving it to them, and I have no doubt that the American people of the next generation would be of the same opinion.

I think it much more likely, however, that after the Filipino people shall have been associated with the American people for a generation or more, and shall have tasted the prosperity they will find behind the national tariff wall, they will prefer a relation to America like that of Canada or Australia to England to one of absolute independence.

Very respectfully, yours,

W. H. TAFT.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not Mr. HULL gave the interview attributed to him. If he did, I think it is a view which he holds alone, and represents no part of the view held here. But merely that the story may be complete, I ask that the Secretary read the interview of the Japanese minister, published this morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

JAPAN A GOOD NEIGHBOR—NO DESIGNS ON PHILIPPINES OTHER THAN FRIENDSHIP—MINISTER TAKAHIRA EXPRESSES SURPRISE AT HULL INTERVIEW—AMERICAN CONTROL OF THE ISLANDS AIDS JAPAN.

"Representative HULL, who declares in an interview that the Japanese are now planning to insist on possession of the Philippines as soon as convenient after the conclusion of their war with Russia, evidently has not paid much attention to the policy of Japan heretofore," said Mr. Kogoro Takahira, the Japanese minister, when shown the HULL interview by a representative of the Post yesterday.

"I can not but believe that the gentleman of the American Congress who made the statement must have been misquoted," he continued, "but if it is true, I can not see upon what ground the apprehension that the Japanese will descend upon the Philippines after the conclusion of the war is based. Mr. HULL must think that Japan is drunk with success, and is determined to grasp everything in sight. Is there really any evidence of the intention of Japan to do this? Just now she is engaged in a life-and-death struggle for existence in Manchuria. She will make every sacrifice of life and treasure to carry out that end; but she is not intent upon gaining the possessions of the United States in the Philippines. The possession of the islands by this country is beneficial to Japan and its people. The United States has given an object-lesson to the Orient of a more efficient civilization. We are trying to do our best to teach the Koreans, as well as the Chinese, and we are aided by what has been done by the United States in proving the benefits of the principle of progress. I am surprised to see such a statement given out by an enlightened Representative in Congress.

"It is true that the advent of the United States as the controlling power in the rich possessions of the Philippines is a matter of close interest to Japan. Before 1898 there was little intercourse and trade between the two groups of islands, but since the American occupation it is a notable fact that both have increased considerably. This is gratifying, of course, but what the people of Japan hope for is not only the commercial and industrial development of the Philippines and the consequent mutually prosperous commerce with my country, but also the establishment of a permanent condition of peace and security from disturbance there.

"My opinion regarding the relations which Japan should maintain with the Philippines is very simple—that they should be good neighbors, whose commerce will steadily develop and whose social and political conditions will be progressive and peaceful. Japan has never had any intention of taking advantage of her neighbors or to seek for territorial aggrandizement, but the sincere desire of her Government is to have all neighboring countries realize that mutual interests can best be promoted by the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of the tie of interdependence. I do not mean by this that a race coalition should be formed hostile to the interests of other countries, such as has been typified in the expression 'yellow peril.' Japan wishes other nations to be peaceful and prosperous so that she may be also.

"The United States, with all its power, is now a member of the sisterhood of Eastern nations. Japan welcomes a power whose aims she knows are identical with her own and whose great influence she feels certain will be thrown in the balance for peace and prosperity for all."

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from Illinois will not press his motion for a moment. I desire to say a word.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CULLOM. It seems to me we have had a great variety of talk this morning.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think it is due to my colleague in the House, whose interview has been made the basis of discussion here, that the Senator from Illinois should yield.

Mr. SPOONER. Alleged interview.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senators from Iowa feel that they ought to vindicate their colleague in the House, I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 2 o'clock.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CULLOM. I yield to the Senator from Iowa, and then I shall have to ask for a vote on my motion.

Mr. MONEY. I rise to a point of order. I do not think the honorable chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations ought to yield for a moment to any one Senator and then insist upon his motion. The motion to refer is debatable.

Mr. CULLOM. Of course it is. But Senators can debate it here all day in open session.

Mr. MONEY. If Senators wish to speak on it, they have a right to do so.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I certainly do not intend to debate any matter which is alleged to be pending before the Senate, but I think I ought to be permitted to say that in my judgment the interview which has been read, attributed to my colleague in the House, is at least a very doubtful expression of his views or opinions. I base that upon the fact that this same interview appeared in various journals throughout the country, notably the New York Herald of yesterday, and I noticed that the interview was attributed to Mr. HULL, at Sioux City, Iowa, whereas this appears to be attributed to him at Des Moines, Iowa. I have a very distinct conviction——

Mr. CARMACK. The Post merely gives the place from which the story was sent.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It is dated Des Moines, Iowa, and my attention was directed to that from the circumstance that it appeared yesterday in the New York Herald under the date line of Sioux City, Iowa. I doubt very much whether that interview is a correct, or at least an adequate, expression of any views which Mr. HULL has given to the public.

I have a very distinct conviction that, whatever may be the basis of the article, opinions have been attributed to him which he would be very far from avowing. I certainly agree with those who have said that the interview, as relating to our affairs in the Far East, makes a very incorrect and, to my mind, a very grotesque statement of the probable future of our country in its relations with Japan, and I am very glad that the intelligent and clear-sighted interview with the Japanese minister has been placed in the RECORD by the side of it.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I merely wish to add one word to what my colleague has said. I think I can go further and say that I do not believe the interview in any way is a correct interpretation of the views of the chairman of the Military Committee of the House. But I wish also to add that if he is responsible for such an interview, in my judgment he is practically alone in expressing that view, not only as respects the situation here, but also as affecting the situation in Iowa.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. CARMACK. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that his colleague in the House is not entirely alone in that view if the publication of the statements made by our naval officers in eastern waters is correct as printed a short while ago in the

New York Herald. They said it was the universal opinion of the Japanese that they ought to have the Philippine Islands, and that they resent our intrusion there.

I wish to say, as I do not intend to speak again on this subject, that I think the statement made by the Japanese minister is just the kind of statement to be expected from Japan under the circumstances. It does not mean anything at all.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not familiar with what our naval officers in the Far East may be saying or what they may believe. I only want to express what I understand to be the opinion of the people of my own State and the public, so far as I know, immediately surrounding it. I do not believe, first, that Captain HULL made this statement. Secondly, I wish to say if he did there are very few people in the State of Iowa who share with him the views which appear in this newspaper article.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask the Senator from Illinois to withdraw the motion for one moment.

Mr. CULLOM. Does the Senator from Wisconsin really desire that I should withdraw it?

Mr. SPOONER. If I did not really desire that the Senator should withdraw the motion, I would not ask him.

Mr. CULLOM. On the desire expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin, I will withdraw it for one moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois withdraws the motion on the request of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word. I believe the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] is correct as to the views of his colleague, the chairman of the Military Committee of the House. If the Senator from Iowa is mistaken about that, I believe he is correct in the proposition that very few people in Iowa or any other State of this Union agree with the views imputed by the newspaper to the chairman of the Military Committee of the House.

We have differed upon the Philippine question. Many Senators on the other side thought the United States ought not to have acquired the Philippines. There was fair ground for difference of opinion, probably, upon that proposition. I think there is no difference between the minority and the majority in this Chamber that we have acquired the Philippine Islands and that to-day the United States is titular sovereign of the Philippine Archipelago. What the people of the United States will choose in the long run to do with the Philippines, what the ultimate policy of the United States will be as to the Philippines, no man now can say. There has been no committal by Congress, and it is a matter entirely, under the Constitution, for Congress to determine as to the ultimate attitude of this country toward the Philippines.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he read the letter in this morning's Post from the Secretary of War on this subject, where he expresses the opinion that we will hold the Philippines indefinitely?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, Mr. President, that is the opinion of the Secretary of War. The Constitution says that "the Congress shall have power *to dispose of* and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." I myself have never doubted that when the time came that the Filipinos were able to maintain a government of their own, independently, if you please, or under the protection of the United States Government, so far as foreign nations are concerned, and they asked to be permitted to maintain such a government, being fit, there would be no division of party in the United States as to granting them that right. We have made no improvident pledge to handicap this country in the future upon that subject.

This Government is going along, dealing day by day, month by month, and year by year, with the problem as it presents itself in varied phases. But—and this is what I arose to say—however we may have differed about the wisdom of their acquisition, however we may have differed as to the policy which should in the meantime be pursued legislatively as to them, there is one proposition upon which we will not differ, and that is this: There is no government in the world which can take from the United States in the East or in the West any territory which belongs to the United States. Upon that there is and will be but one political party in the United States. Japan has fought with surpassing skill, devotion, and gallantry. Her conduct has been dignified, and I think the suggestion here referred to is an imputation of folly which her minister justly resents and repudiates.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After four hours and five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 18, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 17, 1905.

FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

Peter V. DeGraw, of the District of Columbia, to be Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSY.

Francis G. Landon, of New York, now third secretary of the embassy at Berlin, to be second secretary of the embassy of the United States at Vienna, Austria.

Nelson O'Shaughnessy, of New York, now secretary of the legation at Copenhagen, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at Berlin, Germany.

CONSULS.

Hiram J. Dunlap, of Illinois, to be consul of the United States at Cologne, Germany.

Jesse B. Jackson, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Alexandretta, Turkey.

William R. Estes, of Minnesota, now consul at Antigua, to be consul of the United States at Solingen, Germany.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA.

John H. Campbell, of Arizona, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona.

JUDGE OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

Fenton W. Booth, of Illinois, to be judge of the Court of Claims.

DISTRICT JUDGES.

Joseph Cross, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Francis M. Wright, of Illinois, now serving as judge of the Court of Claims, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

John W. Dunkle, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Gunner Clifford H. Sheldon to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 27th day of April, 1904, having completed six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Clarence L. Hobart, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for the district of Alaska, in the Territory of Alaska.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Louis P. Summers, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Virginia.

POSTMASTERS.

MINNESOTA.

Charles G. Spaulding to be postmaster at Mapleton, in the county of Blue Earth and State of Minnesota.

Robert S. Tucker to be postmaster at Lake Benton, in the county of Lincoln and State of Minnesota.

MISSOURI.

Henry L. Eads to be postmaster at Pattonsburg, in the county of Daviess and State of Missouri.

OHIO.

C. W. Dawson to be postmaster at New Richmond, in the county of Clermont and State of Ohio.

John A. Kneisly to be postmaster at Osborn, in the county of Greene and State of Ohio.

Sidney J. Winney to be postmaster at Ohio City, in the county of Van Wert and State of Ohio.

VIRGINIA.

Albert A. Evans to be postmaster at Mount Jackson, in the county of Shenandoah and State of Virginia.

WISCONSIN.

Christian A. Hansen to be postmaster at Stoughton, in the county of Dane and State of Wisconsin.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *March 18, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The President pro tempore (WILLIAM P. FRYE, a Senator from Maine) took the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, if there be no objection.

ASSISTANT CLERKS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. KEAN. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM] to report a substitute for the resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed substitute will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the salaries of the assistant clerk to the Committee on Appropriations (authorized by resolution of February 20, 1900), the assistant clerk of the Committee on Cuban Relations (authorized by resolution of January 28, 1903), and the assistant clerk of the Committee on Public Lands (authorized by resolution of February 24, 1903), paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at $1,200 per annum, are hereby increased to $1,440 per annum each, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the impression that the law provides there shall be no additional salary or compensation paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. KEAN. This is not an additional salary within the meaning of the statute. It is a reappointment at a different salary, that is all. There are three assistant clerks of committees of the Senate employed at the present time—one as assistant clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, another as assistant clerk of the Committee on Cuban Relations, and another as assistant clerk of the Committee on Public Lands—who each receive $1,200 per annum. This resolution places them on the same basis as all the other assistant clerks, at a compensation of $1,440, making a total increase of $720.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. For the three assistant clerks?

Mr. KEAN. For the three assistant clerks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Was the Senator's attention called to the law? The proviso is as follows:

Provided, That no payment shall be made from said contingent funds as additional salary or compensation to any officer or employee of the Senate or House of Representatives.

Mr. KEAN. That is very true; but I understand the statute refers to those employed under an appropriation by Congress. This is an appropriation from the contingent fund. These places were created by the Senate, and these assistant clerks are not paid from the General Treasury, but from the contingent fund.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution reported as a substitute by the Senator from New Jersey?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

JOSE IGNACIO RODRIGUEZ.

Yesterday, while the doors were closed, Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to Jose Ignacio Rodriguez, the sum of $66, for the translation from Spanish into English of the constitution of Santo Domingo.

To-day Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the foregoing resolution, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

AFFAIRS IN SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. TELLER. I suppose the regular order is the resolution of inquiry that I offered, and the pending question is on the motion made by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. We did not have a vote on that motion yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are two resolutions on the table. One was submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], which precedes the resolution offered by the Senator from Colorado

Mr. TELLER. Very well. Then my resolution will be withheld until after the resolution of the Senator from Alabama is considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 8, by Mr. MORGAN——

Mr. GORMAN. That resolution should be laid aside temporarily.

Mr. TELLER. I suggest that it be laid aside temporarily. The Senator from Alabama is not present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the resolution will be laid aside and the resolution offered by the Senator from Colorado, which comes over from a previous day, will be laid before the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. That resolution has already been offered, and it is now standing on a motion to refer. There have been two amendments made to it, and I should like to have it read as amended. The Senator from Iowa offered an amendment to it.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. TELLER on the 15th instant, as amended, as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested, if, in his opinion, not incompatible with the public interest, to send to the Senate, for use in executive sessions, copies of the instructions given to Commodore Dillingham and Minister Dawson, or either of them, regarding Dominican affairs, and copies of all correspondence and telegrams relating to Dominican affairs, or relating to any proposed agreement, protocol, or treaty between the United States and Santo Domingo, from July 1, 1904, to the 1st of March, 1905.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, it seems to me that that resolution ought to be satisfactory to everyone in the Senate. I do not suppose that any Senator here expects that we will dispose of the pending treaty at this session of the Senate, and it appears to me that whenever we do come to an examination of it, which must be at the next session of Congress, we ought to come here prepared to discuss it on all the facts which are to be brought before the Senate or which ought to be brought before the Senate. If this resolution is adopted now, we shall have at the incoming of Congress the information we desire.

Mr. President, it has been the custom of the Senate at all times, when resolutions of inquiry of this character were offered, if the form was acceptable, to at least pass them. Now, if any Senator thinks there is anything that ought yet to be added to the resolution to make it acceptable and will make the suggestion, I will agree that the amendment may be made.

Mr. President, in my judgment when the Senate comes to consider a treaty the Senate is entitled to everything that has taken place prior to the sending of the treaty to the Senate. I do not think the President of the United States can, under those circumstances, refrain from sending the correspondence and all the details, because we are as much a part of the treaty-making power as is the Executive. We have the final veto on whatever he may do; we have the power to amend, to change, or to reject as we see fit.

It is an absurdity, Mr. President, to say that the President can have in his possession facts and information which were necessary for him to negotiate the treaty that we can not have before the Senate when we come to consider this question. We do not consider the form of the treaty alone. We consider the propriety of the proposed treaty. We consider whether the American interests will be promoted by it—not only the form, but all the surroundings and its effects are a matter of consideration for the Senate.

Mr. President, if this resolution is not passed now or at some subsequent period there will be a very violent departure from the precedent heretofore made in the Senate. I should like to have some Senator who objects to this inquiry tell me upon what theory we are to be deprived of the information which belongs to us.

I know, Mr. President, all that can be said against opening the archives of the State Department, but will anyone here pretend that any danger is threatened by giving us the information as to what were the instructions to Mr. Dillingham? Will anyone here pretend that we will jeopardize the interests or the foreign relations of this Government with Santo Domingo or any other power? We have been told in the public press all about it. We have been told all about the instructions in the public press, but we do not know whether it is correct or not.

I have heard on the streets that one reason why we should refuse to adopt this resolution of inquiry is that there was great danger some foreign government—and the government has been named as that of Germany—was about to intervene.

Mr. President, in my judgment, and I am responsible for what I say on this subject, from the information I have, I say that

is a mere fiction and a myth; that Germany has had no intention at any time of interfering down there in behalf of any German creditors, and, so far as I know, Germany is not complaining of any conduct of this Administration of ours or even of the Santo Domingo country.

I know the Assistant Secretary of State, in his interview given to the public, declared that we had been brought in imminent peril. He said:

> The unfortunate financial condition of Santo Domingo more than once in the last decade has brought to the United States Government questions fraught with imminent peril.

I am a little uncertain whether he meant this Government or Santo Domingo, but assuming that it was Santo Domingo we are entitled to know who is threatening Santo Domingo. If it is we who are brought in peril, then we are certainly entitled to know it.

Mr. President, I do not believe there is any reason why this resolution should not pass. As I said yesterday, I do not suppose it will pass. I am not disposed to unduly press it, and under present conditions, apparent, I think, to the Senate generally, I am not going to call even for a yea-and-nay vote on it. I will not explain why. Senators will understand that without any explanation on my part.

Mr. President, if at the next session of Congress we come here to consider this treaty, that has practically ceased now to be considered before the Senate, we are not going to consider it without the information that belongs to this body under such conditions, and no President will, in my judgment, refuse to send us all the information he has on that subject.

If this was not the last day, or if I did not hope that it was the last day of the session, I should be tempted to say some things concerning the Monroe doctrine. I had supposed until within a few days that an opportunity might be presented. But I shall defer that, Mr. President, until some favorable opportunity, when I shall endeavor to show that the suggestion made in the President's message that the Monroe doctrine requires certain conduct on our part, is sustained neither by precedent nor by the principle of the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to let the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations dispose of the question for the time being. If the resolution goes to the committee to be buried, as I know it will, and I know that is the purpose of the motion, I shall find a way, if I live until the next session of Congress, to renew it in a form that so far as the form is concerned will not be objectionable; and I will put the dominant party in the Senate upon the ground of determining whether we are to have the information or not, or whether it is a mere caprice, or because there is something they want to conceal, which I doubt very much. I believe, Mr. President, it is through mere caprice that the resolution is not allowed to pass at this time.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations are not in the habit of burying anything that ought not to be buried, and sometimes we do not bury things that ought to be buried perhaps.

So far as this resolution is concerned, I shall ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I will assure the Senator from Colorado that at the proper time it will be taken up and considered just as though it were any other question that might be involved in the treaty. I therefore move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois moves that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TELLER. That motion is already pending.

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; it is. I had forgotten it.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, if we refer the resolution now to the Committee on Foreign Relations, so far as I am able to judge of the outlook, there will be no opportunity for that committee to consider the resolution or report it at this session and to get it passed by the Senate. The result will be that when we meet here at the regular session of the Senate in December we will be as devoid of information as we are now.

As we stand to-day, Mr. President, the Senate has its head in a complete fog. It was at one time the fashion of the Government to submit great questions, such as we have here, to the Attorney-General. After he had expressed his opinion upon the legal bearings of the case the Secretary of State would often address a letter to the President, in which he laid before him a full scheme of the subject-matter, and when the communication was made to the Senate they had easily accessible to themselves both an exposition of law and a circumstantial relation of the facts upon which they were invited to act.

In this case, Mr. President, we have a brief message from the President. The history of the matter which is involved in the treaty is but imperfectly laid before us.

I contend that when the Senate is invited to act upon a subject-matter it ought to have the fullest information that can be given it officially concerning that subject-matter. It is to be presumed that the Senate desires to act with the highest intelligence that can be applied to a grave concern. It is obvious that the highest intelligence can not be exercised upon a public question unless all reasonable information is supplied and a full account of it given.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] yesterday, I think, rather placed, by his method of statement, Senators who advocate some such resolution as this in a false position. He poses us as demanding something of the President. The word "demand" is the word which he applied to characterize this resolution. The resolution is not a demand. If it were a demand, I would not support it. I do not consider that we have the right to demand of the President or of the Departments a statement of the history in their possession. I remember to have seen the incident related that during the Administration of President Jackson there was submitted to him a letter from the French minister in which the words "je demande" were employed. As soon as he saw them he became very much irritated and swore that no response would be made. A felicitous interpreter happening to be near stated that these words in French did not imply what they might seem to do when translated into English, but signified "request," whereupon the President became entirely amenable to the influences of good humor and said there could be no objection in the world to complying with a request so politely stated.

Mr. President, this is a resolution from the only body in this country that can ratify a treaty, and it simply asks for official information respecting that treaty. In a logical sense it would seem to me that it ought to pass of course. Equally, of course, the President preserves in dignity and not in suspicion his right to act upon that request in such a manner as he thinks the best interests require.

But the Senator from Massachusetts says that were the President to convey to the Senate a statement that, according to his judgment, the public interests enjoin upon him not to communicate certain particular information, we would put the President in a false position. That is approaching this subject in a style which, as it seems to me, does not comport either with the dignity of the Senate or with the dignity of the President of the United States. We deal with the subject from different standpoints, but I deny that any Senator deals with it in any fog of suspicion; and I deny that the President of the United States can acquire any fog of suspicion around himself unless it might be gathered indeed by such curious insinuations.

I believe the President of the United States to be an exceedingly manly man, an exceedingly bold man, and a man who does not fear to do anything that he may conclude it is right for him to do. And while I may often differ with him in opinion, I can not attribute to him any such weakness as the apprehension that he will be put in a false position by a respectful request of the Senate to be given such information as they deem fitting to this subject.

Mr. President, we need this information. We can not intelligently sum up this subject-matter without the information. If it be (I have no reason to think that it is) a history made under such conditions that either the judgment of the American people upon it or that of other nations may be feared, the President would not be without precedent if he were to set forth such reasons as actuated him—and they appear to be correct reasons—for withholding such matters as might be of too delicate a nature to impart either to the Senate or to the people of the United States. But why imagine, Mr. President, that such a condition exists, when we have no information that it exists? Why suppose an exceptional condition of affairs, when there is nothing to suggest an exceptional condition of affairs?

Furthermore, Mr. President, whatever may be done about this matter, and whatever has been done about this matter, is sure, in the nature of things, to become public. Publicity is a part of our institutions. It is also a part of the spirit of the age in which we live. No nation and no administration and no great affair which affects the interests of the civilized world can be, in these days, hid away in darkness and in silence. And the best time for publicity to pervade our public concerns is before we deal with them, and not afterwards, for it is only beforehand that minds can be instructed by that publicity, and that opinions may be formed from full possession of facts. In many cases without such information we may only recall the transaction of public business with regret that this or that was not known, and that mistakes might have been avoided.

I regret to see the Senate in the attitude of endeavoring to

withhold from itself or from the people of this country full enlightenment upon a great subject-matter in which all of us are so deeply interested, and in which the public are as much interested as any individual could be.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, my experience in the Senate has been briefer than that of the Senator from Virginia, but in the course of my twelve years' service here I have taken part in the consideration of many treaties. I have never known a case where the correspondence or the reports of interviews, the process of negotiation by which the treaty was brought into being, had been requested from the President. There was one case in which that correspondence was requested after the treaty had been ratified, and in that case it was sent in in manuscript under the strictest injunctions of secrecy. It was never printed. It was placed in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, and any Senator who desired examined it. But that was after the ratification of the treaty.

Now, this rule and practice rest, as it seems to me, on a sound foundation. The Constitution intrusts to the President the sole power of negotiating treaties. In the course of negotiation many notes are interchanged, many interviews are held of which brief reports are made to the Government, and much is done in an informal and unofficial way in order to bring the treaty to pass. In that process of negotiation we are not concerned. We begin to act only when the treaty is sent to us for approval or disapproval.

But if we make these requests, of which this is one of the first instances that I recall, for all the correspondence on which the negotiation is based, we ask the President to send to us not only what our Government has said and written, but inevitably what the other government has said or written, either in the direct form of their letters or in reports of their statements, and that I do not think any President could properly do. It is entirely within our province to ask for information on a definite point, which the President himself is at liberty to give us, but to ask from him all the correspondence on which a treaty is based before we act upon that treaty seems to me a mistaken practice, if it should ever be adopted. My objection to the Senate placing itself in that position is fundamental.

It is perfectly true that the President can refuse to send in papers that he thinks it incompatible with the public interests to send, but if we ask him by a public resolution to send in certain papers on which negotiation is based and he is obliged to refuse, as I believe he would be in proper observance of the comity obtaining between nations, then he is in the position where it would be very easy for persons disposed to be hostile to say that he was keeping back incriminating documents when he was simply doing what good practice and international custom required.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. As I understand the point of the Senator's argument, it is that a great many people would not believe the President made an answer in good faith to this resolution if he declined to send the information.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator misunderstands me completely. I never intimated anything of the sort. I said there were people who would not be slow to charge it, and when party lines are drawn in our foreign affairs it is quite possible that such charges would be made. I do not mean to say that they would be made by Senators who are familiar with the circumstances, but made in the heat of party conflict.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. If the Senator will permit me for a moment, I will say if the President were to send a message to the Senate stating that it was incompatible with the public interest for him to send those papers here, I for one would believe that the statement was made in perfect good faith, and I think it would be so accepted by the Senate. I do not see that there is any point in the Senator's argument, unless he fears that there would be a distrust of the President's truthfulness and good faith in making that reply.

Mr. LODGE. I have no fear, Mr. President, that there would be any distrust of the President's truthfulness either here or among the people at large. I think the opinion of the American people in regard to the truthfulness of the President of the United States has been sufficiently manifested to leave no doubt on that point.

Mr. CARMACK. Then, if the Senator will permit me, why should he fear that such charges would be made if he knows that nobody would believe them?

Mr. LODGE. Because I have known a great many charges made by the party opposed to the President, which I think nobody seriously believed.

Mr. CARMACK. And they did not do any harm.

Mr. LODGE. No; it is quite evident that they did not do any harm.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not the state of public affairs, and has it not been ever since the foundation of the Government the fact that some people are always making charges against everybody? Is it fair for the Senate to consider, in discharging its duties, the fear that somebody might charge something on somebody else?

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senate ought not to make a request on the President which we know beforehand that he is bound, owing to the relations of another government to the question, to refuse to answer in whole or in part. It has never been the practice here; it has never been done.

I do not suppose there is one line in all the negotiations which anybody may not know, but I do think that it would be a most unfortunate precedent for the Senate to adopt the ground that, pending the ratification of a treaty, the President should be asked to send in the papers involving the correspondence and the attitude and the expression of opinion of a foreign government. If it can be applied to one government it can be applied to all. I do not think that this unusual request is a wise or a proper one to make. For that reason I hope the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I am quite sure the Senator from Massachusetts, whatever his personal and political friendship for the President may be, does not speak by authority when he seems to me to intimate that the President, if he thought it was incompatible with the public interest to send the documents to the Senate, would be embarrassed in saying that to the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think he would be in the least embarrassed to so say. I have never known him to be afraid to say what he thought.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator said there was danger of embarrassing the President and that somebody might criticise him improperly. Why, Mr. President, old George Washington, without any precedent before him, was brave enough, when he thought a paper should not go to Congress, to say so; and I think practically that every President since has been able to say that.

Mr. MORGAN. That was in reference to the other House.

Mr. TELLER. Yes; in reference to the other House, which had called for certain documents. President Washington was brave enough to say that they were not entitled to them; and I think I may say that all the Presidents from that time down have been more or less accustomed to saying that very thing. They have said, "There are certain things that I think ought to be withheld;" and they have withheld them. If the Senator's argument means anything, it means that we must refrain from calling for information for fear there may be something in the Government archives that the executive department does not want to give us, and that the President will be subjected to criticism if he does not do so, although custom has authorized him to say: "It is incompatible with the public interest to comply with your request, and therefore I decline." Mr. President, in my experience in the Senate I have seen that done repeatedly, and I have never in my life known a single criticism of it. I have never heard a Senator who was opposed to the President politically or otherwise raise a question but that it was the exercise of a power which belonged to him, a power which was intrusted to him for the public good. We have never had a President who was not brave enough to say that when such a necessity arose, and we have never had a Senate mean enough to criticise him when he exercised that power.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I do not think that there is any very great importance attached to this resolution whether it should be adopted or not; but it presents a practical question. If we were to instruct the Committee on Foreign Relations or to request the President at once to furnish us the information desired in the resolution, unless we are prepared to remain here for a week or two longer, we should not, perhaps, be able to get it. Therefore I say that the proper thing to do, in my judgment, in view of the probable early adjournment of the session, is to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and I hope that will be the action of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, this resolution ought to be adopted by the Senate without any hesitancy, I think, in justice to its own reputation. Senators here claim that information is

desired relative to the matters that are contained in or sought to be brought out by this resolution. It is very evident that there are questions connected with this resolution that we do not feel at liberty to allude to in open debate; but the minds of Senators evidently have been very much impressed with the necessity of getting from the State Department the correspondence in regard to certain transactions in the island of Santo Domingo; and when we are required to act on treaties, protocols, and things of that sort, and to advise the President—that is what the action of the Senate ought to be; the Constitution says that we are here for the purpose of advising him in the matter of making treaties—we ought to have all the information that bears upon the subject.

I do not agree at all with the proposition stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] on yesterday, that the Senate in its executive session holds any such relation to the President of the United States as to exclude them from any information relating to treaties which would enable them to give him proper advice and give their own consent to this supreme law of the United States which we are enacting here in this Chamber. There is no other part of the legislative power of the United States which is invited in here to assist us in making this supreme law. In ordinary legislation we are very glad to have the assistance of the House of Representatives, and it is absolutely necessary. A legislative department consisting only of one body is not allowable in the United States in conformity with the principles of our constitutional government, except in the single case of advising and consenting to a treaty, which becomes the supreme law of the land whenever we consent to it.

The other party, Mr. President, who is engaged in legislating upon this supreme law of the United States is in this particular case the man Morales, down there in Santo Domingo. Well, sir, if he was elected to the Senate of the United States from a State of this Union, and sent here otherwise duly qualified, this Senate would not receive him; it could not do it out of respect to its own character; it could not possibly receive him upon his personal merits. He is recognized as President in Santo Domingo, owing to the comity of nations and the necessity to preserve commercial and other relations with all foreign countries. The doctrine of international law is that a man who occupies such a position, it makes no difference how he got it, if he is in possession of the government there, may be, and ought to be, recognized by the President of the United States as the de facto President of that country. We do not base the recognition upon his de jure rights at all, but upon his de facto rights.

Now, there he is, and he is participating with this Senate in enacting a supreme law for the United States. Well, the nearest we can get to his views on this question is to ask the President of the United States to send in the correspondence that he has had with him. It is a matter that ought to be looked into. There may be a question of propriety on the part of the Senate in ratifying a treaty with such a man as Morales. The Senate of the United States may refuse to consider it.

For a long time here, under the express provisions of the Constitution of the United States, we ratified treaties with the Indian tribes; that is to say, with the chiefs of the tribes. After a while we came to recognize the absurdity of that, because those men were absolutely incompetent to make treaties, and we knew it. So quietly we withdrew the jurisdiction from the Senate, assumed it in behalf of both Houses of Congress, and undertook to make contracts with the Indian tribes by a sort of programme that we ourselves laid down, whereby we could deal with them on most important matters through the assistance of commissioners and of acts of Congress.

Why did we do that? Simply because those chiefs were not competent to represent their governments, and no one could tell whether a man who was chief to-day had the right to be or would be chief to-morrow. So in recognition of that first principle of treaty making or contract making with independent governments, we have adopted that as the scheme now upon which we shall deal with the Indians.

Now, look at Morales—and I might include several other chieftains who are presiding now in the office of presidency of those republics—look at them. What are they? Who are they? What rights have they got? How can we invite them to come in here to participate with us in making the supreme law of the United States? This treaty when ratified, if it should be ratified, becomes a law that breaks down any State constitution, any State law; and I believe it would break down any law of the United States that is in conflict with it.

That is the ground we took here when we were arguing the Panama question, the question of government there, etc., and the treaty with Panama. If there were any laws in the way of a treaty made with Panama, they would give way; they would be repealed by the power and effect of the treaty. So in this case, if there is any part of the law of the United States, such as the collection of the customs of the United States, the rate of taxation, the occupancy of their ports and custom-houses by our agents, and the like of that, this treaty, Mr. President, breaks down the laws of the United States, and it breaks down the Constitution of the United States, in my humble opinion. But at all events there is no law which we touch or have touched in a long time that has the importance that must be attached to the laws that are provided in this treaty to be enacted as the supreme law of the United States.

Mr. President, in order to understand what we ought to do in the island of Santo Domingo and what we ought to do in respect of the people of that country, the President has assumed and exercised the right, and we have the right in concert with him—in correspondence with him—to know those same things, so that we may come to a judgment as to whether we will consent to the enactment of this law—for that is what we are doing, enacting a law.

It is not true that the President has a right to withhold information on the subject of a treaty—I will confine my remarks to that—from the Senate upon the proposition, stated by the Senator from Massachusetts on yesterday, that there are matters connected with the negotiation of treaties that we are compelled to keep in the archives of the State Department and in the bosom of the President and the Secretary of State, for the reason that other nations would not treat freely with us if they thought that their pour parlers and various other efforts to get at an agreement were to be investigated by the Senate.

Let us see what that amounts to. That depends upon whether or not these state secrets—for they are state secrets—are as much protected against exposure when communicated to the Senate as they are when communicated to the President. As a matter of practice, Mr. President, neither body can avoid exposure. The editors of proceedings in executive sessions are here to expose what we say, and a great deal of what we do not say, to the world; but the world is charitable enough to put them down as falsifiers and give us the benefit of the doubt. That is about the situation here. When we go down to the streets and find that horde of enterprising, enlightened, and intelligent reporters around the Department of State and around the Executive Office, so that a man can hardly break through them to get in or out—certainly he can not do it without being interrupted in his business—what are they doing there? They are picking up information from the President and from his men around him and from the State Department and other Departments, but more particularly from the President and the State Department, which they go and circulate to the world. There is a freedom of giving out such information there which I think must surprise other nations as to the liberality and democracy of our institutions, because nothing is sent here, or very little is sent here, under the confidence of our rules that does not appear next morning in the public papers as having been given out.

We find statements, statements, statements made by the Secretary of State and the Assistant Secretary of State and "published by authority," it is said, in the important, influential, and reputable newspapers, that are not communicated here. When the Senate gets hold of these facts in this indirect way and we offer a resolution here to bring out the actual facts, Senators rise and object that we are not worthy of confidence; that we must advise the President without being informed of what the facts are. He has advised himself as to the signing and sending here of a treaty upon a state of facts—of course he could not do it otherwise—but when it comes to the question of whether a coordinate branch of the Government, the Senate, shall also advise him, we are left in the dark, and he refuses to show us the papers, we will say, upon which he took his course of action and made his recommendation. We have to vote the law of the land in the absence of the facts that the President has acted upon, and he and his friends stand around him and say: "No, it would be impolite; it would be perhaps dangerous for the President of the United States to send in his message here stating the facts upon which he acted in negotiating the treaty lest you might give them out to the world." As a matter of fact, I think the Senate can very well afford to compare notes with the executive department on the question of retailing to the world facts that ought to be kept sacred in that department. I think so, and the people think so, and they think rightly about it.

This resolution ought not to be opposed. The Senate ought not to humiliate itself and ought not to place upon itself the brand that it is worthy to be treated in the way we are treated when the President refuses or withholds or fails to send in information that we need here. We believe we need it, and we

know we need it, in order to get at the facts of the transaction and base a sound judgment and consent under the Constitution and our oaths upon a proposition to ratify the treaty.

We ought not to put that brand upon ourselves, but that is what we are doing. We are announcing to the world that the President of the United States must not be invited by this body to send to it the papers that relate to the correspondence out of which the treaty originated because we are not fit to be trusted with it; and yet it is asserted here, and admitted on all sides, that the President, for reasons of his own, may, after all, decline the request, because he is under some peculiar personal obligation or Presidential obligation not to furnish the particular facts. He has a right to decline the request without any impeachment of his motives. We do not impeach his motives whenever he makes such a reservation and refuses to send the information desired. That is supposed to be and asserted to be the prerogative of the President and necessary for the safety of the public.

So the Senate makes no complaint when this information is withheld; but let the President take that ground, not that he is not compelled to communicate to the Senate the facts in reference to the negotiation of the treaty, but that there are certain facts within his keeping in the particular case which he may withhold for reasons best known to himself. Then the Senate would yield at once and would not pass under the ban and suspicion inflicted by themselves upon their own trustworthiness.

Mr. GORMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama, who has had great experience and has most extensive knowledge in regard to questions of this character, whether in connection with the negotiation of treaties by this Government there has been a single instance in the whole history of the Government up to within the last ten years where there has been raised the slightest question as to the adoption of such a resolution or where there has been a refusal on the part of the President of the United States to communicate to the Senate when it is considering a treaty all the correspondence in relation thereto?

Mr. MORGAN. Never, Mr. President, within my knowledge or information, in regard to a treaty. In regard to public appointments to office the Cleveland Administration took a ground which I think is entirely untenable. I think we did ourselves very great injustice in not requiring Mr. Cleveland to bring forward the reasons for removal of men from office. Citizens of the United States have a right, when they are driven from office, to know, and to have their Senators and Representatives know, what grounds there are for their removal. Whatever the grounds are they ought to be stated. That was a bad rule; it was a bad break we made in the wrong direction when we applied it to appointments to office, but, so far as I am informed, we have never applied that rule to treaties, and I do not think any Senator here can cite an instance in which it has been done.

Mr. GORMAN. If the Senator from Alabama will allow me, I should like to call his attention, in view of what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has said about this matter in the consideration of the pending treaty, that when General Grant was President of the United States he negotiated a treaty for the acquisition of this island of Santo Domingo, and, without the passage of a resolution by the Senate, he furnished to the then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Hon. Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, all the correspondence, and on the 24th day of March, 1870, Mr. Sumner presented it to the Senate. It is set out in the Executive Journal, as follows:

> Mr. Sumner presented a letter of the Secretary of State, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, communicating copies of the instructions under which the convention and treaty of the United States and Santo Domingo were negotiated, together with the accompaniments therein referred to; which was ordered to be printed in confidence for the use of the Senate.

So in looking back, as I had cause to do some year or two ago, I found that in almost every case the Department furnished voluntarily all the correspondence which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] says ought not to be presented at any time, and in no case in the history of the body where the resotion was couched in proper language was it ever refused to pass a resolution asking for such information.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I am not very familiar with that particular incident, although I knew it in a historical way; but that was a case where a brave and honest President squared his action with his sense of duty. His idea was that the Senate of the United States, in acting upon what was then a very difficult problem relating to this same island, ought to be informed of everything that had been done and said in that transaction. When we have such Presidents, we have no occasion to be making requests through resolutions that we be informed of this, that, and the other thing connected with it. It is the absence of such Presidents. I think, Mr. President, that has forced us into this unpleasant duty of asking for information by resolution that ought to come voluntarily. It is a part of the duty of the President to communicate it to us, so that we can know what he acted upon and whether to advise him that his action was correct or incorrect and inform him, if we can, where he overlooked some point.

Look at the first Hay-Pauncefote treaty; how it was argued and discussed here, how every fact in regard to the whole subject was brought forward by President McKinley, and how the Senate disagreed with that great and splendid man in the wording of that treaty and amended it, knowing at the time they amended it that it would fail, because Great Britain would not accept the construction that the United States Senate put upon it. The fact that the Senate took that action on that occasion has saved this Government from an involvement about which we would have been worrying to-day very seriously.

I hope the Senate will pass this resolution and let us go on and attend to this business as we ought to, because some of us, at least, are not satisfied that we have got the information that is necessary.

There is one paper connected with this business—and I will not designate it—which seems to have taken effect and produced very important results in Santo Domingo, without anybody being able to trace its origin or knowing whether it originated here or whether it originated in Santo Domingo, or who prepared it or drew it up, or under what instructions, if any, that agreement was made. We knew nothing about it. It is a matter of serious dispute all around as to where that paper comes from and by whose authority that contract was entered into.

Well, I suppose the general purpose of this resolution is to get at the history of that paper; to find out in some way, if we can, who originated it, where it was first made, and by what authority it was ever formulated into a contract between this Government and the Government of Santo Domingo. We do not know anything about it, and here we are lingering along, not even considering the amendments to this treaty nor taking a single vote upon anything at all, in our effort to get information. It is an honest effort, and I hope it will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator from Illinois will allow me to interrupt him a moment, I thought that before he moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business he would permit action to be taken upon the resolution which I offered yesterday, to which he objected, and which came up this morning.

Mr. CULLOM. I think we had better get along with executive matters.

Mr. MORGAN. I know the Senator thinks we had better get along, but I have an opinion of my own as to what ought to be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois insist upon his motion

Mr. CULLOM. I think I shall have to insist upon it.

EXTENSION OF PATENTS IN CERTAIN CASES.

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator from Illinois will yield to me for a moment, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the printing of a document.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask unanimous consent for the printing, as a document, of an argument regarding legislation for the extension of letters patent. The expense, I believe, will be less than $500. It is now under consideration by the American Bar Association, and it is claimed that the argument which I ask to have printed contains valuable information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. KEAN. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To print as a Senate document the paper to which the Senator from Nevada has referred.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. What is the nature of the paper?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It relates to patent matters.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It relates to legislation for the extension of patents in proper cases beyond the term of the original grant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the paper referred to by the Senator from Nevada will be printed as a document. The Chair hears no objection.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. During the executive session several messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries. After two hours and twenty-eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

While the doors were closed, at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., Mr. CULLOM submitted the following resolution, which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee to consist of two Senators be appointed by the Chair to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that, unless he may have some further communication to make, the Senate is ready to adjourn without day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. CULLOM and Mr. MCCREARY as the committee.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

At 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m. Mr. CULLOM and Mr. MCCREARY, the committee appointed to wait upon the President of the United States, appeared, and

Mr. CULLOM said: Mr. President, the committee who were directed by the Senate to inform the President that if he should have no further communication to make the Senate is ready to adjourn, have discharged that duty, and were requested by the President to inform the Senate that he has no further communication to make.

At 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m. the Senate resumed legislative session.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate do now adjourn without day.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the President pro tempore declared the Senate adjourned without day.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 18, 1905.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Edwin V. Morgan, of New York, now consul at Dalny, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Korea, vice Horace N. Allen, resigned.

CONSULS-GENERAL.

George C. McIntosh, of West Virginia, to be consul-general of the United States at Buenos Aires, Argentine Republic, vice Daniel Mayer, whose nomination was not acted upon at the last session of the Senate.

Horace Lee Washington, of the District of Columbia, now consul at Geneva, to be consul-general of the United States at Cape Town, Cape of Good Hope, vice William R. Bigham, resigned.

CONSULS.

George L. Dobson, of Iowa, to be consul of the United States at Hangchow, China, vice George E. Anderson, appointed consul at Amoy. The nomination of Mr. Dobson to be consul at Nottingham, which was sent to the Senate on the 6th instant, is hereby withdrawn.

John H. Snodgrass, of West Virginia, to be consul of the United States at Pretoria, Transvaal, South Africa, vice Joseph E. Proffit, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Elliott Northcott, of West Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of West Virginia, in place of Thomas E. Davis, deceased.

Walter S. Louden, of Illinois, to be collector of internal revenue for the thirteenth district of Illinois, in place of William H. Powell, deceased.

POSTMASTERS.

OREGON.

J. C. Hodson to be postmaster at Newberg, in the county of Yamhill and State of Oregon, in place of Ezra H. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1904.

Frank Lucas to be postmaster at Monmouth, in the county of Polk and State of Oregon. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Christian C. Kohlsaat, of Illinois, now serving as United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, to be United States circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit. An original appointment under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1905, entitled "An act providing for an additional circuit judge in the seventh judicial circuit, * * * ."

DISTRICT JUDGES.

Solomon H. Bethea, of Illinois, now serving as United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice Christian C. Kohlsaat, nominated to be United States circuit judge for the seventh judicial circuit.

Kenesaw M. Landis, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois. An original appointment under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1905, entitled "An act providing for an additional judge in the seventh judicial circuit, and for the appointment of an additional judge for the northern district of Illinois * * *."

DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

Henry K. Butterfield, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin. A reappointment, his term expiring April 21, 1905.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 18, 1905.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Henry K. Butterfield, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Edwin V. Morgan, of New York, to Korea.

CONSUL-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

Horace Lee Washington, of the District of Columbia, at Cape Town, Cape of Good Hope.

CONSULS.

John H. Snodgrass, of West Virginia, at Pretoria, Transvaal, South Africa.

George L. Dobson, of Iowa, at Hangchow, China.

George C. McIntosh, of West Virginia, to be consul-general at Buenos Ayres, Argentine Republic.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Walter S. Louden, of Illinois, for the thirteenth district of Illinois.

Elliott Northcott, of West Virginia, for the district of West Virginia.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT.

Christian C. Kohlsaat, of Illinois.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

Solomon H. Bethea, of Illinois.

Kenesaw M. Landis, of Illinois.

POSTMASTERS.

OREGON.

J. C. Hodson, at Newberg, Oreg.

Frank Lucas, at Monmouth, Oreg.

EXTRADITION TREATY WITH URUGUAY.

The treaty was ratified and the injunction of secrecy removed March 18, 1905, from a treaty between the United States and Uruguay, signed on March 11, 1905, for the mutual extradition of criminals.

LIST OF OFFICES TO WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE MADE AND NOT CONFIRMED AND FILLED DURING THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE FIFTY-NINTH CONGRESS, ENDING MARCH 18, 1905.

Judge of the district court of the district of Alaska.—Person nominated, James Wickersham.

First lieutenant in the Army of the United States, Infantry Arm.—Person nominated, James L. Craig.

First lieutenant in the Army of the United States, Cavalry Arm.—Person nominated, William C. Gardenhire.

POSTMASTERS

At Thibodaux, La., Arthur A. Boudreaux.

At Northeast, Pa., Perry A. Sanborn.

FIFTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE FIFTY-NINTH CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 4, 1905.*

The first Monday of December being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

The Vice-President (Mr. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS) called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon.

PRAYER.

The Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE, offered the following prayer:

And Solomon stood before the altar of the Lord in the presence of all the congregation of Israel, and spread forth his hands toward heaven;

And he said, Lord God of Israel, there is no God like Thee in heaven above or on the earth beneath, who keepest covenant and mercy with Thy servants that walk before Thee with all their hearts;

And now, O God of Israel, let Thy word, I pray Thee, be verified, which Thou speakest unto Thy servant. But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold the heaven and heaven of heavens can not contain Thee.

Yet have Thou respect unto the prayer of Thy servant, O Lord my God, that Thine eyes may be open toward this house night and day, even toward the place of which Thou hast said "My name shall be there," that Thou mayest hearken unto the prayers which Thy servants shall make toward this place, and hearken Thou to the supplication of Thy servant and of Thy people when they shall pray, and hear Thou in heaven Thy dwelling place, and when Thou hearest, forgive.

What prayer and supplication which shall be made by any man or by all Thy people hear Thou in heaven, Thy dwelling place, and forgive and do and give to every man according to his ways, whose heart Thou knowest, for Thou knowest the hearts of all the children of men.

Let us pray. Father Almighty, Lord of heaven and earth, we thank Thee for everything and we ask Thee for everything. We thank Thee for these days and months since we parted; for health, for light, for air, for breath, for wisdom, for everything that Thou hast been pleased to give Thy servants.

And now we are before Thee in prayer for the work of this Congress in the months that are before us. Thou hast been pleased to send Thy servants to this service. Thy kingdom is to come and Thy will is to be done on earth as it is done in heaven. And here are all these ministers of Thine, apostles of Thine, sent by Thee to go forward to bring in this kingdom. They have to hew down the mountains and to lift up the valleys. They have to make the waters flow and the deserts blossom. And they are here to pledge themselves to Thee, the living God, our Father, with us always—strength for Thy commandments; strength for each of Thy servants here; wisdom, Thy perfect wisdom, for whatever they may have to decide and whatever they may do, and the love of justice, truth, and peace in every heart before Thee.

Father, we thank Thee for so much! For peace among the nations; that Thou hast sheathed the sword and that men need study war no more; for concord, the blessing and prosperity of this happy nation, whose God is the Lord; that men bear each others burdens; that they go forward as brethren, each with each and each with all.

And so be with us in these days that are to come. Light, love, and strength, Father; we ask everything of Thy perfect love, as Thy children in the Lord Jesus.

Join me, all, audibly in the Lord's prayer.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is done in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll of the Senate.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alger	Daniel	Heyburn	Perkins
Allee	Depew	Hopkins	Pettus
Allison	Dick	Kean	Piles
Ankeny	Dillingham	Kittredge	Platt
Bacon	Dolliver	Latimer	Proctor
Bailey	Dryden	Lodge	Rayner
Beveridge	Dubois	Long	Scott
Blackburn	Elkins	McCreary	Simmons
Bulkeley	Flint	McCumber	Smoot
Burkett	Foraker	Mallory	Spooner
Burnham	Foster	Martin	Stone
Burrows	Frye	Millard	Sutherland
Carter	Fulton	Money	Teller
Clapp	Gallinger	Morgan	Tillman
Clark, Mont.	Gamble	Nelson	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gorman	Newlands	Wetmore
Clarke, Ark.	Hale	Nixon	
Crane	Hansbrough	Overman	
Culberson	Hemenway	Penrose	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. BACON. As my colleague [Mr. CLAY] did not respond to his name on the roll call, I desire the RECORD to show that he is absent on account of personal illness.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I have already presented the credentials of my colleague [Mr. Knox] and they have been filed. I ask that he now be sworn in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect from Pennsylvania will present himself at the desk.

Mr. Knox was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. PENROSE; and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

SENATOR FROM RHODE ISLAND.

Mr. WETMORE. I desire that my colleague [Mr. Aldrich] may be sworn. His credentials have been presented and filed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect from Rhode Island will present himself at the desk.

Mr. Aldrich was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. WETMORE; and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

SENATORS FROM MISSOURI AND TENNESSEE.

Mr. STONE presented the credentials of William Warner, chosen by the legislature of the State of Missouri a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. GORMAN presented the credentials of James B. Frazier, chosen by the legislature of the State of Tennessee a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy in the term beginning March

4, 1905, occasioned by the death of William B. Bate; which were read and ordered to be filed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senators-elect whose credentials have been read will present themselves at the desk and receive the oath of office.

Mr. Warner and Mr. Frazier were escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. STONE and Mr. GORMAN, respectively, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to them, they took their seats in the Senate.

SENATORS PRESENT.

The following Senators were present:
From the State of—
Alabama—John T. Morgan and Edmund W. Pettus.
Arkansas—James P. Clarke.
California—Frank P. Flint and George C. Perkins.
Colorado—Henry M. Teller.
Connecticut—Morgan G. Bulkeley.
Delaware—J. Frank Allee.
Florida—Stephen R. Mallory.
Georgia—Augustus O. Bacon.
Idaho—Fred T. Dubois and Weldon B. Heyburn.
Illinois—Albert J. Hopkins.
Indiana—Albert J. Beveridge and James A. Hemenway.
Iowa—William B. Allison and Jonathan P. Dolliver.
Kansas—Chester I. Long.
Kentucky—Joseph C. S. Blackburn and James B. McCreary.
Louisiana—Murphy J. Foster.
Maine—William P. Frye and Eugene Hale.
Maryland—Arthur P. Gorman and Isador Rayner.
Massachusetts—Winthrop M. Crane and Henry Cabot Lodge.
Michigan—Russell A. Alger and Julius C. Burrows.
Minnesota—Moses E. Clapp and Knute Nelson.
Mississippi—H. D. Money.
Missouri—William J. Stone and William Warner.
Montana—Thomas H. Carter and William A. Clark.
Nebraska—Elmer J. Burkett and Joseph H. Millard.
Nevada—Francis G. Newlands and George S. Nixon.
New Hampshire—Henry E. Burnham and Jacob H. Gallinger.
New Jersey—John F. Dryden and John Kean.
New York—Chauncey M. Depew and Thomas C. Platt.
North Carolina—Lee S. Overman and Furnifold M. Simmons.
North Dakota—Henry C. Hansbrough and Porter J. McCumber.
Ohio—Charles Dick and Joseph B. Foraker.
Oregon—Charles W. Fulton.
Pennsylvania—Philander Chase Knox and Boies Penrose.
Rhode Island—Nelson W. Aldrich and George P. Wetmore.
South Carolina—Asbury C. Latimer and Benjamin R. Tillman.
South Dakota—Robert J. Gamble and Alfred B. Kittredge.
Tennessee—James B. Frazier.
Texas—Joseph W. Bailey and Charles A. Culberson.
Utah—Reed Smoot and George Sutherland.
Vermont—William P. Dillingham and Redfield Proctor.
Virginia—John W. Daniel and Thomas S. Martin.
Washington—Levi Ankeny and Samuel H. Piles.
West Virginia—Stephen B. Elkins and Nathan B. Scott.
Wisconsin—John C. Spooner.
Wyoming—Clarence D. Clark and Francis E. Warren.

SENATOR FROM FLORIDA.

Mr. MALLORY presented the credentials of James P. Taliaferro, chosen by the legislature of the State of Florida a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read and ordered to be filed.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed as the committee Mr. ALLISON and Mr. MORGAN.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled, and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING.

Mr. FRYE. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] desired me to state that he is detained from the Chamber to-day by illness. I offer the following resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian until otherwise ordered.

DEATH OF SENATOR ORVILLE HITCHCOCK PLATT.

Mr. BULKELEY. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to announce to the Senate the death, since the close of the last session of this body, of the senior Senator from Connecticut, Hon. ORVILLE HITCHCOCK PLATT, who died at his summer residence, Washington, Conn., April 21, 1905.

I desire, Mr. President, to offer the following resolutions for the consideration of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut offers resolutions, which will be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate with deep regret has listened to the announcement of the death of the Hon. ORVILLE HITCHCOCK PLATT, for more than a quarter of a century a member of this body, a period marked by five consecutive elections, as a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Connecticut.

The resolutions were agreed to unanimously; and the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 5, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 4, 1905.*

This day, in compliance with the provisions of the Constitution, the Members-elect of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-ninth Congress assembled in their Hall and were called to order by Mr. ALEXANDER MCDOWELL, the Clerk of the last House.

The CLERK. Prayer will be offered by the Chaplain of the last House.

The following prayer was offered by the Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., Chaplain of the last House.

Infinite and eternal Spirit, Father of all souls and the giver of all gifts, humbly and devoutly we bow before Thee and ackowledge with gratitude our indebtedness to Thee for all that we are and all that we can hope to be as individuals and as a nation.

From weakness to power, from small to great, from insignificance to a world-wide influence Thou hast led us onward and upward as a nation, and we would not forget that "to whom much is given of him much will be required," "that righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

Forgive, we beseech Thee, our individual and national sins and cleanse us from all iniquity, that with pure motives, high resolves, and noble endeavors we may move forward to yet greater achievements.

Here in Thy sight, under the dome of this great Capitol, we are gathered together, the Senators and Representatives of eighty millions of people, who have committed to their care the interests and welfare of the nation. Grant, O most merciful Father, that with clear conceptions, lofty ideals, and patriotic zeal they may fulfill to the uttermost the obligations resting upon them. Impart unto the Speaker of this House strength and wisdom, that he may guide this body through all its deliberations to the highest and best results.

Be graciously near to the President of these United States, his advisers, and all others in authority, that with unanimity of purpose, guided by the light of heaven, the laws of the land may be faithfully executed and the affairs of state wisely and amicably administered to the uplift of the people and to the honor and glory of Thy holy name.

We thank Thee for the peace and prosperity which prevails throughout our borders and that we are at peace with all the world, and we most fervently pray that these conditions may continue so long as the Republic shall live, in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, who taught us, when we pray, to say:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The CLERK. The Clerk will call the roll by States to ascertain if a quorum of the Fifty-ninth Congress is present.

The roll, as made by the Clerk, was then called as follows:

ALABAMA.

George W. Taylor.
Ariosto A. Wiley.
Henry D. Clayton.
Sydney J. Bowie.
J. Thomas Heflin.
John H. Bankhead.
John L. Burnett.
William Richardson.
Oscar W. Underwood.

ARKANSAS.

Robert Bruce Macon.
Stephen Brundidge, jr.
John C. Floyd.
John S. Little.
Charles C. Reid.
Joseph T. Robinson.
Robert M. Wallace.

CALIFORNIA.

James N. Gillett.
Duncan E. McKinlay.
Joseph R. Knowland.
Julius Kahn.
Everis A. Hayes.
James C. Needham.
James McLachlan.

COLORADO.

Franklin E. Brooks.
Robert W. Bonynge.
Herschel M. Hogg.

CONNECTICUT.

George L. Lilley.
E. Stevens Henry.
Nehemiah D. Sperry.
Edwin W. Higgins.
Ebenezer J. Hill.

DELAWARE.

Hiram R. Burton.

FLORIDA.

Stephen M. Sparkman.
Frank Clark.
William B. Lamar.

GEORGIA.

Rufus E. Lester.
James M. Griggs.
Elijah B. Lewis.
William C. Adamson.
Leonidas F. Livingston.
Charles L. Bartlett.
Gordon Lee.
William M. Howard.
Thomas M. Bell.
Thomas W. Hardwick.

IDAHO.

Burton L. French.

ILLINOIS.

Martin B. Madden.
James R. Mann.
William W. Wilson.
Charles S. Wharton.
Anthony Michalek.
William Lorimer.
Philip Knopf.
Charles McGavin.
Henry S. Boutell.
George Edmund Foss.
Howard M. Snapp.
Charles E. Fuller.
Robert R. Hitt.
James McKinney.
George W. Prince.
Joseph V. Graff.
John A. Sterling.
Joseph G. Cannon.
William B. McKinley.
Henry T. Rainey.
Zeno J. Rives.
William A. Rodenberg.
Frank L. Dickson.
Pleasant T. Chapman.
George W. Smith.

INDIANA.

John H. Foster.
John C. Chaney.
William T. Zenor.
Lincoln Dixon.
Elias S. Holliday.
James E. Watson.
Jesse Overstreet.
George W. Cromer.
Charles B. Landis.
Edgar D. Crumpacker.
Frederick Landis.
Newton W. Gilbert.
Abraham L. Brick.

IOWA.

Thomas Hedge.
Alert F. Dawson.
Benjamin P. Birdsall.
Gilbert N. Haugen.
Robert G. Cousins.
John F. Lacey.
John A. T. Hull.
William P. Hepburn.
Walter I. Smith.
James P. Conner.
Elbert H. Hubbard.

KANSAS.

Charles F. Scott.
Charles Curtis.
Justin D. Bowersock.
Philip P. Campbell.
James M. Miller.
William A. Calderhead.
William A. Reeder.
Victor Murdock.

KENTUCKY.

Ollie M. James.
Augustus O. Stanley.
James M. Richardson.
David H. Smith.
Swagar Sherley.
Joseph L. Rhinock.
South Trimble.
George G. Gilbert.
Joseph B. Bennett.
Frank A. Hopkins.
Don C. Edwards.

LOUISIANA.

Adolph Meyer.
Robert C. Davey.
Robert F. Broussard.
John T. Watkins.
Joseph E. Ransdell.
Arsené P. Pujo.

MAINE.

Amos L. Allen.
Charles E. Littlefield.
Edwin C. Burleigh.
Llewellyn Powers.

MARYLAND.

Thomas A. Smith.
Joshua F. C. Talbott.
Frank C. Wachter.
John Gill, jr.
Sydney E. Mudd.
George A. Pearre.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George P. Lawrence.
Frederick H. Gillett.
Rockwood Hoar.
Charles Q. Tirrell.
Butler Ames.
Augustus P. Gardner.
Ernest W. Roberts.
Samuel W. McCall.
John A. Keliher.
William S. McNary.
John A. Sullivan.
John W. Weeks.
William S. Greene.
William C. Lovering.

MICHIGAN.

Edwin Denby.
Charles E. Townsend.
Washington Gardner.
Edward L. Hamilton.
William Alden Smith.
Samuel W. Smith.
Henry McMorran.
Joseph W. Fordney.
Roswell P. Bishop.
Archibald B. Darragh.
H. Olin Young.

MINNESOTA.

James A. Tawney.
James T. McCleary.
Charles R. Davis.
Fred C. Stevens.
Loren Fletcher.
Charles B. Buckman.
Andrew J. Volstead.
J. Adam Bede.
Halvor Steenerson.

MISSISSIPPI.

Ezekiel S. Candler, jr.
Thomas Spight.
Wilson S. Hill.
Eaton J. Bowers.
Frank A. McLain.
John S. Williams.

MISSOURI.

James T. Lloyd.
William W. Rucker.
Frank B. Klepper.
Frank B. Fulkerson.
Edgar C. Ellis.
David A. De Armond.
John Welborn.
Dorsey W. Shackleford.
Champ Clark.
Richard Bartholdt.
John T. Hunt.
Ernest E. Wood.
Marion E. Rhodes.
William T. Tyndall.
Cassius M. Shartel.
Arthur P. Murphy.

MONTANA.

Joseph M. Dixon.

NEBRASKA.

John L. Kennedy.
John J. McCarthy.
Edmund H. Hinshaw.
George W. Norris.
Moses P. Kinkaid.

NEVADA.

Clarence D. Van Duzer.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Cyrus A. Sulloway.
Frank D. Currier.

NEW JERSEY.

Henry C. Loudenslager.
John J. Gardner.
Benjamin F. Howell.
Ira W. Wood.
Charles N. Fowler.
Henry C. Allen.
Richard Wayne Parker.
William H. Wiley.
Marshal Van Winkle.
Allan L. McDermott.

NEW YORK.

William W. Cocks.
George H. Lindsay.
Charles T. Dunwell.
Charles B. Law.
George E. Waldo.
William M. Calder.
John J. Fitzgerald.
Timothy D. Sullivan.
Henry M. Goldfogle.
William Sulzer.
William Randolph Hearst.
William Bourke Cockran.
Herbert Parsons.
Charles A. Towne.
J. Van Vechten Olcott.
Jacob Ruppert, jr.
William S. Bennet.
Joseph A. Goulden.
John E. Andrus.
Thomas W. Bradley.
John H. Ketcham.
William H. Draper.
George N. Southwick.
Frank J. Le Fevre.
Lucius N. Littauer.
William H. Flack.
James S. Sherman.
Charles L. Knapp.
Michael E. Driscoll.
John W. Dwight.
Sereno E. Payne.
James Breck Perkins.
J. Sloat Fassett.
James W. Wadsworth.
William H. Ryan.
De Alva S. Alexander.
Edward B. Vreeland.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John H. Small.
Charles R. Thomas.
Edward W. Pou.
William W. Kitchin.
Gilbert B. Patterson.
Robert N. Page.
E. Spencer Blackburn.
Edwin Y. Webb.
James M. Gudger, jr.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Asle J. Gronna.

OHIO.

Nicholas Longworth.
Herman P. Goebel.
Robert M. Nevin.
Harvey C. Garber.
William W. Campbell.
Thomas E. Scroggy.
J. Warren Keifer.
Ralph D. Cole.
James H. Southard.
Henry T. Bannon.
Charles H. Grosvenor.
Edward L. Taylor, jr.
Grant E. Mouser.
Amos R. Webber.
Beman G. Dawes.
Capell L. Weems.
Martin L. Smyser.
James Kennedy.
W. Aubrey Thomas.
Jacob A. Beidler.
Theodore E. Burton.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Henry H. Bingham.
Robert Adams.
Reuben O. Moon.
Edward De V. Morrell.
George D. McCreary.
Thomas S. Butler.
Irving P. Wanger.
H. Burd Cassel.
Thomas H. Dale.
Henry W. Palmer.
George R. Patterson.
Marcus C. L. Kline.
Mial E. Lilley.
Elias Deemer.
E. W. Samuel.
Thaddeus M. Mahon.
Marlin E. Olmsted.
John M. Reynolds.
Daniel F. Lafean.
Solomon R. Dresser.
George F. Huff.
Allen F. Cooper.
Ernest F. Acheson.
Arthur L. Bates.
Gustav E. Schneebeli.
William O. Smith.
William H. Graham.
John Dalzell.
James Francis Burke.
Andrew J. Barchfeld.

RHODE ISLAND.

Daniel L. D. Granger.
Adin B. Capron.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

George S. Legare.
James O. Patterson.
Wyatt Aiken.
Joseph T. Johnson.
David E. Finley.
J. Edwin Ellerbe.
Asbury F. Lever.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Charles H. Burke.
Eben W. Martin.

TENNESSEE.

Walter P. Brownlow.
Nathan W. Hale.
John A. Moon.
M. G. Butler.
William C. Houston.
John Wesley Gaines.
Lemuel P. Padgett.
Thetus W. Sims.
Finis J. Garrett.

TEXAS.

Morris Sheppard.	George F. Burgess.
Moses L. Broocks.	Robert L. Henry.
Gordon Russell.	Oscar W. Gillespie.
Choice B. Randell.	John H. Stephens.
Jack Beall.	James L. Slayden.
Scott Field.	John N. Garner.
Alexander W. Gregg.	William R. Smith.
John M. Moore.	

UTAH.

Joseph Howell.

VERMONT.

David J. Foster.	Kittredge Haskins.

VIRGINIA.

William A. Jones.	Carter Glass.
Harry L. Maynard.	James Hay.
John Lamb.	John F. Rixey.
Robert G. Southall.	Campbell Slemp.
Claude A. Swanson.	Henry D. Flood.

WASHINGTON.

Wesley L. Jones.	William E. Humphrey.
Francis W. Cushman.	

WEST VIRGINIA.

Blackburn B. Dovener.	Harry C. Woodyard.
Thomas B. Davis.	James A. Hughes.
Joseph Holt Gaines.	

WISCONSIN.

Henry A. Cooper.	John J. Esch.
Henry C. Adams.	James H. Davidson.
Joseph W. Babcock.	Edward S. Minor.
Theobold Otjen.	Webster E. Brown.
William H. Stafford.	John J. Jenkins.
Charles H. Weisse.	

WYOMING.

Frank W. Mondell.

ARIZONA.

Marcus A. Smith.

NEW MEXICO.

William H. Andrews.

OKLAHOMA.

Bird S. McGuire.

HAWAII.

Jonah Kalanianaole.

PORTO RICO.

Tulio Larrinaga (Resident Commissioner).

The following Members failed to answer to their names:

Sylvester C. Smith.
William G. Brantley.
Samuel M. Robertson.
George A. Loud.
Benjamin G. Humphreys.
Adam M. Byrd.
Ernest M. Pollard.
Claude Kitchin.
Binger Hermann.
John N. Williamson.
George A. Castor.
Joseph C. Sibley.
Malcom R. Patterson.
Albert S. Burleson.

The CLERK. Three hundred and sixty-nine Members have answered to their names; a quorum of the Fifty-ninth Congress is present.

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP.

The Clerk presented for the information of the House a statement showing the changes that have occurred since the regular election of Members of the Fifty-ninth Congress.

The statement is as follows:

District.	Name.	Date of vacancy.	Name of successor.
First Nebraska	Elmer J. Burkett[a]	Mar. 4,1905	Ernest M. Pollard.
First Indiana	James A. Hemenway.[a]	....do....	John H. Foster.
Second West Virginia	Alston G. Dayton[a]	Mar. 17,1905	Thos. B. Davis.
Eighth Texas	John M. Pinckney.[b]	Apr. 24,1905	John M. Moore.
Third Connecticut	Frank B. Brandegee.[a]	May 9,1905	Edwin W. Higgins.
Fourteenth Illinois	Benjamin F. Marsh.[b]	June 3,1905	James McKinney.

[a] Resigned. [b] Died.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague [Mr. MARSHALL] be placed on the roll. The certificate has evidently been lost. There is no contest in the case and no opposition.

Mr. PAYNE. That would not be in order until after the organization of the House.

The CLERK. It would be a matter of unanimous consent. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the name of his colleague [Mr. MARSHALL] be added to the roll. Is there any objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. At this stage of the proceedings I shall object. At the proper time that will be in order.

The CLERK. Nominations for Speaker are now in order.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

Mr. HEPBURN. I present the name of Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON, a Representative-elect from the State of Illinois, as a candidate for Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-ninth Congress. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I nominate for Speaker a Representative-elect from the State of Mississippi, Hon. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CLERK. Are there any other nominations? No others are heard. The following tellers will please take their places at the desk: Mr. DENBY of Michigan, Mr. WEBB of North Carolina, Mr. DICKSON of Illinois, and Mr. BEALL of Texas. The Clerk will call the roll, and Members will answer for whom they wish to vote as their names are called.

The question was taken; and there were—for Mr. CANNON, 243 votes; for Mr. WILLIAMS, 128 votes; not voting 15, as follows:

For Mr. Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois—243.

Acheson	Dawson	Jones, Wash.	Payne
Adams, Pa.	Deemer	Kahn	Pearre
Adams, Wis.	Denby	Keifer	Perkins
Alexander	Dickson, Ill.	Kennedy, Nebr.	Pollard
Allen, Me.	Dixon, Mont.	Kennedy, Ohio	Powers
Allen, N. J.	Dovener	Ketcham	Prince
Ames	Draper	Kinkaid	Reeder
Andrus	Dresser	Klepper	Reynolds
Babcock	Driscoll	Knapp	Rhodes
Bannon	Dunwell	Knowland	Rives
Barchfeld	Dwight	Lacey	Roberts
Bartholdt	Edwards	Lafean	Rodenberg
Bates	Ellis	Landis, Chas. B.	Samuel
Bede	Esch	Landis, Frederick	Schneebeli
Beidler	Fassett	Law	Scott
Bennet, N. Y.	Flack	Lawrence	Scroggy
Bennett, Ky.	Fletcher	Le Fevre	Shartel
Bingham	Fordney	Lilley, Conn.	Sherman
Birdsall	Foss	Lilley, Pa.	Slemp
Bishop	Foster, Ind.	Littauer	Smith, Cal.
Blackburn	Foster, Vt.	Littlefield	Smith, Ill.
Bonynge	Fowler	Longworth	Smith, Iowa
Boutell	French	Lorimer	Smith, Pa.
Bowersock	Fulkerson	Loud	Smith, Samuel W.
Bradley	Fuller	Loudenslager	Smith, Wm. Alden
Brick	Gaines, W. Va.	Lovering	Smyser
Brooks, Colo.	Gardner, Mass.	McCall	Snapp
Brown	Gardner, Mich.	McCarthy	Southard
Brownlow	Gardner, N. J.	McCleary, Minn.	Southwick
Buckman	Gilbert, Ind.	McCreary, Pa.	Sperry
Burke, Pa.	Gillett, Cal.	McGavin	Stafford
Burke, S. Dak.	Gillett, Mass.	McKinlay, Cal.	Steenerson
Burleigh	Goebel	McKinley, Ill.	Sterling
Burton, Del.	Graff	McKinney	Stevens, Minn.
Burton, Ohio	Graham	McLachlan	Sulloway
Butler, Pa.	Greene	McMorran	Tawney
Calder	Gronna	Madden	Taylor, Ohio
Calderhead	Grosvenor	Mahon	Thomas, Ohio
Campbell, Kans.	Hale	Mann	Tirrell
Campbell, Ohio	Hamilton	Martin	Townsend
Capron	Haskins	Michalek	Tyndall
Cassel	Haugen	Miller	Van Winkle
Chaney	Hayes	Minor	Volstead
Chapman	Hedge	Mondell	Vreeland
Cocks	Henry, Conn.	Moon, Pa.	Wachter
Cole	Hepburn	Morrell	Wadsworth
Conner	Higgins	Mouser	Waldo
Cooper, Pa.	Hill, Conn.	Mudd	Wanger
Cooper, Wis.	Hinshaw	Murdock	Watson
Cousins	Hitt	Murphy	Webber
Cromer	Hoar	Needham	Weeks
Crumpacker	Hogg	Nevin	Weems
Currier	Holliday	Norris	Welborn
Curtis	Howell, N. J.	Olcott	Wharton
Cushman	Howell, Utah	Olmsted	Wiley, N. J.
Dale	Hubbard	Otjen	Wilson
Dalzell	Huff	Overstreet	Wood, N. J.
Darragh	Hughes	Palmer	Woodyard
Davidson	Hull	Parker	Young
Davis, Minn.	Humphrey, Wash.	Parsons	
Dawes	Jenkins	Patterson, Pa.	

For Mr. John S. Williams, of Mississippi—128.

Adamson	De Armond	Gudger	Lever
Aiken	Dixon, Ind.	Hay	Lewis
Bankhead	Ellerbe	Hearst	Lindsay
Bartlett	Field	Heflin	Little
Beall, Tex.	Finley	Henry, Tex.	Livingston
Bell, Ga.	Fitzgerald	Hill, Miss.	Lloyd
Bowers	Flood	Hopkins	McDermott
Bowie	Floyd	Houston	McLain
Broocks, Tex.	Gaines, Tenn.	Howard	McNary
Broussard	Garber	Hunt	Macon
Brundidge	Garner	James	Maynard
Burgess	Garrett	Johnson	Meyer
Burnett	Gilbert, Ky.	Jones, Va.	Moon, Tenn.
Butler, Tenn.	Gill	Keliher	Moore
Candler	Gillespie	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Padgett
Clark, Fla.	Glass	Kline	Page
Clark, Mo.	Goldfogle	Lamar	Patterson, N. C.
Clayton	Goulden	Lamb	Patterson, S. C.
Cockran	Granger	Lee	Pou
Davey, La.	Gregg	Legare	Pujo
Davis, W. Va.	Griggs	Lester	Rainey

Randell, Tex.	Ryan	Sparkman	Towne
Reid	Shackleford	Spight	Trimble
Rhinock	Sheppard	Stanley	Underwood
Richardson, Ala.	Sherley	Stephens, Tex.	Van Duzer
Richardson, Ky.	Sims	Sullivan, Mass.	Wallace
Rixey	Slayden	Sullivan, N. Y.	Watkins
Robertson, La.	Small	Sulzer	Webb
Robinson, Ark.	Smith, Ky.	Swanson	Weisse
Rucker	Smith, Md.	Talbott	Wiley, Ala.
Ruppert	Smith, Tex.	Taylor, Ala.	Wood, Mo.
Russell	Southall	Thomas, N. C.	Zenor

Not voting—15.

Brantley	Castor	Kitchin, Claude	Sibley
Burleson	Hardwick	Marshall	Williamson
Byrd	Hermann	Patterson, Tenn.	Williams
Cannon	Humphreys, Miss.	Ransdell, La.	

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. CASTOR] is detained at home by illness.

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The result is, for Speaker, Mr. CANNON has received 243 votes, Mr. WILLIAMS 128. Mr. CANNON, having received a majority of the votes cast, is duly elected Speaker of the Fifty-ninth Congress. [Applause.] The Clerk appoints Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, Mr. KEIFER of Ohio, Mr. VREELAND of New York, and Mr. UNDERWOOD of Alabama, a committee to escort the Speaker to his place. [Prolonged applause.]

(When Mr. CANNON appeared with the Members designated, the Members of the House, rising in a body, greeted him with loud and general applause, which was renewed as he ascended to the chair.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Gentlemen, I have the honor of introducing to the House of Representatives of the Fifty-ninth Congress the Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON, who will be, and who deserves to be, its Speaker. [Loud applause.]

The SPEAKER. I thank you for the honor you have conferred upon me, particularly as I may be able to consider your action as an indorsement of my services as Speaker of the last Congress. We are here as representatives of the people. This House is the only place where the voice of the majority of the people, without intervening machinery, may directly express itself. [Applause.] Therefore our responsibility, being more direct, is the greater. As your Speaker I shall endeavor to preside over your deliberations with fairness to both parties, and to every individual Member. When I have done that, I may claim to have fairly fulfilled the duties of Speaker under the legislative law.

There is, however, a duty for the whole membership of this House as well as for the Speaker. The House is powerless without a quorum, and the public business will move slowly and unfortunately if Members are absent from the sessions of the House or from the sessions of the committees. Therefore I ask of you not only charity for and patience with my own shortcomings as the presiding officer, but also prompt attendance and diligence on your part, which alone can make our coming session advantageous to the country. [Applause.]

SWEARING IN OF THE SPEAKER.

Mr. BINGHAM, the Member longest in continuous service in the House, was named by the Clerk to administer the oath of office to the Speaker-elect, and the oath was accordingly administered.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS AND DELEGATES.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll by States and Territories; and Members and Delegates, as their names are called, will please come forward to the area in front of the Clerk's desk and take the prescribed oath of office.

The SPEAKER then administered the oath of office to the Members and Delegates presenting themselves.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania and Mr. COCKS qualified by affirmation.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the name of my colleague, Mr. Marshall, be added to the roll, the certificate of his election having been lost.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota requests unanimous consent that his colleague, Mr. Marshall, from that State, may take the oath of office, his credentials not having arrived.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Pending the request I would like to ask the gentleman if there is any question or contest concerning the election.

Mr. GRONNA. No, sir; no contest or question whatever.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Thereupon Mr. Marshall appeared at the bar and took the oath of office.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

Mr. HEPBURN submitted a resolution; which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That Alexander McDowell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Henry Casson, of the State of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Frank B. Lyon, of the State of New York, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph C. McElroy, of the State of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives;

That Henry N. Couden, of the State of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer as a substitute for the resolution just submitted the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That W. S. Cowherd, of Missouri, be elected Clerk of the House of Representatives; that Charles A. Edwards, of Texas, be elected Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives; that J. R. Taylor, of Arkansas, be elected Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; that Robert L. Douglass, of South Carolina, be elected Postmaster of the House of Representatives; that Austin Crouch, of Alabama, be elected Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The question being taken, the substitute offered by Mr. HENRY of Texas was rejected.

The resolution of Mr. HEPBURN was then adopted.

The officers mentioned in the above resolution came to the bar of the House and the oath of office was administered to them by the Speaker.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected JOSEPH G. CANNON, a Representative from the State of Illinois, as Speaker, and Alexander McDowell, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, as Clerk of the Fifty-ninth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE OF NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that JOSEPH G. CANNON, a Representative from the State of Illinois, has been elected Speaker; that Alexander McDowell, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, has been elected Clerk, and that the House is ready for business.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate has passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled, and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Also:

Resolved, That a committee, consisting of two Senators, be appointed, to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

And that, in compliance with the foregoing, the Vice-President had appointed as said committee Mr. ALLISON and Mr. MORGAN.

Also:

Resolved, That the Senate, with deep regret, has listened to the announcement of the death of the Hon. ORVILLE HITCHCOCK PLATT, for more than a quarter of a century a member of this body, a period marked by five consecutive elections, as a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

COMMITTEE TO WAIT ON THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate, to wait on the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as such committee on the part of the House Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota, Mr. LITTAUER, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

THE RULES.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-eighth Congress be adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-ninth Congress, including the standing orders of March 8 and March 14, 1900 (relating to the consideration of pension and claim bills on Fridays), which are hereby continued in force during the Fifty-ninth Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to offer an amendment to that resolution.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Does the gentleman desire time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to offer an amendment to the resolution just reported.

Mr. DALZELL. I can not yield for that purpose. I will yield to the gentleman any reasonable amount of time for the purpose of debate, but not otherwise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman propose to exhaust his time? Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Have I not a right when the gentleman is through to offer an amendment to the pending resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor and is entitled to the floor. Whether the gentleman from Mississippi will have the right to offer an amendment will depend upon the action of the House; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has invoked the opinion of the House in the premises.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Another parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania calls for the previous question before he sits down, then I shall have no opportunity to offer an amendment at all.

The SPEAKER. Not if the House sustains the demand for the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I shall ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield to me a moment for the purpose of making a few innocuous observations.

Mr. DALZELL. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Five minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in arising, which will remain a purpose unaccomplished, was to get the opportunity of offering an amendment to the resolution—the amendment providing that the rules of the Fifty-eighth Congress should be adopted "for not longer than thirty days." The object which I had in view in offering that amendment was to secure to the House of so-called Representatives of the American people an opportunity to adopt its own rules by amending in a manner satisfactory to itself the rules of the last House. I hope the membership of the House understands that the only door whereby I can make an entrance in order to offer that amendment is that made by voting down the demand for the previous question, which in due time will be made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there have been from time immemorial almost "blanket Indians" upon the majority side—people who were dissatisfied with the rules. A majority even of the majority sometimes is frequently dissatisfied with the rules so adopted in this body as to cut them off from all right to propose amendments even; they—some of them—know that these rules have been adopted not so much for the purpose of manacling the minority party in the Chamber as for the purpose of manacling the minority of the majority on that side of the Chamber. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, those of you who are in earnest about wanting to get an opportunity for an expression of the views of the American people's Representatives during this Congress will vote "No!" when the gentleman from Pennsylvania calls the previous question, or attempts to call it, and those of you who are willing in advance to be manacled, and especially the kids in the House who afterwards will have no views whatsoever, have at least had your eyes opened by the public announcement I have just made. If you will vote down the previous question and give an opportunity to adopt the amendment of which I have spoken, then at the end of thirty days the majority of this Chamber—the Republicans in this Chamber—will have an opportunity to vote such rules as they think just and fair, not only to the minority party (and from the majority we expect but little consideration), but to themselves and to the country.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait a minute; I have just a few moments.

Mr. OLMSTED. We will give you more time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, there is a great difference of opinion growing up in the ranks of the Republican party. [Applause on Democratic side.] The La Follette idea, the Cummins idea, the new Massachusetts free-raw-material idea, all sorts of new stand-pat ideas come in upon us on the breezes from the West and from the Northeast, all of them from people pretending at any rate to want to revise the present exorbitant tariff schedules, to do something for the extension of foreign markets for the American farmer and manufacturer, to do something in behalf of freer, broader reciprocal trade relations with the nations of the earth. Right here at the threshold I tell you if you adopt this resolution when you adopt the previous question upon it you have adopted rules that will render you just as helpless as a bird trying to fly in an asphalt lake. Now I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to ask the gentleman from Mississippi in what important particular the manacles in operation during the last Congress, and which we are about to put in operation during the present Congress, differ from the manacles imposed by the party to which the gentleman from Mississippi belongs during the last Congress in which it was in the majority.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying of the logicians that the poorest thing that pretends to be an argument and is not is an "et tu quoque." [Laughter.] It may have been true that at some time in the past when we were the majority party we wanted to keep down our minority in our party, and it is true to-day that you want to do it, but there never was a time when any Democratic House was ever run by precisely these rules, nor if it had been would it be a justification of them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will extend my time so as to enable me to answer it.

Mr. DALZELL. I will extend the gentleman's time.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just sufficient time to answer the question.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one minute.

Mr. WHARTON. The gentleman from Mississippi used an expression in his remarks concerning the "kids" in the House. I would like to have him explain that expression of "kids" in the House. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, with that degree of reverence which the personal appearance of my interrogator excites in my mind [laughter and applause] I should say that he is perhaps the last person in the House who ought to ask the question. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we all learned through the medium of the public press that at the Democratic caucus the gentleman from Mississippi was given power and directed to speak for the minority. Where he gets any authority to speak for the minority of the majority I do not know. I recognize his right, however, when he undertakes to speak for those who are in favor of tariff revision. Now, these rules have been the rules of the House of Representatives ever since the Fifty-first Congress. They were the rules of the Fifty-second Congress—a Democratic Congress, presided over by Speaker Crisp. They were the rules of the Fifty-third Congress, presided over by a Democratic Speaker. The gentleman says not exactly the same rules, but they are substantially the same rules. The difference amounted to nothing at all, and I confess to some surprise that any objection is made on the part of the gentleman from Mississippi when I refer to what took place at the meeting of the Fifty-eighth Congress, when, without objection or protest on the part of the gentleman from Mississippi or anyone on that side of the House, the rules were adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps, in explanation of the fact we did not protest at that time, I might say that we were expecting a stalwart and strenuous protest to come from a Republican Member whom I now have in my eye. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I have no idea whom the gentleman is to whom the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] refers. [Laughter.] But I would suggest to him that our friends upon the other side of the House—and I do not mean to be cruel—are in a less fortunate position, perhaps, as to

entering protest now than they were at the meeting of the Fifty-eighth Congress.

I ask for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] demands the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Division, Mr. Speaker; and in order to save time we will just have the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 126, not voting 31, as follows:

YEAS—228.

Acheson	Dawes	Humphrey, Wash.	Parker
Adams, Pa.	Dawson	Jenkins	Parsons
Alexander	Deemer	Jones, Wash.	Patterson, Pa.
Allen, Me.	Denby	Kahn	Payne
Allen, N. J.	Dickson, Ill.	Keifer	Pearre
Ames	Dixon, Mont.	Kennedy, Nebr.	Perkins
Andrus	Dovener	Kennedy, Ohio	Pollard
Babcock	Draper	Ketcham	Powers
Bannon	Dresser	Kinkaid	Prince
Barchfeld	Driscoll	Klepper	Reeder
Bartholdt	Dunwell	Knapp	Reynolds
Bates	Dwight	Knopf	Rhodes
Bede	Edwards	Knowland	Rives
Beidler	Ellis	Lacey	Rodenberg
Bennet, N. Y.	Esch	Lafean	Samuel
Bennett, Ky.	Fassett	Landis, Chas. B.	Schneebeli
Bingham	Flack	Landis, Frederick	Scott
Birdsall	Fletcher	Law	Scroggy
Bishop	Fordney	Lawrence	Shartel
Blackburn	Foss	Le Fevre	Sherman
Bonynge	Foster, Ind.	Lilley, Conn.	Slemp
Boutell	Foster, Vt.	Lilley, Pa.	Smith, Cal.
Bowersock	Fowler	Littlefield	Smith, Ill.
Bradley	French	Longworth	Smith, Iowa
Brick	Fulkerson	Lorimer	Smith, S. W.
Brooks, Colo.	Fuller	Loudenslager	Smith, Wm. Alden
Brown	Gaines, W. Va.	McCall	Smyser
Brownlow	Gardner, Mass.	McCarthy	Snapp
Buckman	Gardner, Mich.	McCleary, Minn.	Southwick
Burke, Pa.	Gardner, N. J.	McCreary, Pa.	Sperry
Burke, S. Dak.	Gilbert, Ind.	McGavin	Stafford
Burleigh	Gillett, Mass.	McKinlay, Cal.	Steenerson
Burton, Del.	Graff	McKinley, Ill.	Sterling
Burton, Ohio	Graham	McKinney	Stevens, Minn.
Butler, Pa.	Greene	McLachlan	Sulloway
Calder	Gronna	McMorran	Tawney
Calderhead	Grosvenor	Madden	Taylor, Ohio
Campbell, Kans.	Hale	Mahon	Thomas, Ohio
Campbell, Ohio	Hamilton	Mann	Tirrell
Capron	Haskins	Marshall	Van Winkle
Cassel	Haugen	Martin	Volstead
Chaney	Hayes	Michalek	Vreeland
Chapman	Hedge	Miller	Wachter
Cocks	Henry, Conn.	Minor	Wadsworth
Cole	Higgins	Moon, Pa.	Waldo
Conner	Hill, Conn.	Morrell	Wanger
Cooper, Pa.	Hinshaw	Mouser	Watson
Cousins	Hitt	Mudd	Webber
Cromer	Hoar	Murdock	Weeks
Crumpacker	Hogg	Murphy	Weems
Currier	Holliday	Needham	Welborn
Curtis	Howell, N. J.	Nevin	Wharton
Cushman	Howell, Utah	Norris	Wiley, N. J.
Dale	Hubbard	Olcott	Wilson
Dalzell	Huff	Olmsted	Wood, N. J.
Darragh	Hughes	Otjen	Woodyard
Davis, Minn.	Hull	Palmer	Young

NAYS—126.

Adams, Wis.	Garber	Lewis	Sheppard
Adamson	Garner	Lindsay	Sherley
Aiken	Garrett	Little	Sims
Bankhead	Gilbert, Ky.	Livingston	Slayden
Bartlett	Gill	Lloyd	Small
Beall, Tex.	Gillespie	McDermott	Smith, Ky.
Bell, Ga.	Glass	McLain	Smith, Md.
Bowers	Goldfogle	McNary	Smith, Tex.
Bowie	Goulden	Macon	Southall
Broocks, Tex.	Granger	Maynard	Sparkman
Broussard	Gregg	Meyer	Spight
Brundidge	Gudger	Moon, Tenn.	Stanley
Burgess	Hay	Moore	Stephens, Tex.
Burleson	Hearst	Padgett	Sullivan, Mass.
Burnett	Heflin	Page	Sullivan, N. Y.
Butler, Tenn.	Henry, Tex.	Patterson, N. C.	Sulzer
Candler	Hill, Miss.	Patterson, S. C.	Swanson
Clark, Fla.	Hopkins	Pou	Talbott
Clark, Mo.	Houston	Pujo	Thomas, N. C.
Clayton	Howard	Rainey	Towne
Cockran	Hunt	Randell, Tex.	Underwood
Davey, La.	James	Reid	Van Duzer
Davis, W. Va.	Johnson	Rhinock	Wallace
De Armond	Jones, Va.	Richardson, Ala.	Watkins
Dixon, Ind.	Kellher	Richardson, Ky.	Webb
Ellerbe	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rixey	Weisse
Field	Kline	Robinson, Ark.	Wiley, Ala.
Finley	Lamb	Rucker	Williams
Fitzgerald	Lee	Ruppert	Wood, Mo.
Flood	Legare	Russell	Zenor
Floyd	Lester	Ryan	
Gaines, Tenn.	Lever	Shackleford	

NOT VOTING—31.

Brantley	Castor	Davidson	Goebel
Byrd	Cooper, Wis.	Gillett, Cal.	Griggs
Hardwick	Littauer	Ransdell, La.	Taylor, Ala.
Hepburn	Loud	Roberts	Townsend
Hermann	Lovering	Robertson, La.	Trimble
Humphreys, Miss.	Mondell	Sibley	Tyndall
Kitchin, Claude	Overstreet	Smith, Pa.	Williamson
Lamar	Patterson, Tenn.	Southard	

SWEARING IN A MEMBER.

After the first call of the roll:

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson] present, and does the gentleman desire to take the oath of office?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes, sir; I desire to be sworn in and take the oath.

Mr. Burleson appeared at the bar and took the oath of office.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the names of those not answering upon the first roll call.

The call of the roll was completed as above recorded.

So the previous question was ordered.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my name was not called. I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman paying attention when his name should have been called, and failed to hear it?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I was.

The SPEAKER. Call the gentleman's name.

The name of Mr. GAINES of Tennessee was called, and he voted "no."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock meridian.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

DIGEST AND MANUAL.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 2,000 copies of the Digest and Manual of the Rules and Practice of the House of Representatives for the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress, the same to be bound and distributed under the direction of the Speaker and Clerk of the House.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

SPECIAL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That John T. Chancy be continued in the services of the House in his present position during the Fifty-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the Fifty-ninth Congress, and until the organization of the Sixtieth Congress, Isaac R. Hill be authorized to act as special employee of the House of Representatives and receive compensation at the rate of $1,500 per annum; that Felton B. Knight and Joseph J. Sinnott be authorized to act as special messengers of the House of Representatives, each to receive compensation at the rate of $1,200 per annum, and that James F. English be authorized to act as special chief page of the House of Representatives at the rate of $900 per annum, and $500 additional for services as pair clerk.

Said officers shall at all times be under the direction and control of the Speaker of the House, and they shall be subject to removal by him for cause at any time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas if this is the usual resolution?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. It is the usual resolution.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it the same number of employees that they had last year?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. It is the same number, and the same salaries as they had last session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

DRAWING OF SEATS.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House do now proceed to draw seats for Members and Delegates of the present Congress, in pursuance of Rule

XXXII, and when names of Members absent from the city or on account of sickness are called, that seats be selected by their colleagues: *And provided*, That in selecting seats the precedents of the Fifty-second and Fifty-fourth Congresses be followed, whereby the section of seats next the main aisle on the minority side were given to the majority side, leaving any further excess of majority Members to be accommodated in the seats on the extreme left of the minority side.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, just one word in explanation of the effect of this resolution. Upon its adoption this section of seats on my left, on the other side of the aisle, would be selected by Republicans as their names are called, and then the excess of Republicans would have to select their seats in the last row on the extreme left of the Hall, commonly known as the "Cherokee Strip." That will seat twenty-one. This section to my left will seat thirty-five. That will leave the minority the three middle sections between the last section on the left of the Hall and the one on my left, and these three sections will furnish enough seats, and more than enough, to seat all the minority Members. I would say that this division of the seats was made first in the Fifty-second Congress and again in the Fifty-fourth Congress, when the majority was nearly as large as it is at the present time on the majority side of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman from Minnesota is mistaken in one respect. The majorities in those Congresses were not nearly as large as the majority in this one, but very much larger.

Mr. TAWNEY. In the Fifty-fourth Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the Fifty-fourth Congress the Republicans had 134 majority in the House, whose membership was 357. In that House the Democrats numbered 104, Republicans 245, and Populists 7. The Republicans had a majority over the Democrats of 141 and over all told of 134. In the Fifty-second Congress, with a membership of only 333, the Republicans had only 88 Members, while the Democrats had 231 and the Populists had 14, so that the Democrats had a majority over the Republicans of 153, and over all of 14 less than that, or 139.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Democracy will always remain of an equal mind upon the question of never administering to anyone else a dose which it is not prepared in its turn to take. I find after examining the precedents—and I will frankly say that I was very much disappointed when, after examination, I found them so—that in the Fifty-second Congress we did take the seats up to that aisle, the first one beyond the middle aisle. We took them upon the principle of keeping the majority as nearly as possible together in a compact body, and the minority as nearly as possible together in a compact body; and although our majority then was not only absolutely larger but very much larger in percentage, because of the comparative smallness of the membership at that time, yet it is a precedent which we ourselves have set. It was done in the Fifty-second Congress by unanimous consent, and again in the Fifty-fourth Congress, when, by unanimous consent, the Republicans took the seats up to the first aisle of the left of the center aisle, their majority then being 134.

I had contemplated making objection to unanimous consent, but under the circumstances, all the precedents considered, I think it fair not to do so, and shall not.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the resolution provide for the colleagues of absent Members drawing their seats?

Mr. TAWNEY. It does.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understood it to apply only to absence on account of sickness.

Mr. TAWNEY. Absence for any cause.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does it read that way.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have that part of the resolution read once more, or the provision for drawing seats for absent Members.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. TAWNEY. I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the adoption of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Minnesota allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask him if the latter portion of the resolution is not contrary to all precedents up to this time? In other words, does not his resolution direct on which side of the Chamber a Member shall take his seat, and has it not heretofore been allowed that a Member might take his seat where he desired, merely agreeing by unanimous consent which portion of the House belonged to the Republicans and which to the Democrats?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say that the latter part of the resolution has heretofore been agreed to by unanimous consent, and we ask now to agree to consideration of the entire resolution by unanimous consent, and if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] fears the effect of that precedent, I have no objection to withdrawing that part of the resolution and asking that the division of seats on the floor be made by unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say to the gentleman that for a hundred years this House has assembled and agreed on the seats which the Members should occupy without anything being forced down the throat of the minority by a vote of the majority. I am sure that the minority are willing to do what is courteous and proper under the circumstances, and I do not think the gentleman should set a precedent by saying, "By a vote of this House we will force you to take your seats where we direct you."

Mr. WILLIAMS. If that be the meaning of the resolution, I have certainly misunderstood it. I understand that the gentleman from Minnesota is now asking unanimous consent.

Mr. TAWNEY. For the consideration of this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For the consideration of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The resolution is a matter of privilege.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought he was asking unanimous consent for the passage of the resolution. Hitherto, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] says, this has been a matter of agreement by unanimous consent.

Several MEMBERS. Why not ask unanimous consent?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing that it shall be done in that way.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi that there is no objection to the arrangement provided for in the latter part of the resolution, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that and to adopt the former part of the resolution, which has always been adopted by a vote of the House. Then I will ask unanimous consent that the division of seats be made as contemplated by the latter part of the resolution by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution in the form indicated by the gentleman from Minnesota, and read the first part of it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House do now proceed to draw seats for Members and Delegates of the present Congress, in pursuance of Rule XXXII, and when names of Members absent from the city or on account of sickness are called, that seats be selected by their colleagues.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. I now ask unanimous consent that in the drawing of seats this section to my left be set aside for the Republican Members as their names are called, and that the section on the extreme left of the House be likewise reserved for the Republican Members, leaving the other sections in the center of the Democratic side for the Democratic Members, and this side, in addition to the other seats indicated, for the Republicans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that before this rule is enforced the Hon. J. WARREN KEIFER, an ex-Speaker of this House, be permitted to draw his seat; that the Hon. HENRY H. BINGHAM, a Member from Pennsylvania, and the "Father of the House;" the Hon. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, leader of the minority, and those Members who have served twenty years, or who were Members of the Fiftieth Congress and have served continuously until the present time, also be permitted to draw their seats.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, to that request I shall be forced to make an objection. One word in explanation. I think if we give Members with twenty years' service their seats you will have broken down the line of demarcation, and the next time it will be Members with eighteen years' service, and then fifteen years, and there will be no end to it. I think it would be better to make the request in the usual form for the ex-Speaker who has a seat upon the floor, the leader of the majority, and the leader of the minority, and, of course, the "Father of the House."

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will change my request, and also include the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] with those I have already named.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KEIFER, an ex-Speaker of this House; the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE; the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WILLIAMS; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BINGHAM, the "Father of the House," be permitted to choose their seats.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would like also to include the gentleman from New York, Mr. KETCHAM, who has served thirty-four years as a Member of this House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is better, Mr. Speaker, that we should keep within the precedents.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. In the Fifty-seventh Congress

the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Richardson], who was the predecessor of the gentleman from Mississippi as leader of the minority, made a similar request for Mr. Creamer, of New York, because he had been a Member of the House so many years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It seems very ungracious to object, but I do not see for the life of me where it would stop if we once enter upon this line. It is such an ungracious thing that I hate to do it, but I can see no end to it.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Mississippi objects, and I will withdraw my last request for the gentleman from New York, Mr. KETCHAM.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman's request includes the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KEIFER, an ex-Speaker of the House; the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE; the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WILLIAMS, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BINGHAM. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I call for the reading of Rule XXXII.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

RULE XXXII.

DRAWING OF SEATS.

1. At the commencement of each Congress, immediately after the Members and Delegates are sworn in, the Clerk shall place in a box, prepared for that purpose, a number of small balls, of marble or other material, equal to the number of Members and Delegates, which balls shall be consecutively numbered and thoroughly intermingled, and at such hour as shall be fixed by the House for that purpose, by the hands of a page, draw said balls one by one from the box and announce the number as it is drawn, upon which announcement the Member or Delegate whose name on a numbered alphabetical list shall correspond with the number on the ball shall advance and choose his seat for the term for which he is elected.

2. Before said drawing shall commence each seat shall be vacated and so remain until selected under this rule, and any seat having been selected shall be deemed forfeited if left unoccupied before the call of the roll is finished, and whenever the seats of Members and Delegates shall have been drawn, no proposition for a second drawing shall be in order during that Congress.

The drawing of seats began at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes and was concluded at 3 o'clock and 33 minutes.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER announced the following committees:

Committee on Rules.—The Speaker; John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania; Charles H. Grosvenor, of Ohio; John S. Williams, of Mississippi, and David A. De Armond, of Missouri.

Mileage.—William A. Reeder, of Kansas; William H. Flack, of New York; Charles S. Wharton, of Illinois; Elijah B. Lewis, of Georgia, and Ernest E. Wood, of Missouri.

DEATH OF SENATOR PLATT OF CONNECTICUT.

Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ORVILLE HITCHCOCK PLATT, a Senator of the United States of the State of Connecticut.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

The resolution was agreed to.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE MARSH, OF ILLINOIS.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my painful duty to announce the death of a late distinguished Member of this House. At a later date I shall ask the House to set aside a day on which suitable testimonials to his great work and eminent services may be heard. I desire to offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. BENJAMIN F. MARSH, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be directed to transmit this resolution to the Senate and a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of the respect which we hold of the memory of the deceased Senator, ORVILLE HITCHCOCK PLATT, and the deceased Member, BENJAMIN F. MARSH, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes) the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations for defraying the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the year ending June 30, 1907—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, transmitting a statement of the sums of money drawn and disbursed by him—to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives, transmitting a list of the property in his charge on December 4, 1905—to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered for the year ended December 2, 1905—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an abstract of the official emoluments of officers of the customs service—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a statement of expenditures for International Exchanges, etc., for the year ended June 30, 1905—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

The annual report of A. McDowell, Clerk of the House of Representatives, for the year ended June 30, 1905—to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 1) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2) requiring all corporations engaged in interstate commerce to make returns, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 3) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 8, 1902—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 4) to amend section 3646, Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by act of February 16, 1885—to hte Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5) to provide for the refunding of certain money, and so forth—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6) for the relief of the Monongahela Iron and Steel Company, of Pittsburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7) to provide a seal for United States commissioners—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8) for the relief of the Harbison-Walker Company, of Pittsburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10) to authorize the courts of the United States to require a party to submit to a personal physical examination in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 11) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Columbus, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12) to extend the limits of the Shiloh National Military Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13) requiring postmasters to affix stamps to letters when sufficient coin accompanies the letters to pay the postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14) in aid of the common schools in Mississippi—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Corinth, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Tupelo, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Tombigbee River, in the State of Mississippi and in the State of Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 18) relating to arrears in pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19) for the appointment of a United States district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee, to detach certain counties from the eastern district of Tennessee and to attach the same to the middle district of Tennessee, to provide for divisions in said middle district of Tennessee and the time for holding the courts, and to provide for officers of the courts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20) to change and fix the time for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States for the middle district of Tennessee; in the southern division of the eastern district of Tennessee at Chattanooga, and the northeastern division of the eastern district of Tennessee at Greeneville, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21) to establish the tenth judicial circuit and to provide for a circuit court of appeals therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22) granting an appropriation to the trustees of the Woman's National Industrial Exhibit of the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 23) to authorize the appointment of a United States commissioner for the central judicial district of the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24) establishing a United States court at Wapanucka, Ind. T.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25) to provide for a United States reform school, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26) to give longevity pay to employees in the classified civil service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27) to amend joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing Members to certify monthly the amount paid by them for clerk hire and directing the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House," approved March 3, 1893—to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28) to provide for the erection of a public building at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29) to authorize the Delaware Indians in the Cherokee Nation to bring suit in the Court of Claims against the United States, and the Mississippi Choctaws to sue the Choctaw Nation, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30) to add a corps of dental surgeons to the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 31) to reorganize the corps of dental surgeons attached to the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32) to provide a home for aged and infirm colored people—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 33) authorizing the Secretary of War to provide condemned cannon and carriages for ornamentation purposes in the national cemetery at Knoxville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 34) to empower the Secretary of War to allow burial of wives of deceased enlisted men in national cemeteries in the same graves as deceased soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 35) authorizing the Secretary of War to accept the tract of land at or near Greeneville, Tenn., where lie the remains of Andrew Johnson, late President of the United States, and establishing the same as a fourth-class national cemetery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 36) to increase the efficiency of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 37) fixing the hours of labor in the Executive Departments in Washington—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 38) regulating pilots—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 39) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and to provide for national aid in the improvement of the public roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 40) for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the Southern Appalachian Mountains, to be known as the "National Appalachian Forest Reserve"—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 41) granting a pension to certain East Tennesseans engaged in the secret service of the United States during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 42) for the relief of certain persons who volunteered to serve as members of Tenth Regiment of Tennessee Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 43) to repeal certain laws relating to permanent and indefinite appropriation—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 44) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States courts and other Government offices at East St. Louis, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 45) for the erection of a public building at Belleville, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 46) to provide for the erection of a public building at Alton, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 47) to amend section 4386 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 48) to establish a postal savings bank system, and to provide for the conduct and regulation of the same—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 49) regulating sleeping-car service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 50) to amend section 3394 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 51) establishing regular terms of the United States circuit and district courts at South Bend, Ind.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 52) to legalize and permit the maintenance of certain dams in and bridges over the St. Joseph River, in the States of Indiana and Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 53) defining the power of the academic board at the Naval Academy with regard to the admission of candidates and the retention of deficient midshipmen—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 54) to provide for the purchase of additional ground and the enlargement and improvement of the public building at South Bend, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 55) to create a commission to investigate the expediency and practicability of establishing public rifle ranges throughout the United States, and to report a feasible plan or method for establishing such rifle ranges—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 56) to amend an act entitled "An act in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents,' approved June 27, 1890," approved May 9, 1900—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 57) to provide for the erection of a public building at Portland, in the State of Maine—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 58) to prevent the unlawful wearing of the badge or insignia of the Grand Army of the Republic or other soldier organizations—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 59) providing for the construction or purchase of a steam vessel for service at Portland, Me.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 60) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the salaries of the deputy collectors of customs at the subports of Tacoma and Seattle, in the State of Washington, and repealing all laws inconsistent therewith—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 61) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Puyallup Indian school plant at Tacoma, Wash.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 62) to authorize the construction of two steam vessels for the Revenue-Cutter Service for duty on Puget Sound, Washington—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 63) to establish a dwelling for keeper of fog signal at Robinson Point, State of Washington—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 64) making an appropriation for the administration and improvement of the Mount Rainier National

Park, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 65) providing for the establishment of a life-saving station in the vicinity of Cape Flattery, or Flattery Rocks, on the coast of Washington—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 66) establishing a fog signal at Ediz Hook light station, State of Washington, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 67) granting right of way for telegraph and telephone lines in the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 68) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Aberdeen, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 69) increasing the limit of cost for public building at Tacoma, Wash.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 70) providing for a public building at Olympia, State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 71) to provide a temporary home for ex-volunteer Union soldiers and sailors in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 72) to acquire certain ground for a Government reservation—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 73) providing for the erection of a public building at Manistee, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 74) to amend section 2871, Revised Statutes, and section 25 of act of June 26, 1884—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 75) to purchase a painting of Abraham Lincoln—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 76) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 77) declaring certain cars used in the transportation of articles of interstate and foreign commerce common carriers, and prohibiting an ownership in or control over them by shippers—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 78) to remove the restrictions on the alienation and taxation of land in Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 79) providing for the admission of the State of Sequoyah into the Union, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 80) to divide the State of Virginia into three judicial districts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 81) to provide for the improvement of Clinch River, in Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 82) to provide for the improvement of Powell River, in Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 83) to provide for the erection of a public building at Big Stone Gap, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 84) to provide for the erection of a public building at Wytheville, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 85) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of a sanitarium for disabled volunteer soldiers at New River, White Sulphur Springs, in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 86) to provide for the improvement of the headwaters of Big Sandy River, in Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 87) permitting the Washington Market Company to lay a conduit across Seventh street west—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 88) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. William Campbell—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 89) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bridgeton, in the State of New Jersey—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 90) to amend the copyright laws—to the Committee on Patents

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 91) for the amendment of the patent laws—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 92) fixing salary of Vice-President and members of the Cabinet—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 93) providing for the repair and rebuilding of the road from Harrisonville, N. J., to the post at Fort Mott, N. J., and the national cemetery at Finns Point, New Jersey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 94) authorizing the President to appoint an inspector, to be attached to the office of the Secretary of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 95) to provide for surveys of rivers and harbors at the expense of State or municipal authorities—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LORIMER (by request): A bill (H. R. 96) in relation to national mortgage banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 97) to enable the people of Oklahoma to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 98) to place works of art on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 99) to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 100) to encourage and to temporarily assist the construction, equipment, operation, and maintenance of railroads in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 101) to place hides on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 102) to provide for the survey of Elk River, in Tennessee and Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 103) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lewisburg, in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 104) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Murfreesboro, in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 105) for the continued improvement of Caney Fork River, Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 106) for the erection and construction of a public building in the city of Brainerd for the accommodation of the United States post-office and other Government offices—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 107) providing that the statute of limitations shall not be interposed in any suit brought by any laborer, workman, or mechanic in the Court of Claims against the United States to recover wages claimed to be due him under the national eight-hour law—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 108) for the establishment of a third-order flash light and fog signal upon south end of breakwater, harbor of refuge, Milwaukee, Wis.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 109) to provide for untaxed denaturalized alcohol for manufacturing purposes and for use in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 110) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment, who were the first fully equipped soldiers to arrive, on April 19, 1861, for the defense of the city of Washington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 111) to encourage the export trade in drugs, chemicals, and other articles of domestic manufacture—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 112) to encourage the export trade—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 113) to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 114) to appropriate the sum of $40,000 to the Cape Cod Pilgrim Memorial Association, to be used in erecting at Provincetown, Mass., a suitable memorial of the landing of the Pilgrims—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 115) for the erection of a public building at Plymouth, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 116) to amend chapter 11 of the laws of

1897, entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 117) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 118) to amend sections 713 and 714 of "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the acts approved January 31 and June 30, 1902, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 119) amendatory of an act entitled "An act to provide for payment of damages on account of changes of grade due to construction of the Union Station, District of Columbia," approved April 22, 1904—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 120) to amend section 7 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 121) authorizing the extension of Seventeenth street NW.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 122) to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 123) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish building lines—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 124) to regulate the operation of street railways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 125) regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 126) for the widening of a section of Columbia road east of Sixteenth street—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 127) authorizing the extension of Rhode Island avenue NE.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 128) for the opening of a connecting highway between Water Side drive and Park road, District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 129) for the opening of a connecting parkway along Piney Branch, between Sixteenth street and Rock Creek Park, District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 130) authorizing the extension of Kalorama road NW.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 131) to provide for the purchase of additional ground and the enlargement and improvement of the public building at Beaver Falls, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 132) to amend section 3893 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 133) authorizing the construction upon the military reservation at Fort Morgan, Ala., of a suitable building for the use and accommodation of the customs service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 134) to provide a site and erect a public building at Troy, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 135) to fix the fees of court criers, bailiffs, and witnesses in attendance upon the United States courts in Alabama—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 136) to provide a site and erect a public building at Andalusia, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 137) to provide a site and erect a public building at Greenville, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 138) to create a commission to investigate the expediency and practicability of establishing public rifle ranges throughout the United States—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 139) to erect suitablle buildings, and to improve the grounds around the same, for disabled Confederate soldiers, at or near Mountain Creek, Ala.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 140) to establish and maintain a national sanitarium for indigent consumptives—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 141) for the erection of a monument to Jeremiah O'Brien—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 142) to establish a soldiers' home at or near Daphne, in Baldwin County, Ala.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 143) in relation to the expenses of holding courts of the United States in the northern and middle districts of Alabama—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 144) appropriating $100,000 to enlarge the public building at Montgomery, Ala., so as to meet the necessities of the public business—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 145) to amend section 4386 of the Revised Statutes of the United States regulating the transportation of animals from one State to another—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 146) further regulating the class of matter denied admission to the mail—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. VAN DUZER: A bill (H. R. 147) to provide against entering into a contract by any officer or employee of the Government of the United States of America for products of convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 148) to establish postal savings banks for depositing savings at interest, with the security of the Government for the repayment thereof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 149) to appropriate $50,000 for the purpose of sinking artesian wells in the State of Nevada—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 150) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Nevada—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 151) to reestablish the United States mint at Carson City, Nev.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 152) to amend section 953 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 153) to authorize the erection of a monument at Point Pleasant, W. Va., to commemorate the battle of the Revolution fought at that point between the Colonial troops and Indians October 10, 1774—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 154) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Bluefield, W. Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 155) to provide for enlarging the public building at Knoxville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 156) to establish a subtreasury at Knoxville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 157) for the erection of a public building at Morristown, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 158) for the erection of a public building at Harriman, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 159) providing for the adjustment of accounts of laborers, workmen, and mechanics arising under the eight-hour law—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 160) imposing a tax on certain transactions in grain, provisions, cotton, stocks, bonds, and other securities, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 161) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to extend, enlarge, and improve the post-office and custom-house building at Springfield, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 162) to establish at Atlanta, Ga., a subtreasury—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 163) to provide a site and erect a public building in Covington, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 164) to provide a site and erect a public building in Monroe, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 165) to provide for the erection of a public building at Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 166) establishing the Atlanta National Military Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 167) to commemorate the heroism and sacrifice of the officers and men of the United States monitor *Tecumseh*, lost leading the advance at the battle of Mobile Bay, August 5, 1864—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 168) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Lagrange, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 169) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Carrollton, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 170) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Newnan, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 171) for the improvement of the Chattahoochee River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 172) providing for the erection of a public building at Bessemer, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 173) to protect merchants and traders from oppression by trusts and combines—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 174) to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to extend, enlarge, and improve the post-office and courthouse building at Birmingham, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 175) to refund the cotton tax—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 176) to exclude certain aliens from admission to the United States under the immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: A bill (H. R. 177) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Easton, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 178) providing for the erection of a monument at Kings Mountain battle ground commemorative of Generals Campbell, McDowell, Colonel Shelby, and others who participated in the battle of Kings Mountain on the 7th day of October, A. D. 1780—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 179) for the erection of a monument to the memory of John Paul Jones—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 180) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and to provide for national aid in the improvement of the public roads—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 181) for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the White Mountains, to be known as the National White Mountain Forest Reserve—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 182) to provide for the enlargement and improvement of the public building at Fort Worth, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 183) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 184) to regulate carriers engaged in interstate commerce, to prohibit them from limiting their common-law liability, and to increase the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 185) to provide for site and public building at Chambersburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 186) to authorize the readjustment of the accounts of Army officers in certain cases, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 187) to amend act of June 9, 1884—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 188) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 8, 1902—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 189) to establish a life-saving station at the Isles of Shoals, off Portsmouth, N. H.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 190) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Dover, in the State of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 191) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HASKINS (by request): A bill (H. R. 192) to exempt from duty all mineral waters when imported in barrels or casks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 193) for the erection of a public building at Barre, Vt.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 194) for the erection of a public building at Island Pond, Vt.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 195) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Rhode Island—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 196) to authorize the construction of light-house keepers' dwellings at Buffalo Harbor, New York—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 197) to authorize the construction of light-house keepers' dwellings at Buffalo Harbor, New York—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 198) to establish range lights on the Niagara River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 199) to amend the act of June 27, 1890, giving pensions to soldiers and sailors who were incapacitated for the performance of manual labor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 200) to amend the act of June 27, 1890, giving pensions to soldiers and sailors who were incapacitated for the performance of manual labor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 201) to provide for the construction of a revenue cutter of the first class for service in the waters of Key West, Fla.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 202) providing for the marking and protection of the battlefield known as "Dade's massacre," in Sumter County, Fla., and for the erection of a monument thereon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 203) providing an appropriation for a public building at Carbondale, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 204) to improve Clear Fork River, in Kentucky and Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 205) providing for the erection of a public building at Watertown, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 206) for the erection of a public building at Fulton, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 207) for the benefit of officers who served over three years during the civil war and over thirty years since, and who have retired on account of disability incurred in the line of duty since the close of the Spanish-American war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 208) to erect a monument on Brandywine battlefield, Chester County, Pa.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 209) to define the offense commonly known as hazing, and to provide a punishment for the same at the United States Naval Academy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 210) to erect a monument to the memory of John Morton—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 211) to provide for the extension and enlargement of the public building at Chester, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 212) to establish a national military park at the Brandywine battle ground, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 213) to provide for the verification of papers by national banking associations—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 214) to provide a public building for the use of the post-office and other civil offices of the city of Pine Bluff, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 215) to repeal the several acts authorizing an internal tax on cotton and relating to the same, and providing for the payment to the treasurers of the respective States wherein said tax was levied and collected the amounts so collected upon the creation by law in said States of a tribunal to adjudicate the claims of individuals for such taxes paid in said respective States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 216) declaring all persons or associations of persons, joint stock companies, corporations, or associations of such companies or corporations, owning or operating, or owning and operating private freight cars used in interstate commerce to be common carriers and subject to the provisions of

the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 217) to provide for the improvement, construction, and repair of the dikes and abutment work and the maintenance of the river bank and channel of the Arkansas River at Pine Bluff, Ark., and to appropriate $40,000 therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 218) to appropriate $100,000 to preserve and maintain the river channel and to prevent the threatened cut-off in the Arkansas River near Pine Bluff, Ark.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 219) to prevent corporations engaged in interstate business or commerce from making contributions to campaigns for Federal offices—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 220) to amend the act of Congress of June 5, 1900, relating to the allowance of exceptions—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 221) for the establishment of a board for the protection of children and animals—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 222) authorizing the taxation, homesteading, and sale of Federal lands within irrigation districts—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 223) providing for the sale of the old mint building and site thereof at Denver, Colo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 224) in relation to the elective franchise, defining offenses against the same, and prescribing punishments therefor—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 225) to provide for an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the district of Colorado—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 226) to purchase certain lands adjacent to the present site of Fort Logan, Colo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 227) to increase proportionately with the present rating for total deafness the pensions of all persons who may be entitled to pension under the general laws for partial deafness—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 228) repealing an act entitled "An act to extend the time for presenting claims for additional bounties," and so forth—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 229) providing for the purchase of metal and the coinage of minor coins, and the distribution and redemption of said coins—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 230) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Denver, in the State of Colorado—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 231) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States courts at Texarkana, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 232) amending section 17, chapter 296, United States Statutes at Large, volume 14, so as to provide that members of Congress using free transportation to and from Congress shall not receive mileage—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 233) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for the loss or destruction, without fault or negligence on the part of said officers and men, of property belonging to them in the military service of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 234) amendatory of the pension law in the act of June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 235) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Niles, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 236) amending the national-bank act of 1864 for the better security of national-bank deposits—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 237) to provide for a pension of $24 per month for soldiers and sailors who have attained the age of 70 years—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 238) to pension all soldiers and sailors who served in the Army or Navy of the United States at least ninety days in the war of the rebellion, and who were honorably discharged therefrom, at the rate of $12 per month, and also placing upon the pension roll of the United States the widows of such soldiers and sailors who were married prior to June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 239) relating to liability of common carriers by railroads in the District of Columbia and Territories and common carriers by railroads engaged in commerce between the States and between the States and foreign nations to their employees—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 240) to provide for an allowance for subsistence of rural free-delivery carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 241) granting to rural free-delivery carriers an annual leave of absence, not exceeding fifteen days, with pay—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 242) to provide for the further improvement of the harbor of Erie, Pa.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 243) to provide for site and public building at Meadville, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 244) to provide for the issuance of postage-stamp certificates—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 245) to determine the term of service of all soldiers, sailors, and marines serving in the war of the rebellion for a period of ninety days or more—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 246) creating a national board of pardons—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 247) making the anniversary of William McKinley's birthday a legal holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 248) making the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 249) to provide for the erection of a public building at Grand Rapids, in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 250) to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. VAN DUZER: A bill (H. R. 251) to establish the Department of Mines and Mining—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 252) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint certain persons in the Regular Army and place them upon the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 253) providing for the recognition of the men who served as locomotive engineers during the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 254) declaring all persons or associations of persons, joint stock companies, corporations, or associations of such companies or corporations, owning or operating or owning and operating private freight cars and refrigerator cars used in interstate commerce to be common carriers and subject to the provisions of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 255) granting pensions to Army locomotive engineers, and providing pensions to widows and minor children of Army locomotive engineers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 256) to provide for presenting a badge or button to each honorably discharged soldier, sailor, and marine of the war for the preservation of the Union, and for protecting the same by law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 257) providing for an additional appropriation for the public building at Flint, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 258) providing for the erection of a public building at Pontiac City, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 259) to increase the pay of mail carriers on rural free-delivery routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 260) to increase the pension of those who have lost a limb above the knee and total deafness of both ears (combined) in the military or naval service of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 261) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sewickley, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 262) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Watertown, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 263) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Huron, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 264) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Mitchell, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 265) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lead, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 266) increasing the cost of public building at Spokane, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 267) to admit the products of the Philippine Islands into all of the ports of the United States of America free of duty—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 268) to amend an act entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases," approved January 5, 1893—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 269) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Paragould, in the State of Arkansas—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 270) to increase the pensions of widows of Mexican soldiers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 271) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of churches, lodges, and educational or eleemosynary institutions arising from the late civil war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 272) to provide for the construction and maintenance of levees along the Mississippi River, from the hills above Cairo to the Head of the Passes, by the Government of the United States of America—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

Also, a bill (H. R. 273) to prohibit the collection of a revenue tax, or the granting of other authority permitting or authorizing the sale or giving away of foreign or domestic distilled spirits, intoxicating liquors, wines, or any compound thereof in any district or territory of any of the several States or Territories of the United States of America where the sale or giving away of such foreign or domestic distilled spirits, intoxicating liquors, wines, or any compound thereof are prohibited by the laws of said States or Territories, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 274) to prevent the fraudulent naturalization of aliens—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 275) to regulate the taking of appeals or writs of error from the United States district courts in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 276) to authorize the issuance of special bench warrants in certain criminal cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 277) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved the 3d day of March, in the year 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 278) to regulate carriers engaged in interstate commerce, to prohibit them from limiting their common-law liability, and to increase the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 279) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at York, in the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 280) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Gettysburg, in the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 281) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to purchase certain lands on the battlefield of Gettysburg, and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 282) granting a fifteen-day leave of absence to rural free-delivery letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 283) to provide suitable medals for officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps who participated in certain engagements of the civil war—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 284) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the Hospital Corps of the Navy of the United States, and to define its duties and regulate its pay—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 285) to provide for the extermination or control of the gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 286) to appropriate $15,000 for the study of the foreign natural enemies or means of control of the gypsy moth and of the brown-tail moth, and for the introduction of such of these as promise to be useful in controlling the two insects named in America—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 287) to purchase a painting of the several ships of the United States Navy known as the "Squadron of Evolution," and entitled "Peace"—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 288) to remove the duty on hides of cattle—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 289) to remove the duty on coal—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 290) concerning the naval hospital grounds at Chelsea, Mass.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 291) authorizing the President to enter into a commercial treaty with the Government of His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with the view to reciprocity between the United States of America and Canada, with reference to a modification of the customs tariff of Canada imposing a duty upon American strawberries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 292) to amend the postal laws of the United States and permit all newspapers or publications of the second class, one copy to each actual subscriber, to go free through the mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 293) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to place a clock in the Government building in the city of Newbern, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 294) authorizing the retirement of lighthouse keepers and the payment to them of a pension—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 295) to enlarge the trade and promote the sale of cotton products in foreign markets—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 296) to supplement an act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, and amendments thereto—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 297) to authorize the construction of dams and power stations in the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Alabama—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 298) to put printing paper and wood pulp on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 299) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 300) to extend the privilege of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise to various subports in customs collection district of Puget Sound, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 301) dividing the State of South Carolina into two judicial districts, providing for the appointment of a district judge, and so forth—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 302) for the erection of a public building at Anderson, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 303) for the erection of a public building at Belvidere, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 304) for the construction of an addition to the public building at Rockford, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 305) to enlarge the post-

office and court-house building in the city of Williamsport, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COCKRAN: A bill (H. R. 306) providing for the appointment of a special commission to inquire into and ascertain the amounts of money expended by both parties at all elections for Presidential electors from 1892 to 1904, both inclusive—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 307) providing that all contributions exceeding $50 in amount hereafter made to the expenses of political parties at elections where Presidential electors and Representatives in Congress are chosen shall be reported to the clerk's office of the district court of the United States for the district in which the donors reside, and for the publication of such reports—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 308) to amend section 2 of chapter 89 of Supplement to the Revised Statutes of the United States, volume 1, second edition, 1874 to 1892, page 282—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 309) to repeal an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and the amendment to said act approved February 5, 1903—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 310) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 2294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 311) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend the homestead laws as to certain unappropriated and unreserved lands in Nebraska," approved April 28, 1904—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 312) providing for the holding of Federal court at Kearney, Nebr.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 313) to restore homestead rights to certain persons who made entries within a certain area in Nebraska between the 28th day of April and the 28th day of June, 1904, upon conditions—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 314) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of North Platte, State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 315) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Kearney, State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 316) to increase the pensions of those who have been disabled so as to render their incapacity to perform manual labor equivalent to the loss of a hand or foot—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNWELL: A bill (H. R. 317) to increase the efficiency of United States shipping commissioners and to provide for the organization of a free shipping bureau—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 318) appropriating $25,000 to enlarge the public building at Brooklyn, N. Y., to meet the necessities of public business—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 319) to establish a fish hatchery and fish-culture station in the county of Franklin, in the State of New York, for the propagation of trout, bass, and other game and food fishes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 320) to commemorate the battle of Plattsburg and to provide a monument in honor of American sailors and soldiers killed in defense of Plattsburg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 321) for the erection of a public building at Malone, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 322) to extend the provisions of the pension act of June 27, 1890, to the Missouri Enrolled State Militia and other organizations—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 323) to declare February the 12th a national holiday—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 324) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Brig. Gen. Nathaniel Lyon at St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 325) for the erection of a public building at Danville, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 326) for the erection of a public building at Lawrenceburg, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 327) limiting the hours of daily services of laborers, workmen, and mechanics employed upon the public works of or work done for the United States or any Territory or the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 328) in relation to contempts of court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 329) providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 330) to create the Territory of Alaska and to provide for the government of the same—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 331) to regulate commerce with foreign nations; to make preference for the use of American freighting vessels; to extend the postal service by American steamships, and to promote American trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 332) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, and cannon balls in their respective Departments," approved May 22, 1896—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 333) to prevent the unauthorized use of the names or pictures of persons for the purposes of trade—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 334) to amend section 1395 of the Revised Statutes, to increase the number of chaplains in the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 335) to provide for the erection of a public building at Madisonville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 336) to provide for the erection of a public building at Athens, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 337) to provide for the erection of a public building at Cleveland, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 338) to provide for the erection of a public building at Winchester, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 339) granting right of way for road through Government reservation north of national cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 340) to amend sections 4924 and 4927 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents—to the Committee on Patents.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 341) recognizing the military service of and giving pensionable status under all pension laws of the United States to persons serving under United States officers as home guards, militia, or other provisional troops during the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 342) to provide for the erection of an addition to and the improvement of the United States court-house and post-office building at Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 343) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sparta, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 344) to provide for the erection of a public building at McMinnville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 345) to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations, and regulating the expenditure thereof—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 346) to erect a public building at Dixon, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 347) for the improvement of the public schools of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 348) providing for the erection of a public building at Muscatine, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 349) for the suppression of train robberies in the Territories of the United States and other places, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 350) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Mitchell, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 351) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Huron, in the

State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also a bill (H. R. 352) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Watertown, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 353) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 354) for the erection of a public building at Syracuse, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 355) providing for the manner of payment of postage on books, catalogues, and other printed matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 356) for the protection of producers, manufacturers, and venders of milk and cream, and of lawful milk beverages composed mainly of milk, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 357) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to improve the Des Moines River, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 358) to amend an act authorizing the Secretary of War to cause to be erected monuments and markers on the battlefield of Gettysburg, Pa., to commemorate the valorous deeds of certain regiments and batteries of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 359) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Ames, in the State of Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 360) for the erection of a public building at Des Moines, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 361) to extend the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885, relative to officers and enlisted men of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 362) to provide for the organization of corporations to engage in commerce with foreign nations and among the several States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 363) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia regarding corporations—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 364) relative to the naturalization laws of the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 365) to amend the civil-service act, known as "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States"—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 366) providing for the erection of a monument in the United States Battle Ground Cemetery at Washington, D. C., located on the spot where the battle of Fort Stevens was fought July 11, 12, and 13, 1864, commemorative of the members of the Twenty-fifth Regiment New York (Sickles's) Volunteer Cavalry, who fell or participated therein—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 367) to authorize the detail of a retired naval officer on behalf of American seamen—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 368) for the relief of certain officers of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 369) for the completion of the Bronx River improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 370) for the deepening and widening of the Bronx Kills, creating a direct channel between Long Island Sound and the Harlem River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 371) for the completion of the Harlem River ship canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 372) for the completion of Westchester Creek improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 373) for the erection of a public building in the borough of the Bronx, New York City—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 374) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 375) to regulate child labor in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 376) concerning reservations of public lands as preserves and breeding grounds for native birds or for game birds, and to punish violations of Executive orders concerning same—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 377) to extend the limits of the port of entry of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 378) to provide for a public building at New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 379) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 380) to authorize the sale of a portion of the Lower Brulé Indian Reservation in South Dakota, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 381) to amend section 2982 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in reference to the sale of supplies to vessels of war—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 382) for the protection of the workingmen of the United States and their families—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 383) to prohibit shanghaiing and peonage in the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 384) to prohibit corporations from contributing to campaign funds in elections of Federal officers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 385) regulating the operation of automobiles and other motor vehicles between the States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 386) for the erection of a public building at Bloomington, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 387) making appropriation for public building at Bedford, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 388) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Trinidad, Colo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 389) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a post-office building thereon at Cape Charles, in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 390) to change the port of Tappahannock, in the district of Tappahannock, in the State of Virginia, to Reedville, Va.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 391) to amend sections 7 and 8 of an act entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service and encourage the saving of life from shipwreck"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 392) to establish a lighted beacon at the mouth of Pungoteague Creek, Chesapeake Bay, Virginia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 393) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who have lost both eyes or who have become totally blind from causes not occurring while in the military or naval service of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 394) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Lancaster, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 395) concerning foreign-built dredges—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 396) to establish a fish hatchery and fish-culture station in southern Ohio, on the waters of the Muskingum, the Hocking, or the Scioto rivers—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 397) to modify an act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 398) to retire on full pay certain disabled persons from the United States Light-House Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 399) to provide for a Delegate to the House of Representatives of the United States from Porto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 400) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Kenosha, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 401) for the erection of a public building at Beloit, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 402) setting aside a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands in the Philippine Islands for school purposes—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 403) to prohibit certain corporations from contributing money to influence the result of elections or to influence legislation—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 404) to establish a minimum tariff of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 405) to amend section 16 of an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 406) to secure to the Philippine Islands free trade with the balance of the domain of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 407) granting certain lands belonging to the United States and situated in the State of Alabama to the State of Alabama for the use and benefit of the common schools of that State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 408) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 409) to amend the homestead laws as to certain unappropriated and unreserved lands in Colorado—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 410) providing for the purchase of metal and the coinage of minor coins, and the distribution and redemption of said coins—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 411) to amend section 5409 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 412) providing for the payment of expenses of judges in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 413) to permit United States marshals to delegate authority to sign official checks—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 414) to limit the time within which prosecutions may be instituted against officers, agents, or employees of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 415) to amend section 1044 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 416) providing for the appointment of a Solicitor for the Post-Office Department and abolishing the office of Assistant Attorney-General for the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 417) to make certain the mileage to be charged to and collected from parties other than the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 418) conferring jurisdiction upon United States commissioners over offenses committed in a portion of the permanent Hot Springs Mountain Reservation, Ark.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 419) to amend section 542 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 420) to amend sections 4092, 4093, 4094, 4095, 4096, and 4129 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 421) to regulate the practice of law in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 422) providing for the exercise of the powers of the judge of the district court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii by certain other judges of the courts of the Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 423) for the erection of a public building at Chippewa Falls, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 424) to amend section 5398 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 425) to extend certain provisions of the Revised Statutes of the United States to the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 426) to amend subdivision 6 of section 4596 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by chapter 28, approved December 21, 1898, entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to American seamen, for the protection of such seamen, and to promote commerce"—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 427) to provide for filing of commissions of officers of the Post-Office Department and Department of Commerce and Labor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 428) to regulate certain criminal procedure in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 429) providing for a tax on United States bonds deposited by national banking associations to secure their circulating notes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 430) to provide for free alcohol in certain arts and industries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 431) to open for settlement 505,000 acres of land in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian reservations, in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 432) to provide for an appeal of one case from the Choctaw and Chickasaw citizenship court to the Supreme Court of the United States—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 433) to subject the mineral lands on the Indian reservations in the United States and Territories to location, operation, development, and entry, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 434) to remove restrictions on the sale of certain lands in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 435) to amend the act relating to Indian depredations—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 436) establishing a United States court and recording district at Duncan, Ind. T., and conforming other districts therewith—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 437) to limit the jurisdiction of the district and circuit courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 438) requiring the United States Government to furnish post-office boxes permanently to all citizens paying the first cost of their box in all post-offices now renting boxes to citizens, and to repeal all laws inconsistent with this act—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 439) providing for the lease of the public grazing lands in the arid States and Territories of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 440) to amend section 4386 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, striking out "twenty-eight consecutive hours" and "twenty-eight hours" and inserting "forty consecutive hours" and "forty hours"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 441) to provide for the union of Oklahoma Territory and the Indian Territory, and to enable the people thereof to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union as the State of Oklahoma, on an equal footing with the original States, and to make donations of public lands to said State—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 442) to prohibit corporations from making money contributions in connection with political elections—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 443) to authorize the President of the United States, in conjunction with the State of Texas, to run and mark the boundary lines between the Territories of Oklahoma and New Mexico and the State of Texas—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 444) extending the operation of the irrigation reclamation act of Congress to the State of Texas—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 445) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Everett, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 446) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Whatcom, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 447) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to contract for the construction of a floating steel dry dock to be stationed within Drum Point Harbor, near the mouth of Patuxent River, Chesapeake Bay, Maryland—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 448) to amend section 29 of an act entitled "An act to provide a national currency, secured by a pledge of United States bonds, and to provide for the circulation and redemption thereof," approved June 3, 1864—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 449) for the relief of tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 450) to prevent corruption at elections, and so forth—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 451) for the erection of a public building in the city of New Britain, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 452) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 453) for a public building at Ann Arbor, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 454) to increase salaries of rural free-delivery carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 455) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Shamokin, in the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 456) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 457) to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY: A bill (H. R. 458) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Quincy, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 459) providing that the United States frigate *Constitution* be transferred to Castle Island, Boston Harbor, to be used as a naval museum—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 460) to amend an act entitled "An act to proivde revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897, as to import duties on hides, harness, leather, boots, and shoes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 461) to amend the customs drawback law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 462) amending section 2513 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 463) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into a contract or contracts for the dredging and improvement of the Anacostia River and the reclamation and improvement of its flats from the line of the District of Columbia to the Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HEARST: A bill (H. R. 464) to enable the United States of America to acquire, maintain, and operate electric telegraphs, and so forth—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 465) to empower United States attorneys, without the direction of the Attorney-General, to enforce the act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 466) to protect trade and commerce against restraints and monopoly—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 467) to prevent wasteful departmental appropriations by requiring estimates of expenditures to specify in detail the items thereof—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 468) to supplement and amend the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and the acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 469) to increase the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to expedite the final decision of cases arising under the act to regulate commerce by creating an interstate commerce court—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 470) for the establishment of a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 471) to protect the lives of seamen engaged in coastwise traffic between the States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 472) to prohibit aliens from fishing in the waters of Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 473) to regulate corporations, joint stock companies, and other associations engaging in interstate and foreign commerce in food and fuel supplies—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 474) to create a railway capitalization commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 475) to place insurance companies and all subsidiary trust and banking companies in which they or their officers own controlling interest under the supervision and control of the Treasury Department of the United States, and to apply to them certain provisions of the national-bank act—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 476) for the protection of citizens of the United States under 15 years of age—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 477) to extend the sovereign visitorial power of the United States over certain life insurance companies and other corporations organized under State laws, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 478) to place insurance companies under the supervision and control of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 479) to define and punish bribery in elections and political conventions—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for Isthmian Canal construction, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 481) to prevent and punish the desecration, mutilation, or improper use of the flag of the United States of America—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVERING: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to uniform hours of labor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution fixing the term of the President at six years—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 3) fixing the date of the election of electors for President and Vice-President and Representatives in Congress, and the date for the assembling of Congress—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 4) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LLOYD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 5) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FOWLER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 6) to cause an examination or survey of part of the westerly side of Arthur Kill or Staten Island Sound—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 7) authorizing George H. Bridgman to accept from the British Government a silver inkstand, in recognition of his services to British interests while minister of the United States to Bolivia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 8) providing for the creation of a joint committee to investigate the collections and expenditure of funds during the national campaigns of 1892, 1896, 1900, and 1904—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 9) providing for the appointment and fixing the duties of the Panama Canal Investigation Committee—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 10) providing for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the transactions of corporations engaged in interstate insurance—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 11) for the publication of eulogies delivered in Congress on Hon. John W. Cranford, late a Representative in Congress—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SULZER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 12) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 13) pro-

viding for the purchase and placing of Mr. Wilson MacDonald's colossal busts of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln in each public school building in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of General Orders, No. 195, War Department, June 29, 1863, for the presentation of medals—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRELL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 15) providing for a survey of a 35-foot channel in the Delaware River at the expense of the city of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) providing for the printing of certain statutes and decisions—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 17) to amend the Constitution of the United States in relation to income and succession taxes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 18) setting aside certain lands within the Mescalero Indian Reservation, in New Mexico, for the use of the Indians thereon, and providing for the sale of the residue of the lands therein for the benefit of said tribe of Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 19) to prevent the lease of certain Indian lands in Oklahoma Territory for a longer period than one year—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 20) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the levy of a tax on incomes and inheritances—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUDD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 21) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to examine and report upon a route for the construction of a free and open waterway to connect the waters of the Chesapeake and Delaware bays—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. HEARST: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 22) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. KINKAID: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 23) to award to James H. Cook, of Agate, Nebr., a bronze medal for valiant services in the Geronimo campaign—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BATES: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 24) to restore the status of the McLane's Erie Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, who served in the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 25) providing for the erection of a monument in Arlington Cemetery to the memory of Charles Vernon Gridley, late captain, United States Navy—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 26) authorizing the payment of $500 by the Secretary of Agriculture to T. H. Reeves, State statistical agent of the Department of Agriculture during the calendar year 1901—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) providing for a survey of the Isthmus of Darien for canal purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANDLER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 28) providing for the printing of 20,000 additional copies of the Jefferson Bible ("Morals of Jesus of Nazareth")—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 29) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. LOVERING: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 1) directing a survey to be made of Green Harbor, at Marshfield, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 2) directing a survey to be made of the harbor at Wareham, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 3) directing a survey to be made and an estimate of costs submitted in view to the erection of a sea wall at Hull, Mass.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BRICK: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 4) providing for the publishing of 10,000 copies of the Declaration of Independence—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CANDLER: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 5) providing for the printing of 3,000 copies of Manual of Fish Culture, with revision—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 6) providing for printing additional United States maps—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 7) providing for the printing of 8,000 additional copies of the Eleventh Special Report of the Commissioner of Labor—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 8) providing for the printing of 10,000 additional copies of the Tenth Special Report of the Commissioner of Labor—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LEWIS: A resolution (H. Res. 13) for the appointment of a committee to investigate the plans and methods used by the Department of Agriculture and the Census Bureau in obtaining data and making their reports relative to cotton, etc.—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A resolution (H. Res. 14) for the investigation of child labor by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A resolution (H. Res. 15) asking information from the Interstate Commerce Commission concerning wages paid railroad employees—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A resolution (H. Res. 16) giving certain powers to Committee on Naval Affairs—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A resolution (H. Res. 17) facilitating the distribution of public documents assigned to Representatives through the House folding room—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A resolution (H. Res. 18) for the appointment of a janitor to the room occupied by the Committee on Education—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A resolution (H. Res. 19) for the appointment of an assistant clerk to the Committee on the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A resolution (H. Res. 20) authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs to have certain printing done, and to sit during the sessions of the House—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 21) authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs to appoint an assistant clerk—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A resolution (H. Res. 22) to recommend reconvening of the Joint High Commission appointed by Great Britain, Canada, and the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A resolution (H. Res. 23) concerning the rights of the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, and Chickasaw Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 24) directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit to the House a copy of the report in regard to the boundary lines of New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNARY: A resolution (H. Res. 25) recommending the reconvening of the Joint High Commission appointed by Great Britain, Canada, and the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A resolution (H. Res. 26) authorizing the Doorkeeper of the House to appoint an additional page in the press gallery—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A resolution (H. Res. 27) concerning war vessels on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 28) asking for an inspection of Holland Harbor, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LORIMER: A resolution (H. Res. 29) providing for the payment of P. L. Coultry for services rendered in the House folding room—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES: A resolution (H. Res. 30) referring to the Court of Claims the House bill and papers for the relief of John Morgan's heirs—to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 482) to correct the muster of Benjamin F. Hasson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 483) granting an increase of pension to B. Frank Paris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 484) granting a pension to William Mayer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 485) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bantom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 486) granting an increase of pension to John Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 487) granting an increase of pension to Arthur F. Truitt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 488) granting an increase of pension to survivors of the Mexican and Indian wars and to their widows—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 489) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Hercher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 490) granting an increase of pension to R. H. Woods—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 491) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. M. E. Norwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 492) granting a pension to Mrs. Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 493) granting a pension to Baley R. Gill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 494) granting a pension to Elcy R. Kelly—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 495) granting a pension to James L. Strickland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 496) granting a pension to Mesura A. Graham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 497) granting a pension to Mary Haynes—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 498) granting a pension to Ruetha Moran—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 499) granting a pension to Penny F. Stevens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 500) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Patman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 501) granting a pension to John McMichael—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 502) granting a pension to Simeon D. Pope—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 503) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. L. Gordon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 504) for the relief of the legal representatives of F. M. T. Brannan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 505) for the relief of Sidney T. Dupuy and George R. Dupuy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 506) for the relief of the heirs of S. H. Hill, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 507) for the relief of the legal representatives of T. L. Walker, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 508) to compensate W. T. Godwin for transportation, rent, and supplies furnished United States authorities engaged in suppressing a riot in Harris County, Ga., in 1867—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 509) for the relief of H. T. Cunningham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 510) for the relief of the legal representatives of Anderson Abercrombie, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 511) for the relief of Jesse J. Bull—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 512) for the relief of the legal representatives of Edward Haile, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 513) to compensate the legal representatives of Henry S. Castellaw for stock and provisions taken for the use of the Army of the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 514) for the relief of William F. Wheeler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 515) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Balthazar Rummel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 516) granting an increase of pension to John F. Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 517) granting an increase of pension to Luke A. Waldron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 518) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Van Riper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 519) granting an increase of pension to William C. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 520) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Stern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 521) granting an increase of pension to James Rout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 522) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Roschdiantsky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 523) granting an increase of pension to Frank G. Hawkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 524) granting an increase of pension to Sylvenus A. Fay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 525) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Conover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 526) granting an increase of pension to Robert Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 527) granting an increase of pension to Richard E. Clapper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 528) granting an increase of pension to James E. Auld—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 529) granting an increase of pension to Francis L. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 530) granting an increase of pension to George E. Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 531) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer Rickett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 532) granting an increase of pension to James T. Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 533) granting an increase of pension to Sumner F. Hunnewell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 534) for the relief of Capt. Herman C. Schumm—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 535) granting a pension to Maria Horne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 536) granting a pension to William Kern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 537) granting a pension to William Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 538) granting a pension to Conrad Strasser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 539) for the relief of Edward Caralan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 540) for the benefit of William H. Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 541) for the relief of Richard C. Silence—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 542) for the relief of Paul Werner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 543) to correct the date of muster of Company F, Pacific Battalion Missouri Home Guards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 544) to amend the miltary record of William Morrison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 545) to correct the military record of John Herbst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 546) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Henry Walter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 547) to correct the military record of Frank Clemens Arendes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 548) to reimburse A. J. Caufman, Girard, Erie County, Pa., in the sum of $300, together with interest thereon from October 16. 1862, for soldier furnished United States, being the amount paid by him to one Charles Morton, as a substitute—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 549) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Starr, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 550) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 551) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 552) granting an increase of pension to William H. Nortrip—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 553) granting an increase of pension to John B. Vile—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 554) granting an increase of pension to Alexis L. Cobb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 555) granting an increase of pension to Orsen Hauser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 556) for the relief of Caleb W. Durham—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 557) granting relief to C. M. Curtiss—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 558) granting relief to Charles E. Russell,

as administrator of John H. Russell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 559) granting an honorable discharge to John P. Webber—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 560) granting an increase of pension to Wilson M. Holmes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 561) granting an increase of pension to Giles Townsend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 562) granting an increase of pension to John F. Mohn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 563) granting an increase of pension to William J. F. Barcus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 564) granting an increase of pension to Sumner Barstow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 565) granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Betts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 566) granting an increase of pension to Cassius M. Carroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 567) granting an increase of pension to Charles Christy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 568) granting an increase of pension to Orrin L. Dake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 569) granting an increase of pension to William H. Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 570) granting an increase of pension to Lewis F. Garson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 571) granting an increase of pension to Halsey P. Gabriel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 572) granting an increase of pension to Dulcina Galbraith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 573) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Houghton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 574) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Hauser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 575) granting an increase of pension to William Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 576) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 577) granting an increase of pension to William Kent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 578) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Lauman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 579) granting an increase of pension to Uriah J. Loop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 580) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McKee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 581) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 582) granting an increase of pension to Fannie J. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 583) granting an increase of pension to Thomah H. Muchmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 584) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 585) granting an increase of pension to John Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 586) granting an increase of pension to Oliver S. McLain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 587) granting an increase of pension to George W. Neely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 588) granting an increase of pension to William H. Nix—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 589) granting an increase of pension to John M. Odenheimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 590) granting an increase of pension to Judson N. Pollard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 591) granting an increase of pension to Oliver F. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 592) granting an increase of pension to Albert N. Raymond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 593) granting an increase of pension to Van B. Straight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 594) granting an increase of pension to Helen E. South—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 595) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Stenbeck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 596) granting an increase of pension to Henry Walter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 597) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 598) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Wales—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 599) granting an increase of pension to Christian White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 600) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. McLain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 601) granting an increase of pension to Israel E. Munger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 602) granting a pension to S. Effie Parkhill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 603) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Blyth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 604) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 605) granting an increase of pension to Harry M. de Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 606) granting an increase of pension to Peter M. Jumper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 607) granting an increase of pension to Susan Robords—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 608) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Jenkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 609) granting an increase of pension to Horace H. Sickles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 610) granting a pension to Serilda J. Shire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 611) granting an increase of pension to John H. Cassidy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 612) granting an increase of pension to George H. Kohler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 613) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 614) granting an increase of pension to William N. Kipling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 615) granting an increase of pension to Walter J. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 616) granting an increase of pension to Lettice M. Blore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 617) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Schmidt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 618) granting an increase of pension to Eunice A. Starr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 619) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Inglis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 620) granting a pension to Hattie L. Chittenden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 621) granting an increase of pension to Alexander E. Irwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 622) granting an increase of pension to John C. Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 623) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Stratton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 624) granting an increase of pension to Cora G. Davison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 625) granting an increase of pension to Corydon W. Sanborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 626) granting an increase of pension to John C. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 627) granting a pension to Helen A. Edic—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 628) granting a pension to David L. Finch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 629) granting a pension to John W. Stites—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 630) granting a pension to Charles F. Teirner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 631) granting a pension to James Russell Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 632) granting a pension to Henry Neikirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 633) granting a pension to William Hendricks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 634) granting a pension to Eliza M. Bedell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 635) for the relief of John R. Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 636) for the relief of William Slater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 637) for the relief of William H. Bone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 638) for the relief of Charles S. Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 639) for the relief of C. W. Sturtevant, Rolla Brown, Alice Brown, M. L. Kelly, Robert G. Duffy, Fread Gehring, T. H. Ross, and L. C. Partee—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 640) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph D. Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 641) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel W. Gates—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 642) to correct the military record of Henry Wagner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 643) granting an increase of pension to Alexander W. Browning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 644) granting an increase of pension to Mary Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 645) for the relief of Leann S. King, assign of Thomas Leitensdorfer—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 646) for the relief of C. W. Sturtevant, Rolla Brown, Alice Brown, M. L. Kelly, Robert G. Duffy, Fread Gehring, T. H. Ross, and L. C. Partee—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 647) for the relief of Mrs. Julia L. Hall—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELL: A bill (H. R. 648) granting a pension to Charles Falbisaner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 649) granting a pension to Lucy T. Bogue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 650) granting a pension to Felix G. Stidger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 651) granting an increase of pension to Robert Brandau—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 652) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. M. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 653) granting an increase of pension to James C. Booth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 654) granting an increase of pension to Amos J. Loranger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 655) granting an honorable discharge to Patrick McGough—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 656) for the relief of John W. Noble—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 657) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Babcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 658) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Bedford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 659) granting an increase of pension to George W. Carey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 660) granting an increase of pension to Squire J. Carlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 661) granting an increase of pension to Cary D. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 662) granting an increase of pension to Abraham E. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 663) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 664) granting an increase of pension to Peter Countryman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 665) granting an increase of pension to James C. Dill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 666) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Frasier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 667) granting an increase of pension to George H. Gaskill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 668) granting an increase of pension to James A. Giles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 669) granting an increase of pension to James M. Heminger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 670) granting an increase of pension to Alfred B. Lowry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 671) granting an increase of pension to Alex McLaughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 672) granting an increase of pension to Stephen S. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 673) granting an increase of pension to John M. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 674) granting an increase of pension to Henry Mock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 675) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Morrissey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 676) granting an increase of pension to Musgrove E. O'Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 677) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Ramsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 678) granting an increase of pension to Emil Schincke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 679) granting an increase of pension to Levi C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 680) granting an increase of pension to Newman S. Snow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 681) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Snurr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 682) granting an increase of pension to George M. Veach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 683) granting an increase of pension to James C. Wattleworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 684) granting an increase of pension to Eli O. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 685) granting an increase of pension to William Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 686) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah S. Wyland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 687) granting a pension to Harvey R. Backus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 688) granting a pension to Johan Frank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 689) granting a pension to George Heminger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 690) granting a pension to William B. Jenkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

Also, a bill (H. R. 691) granting a pension to Thomas McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 692) granting a pension to Samuel Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 693) granting a pension to Albert G. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 694) granting a pension to Maria V. E. Bitters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 695) granting a pension to Mary Jane Gay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 696) granting a pension to Matilda Merrick Goodrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 697) granting a pension to B. Annie Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 698) granting a pension to Martha Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 699) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jonas Albert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 700) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Barnes and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 701) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles E. Bentley and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 702) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Godfrey Bestle and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 703) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob Curry and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 704) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Ely M. De Weese and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 705) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William C. Horner and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 706) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Albert B. Ketterman and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 707) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas F. Lindersmith and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 708) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Andrew Matheny and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 709) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Philpott and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 710) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles Rankert and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 711) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Shaffer and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 712) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Stallter and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 713) to restore to the pension roll Sarah J. Ayers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 714) for the relief of Charles B. Bentley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 715) for the relief of Martin D. Puckett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 716) for the relief of Levi C. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 717) granting an increase of pension to O. B. Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 718) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton D. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 719) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Conant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 720) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Ditt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 721) granting an increase of pension to John R. Keyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 722) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Presdee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 723) granting an increase of pension to George W. Raigle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 724) granting an increase of pension to John A. Coulter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 725) granting a pension to George E. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 726) granting a pension to Belle Royal, widow of Andrew Royal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 727) for the relief of Mary Keith and Benny Keith—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 728) for the relief of La Fayette & Bro.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 729) for the relief of Boone Chandler and others—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 730) granting a pension to Francis M. McClendon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 731) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Netherway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 732) granting a pension to Mollie Townsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 733) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Bayless—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 734) granting a pension to Manley W. Capps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 735) granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Fornshell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 736) granting an increase of pension to John T. Pearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 737) granting a pension to William E. Quirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 738) granting an increase of pension to William A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 739) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 740) granting a pension to Pariade Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 741) granting an increase of pension to Lewis F. Self—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 742) granting an increase of pension to James Wintersteen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 743) granting a pension to John F. Borrows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 744) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McGuigan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 745) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wedelstedt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 746) granting a pension to Thomas Large—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 747) granting an increase of pension to Robert Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 748) granting an increase of pension to Earl B. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 749) granting an increase of pension to Elkanah M. Wynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 750) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 751) granting a pension to Louisa Harwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 752) granting a pension to Richard Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 753) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Dove—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 754) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Lady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 755) granting a pension to Lizzie M. McDougal, daughter of private soldier who died as a prisoner of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 756) granting a pension to Matilda A. Runions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 757) granting a pension to D. M. Simerly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 758) granting a pension to Margaret Cotter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 759) granting a pension to William C. Tilley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 760) granting a pension to Thomas R. Trent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 761) granting a pension to William Branscom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 762) granting a pension to Rebecca Prichard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 763) granting a pension to Morris McIntosh, father of John McIntosh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 764) granting a pension to Strawberry B. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 765) granting a pension to James E. Shehan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 766) granting a pension to William See—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 767) granting a pension to Martha L. Reams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 768) granting a pension to William Riddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 769) granting a pension to Nathan B. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 770) granting a pension to Peter Spurgeon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 771) granting a pension to Martin Click and four others—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 772) granting a pension to Leonard B. Merritt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 773) granting a pension to Monroe Trent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 774) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Ray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 775) granting a pension to John A. Collett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 776) granting a pension to William H. Chambers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 777) granting a pension to Sarah Cupp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 778) granting a pension to J. Lavenia Childs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 779) granting a pension to Pleasant P. Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 780) granting a pension to Joseph Branscom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 781) granting a pension to Samuel Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 782) granting a pension to Sarah Bowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 783) granting a pension to John G. Burchfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 784) granting a pension to Oliver L. Burnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 785) granting a pension to John B. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 786) granting a pension to Hartwell B. Whittle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 787) granting a pension to Pleasant C. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 788) granting an increase of pension to William F. Akerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 789) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 790) granting an increase of pension to William M. Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 791) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Sivils—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 792) granting an increase of pension to George W. Caseday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 793) granting an increase of pension to Alwilda A. Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 794) granting a pension to Jackson Stokely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 795) granting a pension to George W. Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 796) granting a pension to William H. Pierre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 797) granting a pension to David A. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 798) granting a pension to David A. Patton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 799) granting a pension to Zachariah Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 800) granting a pension to Bettie Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 801) granting a pension to Elizabeth Herron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 802) granting a pension to William Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 803) granting a pension to Samuel M. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 804) granting a pension to J. W. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 805) granting a pension to Mary Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 806) granting a pension to Peter Guinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 807) granting a pension to Mary Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 808) granting a pension to Susan Fields—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 809) granting a pension to Daniel Fugate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 810) granting a pension to John B. Graves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 811) granting a pension to Thomas Dalton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 812) granting a pension to William K. Daniel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 813) granting a pension to Isaac Daniel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 814) granting a pension to James Conant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 815) granting a pension to George W. Gabey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 816) granting a pension to John D. Cary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 817) granting a pension to Wiley Cazart—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 818) granting a pension to James K. Bowman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 819) granting a pension to Hester J. Mitchell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 820) granting a pension to Henry Spurgeon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 821) granting a pension to John Ward—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 822) granting a pension to Adella C. Chandler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 823) granting a pension to Elzie May Camp Bernard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 824) to grant a pension to Nancy Dillard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 825) granting a pension to J. S. Grubb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 826) granting a pension to Madison Grimsby—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 827) granting a pension to Ruetha Moran—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 828) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Phipps—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 829) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Pritchett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 830) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah Dezarn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 831) for the relief of John E. Barrett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 832) for the relief of George Killeen—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 833) for the relief of Samuel B. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 834) for the relief of estate of D. W. F. Peoples, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 835) for the relief of Frank B. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 836) for the relief of Thomas J. Wear—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 837) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad and Banking Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 838) for the relief of the heirs of James A. Galbreith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 839) for the relief of heirs of Thomas Harvey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 840) for the relief of Edwin S. Harris—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 841) for the relief of Albert W. Perry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 842) for the relief of the heirs of M. J. Parrott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 843) for the relief of the heirs of Margaret Kennedy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 844) for the relief of R. R. Robinson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 845) for the relief of William B. Sorsby—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 846) for the relief of Mary A. Shufeldt—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 847) for the relief of Lewis F. Self—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 848) to pay heirs of John Sevier, sr., for certain military services rendered to the United States by said John Sevier, sr.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 849) to pay to Jacob Yost the sum of $434—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 850) making appropriation to pay the estate of Samuel Lee, deceased, in full for any claim for pay and allowances made by reason of the election of said Lee to the Forty-seventh Congress and his services therein—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 851) for the relief of estate of Edith Beard, late of Washington County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 852) for the relief of Daniel B. Bowman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 853) for the relief of John T. Phillips—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 854) for the relief of William Ridens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 855) for the relief of the estate of Alexander Reeder, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 856) for the relief of J. J. Starnes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 857) for the relief of Mrs. Emily Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 858) for the relief of the estate of Bryant Wheeler, deceased, late of Claiborne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 859) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of William Irwin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 860) for the relief of Lewis Atkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 861) for the relief of Charles H. Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 862) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Stolsworth, deceased, late of Grainger County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 863) for the relief of the estate of John Moody, deceased, late of Grainger County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 864) for the relief of Thomas J. Wear—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 865) for the relief of the estate of Allen L. Barnes, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 866) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mary Counts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 867) for the relief of the estate of Harriet G. Woods, deceased, late of Hawkins County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 868) for the relief of Solomon Q. Dugger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 869) for the relief of Mack Fulton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 870) for the relief of D. A. Harvey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 871) for the relief of the heirs of William M. Piper, late provost-marshal with the rank of captain—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 872) for the relief of George F. Brott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 873) for the relief of Jacob Barker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 874) for the relief of Peter Dougherty—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 875) for the relief of the legal representatives of George J. Kinzel—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 876) for the relief of Solomon Lyons—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 877) for the relief of the estate of William J. Middleton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 878) for the relief of John Scott Payne—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 879) for the relief of Thomas J. Powell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 880) for the relief of the estate of David L. Ripley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 881) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Church of Prospect, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 882) for the relief of Clara L. Sheffield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 883) for the relief of Lewis White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 884) for the relief of John Walker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 885) for the relief of Marion F. Wolfe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 886) for the relief of George W. Webster—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 887) for the relief of Joseph West—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 888) for the relief of James Vandergriff—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 889) for the relief of George Bailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 890) for the relief of Jacob Barkley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 891) for the relief of Reuben R. Sea—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 892) for the relief of George T. Welch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 893) for the relief of Ezekiel T. Delph—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 894) for the relief of Riley Day—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 895) for the relief of John H. Dickenson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 896) for the relief of Joseph Fawbush—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 897) for the relief of Robert M. Fox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 898) for the relief of David Foster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 899) for the relief of Newton Gray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 900) for the relief of Arthur Y. Green—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 901) for the relief of Joseph Goodman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 902) for the relief of Silas J. Grenade—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 903) for the relief of Samuel Greenlee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 904) for the relief of J. W. Godsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 905) for the relief of Alfred Green—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 906) for the relief of William Girdner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 907) for the relief of James H. Hall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 908) for the relief of Jacob Hybarger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 909) for the relief of Jackson Harris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 910) for the relief of Henry Hall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 911) for the relief of E. S. Parrott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 912) for the relief of Henry Poe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 913) for the relief of Allen Bruner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 914) for the relief of John G. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 915) for the relief of Hugh L. Bowlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 916) for the relief of William Buttery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 917) for the relief of Samuel Babb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 918) for the relief of Walter W. Baker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 919) for the relief of Richard Burton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 920) for the relief of James M. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 921) for the relief of John Butler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 922) for the relief of William S. Cloud—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 923) for the relief of Samuel S. Caldwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 924) for the relief of William M. Cox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 925) for the relief of Thomas Colyer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 926) for the relief of Thomas Saylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of W. R. Sentell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 928) for the relief of Alfred Sellers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 929) for the relief of Pleasant Haun—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 930) for the relief of F. M. Hilton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 931) for the relief of Alexander Harmon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 932) for the relief of Calloway Horton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 933) for the relief of Andrew Cutshal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 934) for the relief of William M. Henry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 935) for the relief of Dulaney P. Harmon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 936) for the relief of Pleasant C. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 937) for the relief of William B. Jenkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 938) for the relief of Richard M. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 939) for the relief of Lincoln S. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 940) for the relief of William Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 941) for the relief of William Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 942) for the relief of Willis M. Kent—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 943) for the relief of James B. Leedy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 944) for the relief of Lewis H. Lee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 945) for the relief of James Mills—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 946) for the relief of W. G. McKenzie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 947) for the relief of James McDonald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 948) for the relief of Henry J. Manis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 949) for the relief of William A. Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 950) for the relief of Robert P. Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 951) for the relief of William Moyers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 952) for the relief of W. E. Peirce—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 953) for the relief of Louis B. Quillan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 954) for the relief of David Roberts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 955) for the relief of Joshua Richardson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 956) for the relief of Jesse Rhea—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 957) for the relief of Ruben S. Sea—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 958) for the relief of Reuben R. Sea—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 959) for the relief of Elbert S. Shanks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 960) for the relief of W. A. Spears—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 961) for the relief of Homer Sheldon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 962) for the relief of Henry Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 963) for the relief of Thomas Sutton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 964) for the relief of George Shults—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 965) for the relief of C. C. Speers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 966) for the relief of John M. Morrison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 967) for the relief of James Nicholes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 968) for the relief of J. G. Odell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 969) for the relief of Levi Viles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 970) for the relief of George Washington Wallace—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 971) for the relief of Wiley Wolf—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 972) for the relief of Stephen Wilbourne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 973) for the relief of Robert Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 974) for the relief of John Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 975) for the relief of William Vance—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 976) for the relief of John G. Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 977) to grant an honorable discharge to Canada Peck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 978) to restore David B. Jeffers to the United States Army with the rank of first lieutenant, and place him upon the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 979) to amend the record of Capt. Thomas H. Reeves, United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 980) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas B. Wingfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 981) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Samuel Lane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 982) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jasper L. Bailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 983) to remove the charge of desertion against William Mullins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 984) to remove the charge of desertion against William H. Wheatley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 985) to remove the charge of desertion standing against William A. Spears—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 986) to correct the military records of W. J. Whitson and Sidney Whitson, and grant their dependent father, Isaac Whitson, a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 987) to correct the military record of James H. Beal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 988) to correct the military record of Thomas Brackins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 989) to correct the military record of Robert Burchfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 990) to correct the military record of Charles Birchfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 991) to correct the military record of William A. Cope—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 992) to correct the military record of William Carder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 993) to correct the military record of Henry C. Coleman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 994) to correct the military record of John Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 995) to correct the military record of Ellis Carter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 996) to correct the military record of Cleaveland Creech—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 997) to correct the military record of Robert Henson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 998) to correct the military record of John Hickman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 999) to correct the military record of William Kelly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1000) to correct the military record of Jacob Linebaugh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1001) to correct the military record of J. K. P. McNabb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1002) to correct the military record of Mat Elliot McLain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1003) to correct the military record of Joseph W. Marley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1004) to correct the military record of Daniel Telley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1005) to correct the military record of Thomas Ownby—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1006) to correct the military record of Samuel Presley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1007) to correct the military record of Daniel K. Self—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1008) to correct the military record of Charles H. Piper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1009) to correct the military record of Joseph Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1010) to correct the military record of Nelson Stover—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1011) to correct the military record of Madison Trent and others—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1012) to correct the military record of Jesse B. Mitchell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1013) to correct the military record of James M. Mace—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1014) to correct the military record of George W. Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1015) to correct the military record of Warren Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1016) to correct the military record of Robert B. Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1017) for the relief of the estate of Adam B. Fuller, deceased, of Greene County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1018) granting an increase of pension to Silas Flourney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1019) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Bayless—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 1020) for the relief of Lee Robbins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1021) for the relief of the heirs of George Montgomery, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1022) for the relief of the heirs of Simon Rockwell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1023) for the relief of the heirs of Archie B. Forbess—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 1024) granting an increase of pension to John E. Hussey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1025) granting an increase of pension to Louis Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1026) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Wilcox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1027) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Friend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1028) granting an increase of pension to Michael Nessline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1029) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1030) granting an increase of pension to Rudolph Huhn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1031) granting an increase of pension to Frank Honde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1032) granting an increase of pension to Seth Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1033) granting an increase of pension to James P. Carpenter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1034) granting an increase of pension to John D. Logan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1035) granting an increase of pension to John Lindquist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1036) granting an increase of pension to Abraham K. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1037) granting an increase of pension to James B. Sales—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1038) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert P. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1039) granting an increase of pension to Paul Steinbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1040) granting an increase of pension to Arbana Wade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1041) granting an increase of pension to Martin Toohy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1042) granting an increase of pension to John J. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1043) granting an increase of pension to Horace Hounsman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1044) granting an increase of pension to Lydia M. Salisbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1045) granting a pension to Caroline Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1046) granting a pension to Amelia Bachelor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1047) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Seits—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1048) granting a pension to William H. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1049) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Epaphroditus Waite—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1050) for the relief of Edwin S. Hall—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 1051) granting an increase of pension to William H. Plunkett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1052) authorizing the issuance of patent in fee to Joseph Vollin—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1053) authorizing the issuance of patent in fee to Jane E. Waldron—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1054) to correct the military record of Henry A. Kippenbrock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1055) to correct the military record of Levi Conright—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1056) granting a pension to Galen S. Clevenger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1057) granting an increase of pension to Caswell D. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1058) granting an increase of pension to Alphonso H. Harvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1059) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Spangler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1060) granting a pension to Margaret E. Lounsbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1061) granting a pension to John Edmund Ray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 1062) granting an increase of pension to George E. Brickett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1063) granting a pension to Mary L. McClure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1064) granting a pension to James B. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1065) granting a pension to Alexander Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1066) granting an increase of pension to William Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1067) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bender—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1068) granting an increase of pension to William S. Quigley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1069) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Britton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1070) granting an increase of pension to William Carson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1071) granting an increase of pension to William K. Keech—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1072) granting an increase of pension to John Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1073) granting an increase of pension to William J. Castlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1074) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Bean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1075) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Roach, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1076) to pay the Standard Steel Casting Company for one 6-inch gun casting—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1077) referring the claim of William H. Diamond, of Chester, Pa., for damages for personal injuries sustained, to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1078) for the relief of Hamilton D. South, second lieutenant, United States Marine Corps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1079) to restore the name of John Sharrocks to the pension roll and granting him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 1080) for the relief of J. W. Walker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1081) for the relief of heirs of John Hamilton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1082) for the relief of the estate of Milton Crawford, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1083) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1084) for the relief of the estate of John Linton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1085) for the relief of the heirs of Gladney, Gardner & Co., of Guntown, Lee County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1086) for the relief of the estate of Richmond Pace, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1087) for the relief of Mrs. Lucretia Lambert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1088) for the relief of the Methodist Church of Kossuth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1089) for the relief of Matilda H. Reed, of Iuka, Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1090) for the relief of the estate of J. K. Morrison, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1091) for the relief of the estate of J. W. Hopkins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1092) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1093) for the relief of the estate of Richard D. Fielder, of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1094) for the relief of Dr. O. R. Early, of Lowndes County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1095) for the relief of Susan C. Robinson, Iuka, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1096) for the relief of the estate of Mary H. Moore, deceased, Iuka, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1097) for the relief of the estate of Josiah White, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1098) for the relief of the estate of William Clement, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1099) for the relief of Nancy H. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1100) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Kossuth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1101) for the relief of Robert Ingram, of Itawamba County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1102) for the relief of Isabella Rowsey, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1103) for the relief of estate of W. F. Young, of Burnsville, Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1104) for relief of estate of W. R. Smith, of Burnsville, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1105) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Gardner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1106) for the relief of estate of D. R. Hubbard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1107) for the relief of the estate of Richard Mann, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1108) for the relief of Mrs. E. A. Hubbard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1109) for the relief of the heirs of Abel Walker, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1110) for the relief of the heirs of M. A. McAnulty, deceased, late of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1111) for the relief of A. W. McClure, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1112) for the relief of the estate of R. C. Bumpass, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1113) for relief of George Kimberley

and Sam Kimberley, heirs of M. P. Kimberley, deceased, late of Tishomingo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1114) for the relief of heirs of Sylvia Cannon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1115) for the relief of the estate of Andrew J. Kincaid—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1116) for the relief of Francis E. Whitfield and Lucy G. Whitfield, of Alcorn County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1117) for relief of heirs of Coleman Rogers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1118) for the relief of J. R. Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1119) for the relief of the trustees of Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Corinth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1120) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Corinth, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1121) for the relief of J. M. Cumby, heir of M. G. Cumby—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1122) for the relief of the Masonic lodge at Bexar, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1123) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Emaline Finklea—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1124) granting an increase of pension to John J. Grant—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1125) granting an increase of pension to Francis Ann Batchelor—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1126) granting a pension to Jesse C. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1127) granting a pension to Rupert Cannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1128) for the relief of Jeremiah Walton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1129) for the relief of James F. Kellum—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 1130) for the relief of Emaline Johns—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1131) granting an increase of pension to George Sargent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1132) granting a pension to Lydia A. Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1133) granting a pension to Mary Lockard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1134) granting a pension to David Graeff—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1135) granting an increase of pension to John Shisler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1136) granting an increase of pension to William D. Stauffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1137) granting an increase of pension to Abraham M. Kauffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1138) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1139) granting a pension to David Zecher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1140) granting an increase of pension to William Weitzel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1141) granting a pension to Katie Cushman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of Ephraim Greenawalt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1143) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim D. Achey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1144) granting an increase of pension to Franklin McFalls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1145) for the relief of John G. Stauffer & Son—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1146) for the relief of parties from whom cigars were seized on account of bearing counterfeit stamps—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 1147) granting a pension to Amanda B. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1148) granting a pension to Marion F. Halbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1149) granting a pension to Theodore F. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1150) granting a pension to Emma J. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1151) granting a pension to Valentine Bartley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1152) granting a pension to Edwin Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1153) granting a pension to Thomas Headdy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1154) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Van Trees—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1155) granting a pension to Margaret A. True—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1156) granting a pension to Andrew J. Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1157) granting a pension to Robert Atkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1158) granting relief to Edward Smith on erroneous muster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1159) granting a pension to John F. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1160) granting a pension to Anna Swords and William Swords—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1161) granting a pension to J. T. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1162) granting a pension to William Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1163) granting a pension to William A. Mathes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1164) granting a pension to Piety Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1165) granting a pension to Andrew J. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1166) granting a pension to Thomas Waddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1167) granting a pension to Samuel A. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1168) granting a pension to Martin B. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1169) granting a pension to Oliver P. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1170) granting a pension to William A. Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1171) granting a pension to Alfred Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1172) granting a pension to Anderson Keen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1173) granting a pension to Robert Gerking—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1174) granting a pension to Frances Guthrie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1175) granting a pension to John B. Gooldy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1176) granting a pension to John H. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1177) granting a pension to James M. Douthitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1178) granting a pension to Herman Buckthall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1179) granting a pension to Thomas Pickett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1180) granting a pension to Elizabeth Buskirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1181) granting a pension to Louiza J. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1182) granting a pension to Ezekiel Bridivell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1183) granting a pension to William G. Walton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1184) granting a pension to Sera A. Douglas and Effie M. Baird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1185) granting a pension to Josiah C. Hancock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1186) granting a pension to William F. Bunger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1187) granting a pension to Barton P. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1188) granting a pension to John H. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1189) granting a pension to Hiram P. Pauley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1190) granting a pension to Thomas S. Fields—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1191) granting a pension to Luzetta Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1192) granting a pension to George B. Hess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1193) granting a pension to James S. Horrall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1194) granting a pension to Samuel Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1195) granting a pension to James E. Speake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1196) granting a pension to James C. McCarty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1197) granting a pension to James C. McCarty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1198) granting a pension to Abagail Tharp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1199) granting a pension to Lydia A. Jewell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1200) granting a pension to John G. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1201) granting a pension to Edward Maxwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1202) granting a pension to John E. Callender—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1203) granting a pension to James S. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1204) granting a pension to George C. Cranshaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1205) granting a pension to Samuel P. Bigger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1206) granting a pension to Allen Crow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1207) granting a pension to Nelson Purcell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1208) granting a pension to Albert P. De Bruler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1209) granting a pension to Sarah E. Dillon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1210) granting a pension to Martha Bartlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1211) granting a pension to S. S. Bryant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1212) granting a pension to John N. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1213) granting a pension to John Breden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1214) granting a pension to Stewart Barnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1215) granting a pension to J. Bass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1216) granting a pension to William H. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1217) granting a pension to Spillard F. Horrall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1218) granting a pension to Nathan H. Hinkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1219) granting a pension to James Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1220) granting a pension to Harvey Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1221) granting a pension to John T. McKee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1222) granting a pension to Jerry Lockwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1223) granting a pension to Andrew Jarvis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1224) granting a pension to Mordechai Dix—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1225) granting a pension to Samuel Wininger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1226) granting a pension to George Wininger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1227) granting a pension to Pierce Gorby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1228) granting a pension to William H. Goins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1229) granting a pension to Henry Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1230) granting a pension to James S. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1231) granting a pension to William King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1232) granting a pension to John V. Buskirk—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1233) granting a pension to Lucretia Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1234) granting an increase of pension to Ewell Plummer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1235) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1236) granting an increase of pension to Frances Brower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1237) granting an increase of pension to Robert Owens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1238) granting an increase of pension to Susan R. Stalcup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1239) granting an increase of pension to Frederick L. Killion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1240) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Headley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1241) granting an increase of pension to John G. Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1242) granting an increase of pension to Luke Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1243) granting an increase of pension to John W. Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1244) granting an increase of pension to Francis G. Lutes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1245) granting an increase of pension to David Rankin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1246) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Ridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1247) granting an increase of pension to Columbus Botts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1248) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1249) granting an increase of pension to William R. Fulk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1250) granting an increase of pension to William F. Browning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1251) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1252) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Mathes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1253) granting an increase of pension to William E. Bilby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1254) granting an increase of pension to Luke V. Temple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1255) granting an increase of pension to Thompson H. Withers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1256) for the relief of John A. Fairfax—the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1257) for the relief of the legal representatives of Nathaniel and William Offut, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1258) for the relief of William Taylor—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1259) for the relief of George A. Exline—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1260) for the relief of Charles R. Van Trees—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1261) for the relief of R. W. Hayden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1262) for the relief of James L. East—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1263) authorizing rehearing in the case of William Donnelly and Patrick Egan in the United States Court of Claims—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1264) for the relief of Peter F. Kendall—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1265) for the relief of John Benefield, executor of Willis Benefield, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1266) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Calvert, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 1267) for the relief of Jane P. Paulk—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1268) for the relief of James A. Paulk—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1269) for the relief of the estate of Aaron Paulk, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1270) for the relief of the heirs of T. L. Scott, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1271) for the relief of Mary F. Casey Tucker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1272) for the relief of the representatives of the estate of Reuben Dawkins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1273) for the relief of the heirs of E. A. Dozier, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1274) for the relief of the legal representatives of Abraham Lawrence, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1275) for the relief of Jerry Andrews—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1276) for the relief of Mrs. L. E. Boatwright—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1277) for the relief of the administrators as such of the estate of Ira T. Jordan, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1278) for the relief of A. J. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1279) granting a pension to William Lanier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1280) granting a pension to Mary K. Lewis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1281) granting a pension to Elizabeth Cotter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1282) granting a pension to Martha Yarbrough—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1283) granting an increase of pension to Epsy Ann Austin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1284) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel J. Maund—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 1285) granting an increase of pension to James Flynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1286) granting an increase of pension to Edward Prentice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1287) granting an increase of pension to John D. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1288) granting an increase of pension to S. D. Platt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1289) granting an increase of pension to Robert I. Brayton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 1290) to correct the military record of S. Spencer Carr—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1291) granting a pension to Joseph Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1292) granting an increase of pension to James H. Van Wagenen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1293) granting an increase of pension to James K. Van Matre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1294) granting an increase of pension to George W. Van De Bogert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1295) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Turney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1296) granting an increase of pension to Morris Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1297) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Emerett Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1298) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1299) granting an increase of pension to Charles Riel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1300) to correct the military record of James U. Quinn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1301) to correct the military record of Christopher Parkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1302) granting an increase of pension to Jane McManus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1303) granting a pension to Hannah McAdams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1304) granting an increase of pension to Harrison P. Luce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1305) for the relief of Frank Lincoln—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1306) granting an increase of pension to Josiah E. Keyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1307) for the relief of William G. Keats—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1308) granting a pension to Lizzie Jestadt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1309) granting a pension to David Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1310) granting a pension to Fred Hugaboom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1311) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1312) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Higley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1313) granting an increase of pension to Chloe M. Hewitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1314) granting an increase of pension to Neil Gillespy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1315) granting a pension to Eliza Farnsworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1316) to correct the military record of John H. Ethridge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1317) to correct the military record of James Donnallam—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1318) granting a pension to Mary Degnan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1319) granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Cresson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1320) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 1321) granting an increase of pension to William H. Morse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 1322) granting an increase of pension to Katherine F. Wainwright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1323) granting an increase of pension to Lorenza Bliss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1324) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1325) granting an increase of pension to Moses P. Bemis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1326) granting an increase of pension to Ora P. Howland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1327) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1328) granting an increase of pension to Samuel O. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1329) granting an increase of pension to Almeda B. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1330) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hildreth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1331) granting an increase of pension to Roswell J. Kelsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1332) granting an increase of pension to William C. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1333) granting a pension to Priscilla Twiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1334) for the relief of the legal representatives of George Soule—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 1335) for the relief of L. K. Scott—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1336) granting a pension to Lucinda Barnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 1337) granting an increase of pension to James B. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1338) granting an increase of pension to William L. Hurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1339) granting an increase of pension to James Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1340) granting a pension to Robert Kennish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1341) granting a pension to George B. Turpin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 1342) to authorize the patenting of certain lands to Margaret Sar-sarp-kin, an Indian woman—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1343) for the relief of Matilda Elizabeth West—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1344) for the relief of Bernard W. Murray—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1345) for the relief of John L. Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1346) for the relief of Herman C. Funk—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1347) for the relief of George Jennings, alias George Fish—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1348) granting a pension to Jerome M. White—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1349) granting a pension to Rudolph Kals—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1350) granting a pension to John Ashworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1351) granting a pension to Charles W. Kyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1352) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Sanford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1353) granting an increase of pension to Robert Bruce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1354) granting an increase of pension to Mason H. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1355) granting an increase of pension to George A. Tyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1356) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Maker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1357) granting an increase of pension to George W. Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1358) granting an increase of pension to John G. P. Eberhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1359) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1360) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Zinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1361) granting an increase of pension to Camillus B. Leftwich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1362) granting an increase of pension to Simon Olsen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1363) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1364) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1365) granting an increase of pension to Philetus G. Burch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1366) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Fradenburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1367) granting an increase of pension to James A. Murch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1368) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cummins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1369) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George Abbott, alias Andrew C. Adams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1370) to reimburse Royal L. Sweany, late deputy collector of internal revenue at Tacoma, Wash.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1371) to refund to J. Tennant Steeb certain duties erroneously paid by him without protest on goods of domestic production shipped from the United States to Hawaii and thereafter returned—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 1372) granting a pension to Josephine I. Richmond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1373) granting an increase of pension to Florence Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1374) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Hoover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1375) granting an increase of pension to Silas Mosher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1376) granting an increase of pension to Ellis Artley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1377) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Dallman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1378) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Hobart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1379) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Conser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1380) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Beck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1381) granting an increase of pension to David H. Quigg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1382) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Fagley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1383) restoring the name of Henry L. Beck to the Army rolls as captain, and providing that he then be placed on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 1384) for the relief of Maramon A. Martin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1385) for the relief of Robert R. Furbey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1386) granting a pension to Rachel E. Newell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1387) for the relief of Benjamin F. Harrison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1388) granting a pension to Thomas S. Magruder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1389) for the relief of Thomas C. Sweeney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1390) granting an increase of pension to Beckwith A. McNemar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1391) for the relief of Gideon C. Corley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1392) granting a pension to William P. Parrill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1393) granting a pension to William Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1394) granting an increase of pension to George W. Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1395) granting a pension to F. S. Snodgrass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1396) for the relief of John W. Vandine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1397) for the relief of Alexander Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1398) for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1399) granting a pension to Eliza J. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1400) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Burrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1401) for the relief of John Burns—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1402) to restore to the pension roll the name of Andrew C. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1403) granting a pension to Sarah F. Armstrong—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1404) granting a pension to Wilson Johnston, of Wheeling, W. Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1405) to pension R. J. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1406) granting a pension to James S. Peery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1407) granting a pension to Enoch J. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1408) to pension James Logston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1409) granting an increase of pension to William L. Alley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1410) granting a pension to Eliza Peel—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1411) granting a pension to William A. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1412) granting a pension to Mary E. Radcliffe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1413) granting a pension to John Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1414) for the relief of Henry P. Mayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1415) granting a pension to Walter Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1416) for the relief of Jacob W. Hudson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1417) granting a pension to Jacob Piles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1418) granting a pension Squire H. Stuck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1419) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Fretwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1420) for the relief of John May—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1421) for the relief of Francis M. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1422) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1423) for the relief of Henry Snider, of Moundsville, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1424) granting a pension to Melvina J. Swiger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1425) granting an increase of pension to John W. Plattenburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1426) granting a pension to Enoch F. Blackwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1427) granting a pension to William P. Parrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1428) for the relief of Elias E. Barnes—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1429) for the relief of Maramon A. Martin, late private of Company A, Sixth Regiment of West Virginia Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1430) granting a pension to Adam Minear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1431) granting a pension to John Kirkman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1432) granting an increase of pension to Rosaline V. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 1433) granting an increase of pension to Philip Graulich—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1434) granting an increase of pension to Eleazer A. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1435) granting an increase of pension to Jason Robbins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1436) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Trumble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1437) granting an increase of pension to Darius J. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1438) granting an increase of pension to Oliver T. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 1439) for the relief of the heirs of Asa O. Gallup—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1440) to increase the pension of Matilda E. Lawton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNWELL: A bill (H. R. 1441) to authorize the President to appoint Col. Henry Lippincott, United States Army, retired, to the grade of brigadier-general, United States Army, on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1442) paying certain claims of G. W. Howland—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1443) for the payment of Robert D. Benedict for services rendered—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1444) for the relief of the estate of F. Z. Tucker, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1445) for the relief of Noah L. Cochen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1446) for the relief of Lucy M. Fisher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1447) granting an increase of pension to Emile H. Brie, alias Amede Brea—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1448) granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Stegman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1449) for the relief of the estate of Brig. Gen. Wager Swayne, in charge of the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands—to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1450) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to cede certain lands to the city of New York—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 1451) for the relief of Mary Leary and children—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1452) for the relief of the heirs of Catharine Gillen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1453) granting an honorable discharge to John B. Tredenick—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1454) removing the charge of desertion from the naval record of Patrick Naddy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1455) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to cede certain lands to the city of New York—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 1456) for the relief of William L. Best—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1457) granting a medal of honor to Michael Finegan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1458) granting a pension to Winifred Casey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1459) granting a pension to William Brown, alias Daniel Mulligan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1460) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Renell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1461) granting an increase of pension to Sarah T. Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1462) granting an increase of pension to John R. Tunnicliff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1463) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Denton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1464) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Gravel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1465) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Daniel O'Brien—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 1466) granting a pension to George W. Graves—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1467) granting an increase of pension to Hiram E. Monroe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1468) granting an increase of pension to Morris B. Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1469) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Munger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1470) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Miles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1471) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Leland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1472) granting an increase of pension to Alice E. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1473) granting an increase of pension to Granville F. North—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1474) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1475) granting an increase of pension to Stephen S. Cornell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1476) granting an increase of pension to John L. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 1477) granting an increase of pension to Israel D. Lum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1478) granting an increase of pension to John Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1479) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Franklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1480) granting an increase of pension to John W. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1481) granting an increase of pension to David A. Maple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1482) granting an increase of pension to Philip Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1483) granting an increase of pension to Josephine E. Quentin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1484) granting an increase of pension to John L. Lovell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1485) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1486) granting an increase of pension to John D. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1487) granting a pension to Oscar W. Humphrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1488) granting a pension to William Shannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1489) granting a pension to James H. Huntington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1490) for the relief of George Serrell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1491) for the relief of William A. Forbes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of Sarah E. Randolph—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1493) to amend the military record of Henry G. Craft—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1494) removing the charges of desertion from and granting an honorable discharge to Benjamin Warner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 1495) for the relief of Tusculum Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 1496) for the relief of Edmund Stanfield—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1497) granting a pension to George Abblerback—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1498) granting a pension to Hickford L. Carrier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1499) granting a pension to Horace Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1500) granting a pension to Emily J. Sherman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1501) granting a pension to Sally Ann Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1502) granting a pension to Catherine M. Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1503) granting a pension to Martha A. Hamlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1504) granting a pension to Alonzo F. Waterbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1505) granting a pension to William Birmingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1506) granting an increase of pension to Eli T. Hoyt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1507) granting an increase of pension to H. D. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1508) granting an increase of pension to Elias McQuay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1509) granting an increase of pension to Caroline N. Lovejoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1510) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta Buck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1511) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius A. Hallenbeck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1512) granting an increase of pension to Melvin T. Edmonds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1513) to correct the military record of Jabez Lumbart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1514) to correct the military record of Joel N. Sanford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1515) to correct the military record of Hiram Eideneir—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1516) to correct the military record of Henry S. Hunter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1517) to correct the military record of C. W. Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1518) to correct the military record of George S. Groesbeck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1519) to correct the military record of Henry Myers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1520) to correct the military record of Jacob Betzer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 1521) for the relief of Anna M. Mershon, administratrix of Daniel S. Mershon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1522) for the relief of Adolphus Yuncker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1523) for the relief of William S. Schenck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1524) for the relief of William H. Cornell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1525) for the relief of Robert T. Short—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1526) for the relief of George Davidson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1527) granting a pension to Charlotte Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1528) granting a pension to Anna J. Randolph—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1529) granting a pension to Laura L. Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1530) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Woodward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1531) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Wellman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1532) granting an increase of pension to James M. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1533) granting an increase of pension to Wilbur F. Vannote—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1534) granting an increase of pension to Adam Weaber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1535) granting an increase of pension to Kemenskio A. N. L. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1536) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Burnwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1537) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Forbis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1538) referring the claim of the legal representatives of William T. Duvall, deceased, against the United States to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 1539) for the relief of Edward S. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 1540) for the relief of Charles Beers, sole surviving partner of the firm of Strauss, Bianchi & Co., of New York City—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1541) for the relief of Charles Uerkvitz—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1542) to provide for a medal in commemoration of the services of Haym Salomon during the war of the Revolution and to express recognition of the same—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1543) granting a pension to Oscar C. Dunlap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1544) granting a pension to George B. Chapin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1545) granting a pension to Florence D. Rafferty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1546) granting a pension to Kate H. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1547) granting an increase of pension to William A. Olmsted—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1548) granting an increase of pension to Emma Leviness—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1549) granting an increase of pension to Louis H. Gein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1550) to provide United States registry for the steamer *Success*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1551) to provide United States registry for the steamer *Marie*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 1552) granting a pension to Annie M. C. McGeary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1553) granting an increase of pension to Harvey J. Fulmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 1554) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Spinning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1555) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Jane Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1556) granting an increase of pension to Susan Wigley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1557) granting an increase of pension to Frank J. Oatley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1558) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Peabody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1559) granting a pension to John B. Kenney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1560) to remove the charge of desertion against William H. Springer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1561) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to grant an honorable discharge to Peter O'Neil—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1562) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to Mathew J. Logan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1563) for the relief of Matthew J. Davis—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1564) for the relief of Michael J. Murphy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1565) for the relief of Theodore H. Bishop—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 1566) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lowry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1567) granting an increase of pension to Edward Duffy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1568) granting an increase of pension to Seth Weldy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1569) granting a pension to Elizabeth Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1570) for the relief of James P. Barney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1571) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph White, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1572) for the relief of Thomas W. Higgins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1573) for the relief of Priscilla R. Burns—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1574) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Sampson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 1575) for the relief of Hudson M. Harris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1576) for the relief of Joseph Johnson, alias Sidney McKizzie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1577) for the relief of George H. White—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1578) for the relief of Henry Ickes, alias William H. Burkett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1579) for the relief of Jacob F. Banks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1580) for the relief of Hiram Pegg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1581) granting a pension to Elmore Hardman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1582) granting a pension to William Behrmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1583) for the relief of James and William Crooks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1584) granting a pension to Roderick R. Ackley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1585) granting an increase of pension to George N. Dutcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1586) granting an increase of pension to W. M. Gaunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1587) for the relief of Elias Minnich—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1588) for the relief of Charles D. Wright—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1589) granting an increase of pension to John C. Dillin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1590) for the relief of E. M. Chilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1591) for the relief of V. R. Hughner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1592) granting a pension to Augustus H. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1593) granting a pension to Sarah K. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1594) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Sanford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1595) granting an increase of pension to James W. Humphrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1596) granting a pension to Catharine A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1597) granting a pension to Perry Dunton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1598) granting a pension to Margeret Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1599) granting a pension to Frank Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1600) granting a pension to A. Norwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1601) granting a pension to Mary E. Horton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1602) granting a pension to Horace Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1603) amending the record of John S. Thomas, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1604) granting a pension to Isaiah H. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1605) for the relief of J. H. Rector—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1606) granting a pension to Susan Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1607) granting an increase of pension to William L. Thornton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1608) for the relief of John Hahn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1609) granting a pension to Sarah A. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1610) granting an increase of pension to Harvey H. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1611) granting a pension to Julia Ann Taggart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1612) granting a pension to Louise S. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1613) for the relief of Samuel Barrow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1614) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1615) granting an increase of pension to Emory A. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1616) for the relief of Charles J. Gibbs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1617) granting a pension to Ivy G. Ten Broeck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1618) granting a pension to Albert C. Sheldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1619) for the relief of John Reed, alias Michael Flannigan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1620) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Maxam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1621) granting a pension to Adah A. Helmer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1622) granting a pension to H. S. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1623) granting a pension to Eliza A. Burger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1624) granting an increase of pension to James F. Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1625) granting an increase of pension to Augustus J. Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1626) to restore to the pension roll Sarah J. Ayers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1627) granting a pension to Elias Minnich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1628) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1629) granting an increase of pension to Abram Rosa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1630) for the relief of Thomas E. Streeter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1631) for the relief of Fannie H. Christopher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1632) granting a pension to Jerry B. Gilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1633) granting an increase of pension to Francis Goake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1634) granting a pension to Celina M. Bass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1635) granting an increase of pension to Anson R. Hodgkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1636) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Disbrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1637) granting a pension to Mary J. Quirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1638) granting a pension to Ellen W. Gallea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1639) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rosa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1640) granting a pension to Charlotte S. Dunning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1641) for the relief of Rev. George W. C. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1642) for the relief of Myron Powers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1643) granting an increase of pension to Calvin H. Parmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1644) granting an increase of pension to Alexander C. M. Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1645) granting an increase of pension to Adolphus Bump—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1646) granting a pension to Ida Eubank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1647) for the relief of the estate of Joshua Hill, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1648) for the relief of the widow of Harrison S. Weeks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1649) granting a pension to John M. Hoisington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1650) granting an increase of pension to Frank B. Watkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1651) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Baxter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 1652) granting a pension to Nahum C. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1653) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Weeks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1654) granting an increase of pension to Carlos H. Rich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1655) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1656) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Hatch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1657) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1658) granting an increase of pension to George M. Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1659) granting an increase of pension to Royal Sanderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1660) granting an increase of pension to William H. Willey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1661) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Day—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1662) granting an increase of pension to Cutler D. Sanborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1663) granting an increase of pension to Orlando S. Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1664) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1665) granting an increase of pension to Frederick E. Hayward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1666) granting an increase of pension to Calvin L. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1667) granting an increase of pension to Abram H. Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1668) granting an increase of pension to Carroll A. McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1669) granting an increase of pension to Ransom O. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1670) granting an increase of pension to Loren S. Axtell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1671) granting an increase of pension to Francis E. Brigham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1672) granting an increase of pension to Jasper H. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1673) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Edson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1674) granting an increase of pension to William A. Eagleson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1675) granting an increase of pension to Melissa S. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1676) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Mackenzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1677) granting an increase of pension to Lovila. L. Hastings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1678) granting an increase of pension to William R. Livermore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1679) to remove the record of dishonorable dismissal from the military record of Henry A. Flint—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1680) for the relief of Nahum C. Baker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1681) to remove the record of dishonorable dismissal from the military record of Julius A. Morrill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1682) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Norris W. Silver, alias Norman W. Silver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 1683) granting a pension to Frank Bougger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1684) granting a pension to I. M. Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill H. R. 1685) granting an increase of pension to George W. Bedient—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1686) granting an increase of pension to George S. McGregor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1687) granting an increase of pension to James C. Daly—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1688) granting an increase of pension to John W. McCauley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1689) granting an increase of pension to William A. Bailor—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1690) granting an increase of pension to Harriet J. Cobbey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1691) granting an increase of pension to S. S. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1692) granting an increase of pension to J. R. Prentice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1693) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Q. Oviatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1694) granting an increase of pension to George H. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1695) granting an increase of pension to Robert Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1696) granting an increase of pension to John Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1697) granting an increase of pension to James H. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1698) granting an increase of pension to Perry Emery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1699) granting an increase of pension to James Batten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1700) granting an increase of pension to James H. Riddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1701) granting an increase of pension to Loyard E. Benton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1702) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Gamble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1703) granting an increase of pension to James McClay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1704) granting an increase of pension to Osiah Attison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1705) granting an increase of pension to Fred Preisinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1706) granting an increase of pension to George H. Washburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1707) granting an increase of pension to John Hamm—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1708) granting an increase of pension to John S. Beardsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1709) granting an increase of pension to B. P. Munns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1710) granting an increase of pension to Herman C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1711) granting an increase of pension to F. D. Garnsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1712) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Roby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1713) granting an increase of pension to John B. Munshaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1714) granting an increase of pension to William D. Purcell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1715) granting an increase of pension to William G. Winslow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1716) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1717) granting an increase of pension to George M. Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1718) granting an increase of pension to Charles I. Krickbaum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1719) granting an increase of pension to William N. Whitlock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1720) granting an increase of pension to James V. Morrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1721) granting an increase of pension to James L. McGee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1722) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1723) granting an increase of pension to Rutson J. Bullock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1724) granting an increase of pension to Horace W. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1725) granting an increase of pension to Isaac D. Neihardt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1726) granting an increase of pension to John Wesley Mosier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1727) granting an increase of pension to Swan Swanson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1728) granting an increase of pension to George C. Vance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1729) granting an increase of pension to George W. Walden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1730) granting an increase of pension to Hanley B. Closson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1731) granting an increase of pension to Josiah D. Fye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1732) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Paisley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1733) granting an increase of pension to William C. Lambert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1734) granting an increase of pension to William H. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1735) granting an increase of pension to Joel H. Mastin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1736) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 1737) to amend the military record of Joseph H. Gibler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1738) for the relief of Sarah A. Clapp—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1739) for the relief of Joseph Leggett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1740) granting an increase of pension to Myron T. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1741) granting a pension to Magdalena Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1742) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Daughenbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 1743) granting a pension to Cornelius J. Ballou—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1744) for the relief of George Ivers, of Boone, Pueblo County, Colo., administrator of William Ivers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1745) for the relief of John H. Alphin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1746) for the relief of Daniel E. Kimball and John H. Alphin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1747) for the relief of Daniel E. Kimball—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1748) for the relief of J. H. McDaniel—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1749) granting certain lands to the city of Durango, Colo.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1750) to correct the military record of Amos Abbott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 1751) for the relief of Joseph Thompson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 1752) granting an increase of pension to Hugh N. Lokerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 1753) granting an increase of pension to James W. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1754) granting a pension to William Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1755) for the relief of West Virginia State troops—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1756) for the relief of James M. Clouston—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1757) for the relief of James M. Stephenson, of Point Pleasant, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1758) for the relief of John H. Snyder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1759) for the relief of John Morgan's heirs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1760) for the relief of Thomas McCallister—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1761) for the relief of F. F. Morris—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1762) for the relief of Turman V. Cremeans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1763) for the relief of Leroy Douglass—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1764) for the relief of William H. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1765) for the relief of J. H. Copenhaven, administrator of Bayliss G. Farley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1766) granting an increase of pension to John T. Stone—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1767) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Marcum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1768) granting an increase of pension to George W. Childers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1769) granting an increase of pension to George W. Lawhern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1770) granting an increase of pension to William Large—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1771) granting an increase of pension to James Clay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1772) granting an increase of pension to James C. Plybon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1773) granting a pension to P. S. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1774) granting a pension to Charles Dillon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1775) granting a pension to Alexander Kinnison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1776) granting a pension to John Muck Maynard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1777) granting a pension to John Bartram—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1778) granting a pension to J. L. Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1779) granting a pension to Daniel Perdew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1780) granting a pension to W. B. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1781) to remove charge of desertion from record of Jesse Ford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1782) to remove the charge of desertion from record of Jefferson Mullins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1783) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John W. Shelton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1784) to remove the charge of desertion from record of S. B. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1785) to remove charge of desertion from records of War Department against William B. Meade—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1786) to remove charge of desertion from the records of War Department against James T. Billups—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 1787) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1788) granting an increase of pension to William D. Christy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1789) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Shade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1790) granting an increase of pension to William H. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1791) granting an increase of pension to John J. Draper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1792) granting an increase of pension to Roswell Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1793) granting an increase of pension to Playford Gregg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1794) granting an increase of pension to Robert McNulty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1795) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1796) granting an increase of pension to John Shadle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1797) granting a pension to James H. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1798) granting an increase of pension to John S. G. Sperry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. Tellisse W. Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1800) granting a pension to Eliza J. Ingle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1801) granting an increase of pension to Horace Kemerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1802) correcting the record of Elisha C. Bierce—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1803) granting a pension to George S. Taylor—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 1804) granting a pension to Mary McCarty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1805) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta V. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1806) for the relief of Sarah Ann Collins and Lauretta Turlington—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1807) for the relief of the Downings Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Oakhall, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 1808) for the relief of J. J. L. Peel—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1809) granting a pension to Lena McNabb—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 1810) granting an increase of pension to James E. Post—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 1811) granting an increase of pension to John B. Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1812) granting an increase of pension to George E. Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1813) granting a pension to Fannie Moynahan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1814) granting a pension to Caleb Shreve—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1815) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Dickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1816) granting an increase of pension to Norman I. Squires—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1817) granting an increase of pension to John S. McCammon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1818) granting an increase of pension to John G. Snook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1819) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Ewing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1820) granting an increase of pension to William Little—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1821) granting an increase of pension to Eli Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1822) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1823) granting an increase of pension to John M. Bayley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1824) granting a pension to Peter R. Crum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1825) granting a pension to Walter Donahue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1826) granting an increase of pension to William H. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1827) granting a pension to Wesley Ann Dodd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1828) granting a pension to Rosina Brestel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1829) granting a pension to Ransom B. Hunter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1830) granting an increase of pension to George Sowerwine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1831) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1832) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus A. Hess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1833) granting an increase of pension to W. E. McRobert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1834) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. McGrew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1835) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Doran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1836) granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1837) granting an increase of pension to William F. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Asa J. Clother—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1839) granting an increase of pension to John W. Ervine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1840) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Kingsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1841) granting a pension to Jane Sloan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1842) granting an increase of pension to John A. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1843) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Snowden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1844) granting an increase of pension to Holowell W. Kinney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1845) granting an increase of pension to Robert Buckner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1846) granting an increase of pension to John G. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1847) granting a pension to Charles C. Jeffers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1848) granting an increase of pension to Solon C. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1849) granting a pension to William C. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1850) granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1851) granting an increase of pension to Ralph D. Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1852) granting a pension to William H. Moody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1853) granting an increase of pension to William J. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1854) granting an increase of pension to Philo J. Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1855) granting an increase of pension to John S. Benjamin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1856) granting an increase of pension to Seth Raymond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1857) granting a pension to Emeline Malone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1858) granting an increase of pension to James Jacobs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1859) granting an increase of pension to George T. B. Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1860) granting an increase of pension to Philip Bessor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1861) granting an increase of pension to David Cool—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1862) granting a pension to D. Y. Mears—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1863) for the relief of M. A. McCafferty—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1864) granting a pension to Julia A. Marlow—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1865) granting a pension to George Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1866) to pay Thomas Madden, of Chadron, Nebr., $9,400 for damages sustained on account of depredations perpetrated by Ogalalla Sioux Indians in the year 1870, in the State of Colorado, without proof of his naturalization as a citizen of the United States, he being of foreign birth—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1867) to grant to homesteaders on the Fort Randall Military Reservation, in Boyd County, Nebr., and Gregory County, S. Dak., a second homestead right—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 1868) granting an increase of pension to Perry Egge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 1869) to correct the military record of Asher Branch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1870) granting a pension to Charlotte E. Brockway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1871) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1872) granting a pension to Mary Florence Davenport—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1873) to pay Orville J. Jennings, of Fulton, N. Y., for work done under contract of March 25, 1889—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1874) granting a pension to George Mottram—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1875) granting an increase of pension to John M. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1876) granting an increase of pension to Alice S. Shepard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1877) granting a pension to Esther Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1878) granting a pension to Mary A. Albright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1879) granting an increase of pension to Martin Braun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1880) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah Swartout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1881) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Beebe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1882) granting an increase of pension to Henry Jacques—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1883) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Lester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1884) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Purcell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1885) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Van Petten—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1886) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 1887) granting a pension to Joseph Brooks—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1888) granting a pension to William T. Scandlyn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1889) granting an increase of pension to William M. Shultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1890) granting an increase of pension to Adam Leak—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1891) granting a pension to Simeon York—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1892) granting an increase of pension to James P. Stinnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1893) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Maxwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1894) granting an increase of pension to William N. Mabry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1895) granting a pension to H. Edward Goetz—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1896) granting an increase of pension to John J. Duff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1897) granting an increase of pension to William R. Duncan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1898) granting an increase of pension to James S. Yarnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1899) for the relief of Isaac A. Duncan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1900) for the relief of the personal representatives of John Gates, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1901) for the relief of Charles Baum—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1902) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1903) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Squibb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1904) granting an increase of pension to Nelson R. Satterlee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1905) granting a pension to Linnie Stuart Toms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1906) granting a pension to Elbert E. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1907) granting a pension to Robert Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1908) granting a pension to Guy W. Rowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1909) granting a pension to Alexander Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1910) granting a pension to Andrew H. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1911) granting a pension to Harriet E. Grogan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1912) granting a pension to Julia A. Powell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1913) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Conley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1914) for the relief of the representatives of M. F. Merritt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 1915) to refund certain taxes

paid by the Fred Miller Brewing Company, of Milwaukee, Wis.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1916) to refund to city of Milwaukee money expended by said city in paving Wisconsin street in front of the United States Government property—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1917) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 1918) to amend the records on file at the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 1919) for the relief of William E. Murray—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1920) to remove the charge of desertion against John C. Partlow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1921) granting an honorable discharge to Thomas Weaver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1922) to provide compensation for injuries received by George E. O'Hair, of Indianapolis, Ind., at Ford's Theater disaster, which occurred June 9, 1893—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1923) granting a pension to Henrietta Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1924) granting a pension to Martha J. Grose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1925) granting a pension to Rebecca J. H. Rupe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1926) granting a pension to Sarah E. McCormack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1927) granting an increase of pension to John Burkhardt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1928) granting an increase of pension to Jemima Carland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1929) granting an increase of pension to David C. Benjamin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1930) granting an increase of pension to Noah Jarvis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1931) granting an increase of pension to John Thrasher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1932) granting an increase of pension to James M. Gwinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1933) granting an increase of pension to John H. Kirby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1934) granting an increase of pension to Ben L. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1935) granting an increase of pension to Harriet J. Sparks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1936) granting an increase of pension to Martin Ottinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1937) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1938) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Foutty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1939) granting an increase of pension to William F. Limpus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1940) granting an increase of pension to Elwood Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1941) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Harlan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1942) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hannah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1943) granting an increase of pension to Anna Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1944) granting an increase of pension to Joshua F. Spurlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1945) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Endsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1946) granting an increase of pension to James A. Sproull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 1947) for the relief of the heirs of Victor Faisans—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 1948) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of the claim of Joel G. Higgins, Brand Higgins, and estate of Annie G. Higgins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 1949) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the members or the legal heirs of the deceased members of the Worth Infantry and York Rifles, who were the first fully armed and equipped soldiers to do active service in response to President Lincoln's call for 75,000 volunteers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 1950) for the relief of the minor children of John W. Geering, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1951) to refer to the Court of Claims the war claims of the State of California—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1952) granting a pension to Axel A. M. Natt och Dag—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1953) granting a pension to Susan S. Theall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 1954) for the relief of Israel Yount—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1955) for the relief of F. X. Smith, Son & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1956) to authorize the President to place the name of Adam K. Baylor on the retired list of the United States Navy with the rank of mate, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1957) granting a pension to Joseph Glassic—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1958) granting a pension to Ida L. and Clara H. Winters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1959) granting a pension to Harry H. Herbst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1960) granting an increase of pension to Conrad Laukenman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1961) granting an increase of pension to Emma Chenoweth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1962) granting an increase of pension to George C. Meyers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1963) granting an increase of pension to John Rauch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1964) to correct the military record of Edward T. Lewis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1965) to correct the military record of George I. Spangler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 1966) for the relief of Letitia Tyler Semple—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 1967) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1968) granting an increase of pension to John Monroe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1969) granting an increase of pension to Christian Petersen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1970) granting an increase of pension to John Huss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1971) granting an increase of pension to Melville A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1972) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Gillon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1973) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1974) granting an increase of pension to William R. P. Foale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1975) granting an increase of pension to William House—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1976) granting an increase of pension to George T. Waring—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1977) granting a pension to Emma C. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 1978) granting an increase of pension to Harry C. Thorne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1979) granting an increase of pension to Amanda L. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1980) granting an increase of pension to Edward Coward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1981) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1982) granting a pension to Ada Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1983) granting a pension to Mary S. Houghtailing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1984) granting a pension to Charles P. Lounsbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1985) to correct the military record of David R. Blessing—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 1986) granting an increase of pension to Morris Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1987) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Lash—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 1988) for the relief of the heirs of Charles A. Folsom—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1989) for the relief of Katie O'Brien—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1990) for the relief of Edward Lautenschlaeger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1991) for the relief of Maurice Langhorne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1992) for the relief of Valentine Lapham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1993) granting a pension to Frank B. Hazleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1994) granting a pension to M. R. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1995) granting a pension to Jane Herr—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1996) granting an increase of pension to George A. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1997) granting an increase of pension to S. C. H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1998) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Cheney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1999) granting an increase of pension to John Hopper—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2000) granting an increase of pension to Skeffington Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2001) granting an increase of pension to Lewis P. Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2002) granting an increase of pension to James Buggie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2003) granting an increase of pension to Emma R. Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2004) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2005) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2006) granting an increase of pension to Florence B. Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2007) granting an increase of pension to Manning D. Birge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2008) granting an increase of pension to William H. Barlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2009) granting an increase of pension to Jane S. Minor—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2010) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel Baird—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 2011) granting an increase of pension to John Lezenby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2012) granting an increase of pension to William Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2013) to correct the military record of John H. Hoagland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2014) granting an increase of pension to Enoch McCabe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 2015) for the relief of Charles Speare—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2016) for the relief of Harrison Loring—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2017) for the relief of Alberth Pires—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2018) for the relief of William Arthur—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2019) for the relief of Harry D. Nickerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2020) granting a pension to Penny F. Stephens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2021) granting a pension to Georgiana M. Trow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2022) granting a pension to Orange S. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2023) granting a pension to Charles W. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2024) granting a pension to Lewis Goulding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2025) granting a pension to Kate Howard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2026) granting a pension to Frank Dixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2027) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Hatch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2028) granting a pension to Charles F. Stetson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2029) granting a pension to Joseph W. Clift—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2030) granting a pension to Isaac E. Shepardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2031) granting a pension to Lydia A. Magoon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2032) granting a pension to Sarah A. McInerney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2033) granting a pension to George C. Peterson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2034) granting a pension to Cora F. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2035) granting a pension to Richmond L. Weston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2036) granting a pension to Louisa Stafford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2037) granting an increase of pension to John Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2038) granting an increase of pension to James Cushing Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2039) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2040) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Lovejoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2041) granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Shepard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2042) granting an increase of pension to Shepard F. Easton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2043) granting an increase of pension to Annie Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2044) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Glancy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2045) granting an increase of pension to Abbie A. Durant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2046) granting an increase of pension to James F. Walsh—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2047) granting an increase of pension to Nahum A. Gurney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2048) granting an increase of pension to John J. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2049) granting an increase of pension to Henry Arey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2050) granting an increase of pension to Irven Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2051) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2052) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Swett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2053) granting an increase of pension to Annie A. Townsend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2054) granting an increase of pension to Ralph A. Adams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2055) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2056) granting an increase of pension to Lucas Longendyke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2057) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Hassett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2058) granting an increase of pension to William Vericker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2059) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Washburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2060) granting an increase of pension to John Farrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2061) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2062) granting an increase of pension to Henry Humble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2063) granting an increase of pension to James H. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2064) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2065) granting an increase of pension to M. Maria F. Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2066) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2067) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Sanford K. Knox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2068) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Timothy Reed—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2069) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Fred A. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2070) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John W. Curtis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2071) to correct the military record of Frederic E. Fiske—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2072) granting arrears of pension to H. Morris Husband—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2073) for the relief of Andrew H. Russell and William R. Livermore—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2074) to grant jurisdiction and authority to the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of Jacob B. Phillips against the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2075) to authorize the United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries to convey certain lands to Joseph S. Fay, jr., Sarah B. Fay, and Henry H. Fay—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2076) granting a pension to Arthur Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2077) granting a pension to Charles Moyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2078) granting a pension to Eliza Romig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2079) granting a pension to George W. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2080) granting an increase of pension to Sidney A. Asson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2081) granting an increase of pension to Kate Park Humphreys—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2082) granting an increase of pension to Siotha Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2083) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Slack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2084) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Maginley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2085) to correct the military record of Calvin Hough—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2086) to correct the military record of George F. Peale—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2087) to correct the military record of John Flaherty—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2088) granting an increase of pension to Sewal A. Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2089) granting an increase of pension to Laura J. Forbes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2090) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Brant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2091) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Peddecord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2092) granting an increase of pension to Franklin M. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2093) granting a pension to Sarah A. Pitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2094) granting a pension to Alice P. Auer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2095) to correct the military record of Norman B. Roberts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2096) for the relief of W. S. Carpenter—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2097) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Frank Gaffney, late of the gunboat *Crusader*, in war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY: A bill (H. R. 2098) granting an increase of pension to James F. Merrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2099) granting a pension to Maurice O. Flanigan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2100) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Wilde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2101) granting a pension to Francis Murphy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2102) granting an increase of pension to Eugenia Tilburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 2103) for the relief of James H. Rodgers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2104) for the relief of the heirs of John McAnulty, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2105) for the relief of Thomas D. Ruffin, of Woodruff County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2106) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2107) for the relief of the Old School Presbyterian Church, of Helena, Phillips County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2108) granting a pension to Mattie Settlemire—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2109) granting a pension to T. P. Allmond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2110) granting a pension to Ella Whittington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2111) granting a pension to Angeline Buckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2112) granting an increase of pension to Michael McManus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2113) granting an increase of pension to L. B. Jackson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2114) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Bibb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2115) granting an increase of pension to David B. Withrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2116) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Hayes—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2117) to compensate the Baptist Church at Helena, Ark., for destruction of its building during the late war by the Federal Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 2118) for the relief of the estates of Aaron Van Camp and Virginius P. Chapin—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 2119) authorizing the Secretary of War to bestow a medal of honor upon Maj. J. O. Skinner, surgeon, United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2120) granting an increase of pension to Parmer Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 2121) for the relief of the Stone, Sand and Gravel Company, of New Orleans, La., and the surety for the performance of its contract with the Government for diverting the mouth of the Yazoo River near Vicksburg—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2122) for the relief of W. P. Qualls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2123) for the relief of Jesse Walling—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) for the relief of E. P. Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2125) for the relief of Sarah Crabtree and the estate of Eli Crabtree, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2126) for the relief of Sarah Crabtree—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2127) for the relief of James Nipper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) for the relief of Isom M. Qualls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2129) for the relief of Lydia A. Newby—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2130) for the relief of C. W. Biese—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2131) for the relief of James A. Lance—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2132) for the relief of the estate of George P. Carmichael, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2133) for the relief of the estate of Burrell L. Bennett, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2134) for the relief of the estate of John A. Heard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2135) for the relief of the estate of Louisa M. Kirklin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2136) for the relief of George W. Penney and the heirs of Thomas Penney, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2137) for the relief of the trustees of Hennegan's Chapel, Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Dunlap, Sequatchie County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2138) for the relief of the estate of Lewis Patterson, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2139) for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Eblen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2140) for the relief of Sarah E. Abernathy, widow of J. J. Abernathy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2141) for the relief of R. H. Sively—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2142) for the relief of D. J. Rogers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2143) for the relief of William M. White, of James County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2144) for the relief of Jasper N. T. Hamilton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) for the relief of Ruth Holder—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2146) granting a pension to Peter Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2147) granting a pension to J. L. McDowell, alias Leander Dickey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2148) granting a pension to Harriet E. Aiken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) granting a pension to William D. Humbard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2150) granting an increase of pension to William E. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2151) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2152) granting an increase of pension to W. A. Pryor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2153) granting an increase of pension to James A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2154) granting an increase of pension to William H. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2155) granting an increase of pension to William H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2156) granting an increase of pension to Rachel E. Ware—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2157) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Benjamin C. Coleman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2158) to complete the military record of Daniel Cook, deceased, and for an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 2159) for the relief of George Edmunds—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2160) granting a pension to Edgar Parish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2161) to pay claimants for goods and effects lost or destroyed by fire at Ellis Island, New York, on June 15, 1897—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 2162) for the relief of Abram G. Hoyt—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2163) for the relief of the heirs of Wesley A. Shelton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 2164) for the relief of Mrs. Bathsheba Gordon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2165) for the relief of the estate of Simeon Houk—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2166) for the relief of Salina E. Lauderdale—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2167) for the relief of William W. Callahan, administrator of the estate of Thomas Gibbs—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIVES: A bill (H. R. 2168) granting an increase of pension to William Bridges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2169) granting an increase of pension to Elisah White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2170) granting a pension to Anna B. Gude—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2171) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Tester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2172) to remove the charge of desertion against Jacob P. Mountz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2173) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Padgett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2174) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Buchanan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 2175) granting an increase of pension to James W. Bliss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2176) granting an increase of pension to James F. Mears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2177) granting an increase of pension to James E. Cushing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2178) granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Alden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2179) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2180) granting an increase of pension to George F. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2181) granting an increase of pension to George W. Vaughn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2182) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2183) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Rowley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2184) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Oliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2185) granting an increase of pension to Asa T. Tarbox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2186) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Farrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2187) to correct the military record of William F. Welch—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2188) to correct the military record of Henry W. Dunbrack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2189) raising the rank of Surg. John W. Baker on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2190) for the relief of Ebeneezer S. Bigelow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2191) for the relief of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of the widows of Union soldiers, sailors, or marines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2193) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Coombs—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2194) granting a pension to Flora C. Keene—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2195) granting a pension to Hannah A. Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2196) granting a pension to Ellen J. Tuttle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2197) granting a pension to Sarah E. Merritt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) granting a pension to Catherine B. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2199) granting a pension to John L. Rumery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2200) granting a pension to Mary A. Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2201) granting a pension to Sarah E. Holbrook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) granting a pension to Ellen Harriman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2203) granting a pension to Albert S. Whittier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) granting a pension to Dexter E. W. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2205) granting an increase of pension to James W. Bliss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2206) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Wentworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2207) granting an increase of pension to Daniel C. Earle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2208) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel M. Neil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) granting an increase of pension to John C. Estes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) granting an increase of pension to Newton C. Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 2211) for the relief of James W. Kingon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2212) for the relief of John B. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) for the relief of John L. Seargeant—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2214) for the relief of Isaac N. Enloe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2215) for the relief of Adam Eichner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of Laura S. Gillingwaters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2217) granting a pension to Elisha T. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2218) granting a pension to Mary Adam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2219) granting a pension to Solomon F. Wehr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2220) granting a pension to Alexander Sinclair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2221) granting a pension to Eliza Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) granting an increase of pension to Absolom J. Mathews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2223) granting an increase of pension to John A. Blanton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2224) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Karns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) granting an increase of pension to Clinton Fizer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2226) granting an increase of pension to George F. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2227) granting an increase of pension to Charles Lapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2228) granting an increase of pension to Alexander H. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2229) granting an increase of pension to Lytle McCracken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2230) granting an increase of pension to John Piper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Koonce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2232) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Reuter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2233) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. Casey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2234) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Gersteneker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2235) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2236) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Coats—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2237) granting an increase of pension to Martin Poole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2238) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Church—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2239) granting an increase of pension to George Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2240) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Nickles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2241) granting an increase of pension to George W. Copley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2242) granting an increase of pension to James Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2243) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Byfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2244) granting an increase of pension to Fred Dilg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2245) granting an increase of pension to Troy Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) granting an increase of pension to Henry Damm—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2247) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Sanspeur—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2248) granting an increase of pension to Rupert Russ—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2249) granting an increase of pension to George W. Shreve—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2250) granting an increase of pension to Alfred F. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2251) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob Schmitt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2252) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frank T. Rose—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2253) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Daniel G. Peterson, alias Robert Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles Lorne, alias Joseph Kello—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2255) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Stephen McKenzie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2256) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick Reck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 2257) granting an increase of pension to James Winspear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) granting an increase of pension to George Taylor, alias George Parks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2259) granting a pension to Louis Leith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2260) granting an increase of pension to James W. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2261) granting an increase of pension to William Penwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2262) granting an increase of pension to John Seymour—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2263) granting an increase of pension to Edward Keating—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2264) granting an increase of pension to Robert McAnally—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2265) granting an increase of pension to Hudson J. Van Scoter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2266) granting an increase of pension to George H. Hodges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2267) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rupert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2268) granting an increase of pension to John Gary, alias John Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2269) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Steel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2270) granting an increase of pension to John Lehn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2271) granting an increase of pension to H. P. Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2272) granting an increase of pension to James Hawkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2273) granting a pension to Oscar W. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2274) granting a pension to Welhelmina Siefert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2275) granting a pension to William Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2276) granting a pension to Sarah J. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2277) granting an increase of pension to William K. Fowle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2278) granting a pension to Julia Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2279) granting a pension to Martin Uehlein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2280) granting an increase of pension to Peter Quermbeck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) to correct the military record of Dean Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2282) to correct the military record of Leander Frost, alias James Benston—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2283) for the relief of Charles E. Lockwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 2284) granting prize money to George W. Cromis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2285) granting a pension to Michael Salter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2286) granting a pension to Jacob Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2287) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Gething—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2288) granting a pension to John H. Seagrist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2289) granting an increase of pension to Algernon Lightcap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2290) granting an increase of pension to Peter Reedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2291) granting an increase of pension to William Elms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) granting a pension to Dennis Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2293) granting a pension to David Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2294) granting a pension to John J. Berger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2295) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to bestow a medal upon Sergt. James M. Seitzinger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2296) to revoke sentence and establish the military record of Capt. George G. Lovett, Company K, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, war of the rebellion, 1861 to 1865—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 2297) for the relief of F. P. Brower—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2298) for the relief of the legal representatives of M. N. Swofford, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2299) for the relief of W. M. Justice, of Hunt County, Tex.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2300) for the relief of W. C. York—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2301) for the relief of the legal representatives of Dr. Thomas B. Waters, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2302) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jonathan Holmes, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2303) for the relief of the estate of J. V. McDaniel, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2304) for the relief of C. W. Reid and Sam Daube—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2305) for the relief of J. M. Carney—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2306) granting an increase of pension to James W. Stell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2307) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 2308) granting an increase of pension to Heloise Gano—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2309) granting an increase of pension to Michael McCarty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2310) granting an increase of pension to James McPherson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2311) granting an increase of pension to Mary Mershon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2312) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Slaughter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2313) granting an increase of pension to John H. Wheeler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2314) granting a pension to Marium Barton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2315) granting a pension to Miranda Berkhead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2316) granting a pension to G. W. Finley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2317) granting a pension to Lottie B. Galleher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2318) granting a pension to Patrick Grogan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2319) granting a pension to A. Hausman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2320) granting a pension to Annie B. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2321) granting a pension to Bridget McFadden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2322) granting a pension to Emeline Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2323) granting a pension to Annie Trace—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2324) granting a pension to Christina Vetter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2325) granting a pension to Charles F. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2326) for the relief of J. W. Bauer and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2327) for the relief of the heirs of Richard Butler, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2328) for the relief of C. P. Cammack, of Jefferson County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2329) for the relief of Mary Douglas Griffiths—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2330) for the relief of William Hulings Henry—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2331) for the relief of W. W. Johnson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2332) for the relief of Catherine B. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2333) for the relief of Simeon H. King's executrix—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2334) for the relief of Anthony McAndrews—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of Rudolphus Minton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2336) for the relief of J. C. Pendleton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 2337) granting a pension to Mary A. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2338) granting a pension to Cyrene Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2339) granting a pension to Daniel Madigan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to Evelyn S. Beardslee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2341) granting a pension to Helen H. Hulbert—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2342) granting a pension to Winifred E. Lewis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2343) granting an increase of pension to Peter Redden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2344) granting an increase of pension to Selden C. Clobridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2345) granting an increase of pension to Antoinette Hannahs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2346) granting an increase of pension to Silas J. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2347) granting an increase of pension to William M. Strope—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2348) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2349) for the relief of Arlington C. Denike—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 2350) for the relief of the heirs of Charles Gothardt—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Swan Hamlen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2352) for the relief of Alfred D. Barton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2353) for the relief of John A. Lovens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2354) for the relief of J. M. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2355) for the relief of Rebecca Mayo—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2356) for the relief of George T. Larkin—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2357) granting a pension to James B. Stuart—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2358) for the relief of John D. Rodgers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2359) for the relief of John E. McDowell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2360) for the relief of G. W. Dunford and James Blair, sureties of S. C. Bralley, late postmaster at Redbluff, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2361) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Sinon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2362) for the relief of Henry H. Wynn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2363) for the relief of I. R. Harkrader—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2364) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Shell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2365) granting a pension to Alfred D. Barton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2366) granting a pension to Henry Sutherland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2367) granting a pension to William L. Beverly—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2368) granting a pension to John Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2369) granting a pension to J. I. Cockran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2370) granting a pension to Mary E. Steinmueller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2371) to pension Maggie E. Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2372) granting a pension to Henry T. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2373) granting an increase of pension to Catherine L. Benteen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2374) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Sloan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2375) granting a pension to Thomas M. Bellomy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2376) granting an increase of pension to James H. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2377) granting an increase of pension to J. N. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2378) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Shell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2379) to remove the charge of desertion against Archibald Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 2380) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Hollis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2381) granting an increase of pension to Almira L. Clay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2382) granting an increase of pension to Dorothy Wieland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2383) granting a pension to Nettie Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2384) granting an increase of pension to John P. Hiles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2385) granting an increase of pension to Henry La Rowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2386) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2387) granting an increase of pension to James K. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2388) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Barnard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2389) granting an increase of pension to James P. Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2390) granting an increase of pension to Hellen H. Hulbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2391) granting an increase of pension to Caleb Eldred—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2392) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2393) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin D. Eddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2394) granting an increase of pension to Frank Buncher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2395) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Clinton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2396) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2397) granting an increase of pension to Deforest W. Cowley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2398) granting an increase of pension to Therena C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2399) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Sanscrainte—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2400) granting an increase of pension to David Mumber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2401) granting an increase of pension to A. A. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2402) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Randall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2403) granting an increase of pension to John W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2404) granting an increase of pension to Abigail Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2405) granting an increase of pension to Sophia E. Farland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2406) granting an increase of pension to Catherine D. Banerly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2407) granting an increase of pension to Orrin Culver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2408) granting an increase of pension to John Wilkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2409) granting an increase of pension to Ransom M. Fillmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2410) granting an increase of pension to Saturnin Jasnowski—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2411) granting an increase of pension to Wiliam Burch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2412) granting an increase of pension to Helen F. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2413) granting an increase of pension to John La More—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2414) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2415) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. H. Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2416) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Dickerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2417) granting an increase of pension to Henry O. Briggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2418) granting an increase of pension to John E. Eggeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2419) granting an increase of pension to Willert F. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2420) granting an increase of pension to William E. Manning, alias George Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2421) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Mevis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2422) granting an increase of pension to Earl R. Childs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2423) granting an increase of pension to Charles Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2424) granting an increase of pension to Alanson A. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2425) granting an increase of pension to Charles Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2426) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hoynes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2427) granting an increase of pension to Philander G. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2428) granting an increase of pension to William H. McEnally—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2429) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Canfield, now Tyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2430) granting an increase of pension to Orrin J. Wells—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2431) granting an increase of pension to John R. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2432) granting an increase of pension to A. Cameron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2433) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Tifft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2434) granting an increase of pension to Shannon W. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2435) granting an increase of pension to Hilia Ann Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2436) granting a pension to John Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2437) granting a pension to Leona Salspaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2438) granting a pension to Lucy Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2439) granting a pension to William Shick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2440) granting a pension to Morgan Gulick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2441) granting a pension to August Nacker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2442) granting a pension to Charles E. Everts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2443) granting a pension to George W. Mower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2444) granting a pension to Alvin D. Hubbord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2445) granting a pension to Hulbert O. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2446) granting a pension to Mary E. A. McConnelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2447) granting a pension to Abram G. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2448) granting a pension to Andrew Ferris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2449) granting a pension to John Algoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2450) granting a pension to Marceny Goodell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2451) granting a pension to Sarah C. Choate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2452) granting a pension to Charles S. Moy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2453) granting a pension to Chancey Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2454) granting a pension to Lizzie J. Hoadley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2455) granting a pension to William Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2456) granting a pension to Elizabeth Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 2457) granting a pension to Sarah E. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2458) granting a pension to E. H. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2459) granting a pension to Homer L. Thayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2460) granting a pension to William Christie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2461) granting a pension to Henry Knoop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2462) granting a pension to Loretta Foote—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2463) granting a pension to Sophia Lorned—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2464) granting a pension to Hannah Lamb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2465) granting a pension to R. C. Worthington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2466) granting a pension to John W. Kincaid—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2467) granting a pension to H. C. Beamer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2468) granting a pension to John Broad—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2469) granting an increase of pension to Alta Mira Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2470) granting a pension to Myra L. Clay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2471) granting a pension to Freeman Rohrabacher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2472) granting a pension to Moses Fragar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2473) granting a pension to William R. Hiscock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2474) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2475) granting a pension to Herbert N. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2476) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2477) granting a pension to Benson McNall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2478) granting a pension to Asa M. Foote—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2479) granting a pension to John Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2480) granting a pension to Jeremiah O'Neill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2481) granting a pension to W. C. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2482) granting a pension to Andrew J. Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2483) granting a pension to C. A. Brunk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2484) granting a pension to Isaac H. Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2485) granting a pension to John Coggins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2486) granting a pension to Mary J. Bowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2487) granting a pension to Huldah A. Bowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2488) granting a pension to James Abbott, alias James Buck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2489) granting a pension to Enos S. Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2490) granting a pension to Lucius Bowdish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2491) granting a pension to Edwin A. Botsford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2492) granting a pension to Richard Dobson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2493) granting a pension to Eliu P. Chadwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2494) granting a pension to Charles H. Penoyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2495) granting a pension to Minnie Louise Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2496) granting a pension to Merritt Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2497) granting a pension to Andrew Farries—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2498) granting a pension to Lorenzo Buck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2499) for the relief of William D. Petty—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2500) for the relief of Jesse H. Dickerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2501) granting relief to certain members of the Seventh Michigan Cavalry, war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2502) to correct the military record of William Klock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2503) to correct the military record of John Balch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2504) to correct the military record of Joseph B. Ellis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2505) to correct the military record of Stephen R. Thorpe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2506) to correct the military record of William B. McCloy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2507) to correct the military record of Franklin E. Roberts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2508) to correct the military record of Harrison Ferguson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2509) to correct the military record of Stephen G. Fishback—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2510) to correct the military record of David Paterson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2511) to correct the military record of Shibley Shepherd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2512) to correct the military record of Henry Berry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2513) to correct the military record of Timothy Way—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2514) to correct the military record of Peter V. Copp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2515) to correct the military record of Milo A. Lucas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2516) to correct the military record of H. M. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2517) to correct the military record of Clark G. Russell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2518) to correct the military record of Capt. A. M. Dobbelaere—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 2519) for the relief of Samuel H. Keifer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2520) for the relief of Charles W. Irwin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2521) for the relief of Joseph Schrembs—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2522) for the relief of Ellen A. Dunn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2523) for the relief of Rodman Hart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2524) for the relief of Augustus Dudley Hubbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2525) for the relief of George W. Hathaway—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2526) for the relief of David Houk—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2527) for the relief of Silas Guernsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2528) for the relief of John Gracy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2529) for the relief of Richard S. Gill—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2530) for the relief of Clark S. Frazier—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2531) granting a pension to Elizabeth Fortier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2532) for the relief of James K. Davie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2533) granting a pension to William H. H. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2534) for the relief of Peter Duchane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2535) for the relief of Cæsar Dixon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2536) for the relief of Walter Culver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2537) for the relief of James Conway, late of Company I, Tenth New York Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2538) for the relief of Persons T. Carpenter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2539) granting a pension to Frances E. Childs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2540) for the relief of Richard Bruner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2541) for the relief of William Barber—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2542) for the relief of W. R. Barrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2543) for the relief of Matthew Bier—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2544) for the relief of L. W. Bon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2545) for the relief of Lemon Barnes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2546) for the relief of George W. Bannan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2547) for the relief of James F. Baker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2548) for the relief of Jacob Black—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2549) for the relief of Lucas P. Retterstonf, alias Joseph Gray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2550) granting a pension to George W. Zanty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2551) granting a pension to Mary J. Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2552) for the relief of John J. Waters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2553) granting a pension to Mary E. Wilkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2554) for the relief of Hiram Winas, late of Company G, Fifteenth Michigan Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2555) for the relief of Lebens G. Landon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2556) for the relief of George W. Lindley, alias George W. La Pratte—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2557) for the relief of William Leech—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2558) for the relief of John W. McCrath—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2559) for the relief of James Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2560) for the relief of Eli W. Marble—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2561) granting a pension to Chester Narragan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2562) granting a pension to Carlton Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2563) for the relief of William O'Donnell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2564) for the relief of F. E. Rosenkrans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2565) for the relief of William Henry Stapleton, alias William Henry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2566) for the relief of John Shields—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2567) for the relief of Warren Shepard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2568) for the relief of A. E. Tower, late captain Company E, Sixth Michigan Cavalry, now of Ionia, Mich.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2569) for the relief of Charles Stewart, late of Company B, Forty-fourth Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2570) granting a pension to Squire M. Armstead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2571) for the relief of John W. Beatty—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2572) for the relief of George W. Blakeslee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2573) for the relief of Chauncey Boyce—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2574) for the relief of Job Trumble—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2575) for the relief of Lucy A. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2576) for the relief of Alonzo Vangordon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2577) granting a pension to Jane Ann Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Warren P. Wood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2579) for the relief of Adam D. Shriner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2580) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2581) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus M. Burgess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2582) granting an increase of pension to Morris M. Comstock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2583) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Forbes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2584) granting an increase of pension to Harriet V. Gridley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2585) granting an increase of pension to Albert Guernsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2586) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Keyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2587) granting an increase of pension to Waldo W. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2588) granting an increase of pension to R. Randall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2589) granting an increase of pension to John Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2590) granting an increase of pension to Magnus D. Slack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2591) granting an increase of pension to Phebe Tate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2592) granting an increase of pension to James M. Travis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2593) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2594) granting an increase of pension to Levi Bearss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2595) granting an increase of pension to Peter D. Sutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2596) to correct the military record of Henry Harris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2597) to correct the military record of Fremont C. Downing—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2598) to correct the military record of Harvey Cluff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2599) to correct the military record of Dayton S. Peck—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2600) to renew certain letters patent—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2601) to renew certain letters patent for a new and useful improvement in metallic railway ties heretofore issued to Sidney B. Wright, late of Wyandotte, Mich.—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2602) to renew certain letters patent for an invention in the means of securing railroad rails to metallic ties, heretofore issued to Sidney B. Wright, late of Wyandotte, Mich.—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2603) to reimburse Nelson H. Walbridge—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2604) for the reimbursement of the heirs of James Anderson for transportation and expenses in recruiting troops for service in the Union Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2605) granting to Sumner H. Tarbell pay for bearing military dispatches for headquarters of the district of Minnesota, St. Paul, during the Sioux outbreak of 1862—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2606) to remove charge of desertion from record of Henry Fuller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2607) granting a pension to James F. Baker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2608) granting a pension to Charles F. Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2609) granting a pension to Hattie Ballou—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2610) granting a pension to Margaret A. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2611) granting a pension to Alanson Beebe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2612) granting an increase of pension to Phœbe B. Beebe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2613) granting a pension to Matthew Bier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2614) granting a pension to General M. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2615) granting a pension to Eliza Burcaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2616) granting a pension to Dolly Burger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2617) granting a pension to Mary Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2618) granting a pension to William Choate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2619) granting a pension to Phila A. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2620) granting a pension to William H. Cline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2621) granting a pension to Walter S. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2622) granting a pension to Henry Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2623) granting a pension to Jane C. Cornell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2624) granting a pension to Aaron M. Dalrymple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2625) granting a pension to Caroline Draper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2626) granting a pension to Kryn Dykema—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2627) granting a pension to Jane A. Ecker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2628) granting a pension to George Eckles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2629) granting a pension to Mary A. Everhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2630) granting a pension to Amri H. Field—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2631) granting a pension to Mary Fitz-Gibbons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2632) granting a pension to Elizabeth Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2633) granting a pension to S. J. Fix—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2634) granting a pension to Electa McLean French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2635) granting a pension to Henry Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2636) granting a pension to Abraham Geiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2637) granting a pension to Levi Goodrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2638) granting a pension to Mary A. Gouldsbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2639) granting a pension to Rose Anna Griffith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2640) granting a pension to Decatur Harmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2641) granting an increase of pension to George W. Heator—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2642) granting a pension to Frank Hiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2643) granting a pension to Benjamin Holben—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2644) granting a pension to Henry Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2645) granting a pension to Mary B. Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2646) granting a pension to William A. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2647) granting a pension to Sylvia H. Lamoreaux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2648) granting an increase of pension to Louis H. Leland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2649) granting a pension to Charles E. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2650) granting a pension to Jay P. Livermore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2651) granting a pension to Mary A. Lossing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2652) granting a pension to Emily M. Lowing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2653) granting a pension to Ann Lynch—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2654) granting a pension to Harriet Mesecas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2655) granting a pension to Lillie Mancha—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2656) granting a pension to Addaile C. Morse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2657) granting a pension to Frank W. Morton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2658) granting a pension to Adrian Musty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2659) granting an increase of pension to Raynor H. Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2660) granting a pension to Perry C. Older—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2661) granting an increase of pension to Martin J. Painter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2662) granting a pension to Emma L. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2663) granting a pension to Josephine A. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2664) granting a pension to Lucinda J. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2665) granting an increase of pension to William Randall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2666) granting a pension to Hannah C. Rich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2667) granting a pension to Sarah Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2668) granting a pension to Julia A. Rosenberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2669) granting a pension to Thomas Scarvell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2670) granting a pension to Henry Star—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2671) granting an increase of pension to Ralph Steffens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2672) granting a pension to Sarah Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2673) granting a pension to Henry Stockford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2674) granting a pension to John H. Sumner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2675) granting a pension to Henry G. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2676) granting a pension to Charles M. Tibbetts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2677) granting a pension to Samuel B. Tibbets—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2678) granting a pension to Charles H. Van Etten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2679) granting a pension to John Van Horn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2680) granting a pension to Dellamarr Wade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2681) granting a pension to Anna E. Warden—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2682) granting a pension to James Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2683) granting an increase of pension to Peter Weber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2684) granting a pension to Birdie M. Wedge—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2685) granting a pension to Susan Weiderwax—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2686) granting a pension to Lester Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2687) granting a pension to Benjamin S. Whitman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2688) granting a pension to Stephen T. Wilcox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2689) granting a pension to James I. Willoughby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2690) granting a pension to Ellen E. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2691) granting an increase of pension to John R. Wyckoff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2692) granting a pension to Elizabeth Yates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2693) granting a pension to James E. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2694) granting a pension to George W. Prescott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2695) granting an increase of pension to James T. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2696) granting a pension to William C. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2697) granting an increase of pension to R. G. Childress—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 2698) for the relief of certain surgeons in the Philippine service—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2699) for the relief of J. S. Huron—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2700) for the relief of James A. Jackson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2701) for the relief of Adam L. Eichelberger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2702) for the relief of Charles S. Blood—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2703) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Weeks—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2704) granting an increase of pension to Martin Gillett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2705) granting an increase of pension to H. W. Perkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2706) granting an increase of pension to Malcolm L. McMullen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2707) granting an increase of pension to James L. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2708) granting an increase of pension to Manluff W. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2709) granting an increase of pension to Julius D. Rogers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2710) granting a pension to Frank E. Saxon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2711) granting a pension to Henry Sistrunk—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2712) granting a pension to Margaret A. Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 2713) granting a pension to Frances H. Brooke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2714) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Charles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2715) granting an increase of pension to Charles Martine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2716) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Banks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2717) granting a pension to Emma Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2718) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hare—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2719) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2720) granting an increase of pension to John H. Sprouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2721) granting an increase of pension to A. R. Matheny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2722) granting an increase of pension to Elam Skivers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2723) granting a pension to Laura W. Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2724) granting an increase of pension to David B. Wacaser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2725) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah E. Waldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2726) granting an increase of pension to John C. Keach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2727) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shropshire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2728) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Beardsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2729) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2730) granting an increase of pension to William F. Worley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2731) granting an increase of pension to James Eddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2732) granting an increase of pension to Vatchel Carmen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2733) granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus G. Peppel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2734) granting an increase of pension to William T. Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2735) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2736) granting a pension to William Meridith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 2737) for the relief of Thomas Crowley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2738) for the relief of Thomas Crowley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2739) for the relief of James Welch—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2740) for the relief of James Welch—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2741) granting a pension to Henrietta Sherman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2742) granting a pension to Sarah J. Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2743) granting a pension to Lucien H. Mussot—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2744) granting a pension to Edward Coppers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2745) granting an increase of pension to William McBride—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2746) granting an increase of pension to James Horan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2747) granting an increase of pension to James Lyons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2748) granting an increase of pension to John Mulligan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2749) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Flynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2750) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas F. Adams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2751) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John J. Waterkeyn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2752) to correct the military record of James A. Lessey, alias Lasey, or Lacy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2753) to correct the naval record of George Nelson Armstrong—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2754) to place David Robertson, sergeant, first class, Hospital Corps, on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 2755) granting an increase of pension to William E. S. Foss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2756) granting an increase of pension to John F. Greene—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2757) granting an increase of pension to Johnathan E. Floyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2758) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Graves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2759) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Eaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2760) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2761) granting an increase of pension to Michael Mahoney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2762) granting an increase of pension to William Chandler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2763) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Sherlock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2764) granting an increase of pension to George L. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2765) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Benson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2766) granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2767) granting an increase of pension to Ransom Manning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2768) granting an increase of pension to George W. McKenney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2769) granting an increase of pension to Ethan A. Valentine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2770) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Plumpton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2771) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McCabe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2772) granting an increase of pension to Eli Cero—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2773) granting an increase of pension to John McNally—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2774) granting a pension to Addie A. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2775) granting an increase of pension to George G. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2776) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Cottiell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2777) granting an increase of pension to Albert F. Durgin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2778) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Mahoney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2779) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Coffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2780) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fifield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2781) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Wyman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2782) granting an increase of pension to John Franklin Hobbs, alias John Franklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2783) granting an increase of pension to James Meagher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2784) granting an increase of pension to Peter King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2785) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Bonynge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2786) granting an increase of pension to Edmond G. Carey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2787) granting an increase of pension to Stephen B. Tarlton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2788) granting an increase of pension to George W. Rowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2789) granting an increase of pension to Merrill Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2790) granting an increase of pension to Lyman Jackman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2791) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2792) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Stockman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2793) granting an increase of pension to Nathan D. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2794) granting an increase of pension to Richard E. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2795) granting a pension to Emma Auger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2796) granting a pension to Benjamin T. Odiorne—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2797) for the relief of John L. Hadley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2798) for the relief of the State of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 2799) for the relief of the victims of the *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2800) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Manahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2801) granting an increase of pension to Alexander M. Lowry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2802) to appoint Warren C. Beach a captain in the Army and place him on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 2803) for the relief of Dewitt Eastman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2804) for the relief of George H. Suits—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2805) for the relief of the Laird-Norton Company, of Winona, Minn.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2806) for the relief of Conrad Bohn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2807) for the relief of Gideon Holton—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2808) for the relief of Harry S. Gillrup—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2809) for the relief of Edward J. Krueger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2810) granting a pension to Lydia E. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2811) granting a pension to Angie A. Marvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2812) granting a pension to Edward A. Goodfellow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2813) granting a pension to Anna McFalls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2814) granting an increase of pension to Alida M. Utter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2815) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2816) granting an increase of pension to James C. Town—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2817) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Doig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2818) granting an increase of pension to Milton Selby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2819) granting an increase of pension to John Horstman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2820) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2821) granting an increase of pension to Turner J. Preble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2822) granting an increase of pension to Levi Gates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2823) granting an increase of pension to Orton D. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2824) granting an increase of pension to Marzavan J. Secord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2825) granting an increase of pension to George Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2826) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Prochel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2827) granting an increase of pension to Henry Westerhouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2828) granting an increase of pension to William W. Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2829) granting an increase of pension to E. A. Whitcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2830) granting an increase of pension to Garrett Schermerhorn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2831) granting an increase of pension to Amyntas Briggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2832) granting an increase of pension to William C. Lathrop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2833) granting an increase of pension to John Hanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2834) granting an increase of pension to John B. Ashton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2835) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Rask—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2836) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Pengilly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2837) to correct the military record of Mark H. Dunnell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2838) granting an honorable discharge to Harry A. White—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2839) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of J. E. Getman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2840) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry J. Bolewine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2841) to remove the charge of desertion against Benjamin F. Dayton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2842) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Ashley C. Cameron—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2843) removing the charge of desertion against David Whitford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 2844) for the relief of C. P. Johnson & Son—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2845) for the relief of the First Baptist Church, of Newbern, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2846) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. J. B. Owen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2847) for the relief of I. F. Hill, executor of W. E. Hill, of Duplin County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2848) for the relief of W. T. Dixon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2849) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Harrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 2850) granting a pension to Jane C. Van Akin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2851) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stoddard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2852) granting an increase of pension to James Dayton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2853) granting an increase of pension to Murray W. Woodward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2854) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Deline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2855) granting an increase of pension to Aaron D. S. Knisiley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2856) granting an increase of pension to George F. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2857) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2858) granting a pension to Jane Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2859) granting a pension to Elizabeth Epke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2860) granting a pension to Catherine M. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2861) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Overmoyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2862) granting a pension to Mary E. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2863) granting an increase of pension to Orville W. Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2864) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Worden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2865) granting an increase of pension to Wilder D. Easlick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2866) granting an increase of pension to Jane Van Wey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2867) granting an increase of pension to Leah Bedford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2868) granting a pension to Harriet A. Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2869) granting a pension to Lucy Caswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2870) granting an increase of pension to Jehu F. Wotring—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2871) granting a pension to Jane A. Sherman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2872) granting an increase of pension to James McIntyre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2873) granting a pension to Sarah M. A. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2874) granting an increase of pension to Orville W. Sage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2875) granting a pension to David E. Boyse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2876) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2877) granting a pension to Lizzie S. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2878) granting a pension to John M. Cheevers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2879) granting a pension to Sarah Babcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2880) granting a pension to Mary E. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2881) granting a pension to Hannah A. Robison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2882) granting an increase of pension to John A. Gragg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2883) granting a pension to Samuel M. Center—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2884) granting a pension to Alice Anna Amsden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2885) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stoddard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2886) granting an increase of pension to Lucius Q. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2887) granting an increase of pension to Dewitt C. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2888) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Trabilcox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2889) granting an increase of pension to James Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2890) granting a pension to Arminda Marble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2891) granting a pension to Augusta D. Murdock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2892) granting a pension to Julia B. Hubble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2893) granting a pension to Amelia Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2894) granting an increase of pension to William R. Hibbord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2895) granting an increase of pension to Robert Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2896) granting a pension to Charles E. Barry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2897) granting a pension to Spencer M. Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2898) granting a pension to James Hummel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2899) granting an increase of pension to Francis X. Soleau—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2900) granting a pension to William E. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2901) granting an increase of pension to William R. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2902) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wyrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2903) granting an increase of pension to William H. Donaldson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2904) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Newton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2905) granting an increase of pension to Burr Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2906) granting an increase of pension to James McIntyre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2907) granting an increase of pension to George R. Beach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2908) granting a pension to Lizzie Callum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2909) granting an increase of pension to Jacob T. Wise—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2910) granting an increase of pension to Artemus Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2911) granting a pension to William G. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2912) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2913) granting a pension to Louise H. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2914) granting a pension to Jerusha M. Crane—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2915) granting a pension to Amelia B. Gifford—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2916) granting a pension to Sarah Soper—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2917) granting a pension to Catharine Essig—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2918) granting a pension to William James Simpson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2919) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Edward H. Beebe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2920) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Edward Montgomery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2921) correcting the military record of Martin Barley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2922) granting an honorable discharge to Eph B. Cooper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2923) for the relief of Phillip Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2924) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Henry D. Cutting, alias Henry C. Stratton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2925) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Melanchton Borst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2926) for the relief of the heirs of John Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2927) to pay and reimburse John F. Milich—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2928) granting relief to Edwin A. Wells—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2929) granting relief to Guy M. Claflin—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2930) for the relief of Myron C. Bond—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2931) for the relief of James Scoby—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2932) for the relief of Joshua P. Talford—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2933) for the relief of Peter Mommie—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2934) granting relief to William H. Rogers—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2935) for the relief of William A. Clark—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2936) for the relief of John J. Bell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2937) for the relief of Henry Hayden, John Kennedy, Wright H. Calkins, and James E. Barrett—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2938) granting relief to certain members of the Seventh Michigan Cavalry, war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2939) for the relief of Arra M. Farnsworth—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2940) for the relief of James I. Mabee—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2941) providing for the payment of $137 to Hugh A. Ernst for services rendered overtime and use of typewriter in the Bureau of Immigration, in the Treasury Department—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2942) for the relief of the heirs of John Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2943) for the relief of James L. Carpenter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2944) for the relief of Peter Fisher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2945) for the relief of Herman B. Robb—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2946) granting relief to the heirs of George C. Lull—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2947) granting relief to Anna Wendell Miller—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2948) for the relief of Deloss M. Baker, Frank W. Clay, and Herman V. C. Hart, committee, and to reimburse those who subscribed and paid for site for post-office building at Adrian, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TYNDALL: A bill (H. R. 2949) granting an increase of pension to George W. Adamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 2950) confirming the title of James F. Hancock to the south half of the southeast quarter and the south half of the southwest quarter of section 26, township 17 south, range 6 west, in Jefferson County, Ala.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2951) authorizing Eli R. Jones to perfect his homestead entry to the southeast quarter of section 32, in township 18 south, of range 2 west, in Jefferson County, Ala.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VAN DUZER: A bill (H. R. 2952) for the relief of the legal representatives of D. P. Crook, deceased—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 2953) granting a pension to Jeremiah Dailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2954) granting a pension to Chauncey P. Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2955) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Torrance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2956) granting a pension to Hannah P. B. Cluney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2957) granting a pension to Herman Borchardt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2958) granting a pension to Isaiah V. Filkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2959) granting an increase of pension to Amos H. Tennant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2960) granting an increase of pension to Frederick P. Leo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2961) granting an increase of pension to R. T. Hazzard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2962) granting an increase of pension to George W. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2963) granting an increase of pension to Rinaldo Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2964) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Ely, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2965) granting an increase of pension to Darius Ketchum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2966) granting an increase of pension to Truman D. Blomers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2967) granting an increase of pension to Adaline Coit—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2968) granting an increase of pension to Sidney Leonard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2969) granting an increase of pension to Nathan P. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2970) granting an increase of pension to John L. Curtiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2971) granting an increase of pension to Charles Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2972) granting an increase of pension to Wilbert Simmons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2973) to remove charge of desertion from military record of John W. Dailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 2974) granting a pension to Susan M. Schmitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2975) granting a pension to Kate B. Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2976) granting a pension to Lawrence Mahearn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2977) granting a pension to George H. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2978) granting a pension to Amanda M. Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2979) granting a pension to John R. Bouldry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2980) granting a pension to Ernest B. Hutchins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2981) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Shepmoes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2982) granting an increase of pension to Ansel K. Tisdale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2983) granting an increase of pension to Horatio Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2984) granting an increase of pension to William H. Gildersleeve—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2985) granting an increase of pension to Herbert A. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2986) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide E. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2987) granting an increase of pension to Joe V. Meigs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2988) for the relief of the Bath Iron Works and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2989) providing for rank and pay for certain retired officers of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 2990) granting a pension to Felix G. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2991) granting a pension to Henry F. Landes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2992) for the relief of Samuel T. Townsend—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2993) for the relief of Mrs. E. W. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2994) for the relief of A. L. Hall—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2995) appropriating $4,243.90 to repay the city of Montgomery, Ala., moneys expended for streets and sidewalks adjacent to the Government building in said city—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 2996) to reimburse Capt. Sydney Layland for sums paid by him while master of the United States transport *Mobile*, in July and August, 1898—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 2997) for the relief of Capt. Sidney F. Shaw—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2998) for the relief of Mary A. Coleman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2999) for the relief of West Virginia State troops—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3000) granting a pension to William Stonestreet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3001) granting a pension to George M. D. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3002) granting an increase of pension to David C. Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3003) granting a pension to Edwin L. Fetty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3004) granting an increase of pension to William Haines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3005) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Shafer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3006) granting an increase of pension to William H. Crites—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3007) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Carder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3008) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Kerr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3009) granting an increase of pension to Murry Shannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3010) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Meadows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3011) granting an increase of pension to Salathial S. Stalnaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3012) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Battin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Emerson Smith Company (Limited), of Beaver Falls, Pa., for a law for two classes of mail only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Friendship Council, No. 201, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Washington, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the board of directors of the Trades League of Philadelphia, against Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance, against prohibitive temperance legislation—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of Rogers, Brown & Co., of

Buffalo, N. Y., favoring reclassification of postage rates—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of East Buffalo Live Stock Association, favoring enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the board of trustees of the New York State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, favoring reestablishment of the canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petition of the business men of Juneau County, Wis., against legislation favoring a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BOUTELL: Petition of over 50 wholesale tea merchants of Chicago, Ill., protesting against any duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Cora G. Davidson, of Denver, Colo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of heirs of Philip Roberts, late of Granger County, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of heirs of Anderson C. Quillen, late of Hancock County, Tenn, for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Stephen Gose, of Claiborne County, Tenn., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Hoboken Council, No. 384, and of J. P. Winower Council, No. 618, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, for a law to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Union Steel Casting Company, the Manufacturers' Association, the Diamond National Bank, the Oil Well Supply Company, and others, for a law providing for two kinds of mail only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of F. Widlar & Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, and other jobbers, protesting against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Harvey Rice Council, No. 211, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, protesting against unrestricted immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CANDLER: Data to accompany a bill providing for the purchase of a site for a public building at Columbia, Miss.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CAPRON: Resolution of Valley Falls Lodge, No. 12, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, in favor of further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island Medical Society, in favor of a reorganization of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island Horticultural Society, in favor of placing basic slag meal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island Horticultural Society, in favor of an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations; also, resolution of the Agricultural Federation, urging increased appropriation for experiment stations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASSEL: Resolutions of Akron Council, No. 906, of Akron, Ohio; Lancaster Council, No. 912, of Lancaster, Pa.; General Cameron Council, No. 851, of Mount Joy, Pa., and Empire Council, No. 120, of Lancaster, Pa., Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CURRIER: Petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers of Woodsville, N. H., and resolution of Railroad Telegraphers, Division No. 45, of New Hampshire, upon railroad rate legislation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEEMER: Petition of C. C. Wright and others, of Williamsport, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLACK: Papers to accompany bill increasing the pension of Charles W. Renell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to correct the military record of Daniel O'Brien—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to William Brown, alias Daniel Mulligan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petition of the Woman's Club of Westfield, N. J., for preservation of Niagara Falls, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: Papers to accompany bill correcting the military record of Jacob Betzer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Melvin T. Edmonds, of Coldwater, Mich., asking for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition to correct military record of Henry Myers, of Battlecreek, Mich.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to William Burmingham, of Albion, Mich.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Alonzo F. Waterbury, helpless son of late Henry W. Waterbury, of Reading, Mich.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Cornelius A. Hollenbeck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Hickford L. Carrier, of Brookfield, Mich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of George Abblerback—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Pittsburg Plate Glass Company, and others, of Pittsburg, Pa., for a law providing for two classes of mail matter only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Hall of J. C. Winower Council, No. 618, of Pennsylvania, and Hall of Hoboken Council, No. 384, of Pennsylvania, for a law restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of citizens of Lancaster, Ohio, praying for further restriction of immigration; also, resolutions of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., concerning admission of Chinese—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward Duffy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Lowry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Resolution of C. J. Bassett Post, No. 56, of Allegan, Mich., for an amendment to the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Woodmen Grange, No. 610, of Gobleville, Mich., in support of a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HASKINS: Resolutions of Division No. 45 of Railroad Telegraphers, and Division No. 106, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, against conferring additional powers upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Protestant churches of St. Johnsbury, Vt., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Council No. 41, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Newport, Vt., in favor of further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of Mr. A. Miller, asking for special pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of C. H. Conley, asking for a special pension act—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of James A. Spraul, asking for a special pension act—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Harriet E. Grogan, asking for special pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Andrew H. Nichols, asking for special pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also petition of Emma Rowe, widow of Charles Rowe, asking for special pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Robert Hopkins, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the general assembly of Connecticut, for uniform laws on marriage and divorce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Council No. 6 and Council No. 12, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of business men of Byron, Ill., against a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Abraham Lincoln Council, No.

2, of California, Junior Order United American Mechanics, in favor of the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, Cal., in regard to the Chinese boycott of American products—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of numerous merchants and mercantile firms of San Francisco, Cal., in favor of amendments of the postal laws so as to provide for two classes of mail matter only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., in respect to the regulation of railroad freight rates and enlargement of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of El Capitan Division, No. 115, Order of Railway Conductors, against granting the Interstate Commerce Commission power to regulate railroad freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry San Francisco merchants, against granting the Interstate Commerce Commission power to fix railroad freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Francisco retail grocers, against placing a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of the peace convention of the Shakers of Mount Lebanon, August 31, 1905, against wars between nations, and for international arbitration for settlement of all disputes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KNAPP: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Jaques—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary I. Lester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of J. B. Van Patten—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition and papers of Mary A. Albright, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition and papers of Francis M. Beebe, for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition and papers of Martin Braun, for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of Rock Council, No. 54, of Glenrock; Susquehanna Council, of Wrightville; Moss Rose Council, of Seven Valleys; Colonial Council, of York, and Hauer Council, of Spring Grove, all in Pennsylvania, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Papers to accompany bills granting pensions to Mary L. Houghtalling, Edward Coward, Martin V. Butler, and Ada Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill to increase the pension of Amanda M. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Parmer Stewart, of Huntingdon, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: Petition of Council No. 2, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Alton, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Mattoon, Ill., against employment of Japanese and Asiatic laborers on the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Retail Grocers' Association, against a duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Decatur Retail Grocers' Association, against a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Journeyman Tailors' Union of America, of Champaign, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Smith, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Rachel E. Ware, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'DJEN: Petition of Ed West and others, for a law restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Springville Council, No. 659, of Arts; William Valley Council, No. 317, of Tower City; Grier City Council, No. 335, of Grier City; Webster Council, No. 23, of Schuylkill Haven, and Jennings Council, No. 367, of Shenandoah, all in Pennsylvania, Junior Order United American Mechanics—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany resolution favoring enlargement of the sale of cotton products in foreign markets—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Petition of the American members of the Education Association of China, relative to Chinese students—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the board of trustees of the New York State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, urging reestablishment of the canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, for legislation permitting admission of Chinese visitors and travelers not of cooly class—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Nome Chamber of Commerce, for representation of Alaska in Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the East Buffalo Live Stock Association, for Government regulation of railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 43, Brotherhood of Painters and Paper Hangers, of Buffalo, relative to wood alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the board of trustees of the Soldiers and Sailors' Home, of Bath, N. Y., favoring reestablishment of the canteen at the Home for the sale of malt liquors only—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension of Winnifred E. Lewis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of residents of Frankfort, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Selden C. Colabridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Cyrene Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Samuel Read Lodge, Knights of Pythias, No. 378, of Utica, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of R. A. Harris and others, for a law restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of J. P. Swayze, secretary for Davisburg Grange, Andersonville, Mich., advocating treaties with France, Russia, Switzerland, and Austria-Hungary relative to such tariff laws as shall best suit the agricultural interests of Michigan in the export trade to said countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Flint River Baptist Association, for betterment of conditions in the Kongo Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: Petitions of Cannonsville Council, No. 25, of Concord; Maiden Council, No. 88, of Maiden, and Gastonia Council, No. 68, all in North Carolina, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petitions of Summers Council, No. 150; Newton Council, No. 75; White Pine Council, No. 8, and Tanner Council, No. 87, Junior Order United American Mechanics, all in West Virginia, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 5, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

ALEXANDER S. CLAY, a Senator from the State of Georgia, and SAMUEL D. McENERY, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT.

Mr. BULKELEY presented the credentials of Frank B. Brandegee, chosen by the legislature of the State of Connecticut a Senator from that State for the unexpired portion of the term beginning March 4, 1903; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. BULKELEY. My colleague is present, and I ask that he be sworn.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect will present himself at the desk and take the oath prescribed by law.

Mr. Brandegee was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. BULKELEY; and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

WILLIAM J. BROWNING, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, appeared and delivered the following message:

Mr. President, I am directed by the House of Representatives to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that JOSEPH G. CANNON, a Representative from the State of Illinois, has been elected Speaker; that ALEXANDER MCDOWELL, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, has been elected Clerk, and that the House is ready for business.

Also, that a committee of three was appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to wait on the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make, and that Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota, Mr. LITTAUER of New York, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi were appointed such committee on the part of the House.

The message further communicated to the Senate resolutions passed by the House commemorative of the life and public services of Hon. ORVILLE HITCHCOCK PLATT, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

The message also communicated to the Senate intelligence of the death of Hon. BENJAMIN F. MARSH, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. ALLISON and Mr. MORGAN, the committee appointed to wait upon the President of the United States, appeared; and

Mr. ALLISON said: Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Senate, together with a similar committee from the House of Representatives, have discharged the duty imposed upon them by waiting upon the President of the United States and informing him that the two Houses of Congress are in session and ready to receive any communication he may have to make. The President extended his cordial greetings individually to the Members and also to the Congress, and informed us that he would communicate immediately in writing.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. PROCTOR was, on his own motion, excused from further service upon the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE.

Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of the secretaries of the President of the United States, appeared and said:

Mr. President, I am directed by the President of the United States to deliver to the Senate several messages in writing.

The messages were received from the secretary and handed to the Vice-President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the annual message of the President of the United States, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary (CHARLES G. BENNETT) read the message, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

The people of this country continue to enjoy great prosperity. Undoubtedly there will be ebb and flow in such prosperity, and this ebb and flow will be felt more or less by all members of the community, both by the deserving and the undeserving. Against the wrath of the Lord the wisdom of man can not avail; in times of flood or drought human ingenuity can but partially repair the disaster. A general failure of crops would hurt all of us. Again, if the folly of man mars the general well-being, then those who are innocent of the folly will have to pay part of the penalty incurred by those who are guilty of the folly. A panic brought on by the speculative folly of part of the business community would hurt the whole business community. But such stoppage of welfare, though it might be severe, would not be lasting. In the long run the one vital factor in the permanent prosperity of the country is the high individual character of the average American worker, the average American citizen, no matter whether his work be mental or manual, whether he be farmer or wage-worker, business man or professional man.

In our industrial and social system the interests of all men are so closely intertwined that in the immense majority of cases a straight-dealing man who by his efficiency, by his ingenuity and industry, benefits himself must also benefit others. Normally the man of great productive capacity who becomes rich by guiding the labor of many other men does so by enabling them to produce more than they could produce without his guidance; and both he and they share in the benefit, which comes also to the public at large. The superficial fact that the sharing may be unequal must never blind us to the underlying fact that there is this sharing, and that the benefit comes in some degree to each man concerned. Normally the wage-worker, the man of small means, and the average consumer, as well as the average producer, are all alike helped by making conditions such that the man of exceptional business ability receives an exceptional reward for his ability. Something can be done by legislation to help the general prosperity; but no such help of a permanently beneficial character can be given to the less able and less fortunate, save as the results of a policy which shall inure to the advantage of all industrious and efficient people who act decently; and this is only another way of saying that any benefit which comes to the less able and less fortunate must of necessity come even more to the more able and more fortunate. If, therefore, the less fortunate man is moved by envy of his more fortunate brother to strike at the conditions under which they have both, though unequally, prospered, the result will assuredly be that while damage may come to the one struck at, it will visit with an even heavier load the one who strikes the blow. Taken as a whole we must all go up or go down together.

CORPORATIONS.

Yet, while not merely admitting, but insisting upon this, it is also true that where there is no governmental restraint or supervision some of the exceptional men use their energies not in ways that are for the common good, but in ways which tell against this common good. The fortunes amassed through corporate organization are now so large, and vest such power in those that wield them, as to make it a matter of necessity to give to the sovereign—that is, to the Government, which represents the people as a whole—some effective power of supervision over their corporate use. In order to insure a healthy social and industrial life, every big corporation should be held responsible by, and be accountable to, some sovereign strong enough to control its conduct. I am in no sense hostile to corporations. This is an age of combination, and any effort to prevent all combination will be not only useless, but in the end vicious, because of the contempt for law which the failure to enforce law inevitably produces. We should, moreover, recognize in cordial and ample fashion the immense good effected by corporate agencies in a country such as ours, and the wealth of intellect, energy, and fidelity devoted to their service, and therefore normally to the service of the public, by their officers and directors. The corporation has come to stay, just as the trade union has come to stay. Each can do and has done great good. Each should be favored so long as it does good. But each should be sharply checked where it acts against law and justice.

So long as the finances of the Nation are kept upon an honest basis no other question of internal economy with which the Congress has the power to deal begins to approach in importance the matter of endeavoring to secure proper industrial conditions under which the individuals—and especially the great corporations—doing an interstate business are to act. The makers of our National Constitution provided especially that the regulation of interstate commerce should come within the sphere of the General Government. The arguments in favor of their taking this stand were even them overwhelming. But they are far stronger to-day, in view of the enormous development of great business agencies, usually corporate in form. Experience has shown conclusively that it is useless to try to get any adequate regulation and supervision of these great corporations by State action. Such regulation and supervision can only be effectively exercised by a sovereign whose jurisdiction is coextensive with the field of work of the corporations—that is, by the National Government. I believe that this regulation and supervision can be obtained by the enactment of law by the Congress. If this proves impossible, it will certainly be necessary ultimately to confer in fullest form such power upon the National Government by a proper amendment of the Constitution. It would obviously be unwise to endeavor to secure such an amendment until it is certain that the result can not be obtained under the Constitution as it now is. The laws of the Congress and of the several States hitherto, as passed upon by the courts, have resulted more often in showing that the States have no power in the matter than that the National Government has power; so that there at present exists a very unfortunate condition of things, under which these great corporations doing an interstate business occupy the position of subjects without a sovereign, neither any State government nor the National Government having effective control over them. Our steady aim should be by legislation, cautiously and carefully undertaken, but resolutely persevered in, to assert the sovereignty of the National Government by affirmative action.

This is only in form an innovation. In substance it is merely a restoration; for from the earliest time such regulation of industrial activities has been recognized in the action of the law-making bodies; and all that I propose is to meet the changed

conditions in such manner as will prevent the Commonwealth abdicating the power it has always possessed, not only in this country but also in England before and since this country became a separate Nation.

It has been a misfortune that the national laws on this subject have hitherto been of a negative or prohibitive rather than an affirmative kind, and still more that they have in part sought to prohibit what could not be effectively prohibited, and have in part in their prohibitions confounded what should be allowed and what should not be allowed. It is generally useless to try to prohibit all restraint on competition, whether this restraint be reasonable or unreasonable; and where it is not useless it is generally hurtful. Events have shown that it is not possible adequately to secure the enforcement of any law of this kind by incessant appeal to the courts. The Department of Justice has for the last four years devoted more attention to the enforcement of the antitrust legislation than to anything else. Much has been accomplished; particularly marked has been the moral effect of the prosecutions; but it is increasingly evident that there will be a very insufficient beneficial result in the way of economic change. The successful prosecution of one device to evade the law immediately develops another device to accomplish the same purpose. What is needed is not sweeping prohibition of every arrangement, good or bad, which may tend to restrict competition, but such adequate supervision and regulation as will prevent any restriction of competition from being to the detriment of the public—as well as such supervision and regulation as will prevent other abuses in no way connected with restriction of competition. Of these abuses, perhaps the chief, although by no means the only one, is overcapitalization—generally itself the result of dishonest promotion—because of the myriad evils it brings in its train; for such overcapitalization often means an inflation that invites business panic; it always conceals the true relation of the profit earned to the capital actually invested, and it creates a burden of interest payments which is a fertile cause of improper reduction in or limitation of wages: it damages the small investor, discourages thrift, and encourages gambling and speculation; while perhaps worst of all is the trickiness and dishonesty which it implies—for harm to morals is worse than any possible harm to material interests, and the debauchery of politics and business by great dishonest corporations is far worse than any actual material evil they do the public. Until the National Government obtains, in some manner which the wisdom of the Congress may suggest, proper control over the big corporations engaged in interstate commerce—that is, over the great majority of the big corporations—it will be impossible to deal adequately with these evils.

I am well aware of the difficulties of the legislation that I am suggesting, and of the need of temperate and cautious action in securing it. I should emphatically protest against improperly radical or hasty action. The first thing to do is to deal with the great corporations engaged in the business of interstate transportation. As I said in my Message of December 6 last, the immediate and most pressing need, so far as legislation is concerned, is the enactment into law of some scheme to secure to the agents of the Government such supervision and regulation of the rates charged by the railroads of the country engaged in interstate traffic as shall summarily and effectively prevent the imposition of unjust or unreasonable rates. It must include putting a complete stop to rebates in every shape and form. This power to regulate rates, like all similar powers over the business world, should be exercised with moderation, caution, and self-restraint; but it should exist, so that it can be effectively exercised when the need arises.

The first consideration to be kept in mind is that the power should be affirmative and should be given to some administrative body created by the Congress. If given to the present Interstate Commerce Commission or to a reorganized Interstate Commerce Commission, such commission should be made unequivocally administrative. I do not believe in the Government interfering with private business more than is necessary. I do not believe in the Government undertaking any work which can with propriety be left in private hands. But neither do I believe in the Government flinching from overseeing any work when it becomes evident that abuses are sure to obtain therein unless there is governmental supervision. It is not my province to indicate the exact terms of the law which should be enacted; but I call the attention of the Congress to certain existing conditions with which it is desirable to deal. In my judgment the most important provision which such law should contain is that conferring upon some competent administrative body the power to decide, upon the case being brought before it, whether a given rate prescribed by a railroad is reasonable and just, and if it is found to be unreasonable and unjust, then, after full investigation of the complaint, to prescribe the limit of rate beyond which it shall not be lawful to go—the maximum reasonable rate, as it is commonly called—this decision to go into effect within a reasonable time and to obtain from thence onward, subject to review by the courts. It sometimes happens at present, not that a rate is too high but that a favored shipper is given too low a rate. In such case the Commission would have the right to fix this already established minimum rate as the maximum, and it would need only one or two such decisions by the Commission to cure railroad companies of the practice of giving improper minimum rates. I call your attention to the fact that my proposal is not to give the Commission power to initiate or originate rates generally, but to regulate a rate already fixed or originated by the roads, upon complaint and after investigation. A heavy penalty should be exacted from any corporation which fails to respect an order of the Commission. I regard this power to establish a maximum rate as being essential to any scheme of real reform in the matter of railway regulation. The first necessity is to secure it; and unless it is granted to the Commission there is little use in touching the subject at all.

Illegal transactions often occur under the forms of law. It has often occurred that a shipper has been told by a traffic officer to buy a large quantity of some commodity and then after it has been bought an open reduction is made in the rate to take effect immediately, the arrangement resulting to the profit of the one shipper and the one railroad and to the damage of all their competitors; for it must not be forgotten that the big shippers are at least as much to blame as any railroad in the matter of rebates. The law should make it clear so that nobody can fail to understand that any kind of commission paid on freight shipments, whether in this form or in the form of fictitious damages, or of a concession, a free pass, reduced passenger rate, or payment of brokerage, is illegal. It is worth while considering whether it would not be wise to confer on the Government the right of civil action against the beneficiary of a rebate for at least twice the value of the rebate; this would help stop what is really blackmail. Elevator allowances should be stopped, for they have now grown to such an extent that they are demoralizing and are used as rebates.

The best possible regulation of rates would, of course, be that regulation secured by an honest agreement among the railroads themselves to carry out the law. Such a general agreement would, for instance, at once put a stop to the efforts of any one big shipper or big railroad to discriminate against or secure advantages over some rival; and such agreement would make the railroads themselves agents for enforcing the law. The power vested in the Government to put a stop to agreements to the detriment of the public should, in my judgment, be accompanied by power to permit, under specified conditions and careful supervision, agreements clearly in the interest of the public. But, in my judgment, the necessity for giving this further power is by no means as great as the necessity for giving the Commission or administrative body the other powers I have enumerated above; and it may well be inadvisable to attempt to vest this particular power in the Commission or other administrative body until it already possesses and is exercising what I regard as by far the most important of all the powers I recommend—as indeed the vitally important power—that to fix a given maximum rate, which rate, after the lapse of a reasonable time, goes into full effect, subject to review by the courts.

All private-car lines, industrial roads, refrigerator charges, and the like should be expressly put under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission or some similar body so far as rates, and agreements practically affecting rates, are concerned. The private-car owners and the owners of industrial railroads are entitled to a fair and reasonable compensation on their investment, but neither private cars nor industrial railroads nor spur tracks should be utilized as devices for securing preferential rates. A rebate in icing charges, or in mileage, or in a division of the rate for refrigerating charges is just as pernicious as a rebate in any other way. No lower rate should apply on goods imported than actually obtains on domestic goods from the American seaboard to destination except in cases where water competition is the controlling influence. There should be publicity of the accounts of common carriers; no common carrier engaged in interstate business should keep any books or memoranda other than those reported pursuant to law or regulation, and these books or memoranda should be open to the inspection of the Government. Only in this way can violations or evasions of the law be surely detected. A system of examination of railroad accounts should be provided similar to that now conducted into the national banks by the bank examiners; a few first-class railroad accountants, if they had proper direction and proper authority to inspect books and papers, could accomplish much in preventing willful violations of the

law. It would not be necessary for them to examine into the accounts of any railroad unless for good reasons they were directed to do so by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is greatly to be desired that some way might be found by which an agreement as to transportation within a State intended to operate as a fraud upon the Federal interstate commerce laws could be brought under the jurisdiction of the Federal authorities. At present it occurs that large shipments of interstate traffic are controlled by concessions on purely State business, which of course amounts to an evasion of the law. The Commission should have power to enforce fair treatment by the great trunk lines of lateral and branch lines.

I urge upon the Congress the need of providing for expeditious action by the Interstate Commerce Commission in all these matters, whether in regulating rates for transportation or for storing or for handling property or commodities in transit. The history of the cases litigated under the present commerce act shows that its efficacy has been to a great degree destroyed by the weapon of delay, almost the most formidable weapon in the hands of those whose purpose it is to violate the law.

Let me most earnestly say that these recommendations are not made in any spirit of hostility to the railroads. On ethical grounds, on grounds of right, such hostility would be intolerable; and on grounds of mere national self-interest we must remember that such hostility would tell against the welfare not merely of some few rich men, but of a multitude of small investors, a multitude of railway employees, wage-workers; and most severely against the interest of the public as a whole. I believe that on the whole our railroads have done well and not ill; but the railroad men who wish to do well should not be exposed to competition with those who have no such desire, and the only way to secure this end is to give to some Government tribunal the power to see that justice is done by the unwilling exactly as it is gladly done by the willing. Moreover, if some Government body is given increased power the effect will be to furnish authoritative answer on behalf of the railroad whenever irrational clamor against it is raised, or whenever charges made against it are disproved. I ask this legislation not only in the interest of the public but in the interest of the honest railroad man and the honest shipper alike, for it is they who are chiefly jeoparded by the practices of their dishonest competitors. This legislation should be enacted in a spirit as remote as possible from hysteria and rancor. If we of the American body politic are true to the traditions we have inherited we shall always scorn any effort to make us hate any man because he is rich, just as much as we should scorn any effort to make us look down upon or treat contemptuously any man because he is poor. We judge a man by his conduct—that is, by his character—and not by his wealth or intellect. If he makes his fortune honestly, there is no just cause of quarrel with him. Indeed, we have nothing but the kindliest feelings of admiration for the successful business man who behaves decently, whether he has made his success by building or managing a railroad or by shipping goods over that railroad. The big railroad men and big shippers are simply Americans of the ordinary type who have developed to an extraordinary degree certain great business qualities. They are neither better nor worse than their fellow-citizens of smaller means. They are merely more able in certain lines and therefore exposed to certain peculiarly strong temptations. These temptations have not sprung newly into being; the exceptionally successful among mankind have always been exposed to them; but they have grown amazingly in power as a result of the extraordinary development of industrialism along new lines, and under these new conditions, which the lawmakers of old could not foresee and therefore could not provide against, they have become so serious and menacing as to demand entirely new remedies. It is in the interest of the best type of railroad man and the best type of shipper no less than of the public that there should be governmental supervision and regulation of these great business operations, for the same reason that it is in the interest of the corporation which wishes to treat its employees aright that there should be an effective employers' liability act, or an effective system of factory laws to prevent the abuse of women and children. All such legislation frees the corporation that wishes to do well from being driven into doing ill, in order to compete with its rival, which prefers to do ill. We desire to set up a moral standard. There can be no delusion more fatal to the Nation than the delusion that the standard of profits, of business prosperity, is sufficient in judging any business or political question—from rate legislation to municipal government. Business success, whether for the individual or for the Nation, is a good thing only so far as it is accompanied by and develops a high standard of conduct—honor, integrity, civic courage. The kind of business prosperity that blunts the standard of honor, that puts an inordinate value on mere wealth, that makes a man ruthless and conscienceless in trade and weak and cowardly in citizenship, is not a good thing at all, but a very bad thing for the Nation. This Government stands for manhood first and for business only as an adjunct of manhood.

The question of transportation lies at the root of all industrial success, and the revolution in transportation which has taken place during the last half century has been the most important factor in the growth of the new industrial conditions. Most emphatically we do not wish to see the man of great talents refused the reward for his talents. Still less do we wish to see him penalized; but we do desire to see the system of railroad transportation so handled that the strong man shall be given no advantage over the weak man. We wish to insure as fair treatment for the small town as for the big city; for the small shipper as for the big shipper. In the old days the highway of commerce, whether by water or by a road on land, was open to all; it belonged to the public and the traffic along it was free. At present the railway is this highway, and we must do our best to see that it is kept open to all on equal terms. Unlike the old highway it is a very difficult and complex thing to manage, and it is far better that it should be managed by private individuals than by the Government. But it can only be so managed on condition that justice is done the public. It is because, in my judgment, public ownership of railroads is highly undesirable and would probably in this country entail far-reaching disaster, that I wish to see such supervision and regulation of them in the interest of the public as will make it evident that there is no need for public ownership. The opponents of Government regulation dwell upon the difficulties to be encountered and the intricate and involved nature of the problem. Their contention is true. It is a complicated and delicate problem, and all kinds of difficulties are sure to arise in connection with any plan of solution, while no plan will bring all the benefits hoped for by its more optimistic adherents. Moreover, under any healthy plan, the benefits will develop gradually and not rapidly. Finally, we must clearly understand that the public servants who are to do this peculiarly responsible and delicate work must themselves be of the highest type both as regards integrity and efficiency. They must be well paid, for otherwise able men can not in the long run be secured; and they must possess a lofty probity which will revolt as quickly at the thought of pandering to any gust of popular prejudice against rich men as at the thought of anything even remotely resembling subserviency to rich men. But while I fully admit the difficulties in the way, I do not for a moment admit that these difficulties warrant us in stopping in our effort to secure a wise and just system. They should have no other effect than to spur us on to the exercise of the resolution, the even-handed justice, and the fertility of resource, which we like to think of as typically American, and which will in the end achieve good results in this as in other fields of activity. The task is a great one and underlies the task of dealing with the whole industrial problem. But the fact that it is a great problem does not warrant us in shrinking from the attempt to solve it. At present we face such utter lack of supervision, such freedom from the restraints of law, that excellent men have often been literally forced into doing what they deplored because otherwise they were left at the mercy of unscrupulous competitors. To rail at and assail the men who have done as they best could under such conditions accomplishes little. What we need to do is to develop an orderly system; and such a system can only come through the gradually increased exercise of the right of efficient Government control.

SAFETY APPLIANCES.

In my annual Message to the Fifty-eighth Congress, at its third session, I called attention to the necessity for legislation requiring the use of block signals upon railroads engaged in interstate commerce. The number of serious collisions upon unblocked roads that have occurred within the past year adds force to the recommendation then made. The Congress should provide, by appropriate legislation, for the introduction of block signals upon all railroads engaged in interstate commerce at the earliest practicable date, as a measure of increased safety to the traveling public.

Through decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the lower Federal courts in cases brought before them for adjudication the safety-appliance law has been materially strengthened, and the Government has been enabled to secure its effective enforcement in almost all cases, with the result that the condition of railroad equipment throughout the country is much improved and railroad employees perform their duties under safer conditions than heretofore. The Government's most effective aid in arriving at this result has been its inspection service, and that these improved conditions are not more general is due to the insufficient number of inspectors employed.

The inspection service has fully demonstrated its usefulness, and in appropriating for its maintenance the Congress should make provision for an increase in the number of inspectors.

HOURS OF LABOR OF RAILROAD EMPLOYEES.

The excessive hours of labor to which railroad employees in train service are in many cases subjected is also a matter which may well engage the serious attention of the Congress. The strain, both mental and physical, upon those who are engaged in the movement and operation of railroad trains under modern conditions is perhaps greater than that which exists in any other industry, and if there are any reasons for limiting by law the hours of labor in any employment, they certainly apply with peculiar force to the employment of those upon whose vigilance and alertness in the performance of their duties the safety of all who travel by rail depends.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY LAW.

In my annual Message to the Fifty-seventh Congress, at its second session, I recommended the passage of an Employers' Liability Law for the District of Columbia and in our navy-yards. I renewed that recommendation in my Message to the Fifty-eighth Congress, at its second session, and further suggested the appointment of a commission to make a comprehensive study of employers' liability, with a view to the enactment of a wise and constitutional law covering the subject, applicable to all industries within the scope of the Federal power. I hope that such a law will be prepared and enacted as speedily as possible.

LABOR.

The National Government has as a rule but little occasion to deal with the formidable group of problems connected more or less directly with what is known as the labor question, for in the great majority of cases these problems must be dealt with by the State and municipal authorities and not by the National Government. The National Government has control of the District of Columbia, however, and it should see to it that the City of Washington is made a model city in all respects, both as regards parks, public playgrounds, proper regulation of the system of housing so as to do away with the evils of alley tenements, a proper system of education, a proper system of dealing with truancy and juvenile offenders, a proper handling of the charitable work of the District. Moreover, there should be proper factory laws to prevent all abuses in the employment of women and children in the District. These will be useful chiefly as object lessons, but even this limited amount of usefulness would be of real national value.

There has been demand for depriving courts of the power to issue injunctions in labor disputes. Such special limitation of the equity powers of our courts would be most unwise. It is true that some judges have misused this power; but this does not justify a denial of the power any more than an improper exercise of the power to call a strike by a labor leader would justify the denial of the right to strike. The remedy is to regulate the procedure by requiring the judge to give due notice to the adverse parties before granting the writ, the hearing to be ex parte if the adverse party does not appear at the time and place ordered. What is due notice must depend upon the facts of the case; it should not be used as a pretext to permit violation of law, or the jeopardizing of life or property. Of course, this would not authorize the issuing of a restraining order or injunction in any case in which it is not already authorized by existing law.

I renew the recommendation I made in my last annual Message for an investigation by the Department of Commerce and Labor of general labor conditions, especial attention to be paid to the conditions of child labor and child-labor legislation in the several States. Such an investigation should take into account the various problems with which the question of child labor is connected. It is true that these problems can be actually met in most cases only by the States themselves, but it would be well for the Nation to endeavor to secure and publish comprehensive information as to the conditions of the labor of children in the different States, so as to spur up those that are behindhand, and to secure approximately uniform legislation of a high character among the several States. In such a Republic as ours the one thing that we can not afford to neglect is the problem of turning out decent citizens. The future of the Nation depends upon the citizenship of the generations to come; the children of to-day are those who to-morrow will shape the destiny of our land, and we can not afford to neglect them. The legislature of Colorado has recommended that the National Government provide some general measure for the protection from abuse of children and dumb animals throughout the United States. I lay the matter before you for what I trust will be your favorable consideration.

The Department of Commerce and Labor should also make a thorough investigation of the conditions of women in industry. Over five million American women are now engaged in gainful occupations; yet there is an almost complete dearth of data upon which to base any trustworthy conclusions as regards a subject as important as it is vast and complicated. There is need of full knowledge on which to base action looking toward State and municipal legislation for the protection of working women. The introduction of women into industry is working change and disturbance in the domestic and social life of the Nation. The decrease in marriage, and especially in the birth rate, has been coincident with it. We must face accomplished facts, and the adjustment to factory conditions must be made; but surely it can be made with less friction and less harmful effects on family life than is now the case. This whole matter in reality forms one of the greatest sociological phenomena of our time; it is a social question of the first importance, of far greater importance than any merely political or economic question can be; and to solve it we need ample data, gathered in a sane and scientific spirit in the course of an exhaustive investigation.

In any great labor disturbance not only are employer and employee interested, but also a third party—the general public. Every considerable labor difficulty in which interstate commerce is involved should be investigated by the Government and the facts officially reported to the public.

The question of securing a healthy, self-respecting, and mutually sympathetic attitude as betweeen employer and employee, capitalist and wage-worker, is a difficult one. All phases of the labor problem prove difficult when approached. But the underlying principles, the root principles, in accordance with which the problem must be solved are entirely simple. We can get justice and right dealing only if we put as of paramount importance the principle of treating a man on his worth as a man rather than with reference to his social position, his occupation, or the class to which he belongs. There are selfish and brutal men in all ranks of life. If they are capitalists their selfishness and brutality may take the form of hard indifference to suffering, greedy disregard of every moral restraint which interferes with the accumulation of wealth, and cold-blooded exploitation of the weak; or, if they are laborers, the form of laziness, of sullen envy of the more fortunate, and of willingness to perform deeds of murderous violence. Such conduct is just as reprehensible in one case as in the other, and all honest and farseeing men should join in warring against it wherever it becomes manifest. Individual capitalist and individual wage-worker, corporation and union, are alike entitled to the protection of the law, and must alike obey the law. Moreover, in addition to mere obedience to the law, each man, if he be really a good citizen, must show broad sympathy for his neighbor and genuine desire to look at any question arising between them from the standpoint of that neighbor no less than from his own; and to this end it is essential that capitalist and wage-worker should consult freely one with the other, should each strive to bring closer the day when both shall realize that they are properly partners and not enemies. To approach the questions which inevitably arise between them solely from the standpoint which treats each side in the mass as the enemy of the other side in the mass is both wicked and foolish. In the past the most direful among the influences which have brought about the downfall of republics has ever been the growth of the class spirit, the growth of the spirit which tends to make a man subordinate the welfare of the public as a whole to the welfare of the particular class to which he belongs, the substitution of loyalty to a class for loyalty to the nation. This inevitably brings about a tendency to treat each man not on his merits as an individual, but on his position as belonging to a certain class in the community. If such a spirit grows up in this Republic it will ultimately prove fatal to us, as in the past it has proved fatal to every community in which it has become dominant. Unless we continue to keep a quick and lively sense of the great fundamental truth that our concern is with the individual worth of the individual man, this Government can not permanently hold the place which it has achieved among the nations. The vital lines of cleavage among our people do not correspond, and indeed run at right angles to, the lines of cleavage which divide occupation from occupation, which divide wage-workers from capitalists, farmers from bankers, men of small means from men of large means, men who live in the towns from men who live in the country; for the vital line of cleavage is the line which divides the honest man who tries to do well by his neighbor from the dishonest man who does ill by his neighbor. In other words, the standard we should establish is the standard of conduct, not the standard of occupation, of means, or of social position. It is the man's moral quality, his attitude toward the great questions which concern all humanity, his cleanliness of life, his power to do his duty toward himself and toward others, which really count; and if we substitute for the standard of personal judgment which treats each man

according to his merits, another standard in accordance with which all men of one class are favored and all men of another class discriminated against, we shall do irreparable damage to the body politic. I believe that our people are too sane, too self-respecting, too fit for self-government, ever to adopt such an attitude. This Government is not and never shall be government by a plutocracy. This Government is not and never shall be government by a mob. It shall continue to be in the future what it has been in the past, a government based on the theory that each man, rich or poor, is to be treated simply and solely on his worth as a man, that all his personal and property rights are to be safeguarded, and that he is neither to wrong others nor to suffer wrong from others.

The noblest of all forms of government is self-government; but it is also the most difficult. We who possess this priceless boon, and who desire to hand it on to our children and our children's children, should ever bear in mind the thought so finely expressed by Burke: "Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites; in proportion as they are disposed to listen to the counsels of the wise and good in preference to the flattery of knaves. Society can not exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there be within the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds can not be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

INSURANCE.

The great insurance companies afford striking examples of corporations whose business has extended so far beyond the jurisdiction of the States which created them as to preclude strict enforcement of supervision and regulation by the parent States. In my last annual Message I recommended "that the Congress carefully consider whether the power of the Bureau of Corporations can not constitutionally be extended to cover interstate transactions in insurance." Recent events have emphasized the importance of an early and exhaustive consideration of this question, to see whether it is not possible to furnish better safeguards than the several States have been able to furnish against corruption of the flagrant kind which has been exposed. It has been only too clearly shown that certain of the men at the head of these large corporations take but small note of the ethical distinction between honesty and dishonesty; they draw the line only this side of what may be called law-honesty, the kind of honesty necessary in order to avoid falling into the clutches of the law. Of course the only complete remedy for this condition must be found in an aroused public conscience, a higher sense of ethical conduct in the community at large, and especially among business men and in the great profession of the law, and in the growth of a spirit which condemns all dishonesty, whether in rich man or in poor man, whether it takes the shape of bribery or of blackmail. But much can be done by legislation which is not only drastic but practical. There is need of a far stricter and more uniform regulation of the vast insurance interests of this country. The United States should in this respect follow the policy of other nations by providing adequate national supervision of commercial interests which are clearly national in character. My predecessors have repeatedly recognized that the foreign business of these companies is an important part of our foreign commercial relations. During the Administrations of Presidents Cleveland, Harrison, and McKinley the State Department exercised its influence, through diplomatic channels, to prevent unjust discrimination by foreign countries against American insurance companies. These negotiations illustrated the propriety of the Congress recognizing the national character of insurance, for in the absence of Federal legislation the State Department could only give expression to the wishes of the authorities of the several States, whose policy was ineffective through want of uniformity.

I repeat my previous recommendation that the Congress should also consider whether the Federal Government has any power or owes any duty with respect to domestic transactions in insurance of an interstate character. That State supervision has proved inadequate is generally conceded. The burden upon insurance companies, and therefore their policy holders, of conflicting regulations of many States, is unquestioned, while but little effective check is imposed upon any able and unscrupulous man who desires to exploit the company in his own interest at the expense of the policy holders and of the public. The inability of a State to regulate effectively insurance corporations created under the laws of other States and transacting the larger part of their business elsewhere is also clear. As a remedy for this evil of conflicting, ineffective, and yet burdensome regulations there has been for many years a widespread demand for Federal supervision. The Congress has already recognized that interstate insurance may be a proper subject for Federal legislation, for in creating the Bureau of Corporations it authorized it to publish and supply useful information concerning interstate corporations, "including corporations engaged in insurance." It is obvious that if the compilation of statistics be the limit of the Federal power, it is wholly ineffective to regulate this form of commercial intercourse between the States, and as the insurance business has outgrown in magnitude the possibility of adequate State supervision, the Congress should carefully consider whether further legislation can be had. What is said above applies with equal force to fraternal and benevolent organizations which contract for life insurance.

THE REVENUES.

There is more need of stability than of the attempt to attain an ideal perfection in the methods of raising revenue; and the shock and strain to the business world certain to attend any serious change in these methods render such change inadvisable unless for grave reason. It is not possible to lay down any general rule by which to determine the moment when the reasons for will outweigh the reasons against such a change. Much must depend, not merely on the needs, but on the desires, of the people as a whole; for needs and desires are not necessarily identical. Of course no change can be made on lines beneficial to, or desired by, one section or one State only. There must be something like a general agreement among the citizens of the several States, as represented in the Congress, that the change is needed and desired in the interest of the people as a whole; and there should then be a sincere, intelligent, and disinterested effort to make it in such shape as will combine, so far as possible, the maximum of good to the people at large with the minimum of necessary disregard for the special interests of localities or classes. But in time of peace the revenue must on the average, taking a series of years together, equal the expenditures or else the revenues must be increased. Last year there was a deficit. Unless our expenditures can be kept within the revenues then our revenue laws must be readjusted. It is as yet too early to attempt to outline what shape such a readjustment should take, for it is as yet too early to say whether there will be need for it. It should be considered whether it is not desirable that the tariff laws should provide for applying as against or in favor of any other nation maximum and minimum tariff rates established by the Congress, so as to secure a certain reciprocity of treatment between other nations and ourselves. Having in view even larger considerations of policy than those of a purely economic nature, it would, in my judgment, be well to endeavor to bring about closer commercial connections with the other peoples of this continent. I am happy to be able to announce to you that Russia now treats us on the most-favored-nation basis.

ECONOMY IN EXPENDITURES.

I earnestly recommend to the Congress the need of economy and to this end of a rigid scrutiny of appropriations. As examples merely, I call your attention to one or two specific matters. All unnecessary offices should be abolished. The Commissioner of the General Land Office recommends the abolishment of the office of receiver of public moneys for United States land offices. This will effect a saving of about a quarter of a million dollars a year. As the business of the Nation grows it is inevitable that there should be from time to time a legitimate increase in the number of officials, and this fact renders it all the more important that when offices become unnecessary they should be abolished. In the public printing also a large saving of public money can be made. There is a constantly growing tendency to publish masses of unimportant information. It is probably not unfair to say that many tens of thousands of volumes are published at which no human being ever looks and for which there is no real demand whatever.

Yet, in speaking of economy, I must in no wise be understood as advocating the false economy which is in the end the worst extravagance. To cut down on the Navy, for instance, would be a crime against the Nation. To fail to push forward all work on the Panama Canal would be as great a folly.

CURRENCY.

In my Message of December 2, 1902, to the Congress, I said: "Interest rates are a potent factor in business activity, and in order that these rates may be equalized to meet the varying needs of the seasons and of widely separated communities, and to prevent the recurrence of financial stringencies which injuriously affect legitimate business, it is necessary that there should be an element of elasticity in our monetary system. Banks are the natural servants of commerce, and upon them should be placed, as far as practicable, the burden of furnishing and maintaining a circulation adequate to supply the needs of our diversified industries and of our domestic

and foreign commerce; and the issue of this should be so regulated that a sufficient supply should be always available for the business interests of the country."

Every consideration of prudence demands the addition of the element of elasticity to our currency system. The evil does not consist in an inadequate volume of money, but in the rigidity of this volume, which does not respond as it should to the varying needs of communities and of seasons. Inflation must be avoided; but some provision should be made that will insure a larger volume of money during the fall and winter months than in the less active seasons of the year; so that the currency will contract against speculation, and will expand for the needs of legitimate business. At present the Treasury Department is at irregularly recurring intervals obliged, in the interest of the business world—that is, in the interests of the American public—to try to avert financial crises by providing a remedy which should be provided by Congressional action.

BUSINESS METHODS IN DEPARTMENTS.

At various times I have instituted investigations into the organization and conduct of the business of the Executive Departments. While none of these inquiries have yet progressed far enough to warrant final conclusions, they have already confirmed and emphasized the general impression that the organization of the Departments is often faulty in principle and wasteful in results, while many of their business methods are antiquated and inefficient. There is every reason why our executive governmental machinery should be at least as well planned, economical, and efficient as the best machinery of the great business organizations, which at present is not the case. To make it so is a task of complex detail and essentially executive in its nature; probably no legislative body, no matter how wise and able, could undertake it with reasonable prospect of success. I recommend that the Congress consider this subject with a view to provide by legislation for the transfer, distribution, consolidation, and assignment of duties and executive organizations or parts of organizations, and for the changes in business methods, within or between the several Departments, that will best promote the economy, efficiency, and high character of the Government work.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

In my last annual Message I said:

"The power of the Government to protect the integrity of the elections of its own officials is inherent and has been recognized and affirmed by repeated declarations of the Supreme Court. There is no enemy of free government more dangerous and none so insidious as the corruption of the electorate. No one defends or excuses corruption, and it would seem to follow that none would oppose vigorous measures to eradicate it. I recommend the enactment of a law directed against bribery and corruption in Federal elections. The details of such a law may be safely left to the wise discretion of the Congress, but it should go as far as under the Constitution it is possible to go, and should include severe penalties against him who gives or receives a bribe intended to influence his act or opinion as an elector; and provisions for the publication not only of the expenditures for nominations and elections of all candidates, but also of all contributions received and expenditures made by political committees."

I desire to repeat this recommendation. In political campaigns in a country as large and populous as ours it is inevitable that there should be much expense of an entirely legitimate kind. This, of course, means that many contributions, and some of them of large size, must be made, and, as a matter of fact, in any big political contest such contributions are always made to both sides. It is entirely proper both to give and receive them, unless there is an improper motive connected with either gift or reception. If they are extorted by any kind of pressure or promise, express or implied, direct or indirect, in the way of favor or immunity, then the giving or receiving becomes not only improper but criminal. It will undoubtedly be difficult as a matter of practical detail to shape an act which shall guard with reasonable certainty against such misconduct; but if it is possible to secure by law the full and verified publication in detail of all the sums contributed to and expended by the candidates or committees of any political parties the result can not but be wholesome. All contributions by corporations to any political committee or for any political purpose should be forbidden by law; directors should not be permitted to use stockholders' money for such purposes; and, moreover, a prohibition of this kind would be, as far as it went, an effective method of stopping the evils aimed at in corrupt practices acts. Not only should both the National and the several State legislatures forbid any officer of a corporation from using the money of the corporation in or about any election, but they should also forbid such use of money in connection with any legislation save by the employment of counsel in public manner for distinctly legal services.

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.

The first Conference of Nations held at The Hague in 1899, being unable to dispose of all the business before it, recommended the consideration and settlement of a number of important questions by another conference to be called subsequently and at an early date. These questions were the following: (1) The rights and duties of neutrals; (2) the limitation of the armed forces on land and sea, and of military budgets; (3) the use of new types and calibers of military and naval guns; (4) the inviolability of private property at sea in times of war; (5) the bombardment of ports, cities, and villages by naval forces. In October, 1904, at the instance of the Interparliamentary Union, which, at a conference held in the United States and attended by the lawmakers of fifteen different nations, had reiterated the demand for a second Conference of Nations, I issued invitations to all the powers signatory to The Hague Convention to send delegates to such a conference and suggested that it be again held at The Hague. In its note of December 16, 1904, the United States Government communicated to the representatives of foreign governments its belief that the conference could be best arranged under the provisions of the present Hague treaty.

From all the Powers acceptance was received, coupled in some cases with the condition that we should wait until the end of the war then waging between Russia and Japan. The Emperor of Russia, immediately after the treaty of peace which so happily terminated this war, in a note presented to the President on September 13, through Ambassador Rosen, took the initiative in recommending that the conference be now called. The United States Government in response expressed its cordial acquiescence and stated that it would, as a matter of course, take part in the new conference and endeavor to further its aims. We assume that all civilized governments will support the movement, and that the conference is now an assured fact. This Government will do everything in its power to secure the success of the conference to the end that substantial progress may be made in the cause of international peace, justice, and good will.

This renders it proper at this time to say something as to the general attitude of this Government toward peace. More and more war is coming to be looked upon as in itself a lamentable and evil thing. A wanton or useless war, or a war of mere aggression—in short, any war begun or carried on in a conscienceless spirit, is to be condemend as a peculiarly atrocious crime against all humanity. We can, however, do nothing of permanent value for peace unless we keep ever clearly in mind the ethical element which lies at the root of the problem. Our aim is righteousness. Peace is normally the handmaiden of righteousness; but when peace and righteousness conflict then a great and upright people can never for a moment hesitate to follow the path which leads toward righteousness, even though that path also leads to war. There are persons who advocate peace at any price; there are others who, following a false analogy, think that because it is no longer necessary in civilized countries for individuals to protect their rights with a strong hand, it is therefore unnecessary for nations to be ready to defend their rights. These persons would do irreparable harm to any nation that adopted their principles, and even as it is they seriously hamper the cause which they advocate by tending to render it absurd in the eyes of sensible and patriotic men. There can be no worse foe of mankind in general, and of his own country in particular, than the demagogue of war, the man who in mere folly or to serve his own selfish ends continually rails at and abuses other nations, who seeks to excite his countrymen against foreigners on insufficient pretexts, who excites and inflames a perverse and aggressive national vanity, and who may on occasions wantonly bring on conflict between his nation and some other nation. But there are demagogues of peace just as there are demagogues of war, and in any such movement as this for The Hague conference it is essential not to be misled by one set of extremists any more than by the other. Whenever it is possible for a nation or an individual to work for real peace, assuredly it is failure of duty not to so strive; but if war is necessary and righteous then either the man or the nation shrinking from it forfeits all title to self-respect. We have scant sympathy with the sentimentalist who dreads oppression less than physical suffering, who would prefer a shameful peace to the pain and toil sometimes lamentably necessary in order to secure a righteous peace. As yet there is only a partial and imperfect analogy between international law and internal or municipal law, because there is no sanction of force for executing the former while there is in the case of the latter. The private citizen is protected in his rights by the law, because the law rests in the

last resort upon force exercised through the forms of law. A man does not have to defend his rights with his own hand, because he can call upon the police, upon the sheriff's posse, upon the militia, or in certain extreme cases upon the Army, to defend him. But there is no such sanction of force for international law. At present there could be no greater calamity than for the free peoples, the enlightened, independent, and peace-loving peoples, to disarm while yet leaving it open to any barbarism or despotism to remain armed. So long as the world is as unorganized as now, the armies and navies of those peoples who on the whole stand for justice, offer not only the best, but the only possible, security for a just peace. For instance, if the United States alone, or in company only with the other nations that on the whole tend to act justly, disarmed, we might sometimes avoid bloodshed, but we would cease to be of weight in securing the peace of justice—the real peace for which the most law-abiding and high-minded men must at times be willing to fight. As the world is now, only that nation is equipped for peace that knows how to fight and that will not shrink from fighting if ever the conditions become such that war is demanded in the name of the highest morality.

So much it is emphatically necessary to say in order both that the position of the United States may not be misunderstood, and that a genuine effort to bring nearer the day of the peace of justice among the nations may not be hampered by a folly which, in striving to achieve the impossible, would render it hopeless to attempt the achievement of the practical. But while recognizing most clearly all above set forth, it remains our clear duty to strive in every practicable way to bring nearer the time when the sword shall not be the arbiter among nations. At present the practical thing to do is to try to minimize the number of cases in which it must be the arbiter, and to offer, at least to all civilized powers, some substitute for war which will be available in at least a considerable number of instances. Very much can be done through another Hague conference in this direction, and I most earnestly urge that this Nation do all in its power to try to further the movement and to make the result of the decisions of The Hague conference effective. I earnestly hope that the conference may be able to devise some way to make arbitration between nations the customary way of settling international disputes in all save a few classes of cases, which should themselves be as sharply defined and rigidly limited as the present governmental and social development of the world will permit. If possible, there should be a general arbitration treaty negotiated among all the nations represented at the conference. Neutral rights and property should be protected at sea as they are protected on land. There should be an international agreement to this purpose and a similar agreement defining contraband of war.

During the last century there has been a distinct diminution in the number of wars between the most civilized nations. International relations have become closer, and the development of The Hague tribunal is not only a symptom of this growing closeness of relationship, but is a means by which the growth can be furthered. Our aim should be from time to time to take such steps as may be possible toward creating something like an organization of the civilized nations, because as the world becomes more highly organized the need for navies and armies will diminish. It is not possible to secure anything like an immediate disarmament, because it would first be necessary to settle what peoples are on the whole a menace to the rest of mankind, and to provide against the disarmament of the rest being turned into a movement which would really chiefly benefit these obnoxious peoples; but it may be possible to exercise some check upon the tendency to swell indefinitely the budgets for military expenditure. Of course such an effort could succeed only if it did not attempt to do too much; and if it were undertaken in a spirit of sanity as far removed as possible from a merely hysterical pseudo-philanthropy. It is worth while pointing out that since the end of the insurrection in the Philippines this Nation has shown its practical faith in the policy of disarmament by reducing its little army one-third. But disarmament can never be of prime importance: there is more need to get rid of the causes of war than of the implements of war.

I have dwelt much on the dangers to be avoided by steering clear of any mere foolish sentimentality because my wish for peace is so genuine and earnest; because I have a real and great desire that this second Hague conference may mark a long stride forward in the direction of securing the peace of justice throughout the world. No object is better worthy the attention of enlightened statesmanship than the establishment of a surer method than now exists of securing justice as between nations, both for the protection of the little nations and for the prevention of war between the big nations. To this aim we should endeavor not only to avert bloodshed, but, above all, effectively to strengthen the forces of right. The Golden Rule should be, and as the world grows in morality it will be, the guiding rule of conduct among nations as among individuals; though the Golden Rule must not be construed, in fantastic manner, as forbidding the exercise of the police power. This mighty and free Republic should ever deal with all other states, great or small, on a basis of high honor, respecting their rights as jealously as it safeguards its own.

MONROE DOCTRINE.

One of the most effective instruments for peace is the Monroe Doctrine as it has been and is being gradually developed by this Nation and accepted by other nations. No other policy could have been as efficient in promoting peace in the Western Hemisphere and in giving to each nation thereon the chance to develop along its own lines. If we had refused to apply the Doctrine to changing conditions it would now be completely outworn, would not meet any of the needs of the present day, and indeed would probably by this time have sunk into complete oblivion. It is useful at home, and is meeting with recognition abroad because we have adapted our application of it to meet the growing and changing needs of the Hemisphere. When we announce a policy, such as the Monroe Doctrine, we thereby commit ourselves to the consequences of the policy, and those consequences from time to time alter. It is out of the question to claim a right and yet shirk the responsibility for its exercise. Not only we, but all American Republics who are benefited by the existence of the Doctrine, must recognize the obligations each nation is under as regards foreign peoples no less than its duty to insist upon its own rights.

That our rights and interests are deeply concerned in the maintenance of the Doctrine is so clear as hardly to need argument. This is especially true in view of the construction of the Panama Canal. As a mere matter of self-defense we must exercise a close watch over the approaches to this canal; and this means that we must be thoroughly alive to our interests in the Caribbean Sea.

There are certain essential points which must never be forgotten as regards the Monroe Doctrine. In the first place we must as a nation make it evident that we do not intend to treat it in any shape or way as an excuse for aggrandizement on our part at the expense of the republics to the south. We must recognize the fact that in some South American countries there has been much suspicion lest we should interpret the Monroe Doctrine as in some way inimical to their interests, and we must try to convince all the other nations of this continent once and for all that no just and orderly government has anything to fear from us. There are certain republics to the south of us which have already reached such a point of stability, order, and prosperity that they themselves, though as yet hardly consciously, are among the guarantors of this Doctrine. These republics we now meet not only on a basis of entire equality, but in a spirit of frank and respectful friendship, which we hope is mutual. If all of the republics to the south of us will only grow as those to which I allude have already grown, all need for us to be the especial champions of the Doctrine will disappear, for no stable and growing American Republic wishes to see some great non-American military power acquire territory in its neighborhood. All that this country desires is that the other republics on this Continent shall be happy and prosperous; and they can not be happy and prosperous unless they maintain order within their boundaries and behave with a just regard for their obligations toward outsiders. It must be understood that under no circumstances will the United States use the Monroe Doctrine as a cloak for territorial aggression. We desire peace with all the world, but perhaps most of all with the other peoples of the American Continent. There are of course limits to the wrongs which any self-respecting nation can endure. It is always possible that wrong actions toward this Nation, or toward citizens of this Nation, in some State unable to keep order among its own people, unable to secure justice from outsiders, and unwilling to do justice to those outsiders who treat it well, may result in our having to take action to protect our rights; but such action will not be taken with a view to territorial aggression, and it will be taken at all only with extreme reluctance and when it has become evident that every other resource has been exhausted.

Moreover, we must make it evident that we do not intend to permit the Monroe Doctrine to be used by any nation on this Continent as a shield to protect it from the consequences of its own misdeeds against foreign nations. If a republic to the south of us commits a tort against a foreign nation, such as an outrage against a citizen of that nation, then the Monroe Doc-

trine does not force us to interfere to prevent punishment of the tort, save to see that the punishment does not assume the form of territorial occupation in any shape. The case is more difficult when it refers to a contractual obligation. Our own Government has always refused to enforce such contractual obligations on behalf of its citizens by an appeal to arms. It is much to be wished that all foreign governments would take the same view. But they do not; and in consequence we are liable at any time to be brought face to face with disagreeable alternatives. On the one hand, this country would certainly decline to go to war to prevent a foreign government from collecting a just debt; on the other hand, it is very inadvisable to permit any foreign power to take possession, even temporarily, of the custom-houses of an American Republic in order to enforce the payment of its obligations; for such temporary occupation might turn into a permanent occupation. The only escape from these alternatives may at any time be that we must ourselves undertake to bring about some arrangement by which so much as possible of a just obligation shall be paid. It is far better that this country should put through such an arrangement, rather than allow any foreign country to undertake it. To do so insures the defaulting republic from having to pay debts of an improper character under duress, while it also insures honest creditors of the republic from being passed by in the interest of dishonest or grasping creditors. Moreover, for the United States to take such a position offers the only possible way of insuring us against a clash with some foreign power. The position is, therefore, in the interest of peace as well as in the interest of justice. It is of benefit to our people; it is of benefit to foreign peoples; and most of all it is really of benefit to the people of the country concerned.

This brings me to what should be one of the fundamental objects of the Monroe Doctrine. We must ourselves in good faith try to help upward toward peace and order those of our sister republics which need such help. Just as there has been a gradual growth of the ethical element in the relations of one individual to another, so we are, even though slowly, more and more coming to recognize the duty of bearing one another's burdens, not only as among individuals, but also as among nations.

SANTO DOMINGO.

Santo Domingo, in her turn, has now made an appeal to us to help her, and not only every principle of wisdom but every generous instinct within us bids us respond to the appeal. It is not of the slightest consequence whether we grant the aid needed by Santo Domingo as an incident to the wise development of the Monroe Doctrine, or because we regard the case of Santo Domingo as standing wholly by itself, and to be treated as such, and not on general principles or with any reference to the Monroe Doctrine. The important point is to give the needed aid, and the case is certainly sufficiently peculiar to deserve to be judged purely on its own merits. The conditions in Santo Domingo have for a number of years grown from bad to worse until a year ago all society was on the verge of dissolution. Fortunately, just at this time a ruler sprang up in Santo Domingo, who, with his colleagues, saw the dangers threatening their country and appealed to the friendship of the only great and powerful neighbor who possessed the power, and as they hoped also the will to help them. There was imminent danger of foreign intervention. The previous rulers of Santo Domingo had recklessly incurred debts, and owing to her internal disorders she had ceased to be able to provide means of paying the debts. The patience of her foreign creditors had become exhausted, and at least two foreign nations were on the point of intervention, and were only prevented from intervening by the unofficial assurance of this Government that it would itself strive to help Santo Domingo in her hour of need. In the case of one of these nations, only the actual opening of negotiations to this end by our Government prevented the seizure of territory in Santo Domingo by a European power. Of the debts incurred some were just, while some were not of a character which really renders it obligatory on, or proper for, Santo Domingo to pay them in full. But she could not pay any of them unless some stability was assured her Government and people.

Accordingly the Executive Department of our Government negotiated a treaty under which we are to try to help the Dominican people to straighten out their finances. This treaty is pending before the Senate. In the meantime a temporary arrangement has been made which will last until the Senate has had time to take action upon the treaty. Under this arrangement the Dominican Government has appointed Americans to all the important positions in the customs service, and they are seeing to the honest collection of the revenues, turning over 45 per cent to the Government for running expenses and putting the other 55 per cent into a safe depositary for equitable division in case the treaty shall be ratified, among the various creditors, whether European or American.

The custom-houses offer well-nigh the only sources of revenue in Santo Domingo, and the different revolutions usually have as their real aim the obtaining possession of these custom-houses. The mere fact that the collectors of customs are Americans, that they are performing their duties with efficiency and honesty, and that the treaty is pending in the Senate, gives a certain moral power to the Government of Santo Domingo which it has not had before. This has completely discouraged all revolutionary movement, while it has already produced such an increase in the revenues that the Government is actually getting more from the 45 per cent that the American collectors turn over to it than it got formerly when it took the entire revenue. It is enabling the poor harassed people of Santo Domingo once more to turn their attention to industry and to be free from the curse of interminable revolutionary disturbance. It offers to all bona fide creditors, American and European, the only really good chance to obtain that to which they are justly entitled, while it in return gives to Santo Domingo the only opportunity of defense against claims which it ought not to pay, for now if it meets the views of the Senate we shall ourselves thoroughly examine all these claims, whether American or foreign, and see that none that are improper are paid. There is, of course, opposition to the treaty from dishonest creditors, foreign and American, and from the professional revolutionists of the island itself. We have already reason to believe that some of the creditors who do not dare expose their claims to honest scrutiny are endeavoring to stir up sedition in the island and opposition to the treaty. In the meantime I have exercised the authority vested in me by the joint resolution of the Congress to prevent the introduction of arms into the island for revolutionary purposes.

Under the course taken, stability and order and all the benefits of peace are at last coming to Santo Domingo, danger of foreign intervention has been suspended, and there is at last a prospect that all creditors will get justice, no more and no less. If the arrangement is terminated by the failure of the treaty chaos will follow; and if chaos follows, sooner or later this Government may be involved in serious difficulties with foreign governments over the island, or else may be forced itself to intervene in the island in some unpleasant fashion. Under the proposed treaty the independence of the island is scrupulously respected, the danger of violation of the Monroe Doctrine by the intervention of foreign powers vanishes, and the interference of our Government is minimized, so that we shall only act in conjunction with the Santo Domingo authorities to secure the proper administration of the customs, and therefore to secure the payment of just debts and to secure the Dominican Government against demands for unjust debts. The proposed method will give the people of Santo Domingo the same chance to move onward and upward which we have already given to the people of Cuba. It will be doubly to our discredit as a nation if we fail to take advantage of this chance; for it will be of damage to ourselves, and it will be of incalculable damage to Santo Domingo. Every consideration of wise policy, and, above all, every consideration of large generosity, bids us meet the request of Santo Domingo as we are now trying to meet it.

ARMY AND NAVY.

We cannot consider the question of our foreign policy without at the same time treating of the Army and the Navy. We now have a very small army—indeed, one well-nigh infinitesimal when compared with the army of any other large nation. Of course the Army we do have should be as nearly perfect of its kind and for its size as is possible. I do not believe that any army in the world has a better average of enlisted man or a better type of junior officer; but the Army should be trained to act effectively in a mass. Provision should be made by sufficient appropriations for maneuvers of a practical kind so that the troops may learn how to take care of themselves under actual service conditions; every march, for instance, being made with the soldier loaded exactly as he would be in an active campaign. The generals and colonels would thereby have opportunity of handling regiments, brigades, and divisions, and the commissary and medical departments would be tested in the field. Provision should be made for the exercise at least of a brigade and by preference of a division in marching and embarking at some point on our coast and disembarking at some other point and continuing its march. The number of posts in which the Army is kept in time of peace should be materially diminished and the posts that are left made correspondingly larger. No local interests should be allowed to stand in the way of assembling the greater part of the troops which would at need form our field armies in stations of such size as will permit the best training to be given to the personnel of all grades, including

the high officers and staff officers. To accomplish this end we must have not company or regimental garrisons, but brigade and division garrisons. Promotion by mere seniority can never result in a thoroughly efficient corps of officers in the higher ranks unless there accompanies it a vigorous weeding-out process. Such a weeding-out process—that is, such a process of selection—is a chief feature of the four years' course of the young officer at West Point. There is no good reason why it should stop immediately upon his graduation. While at West Point he is dropped unless he comes up to a certain standard of excellence, and when he graduates he takes rank in the Army according to his rank of graduation. The results are good at West Point; and there should be in the Army itself something that will achieve the same end. After a certain age has been reached the average officer is unfit to do good work below a certain grade. Provision should be made for the promotion of exceptionally meritorious men over the heads of their comrades and for the retirement of all men who have reached a given age without getting beyond a given rank; this age of retirement of course changing from rank to rank. In both the Army and the Navy there should be some principle of selection, that is of promotion for merit, and there should be a resolute effort to eliminate the aged officers of reputable character who possess no special efficiency.

There should be an increase in the coast artillery force, so that our coast fortifications can be in some degree adequately manned. There is special need for an increase and reorganization of the Medical Department of the Army. In both the Army and Navy there must be the same thorough training for duty in the staff corps as in the fighting line. Only by such training in advance can we be sure that in actual war field operations and those at sea will be carried on successfully. The importance of this was shown conclusively in the Spanish-American and the Russo-Japanese wars. The work of the medical departments in the Japanese army and navy is especially worthy of study. I renew my recommendation of January 9, 1905, as to the Medical Department of the Army and call attention to the equal importance of the needs of the staff corps of the Navy. In the Medical Department of the Navy the first in importance is the reorganization of the Hospital Corps, on the lines of the Gallinger Bill (S. 3984, February 1, 1904), and the reapportionment of the different grades of the medical officers to meet service requirements. It seems advisable also that medical officers of the Army and Navy should have similar rank and pay in their respective grades, so that their duties can be carried on without friction when they are brought together. The base hospitals of the Navy should be put in condition to meet modern requirements and hospital ships be provided. Unless we now provide with ample forethought for the medical needs of the Army and Navy appalling suffering of a preventable kind is sure to occur if ever the country goes to war. It is not reasonable to expect successful administration in time of war of a department which lacks a third of the number of officers necessary to perform the medical service in time of peace. We need men who are not merely doctors; they must be trained in the administration of military medical service.

Our Navy must, relatively to the navies of other nations, always be of greater size than our Army. We have most wisely continued for a number of years to build up our Navy, and it has now reached a fairly high standard of efficiency. This standard of efficiency must not only be maintained, but increased. It does not seem to me necessary, however, that the Navy should—at least in the immediate future—be increased beyond the present number of units. What is now clearly necessary is to substitute efficient for inefficient units as the latter become worn-out or as it becomes apparent that they are useless. Probably the result would be attained by adding a single battle ship to our Navy each year, the superseded or outworn vessels being laid up or broken up as they are thus replaced. The four single-turret monitors built immediately after the close of the Spanish war, for instance, are vessels which would be of but little use in the event of war. The money spent upon them could have been more usefully spent in other ways. Thus it would have been far better never to have built a single one of these monitors and to have put the money into an ample supply of reserve guns. Most of the smaller cruisers and gunboats, though they serve a useful purpose so far as they are needed for international police work, would not add to the strength of our Navy in a conflict with a serious foe. There is urgent need of providing a large increase in the number of officers, and especially in the number of enlisted men.

Recent naval history has emphasized certain lessons which ought not to, but which do, need emphasis. Seagoing torpedo boats or destroyers are indispensable, not only for making night attacks by surprise upon an enemy, but even in battle for finishing already crippled ships. Under exceptional circumstances submarine boats would doubtless be of use. Fast scouts are needed. The main strength of the Navy, however, lies and can only lie in the great battle ships, the heavily-armored, heavily-gunned vessels which decide the mastery of the seas. Heavy-armed cruisers also play a most useful part, and unarmed cruisers, if swift enough, are very useful as scouts. Between antagonists of approximately equal prowess the comparative perfection of the instruments of war will ordinarily determine the fight. But it is of course true that the man behind the gun, the man in the engine room, and the man in the conning tower, considered not only individually, but especially with regard to the way in which they work together, are even more important than the weapons with which they work. The most formidable battle ship is of course helpless against even a light cruiser if the men aboard it are unable to hit anything with their guns; and thoroughly well-handled cruisers may count seriously in an engagement with much superior vessels, if the men aboard the latter are ineffective, whether from lack of training or from any other cause. Modern war ships are most formidable mechanisms when well handled, but they are utterly useless when not well handled; and they can not be handled at all without long and careful training. This training can under no circumstance be given when once war has broken out. No fighting ship of the first class should ever be laid up save for necessary repairs; and her crew should be kept constantly exercised on the high seas, so that she may stand at the highest point of perfection. To put a new and untrained crew upon the most powerful battle ship and send it out to meet a formidable enemy is not only to invite but to insure disaster and disgrace. To improvise crews at the outbreak of a war, so far as the serious fighting craft are concerned, is absolutely hopeless. If the officers and men are not thoroughly skilled in, and have not been thoroughly trained to, their duties, it would be far better to keep the ships in port during hostilities than to send them against a formidable opponent, for the result could only be that they would be either sunk or captured. The marksmanship of our Navy is now on the whole in a gratifying condition, and there has been a great improvement in fleet practice. We need additional seamen; we need a large store of reserve guns; we need sufficient money for ample target practice, ample practice of every kind at sea. We should substitute for comparatively inefficient types—the old third-class battle ship *Texas*, the single-turreted monitors above mentioned, and indeed all the monitors and some of the old cruisers—efficient, modern, seagoing vessels. Seagoing torpedo-boat destroyers should be substituted for some of the smaller torpedo boats. During the present Congress there need be no additions to the aggregate number of units of the Navy. Our Navy, though very small relatively to the navies of other nations, is for the present sufficient in point of numbers for our needs, and while we must constantly strive to make its efficiency higher, there need be no additions to the total number of ships now built and building, save in the way of substitution as above outlined. I recommend the report of the Secretary of the Navy to the careful consideration of the Congress, especially with a view to the legislation therein advocated.

NATURALIZATION LAWS.

During the past year evidence has accumulated to confirm the expressions contained in my last two annual Messages as to the importance of revising by appropriate legislation our system of naturalizing aliens. I appointed last March a commission to make a careful examination of our naturalization laws, and to suggest appropriate measures to avoid the notorious abuses resulting from the improvident or unlawful granting of citizenship. This commission, composed of an officer of the Department of State, of the Department of Justice, and of the Department of Commerce and Labor, has discharged the duty imposed upon it, and has submitted a report, which will be transmitted to the Congress for its consideration, and, I hope, for its favorable action.

The distinguishing recommendations of the Commission are:

First. A Federal bureau of naturalization, to be established in the Department of Commerce and Labor, to supervise the administration of the naturalization laws and to receive returns of naturalizations pending and accomplished.

Second. Uniformity of naturalization certificates, fees to be charged, and procedure.

Third. More exacting qualifications for citizenship.

Fourth. The preliminary declaration of intention to be abolished and no alien to be naturalized until at least ninety days after the filing of his petition.

Fifth. Jurisdiction to naturalize aliens to be confined to United States district courts and to such State courts as have jurisdiction in civil actions in which the amount in controversy

is unlimited; in cities of over 100,000 inhabitants the United States district courts to have exclusive jurisdiction in the naturalization of the alien residents of such cities.

CRIMINAL LAWS.

In my last Message I asked the attention of the Congress to the urgent need of action to make our criminal law more effective; and I most earnestly request that you pay heed to the report of the Attorney-General on this subject. Centuries ago it was especially needful to throw every safeguard round the accused. The danger then was lest he should be wronged by the state. The danger is now exactly the reverse. Our laws and customs tell immensely in favor of the criminal and against the interests of the public he has wronged. Some antiquated and outworn rules which once safeguarded the threatened rights of private citizens, now merely work harm to the general body politic. The criminal law of the United States stands in urgent need of revision. The criminal process of any court of the United States should run throughout the entire territorial extent of our country. The delays of the criminal law, no less than of the civil, now amount to a very great evil.

BREACHES OF TRUST IN PUBLIC SERVICE.

There seems to be no statute of the United States which provides for the punishment of a United States attorney or other officer of the Government who corruptly agrees to wrongfully do or wrongfully refrain from doing any act when the consideration for such corrupt agreement is other than one possessing money value. This ought to be remedied by appropriate legislation. Legislation should also be enacted to cover, explicitly, unequivocally and beyond question, breach of trust in the shape of prematurely divulging official secrets by an officer or employee of the United States, and to provide a suitable penalty therefor. Such officer or employee owes the duty to the United States to guard carefully and not to divulge or in any manner use, prematurely, information which is accessible to the officer or employee by reason of his official position. Most breaches of public trust are already covered by the law, and this one should be. It is impossible, no matter how much care is used, to prevent the occasional appointment to the public service of a man who when tempted proves unfaithful; but every means should be provided to detect and every effort made to punish the wrongdoer. So far as in my power lies each and every such wrongdoer shall be relentlessly hunted down; in no instance in the past has he been spared; in no instance in the future shall he be spared. His crime is a crime against every honest man in the Nation, for it is a crime against the whole body politic. Yet in dwelling on such misdeeds, it is unjust not to add that they are altogether exceptional, and that on the whole the employees of the Government render upright and faithful service to the people. There are exceptions, notably in one or two branches of the service; but at no time in the Nation's history has the public service of the Nation taken as a whole stood on a higher plane than now, alike as regards honesty and as regards efficiency.

PUBLIC-LAND LAWS.

Once again I call your attention to the condition of the public-land laws. Recent developments have given new urgency to the need for such changes as will fit these laws to actual present conditions. The honest disposal and right use of the remaining public lands is of fundamental importance. The iniquitous methods by which the monopolizing of the public lands is being brought about under the present laws are becoming more generally known, but the existing laws do not furnish effective remedies. The recommendations of the Public Lands Commission upon this subject are wise and should be given effect.

The creation of small irrigated farms under the Reclamation Act is a powerful offset to the tendency of certain other laws to foster or permit monopoly of the land. Under that act the construction of great irrigation works has been proceeding rapidly and successfully, the lands reclaimed are eagerly taken up, and the prospect that the policy of national irrigation will accomplish all that was expected of it is bright. The act should be extended to include the State of Texas.

The Reclamation Act derives much of its value from the fact that it tends to secure the greatest possible number of homes on the land, and to create communities of freeholders, in part by settlement on public land, in part by forcing the subdivision of large private holdings before they can get water from Government irrigation works. The law requires that no right to the use of water for land in private ownership shall be sold for a tract exceeding 160 acres to any one land owner. This provision has excited active and powerful hostility, but the success of the law itself depends on the wise and firm enforcement of it. We can not afford to substitute tenants for freeholders on the public domain.

The greater part of the remaining public lands can not be irrigated. They are at present and will probably always be of greater value for grazing than for any other purpose. This fact has led to the grazing homestead of 640 acres in Nebraska and to the proposed extension of it to other States. It is argued that a family can not be supported on 160 acres of arid grazing land. This is obviously true; but neither can a family be supported on 640 acres of much of the land to which it is proposed to apply the grazing homestead. To establish universally any such arbitrary limit would be unwise at the present time. It would probably result on the one hand in enlarging the holdings of some of the great land owners, and on the other in needless suffering and failure on the part of a very considerable proportion of the bona fide settlers who give faith to the implied assurance of the Government that such an area is sufficient. The best use of the public grazing lands requires the careful examination and classification of these lands in order to give each settler land enough to support his family and no more. While this work is being done, and until the lands are settled, the Government should take control of the open range, under reasonable regulations suited to local needs, following the general policy already in successful operation on the forest reserves. It is probable that the present grazing value of the open public range is scarcely more than half what it once was or what it might easily be again under careful regulation.

The forest policy of the Administration appears to enjoy the unbroken support of the people. The great users of timber are themselves forwarding the movement for forest preservation. All organized opposition to the forest reserves in the West has disappeared. Since the consolidation of all Government forest work in the National Forest Service there has been a rapid and notable gain in the usefulness of the forest reserves to the people and in public appreciation of their value. The national parks within or adjacent to forest reserves should be transferred to the charge of the Forest Service also.

MISSISSIPPI LEVEES.

The National Government already does something in connection with the construction and maintenance of the great system of levees along the lower course of the Mississippi; in my judgment it should do much more.

MERCHANT MARINE.

To the spread of our trade in peace and the defense of our flag in war a great and prosperous merchant marine is indispensable. We should have ships of our own and seamen of our own to convey our goods to neutral markets, and in case of need to reenforce our battle line. It can not but be a source of regret and uneasiness to us that the lines of communication with our sister republics of South America should be chiefly under foreign control. It is not a good thing that American merchants and manufacturers should have to send their goods and letters to South America via Europe if they wish security and dispatch. Even on the Pacific, where our ships have held their own better than on the Atlantic, our merchant flag is now threatened through the liberal aid bestowed by other governments on their own steam lines. I ask your earnest consideration of the report with which the Merchant Marine Commission has followed its long and careful inquiry.

JAMESTOWN TERCENTENNIAL.

I again heartily commend to your favorable consideration the tercentennial celebration of the settlement at Jamestown, Virginia. Appreciating the desirability of this commemoration, the Congress passed an act, March 3, 1905, authorizing in the year 1907, on and near the waters of Hampton Roads, in the State of Virginia, an international naval, marine, and military celebration in honor of this event. By the authority vested in me by this act, I have made proclamation of said celebration, and have issued, in conformity with its instructions, invitations to all the nations of the earth to participate, by sending their naval vessels and such military organizations as may be practicable. This celebration would fail of its full purpose unless it were enduring in its results and commensurate with the importance of the event to be celebrated, the event from which our Nation dates its birth. I earnestly hope that this celebration, already indorsed by the Congress of the United States, and by the legislatures of sixteen States since the action of the Congress, will receive such additional aid at your hands as will make it worthy of the great event it is intended to celebrate, and thereby enable the Government of the United States to make provision for the exhibition of its own resources, and likewise enable our people who have undertaken the work of such a celebration to provide suitable and proper entertainment and instruction in the historic events of our country for all who may visit the exposition and to whom we have tendered our hospitality.

PENSIONS.

It is a matter of unmixed satisfaction once more to call attention to the excellent work of the Pension Bureau; for the veterans of the civil war have a greater claim upon us than any other class of our citizens. To them, first of all among our people, honor is due.

Seven years ago my lamented predecessor, President McKinley, stated that the time had come for the Nation to care for the graves of the Confederate dead. I recommend that the Congress take action towards this end. The first need is to take charge of the graves of the Confederate dead who died in Northern prisons.

IMMIGRATION.

The question of immigration is of vital interest to this country. In the year ending June 30, 1905, there came to the United States 1,026,000 alien immigrants. In other words, in the single year that has just elapsed there came to this country a greater number of people than came here during the one hundred and sixty-nine years of our colonial life which intervened between the first landing at Jamestown and the Declaration of Independence. It is clearly shown in the report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration that while much of this enormous immigration is undoubtedly healthy and natural, a considerable proportion is undesirable from one reason or another; moreover, a considerable proportion of it, probably a very large proportion, including most of the undesirable class, does not come here of its own initiative, but because of the activity of the agents of the great transportation companies. These agents are distributed throughout Europe, and by the offer of all kinds of inducements they wheedle and cajole many immigrants, often against their best interest, to come here. The most serious obstacle we have to encounter in the effort to secure a proper regulation of the immigration to these shores arises from the determined opposition of the foreign steamship lines, who have no interest whatever in the matter save to increase the returns on their capital by carrying masses of immigrants hither in the steerage quarters of their ships.

As I said in my last Message to the Congress, we can not have too much immigration of the right sort, and we should have none whatever of the wrong sort. Of course it is desirable that even the right kind of immigration should be properly distributed in this country. We need more of such immigration for the South; and special effort should be made to secure it. Perhaps it would be possible to limit the number of immigrants allowed to come in any one year to New York and other northern cities, while leaving unlimited the number allowed to come to the South; always provided, however, that a stricter effort is made to see that only immigrants of the right kind come to our country anywhere. In actual practice it has proved so difficult to enforce the immigration laws where long stretches of frontier marked by an imaginary line alone intervene between us and our neighbors that I recommend that no immigrants be allowed to come in from Canada and Mexico, save natives of the two countries themselves. As much as possible should be done to distribute the immigrants upon the land and keep them away from the congested tenement-house districts of the great cities. But distribution is a palliative, not a cure. The prime need is to keep out all immigrants who will not make good American citizens. The laws now existing for the exclusion of undesirable immigrants should be strengthened. Adequate means should be adopted, enforced by sufficient penalties, to compel steamship companies engaged in the passenger business to observe in good faith the law which forbids them to encourage or solicit immigration to the United States. Moreover, there should be a sharp limitation imposed upon all vessels coming to our ports as to the number of immigrants in ratio to the tonnage which each vessel can carry. This ratio should be high enough to insure the coming hither of as good a class of aliens as possible. Provision should be made for the surer punishment of those who induce aliens to come to this country under promise or assurance of employment. It should be made possible to inflict a sufficiently heavy penalty on any employer violating this law to deter him from taking the risk. It seems to me wise that there should be an international conference held to deal with this question of immigration, which has more than a merely national significance; such a conference could among other things enter at length into the methods for securing a thorough inspection of would-be immigrants at the ports from which they desire to embark before permitting them to embark.

In dealing with this question it is unwise to depart from the old American tradition and to discriminate for or against any man who desires to come here and become a citizen, save on the ground of that man's fitness for citizenship. It is our right and duty to consider his moral and social quality. His standard of living should be such that he will not, by pressure of competition, lower the standard of living of our own wage-workers; for it must ever be a prime object of our legislation to keep high their standard of living. If the man who seeks to come here is from the moral and social standpoint of such a character as to bid fair to add value to the community he should be heartily welcomed. We can not afford to pay heed to whether he is of one creed or another, of one nation or another. We can not afford to consider whether he is Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Gentile; whether he is Englishman or Irishman, Frenchman or German, Japanese, Italian, Scandinavian, Slav, or Magyar. What we should desire to find out is the individual quality of the individual man. In my judgment, with this end in view, we shall have to prepare through our own agents a far more rigid inspection in the countries from which the immigrants come. It will be a great deal better to have fewer immigrants, but all of the right kind, than a great number of immigrants, many of whom are necessarily of the wrong kind. As far as possible we wish to limit the immigration to this country to persons who propose to become citizens of this country, and we can well afford to insist upon adequate scrutiny of the character of those who are thus proposed for future citizenship. There should be an increase in the stringency of the laws to keep out insane, idiotic, epileptic, and pauper immigrants. But this is by no means enough. Not merely the anarchist, but every man of anarchistic tendencies, all violent and disorderly people, all people of bad character, the incompetent, the lazy, the vicious, the physically unfit, defective, or degenerate should be kept out. The stocks out of which American citizenship is to be built should be strong and healthy, sound in body, mind, and character. If it be objected that the Government agents would not always select well, the answer is that they would certainly select better than do the agents and brokers of foreign steamship companies, the people who now do whatever selection is done.

The questions arising in connection with Chinese immigration stand by themselves. The conditions in China are such that the entire Chinese coolie class, that is, the class of Chinese laborers, skilled and unskilled, legitimately come under the head of undesirable immigrants to this country, because of their numbers, the low wages for which they work, and their low standard of living. Not only is it to the interest of this country to keep them out, but the Chinese authorities do not desire that they should be admitted. At present their entrance is prohibited by laws amply adequate to accomplish this purpose. These laws have been, are being, and will be, thoroughly enforced. The violations of them are so few in number as to be infinitesimal and can be entirely disregarded. There is no serious proposal to alter the immigration law as regards the Chinese laborer, skilled or unskilled, and there is no excuse for any man feeling or affecting to feel the slightest alarm on the subject.

But in the effort to carry out the policy of excluding Chinese laborers, Chinese coolies, grave injustice and wrong have been done by this Nation to the people of China, and therefore ultimately to this Nation itself. Chinese students, business and professional men of all kinds—not only merchants, but bankers, doctors, manufacturers, professors, travelers, and the like—should be encouraged to come here and treated on precisely the same footing that we treat students, business men, travelers, and the like of other nations. Our laws and treaties should be framed, not so as to put these people in the excepted classes, but to state that we will admit all Chinese, except Chinese of the coolie class, Chinese skilled or unskilled laborers. There would not be the least danger that any such provision would result in any relaxation of the law about laborers. These will, under all conditions, be kept out absolutely. But it will be more easy to see that both justice and courtesy are shown, as they ought to be shown, to other Chinese, if the law or treaty is framed as above suggested. Examinations should be completed at the port of departure from China. For this purpose there should be provided a more adequate consular service in China than we now have. The appropriations, both for the offices of the consuls and for the office forces in the consulates, should be increased.

As a people we have talked much of the open door in China, and we expect, and quite rightly intend to insist upon, justice being shown us by the Chinese. But we can not expect to receive equity unless we do equity. We can not ask the Chinese to do to us what we are unwilling to do to them. They would have a perfect right to exclude our laboring men if our laboring men threatened to come into their country in such numbers as to jeopardize the well-being of the Chinese population; and as, mutatis mutandis, these were the conditions with which Chinese immigration actually brought this people face to face, we had and have a perfect right, which the Chinese Government in no way contests, to act as we have acted in the matter of restricting coolie immigration. That this right exists

for each country was explicitly acknowledged in the last treaty between the two countries. But we must treat the Chinese student, traveler, and business man in a spirit of the broadest justice and courtesy if we expect similar treatment to be accorded to our own people of similar rank who go to China. Much trouble has come during the past summer from the organized boycott against American goods which has been started in China. The main factor in producing this boycott has been the resentment felt by the students and business people of China, by all the Chinese leaders, against the harshness of our law toward educated Chinamen of the professional and business classes.

This Government has the friendliest feeling for China and desires China's well-being. We cordially sympathize with the announced purpose of Japan to stand for the integrity of China. Such an attitude tends to the peace of the world.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

The civil service law has been on the statute books for twenty-two years. Every President and a vast majority of heads of departments who have been in office during that period have favored a gradual extension of the merit system. The more thoroughly its principles have been understood, the greater has been the favor with which the law has been regarded by administrative officers. Any attempt to carry on the great executive departments of the Government without this law would inevitably result in chaos. The Civil Service Commissioners are doing excellent work; and their compensation is inadequate considering the service they perform.

The statement that the examinations are not practical in character is based on a misapprehension of the practice of the Commission. The departments are invariably consulted as to the requirements desired and as to the character of questions that shall be asked. General invitations are frequently sent out to all heads of departments asking whether any changes in the scope or character of examinations are required. In other words, the departments prescribe the requirements and the qualifications desired, and the Civil Service Commission cooperates with them in securing persons with these qualifications and insuring open and impartial competition. In a large number of examinations (as, for example, those for trades positions) there are no educational requirements whatever, and a person who can neither read nor write may pass with a high average. Vacancies in the service are filled with reasonable expedition and the machinery of the Commission, which reaches every part of the country, is the best agency that has yet been devised for finding people with the most suitable qualifications for the various offices to be filled. Written competitive examinations do not make an ideal method for filling positions, but they do represent an immeasurable advance upon the "spoils" method, under which outside politicians really make the appointments nominally made by the executive officers, the appointees being chosen by the politicians in question, in the great majority of cases, for reasons totally unconnected with the needs of the service or of the public.

Statistics gathered by the Census Bureau show that the tenure of office in the Government service does not differ materially from that enjoyed by employees of large business corporations. Heads of executive departments and members of the Commission have called my attention to the fact that the rule requiring a filing of charges and three days' notice before an employee could be separated from the service for inefficiency has served no good purpose whatever, because that is not a matter upon which a hearing of the employee found to be inefficient can be of any value, and in practice the rule providing for such notice and hearing has merely resulted in keeping in a certain number of incompetents, because of the reluctance of heads of departments and bureau chiefs to go through the required procedure. Experience has shown that this rule is wholly ineffective to save any man, if a superior for improper reasons wishes to remove him, and is mischievous because it sometimes serves to keep in the service incompetent men not guilty of specific wrong-doing. Having these facts in view, the rule has been amended by providing that where the inefficiency or incapacity comes within the personal knowledge of the head of a department the removal may be made without notice, the reasons therefor being filed and made a record of the department. The absolute right of removal rests where it always has rested, with the head of a department; any limitation of this absolute right results in grave injury to the public service. The change is merely one of procedure; it was much needed; and it is producing good results.

The civil service law is being energetically and impartially enforced, and in the large majority of cases complaints of violations of either the law or rules are discovered to be unfounded. In this respect, the law compares very favorably with any other Federal statute. The question of politics in the appointment and retention of the men engaged in merely ministerial work has been practically eliminated in almost the entire field of Government employment covered by the civil service law. The action of the Congress in providing the Commission with its own force instead of requiring it to rely on detailed clerks has been justified by the increased work done at a smaller cost to the Government. I urge upon the Congress a careful consideration of the recommendations contained in the annual report of the Commission.

COPYRIGHT LAWS.

Our copyright laws urgently need revision. They are imperfect in definition, confused and inconsistent in expression; they omit provision for many articles which, under modern reproductive processes, are entitled to protection; they impose hardships upon the copyright proprietor which are not essential to the fair protection of the public; they are difficult for the courts to interpret and impossible for the Copyright Office to administer with satisfaction to the public. Attempts to improve them by amendment have been frequent, no less than twelve acts for the purpose having been passed since the Revised Statutes. To perfect them by further amendment seems impracticable. A complete revision of them is essential. Such a revision, to meet modern conditions, has been found necessary in Germany, Austria, Sweden, and other foreign countries, and bills embodying it are pending in England and the Australian colonies. It has been urged here, and proposals for a commission to undertake it have, from time to time, been pressed upon the Congress. The inconveniences of the present conditions being so great, an attempt to frame appropriate legislation has been made by the Copyright Office, which has called conferences of the various interests especially and practically concerned with the operation of the copyright laws. It has secured from them suggestions as to the changes necessary; it has added from its own experience and investigations, and it has drafted a bill which embodies such of these changes and additions as, after full discussion and expert criticism, appeared to be sound and safe. In form this bill would replace the existing insufficient and inconsistent laws by one general copyright statute. It will be presented to the Congress at the coming session. It deserves prompt consideration.

ADULTERATION OF FOODS.

I recommend that a law be enacted to regulate interstate commerce in misbranded and adulterated foods, drinks, and drugs. Such law would protect legitimate manufacture and commerce, and would tend to secure the health and welfare of the consuming public. Traffic in foodstuffs which have been debased or adulterated so as to injure health or to deceive purchasers should be forbidden.

SMOKE LAW.

The law forbidding the emission of dense black or gray smoke in the city of Washington has been sustained by the courts. Something has been accomplished under it, but much remains to be done if we would preserve the Capital City from defacement by the smoke nuisance. Repeated prosecutions under the law have not had the desired effect. I recommend that it be made more stringent by increasing both the minimum and maximum fine; by providing for imprisonment in cases of repeated violation; and by affording the remedy of injunction against the continuation of the operation of plants which are persistent offenders. I recommend, also, an increase in the number of inspectors, whose duty it shall be to detect violations of the act.

NATIONAL PARKS.

I call your attention to the generous act of the State of California in conferring upon the United States Government the ownership of the Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Big Tree Grove. There should be no delay in accepting the gift, and appropriations should be made for the including thereof in the Yosemite National Park, and for the care and policing of the park. California has acted most wisely as well as with great magnanimity in the matter. There are certain mighty natural features of our land which should be preserved in perpetuity for our children and our children's children. In my judgment the Grand Canyon of the Colorado should be made into a national park. It is greatly to be wished that the State of New York should copy as regards Niagara what the State of California has done as regards the Yosemite. Nothing should be allowed to interfere with the preservation of Niagara Falls in all their beauty and majesty. If the State can not see to this then it is earnestly to be wished that she should be willing to turn it over to the National Government, which should in such case (if possible, in conjunction with the Canadian Government) assume the burden and responsibility of preserving unharmed Niagara Falls; just as it should gladly assume a similar burden and responsibility for the Yosemite National Park, and as it has

already assumed them for the Yellowstone National Park. Adequate provision should be made by the Congress for the proper care and supervision of all these national parks. The boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park should be extended to the south and east to take in such portions of the abutting forest reservation as will enable the Government to protect the elk on their winter range.

The most characteristic animal of the western plains was the great shaggy-maned wild ox, the bison, commonly known as buffalo. Small fragments of herds exist in a domesticated state here and there, a few of them in the Yellowstone Park. Such a herd as that on the Flathead Reservation should not be allowed to go out of existence. Either on some reservation or on some forest reserve like the Wichita reserve and game refuge provision should be made for the preservation of such a herd. I believe that the scheme would be of economic advantage, for the robe of the buffalo is of high market value, and the same is true of the robe of the crossbred animals.

LIFE-SAVING SERVICE.

I call your especial attention to the desirability of giving to the members of the Life-Saving Service pensions such as are given to firemen and policemen in all our great cities. The men in the Life-Saving Service continually and in the most matter of fact way do deeds such as make Americans proud of their country. They have no political influence; and they live in such remote places that the really heroic services they continually render receive the scantiest recognition from the public. It is unjust for a great nation like this to permit these men to become totally disabled or to meet death in the performance of their hazardous duty and yet to give them no sort of reward. If one of them serves thirty years of his life in such a position he should surely be entitled to retire on half pay, as a fireman or policeman does, and if he becomes totally incapacitated through accident or sickness or loses his health in the discharge of his duty he or his family should receive a pension just as any soldier should. I call your attention with especial earnestness to this matter because it appeals not only to our judgment but to our sympathy; for the people on whose behalf I ask it are comparatively few in number, render incalculable service of a particularly dangerous kind, and have no one to speak for them.

INDIANS.

During the year just past, the phase of the Indian question which has been most sharply brought to public attention is the larger legal significance of the Indian's induction into citizenship. This has made itself manifest not only in a great access of litigation in which the citizen Indian figures as a party defendant and in a more widespread disposition to levy local taxation upon his personalty, but in a decision of the United States Supreme Court which struck away the main prop on which has hitherto rested the Government's benevolent effort to protect him against the evils of intemperance. The court holds, in effect, that when an Indian becomes, by virtue of an allotment of land to him, a citizen of the State in which his land is situated, he passes from under Federal control in such matters as this, and the acts of the Congress prohibiting the sale or gift to him of intoxicants become substantially inoperative. It is gratifying to note that the States and municipalities of the West which have most at stake in the welfare of the Indians are taking up this subject and are trying to supply, in a measure at least, the abdication of its trusteeship forced upon the Federal Government. Nevertheless, I would urgently press upon the attention of the Congress the question whether some amendment of the internal-revenue laws might not be of aid in prosecuting those malefactors, known in the Indian country as "bootleggers," who are engaged at once in defrauding the United States Treasury of taxes and, what is far more important, in debauching the Indians by carrying liquors illicitly into territory still completely under Federal jurisdiction.

Among the crying present needs of the Indians are more day schools situated in the midst of their settlements, more effective instruction in the industries pursued on their own farms, and a more liberal extension of the field matron service, which means the education of the Indian women in the arts of home making. Until the mothers are well started in the right direction we can not reasonably expect much from the children who are soon to form an integral part of our American citizenship. Moreover, the excuse continually advanced by male adult Indians for refusing offers of remunerative employment at a distance from their homes is that they dare not leave their families too long out of their sight. One effectual remedy for this state of things is to employ the minds and strengthen the moral fiber of the Indian women—the end to which the work of the field matron is especially directed. I trust that the Congress will make its appropriations for Indian day schools and field matrons as generous as may consist with the other pressing demands upon its providence.

THE PHILIPPINES.

During the last year the Philippine Islands have been slowly recovering from the series of disasters which, since American occupation, have greatly reduced the amount of agricultural products below what was produced in Spanish times. The war, the rinderpest, the locusts, the drought, and the cholera have been united as causes to prevent a return of the prosperity much needed in the islands. The most serious is the destruction by the rinderpest of more than 75 per cent of the draft cattle, because it will take several years of breeding to restore the necessary number of these indispensable aids to agriculture. The Commission attempted to supply by purchase from adjoining countries the needed cattle, but the experiments made were unsuccessful. Most of the cattle imported were unable to withstand the change of climate and the rigors of the voyage and died from other diseases than rinderpest.

The income of the Philippine government has necessarily been reduced by reason of the business and agricultural depression in the islands, and the government has been obliged to exercise great economy to cut down its expenses, to reduce salaries, and in every way to avoid a deficit. It has adopted an internal-revenue law, imposing taxes on cigars, cigarettes, and distilled liquors, and abolishing the old Spanish industrial taxes. The law has not operated as smoothly as was hoped, and although its principle is undoubtedly correct, it may need amendments for the purpose of reconciling the people to its provisions. The income derived from it has partly made up for the reduction in customs revenue.

There has been a marked increase in the number of Filipinos employed in the civil service, and a corresponding decrease in the number of Americans. The government in every one of its departments has been rendered more efficient by elimination of undesirable material and the promotion of deserving public servants.

Improvements of harbors, roads, and bridges continue, although the cutting down of the revenue forbids the expenditure of any great amount from current income for these purposes. Steps are being taken, by advertisement for competitive bids, to secure the construction and maintenance of 1,000 miles of railway by private corporations under the recent enabling legislation of the Congress. The transfer of the friar lands, in accordance with the contract made some two years ago, has been completely effected, and the purchase money paid. Provision has just been made by statute for the speedy settlement in a special proceeding in the Supreme Court of controversies over the possession and title of church buildings and rectories arising between the Roman Catholic Church and schismatics claiming under ancient municipalities. Negotiations and hearings for the settlement of the amount due to the Roman Catholic Church for rent and occupation of churches and rectories by the Army of the United States are in progress, and it is hoped a satisfactory conclusion may be submitted to the Congress before the end of the session.

Tranquillity has existed during the past year throughout the Archipelago, except in the province of Cavite, the province of Batangas, and the province of Samar, and in the island of Jolo among the Moros. The Jolo disturbance was put an end to by several sharp and short engagements, and now peace prevails in the Moro province. Cavite, the mother of ladrones in the Spanish times, is so permeated with the traditional sympathy of the people for ladronism as to make it difficult to stamp out the disease. Batangas was only disturbed by reason of the fugitive ladrones from Cavite. Samar was thrown into disturbance by the uneducated and partly savage peoples living in the mountains, who, having been given by the municipal code more power than they were able to exercise discreetly, elected municipal officers who abused their trusts, compelled the people raising hemp to sell it at a much less price than it was worth, and by their abuses drove their people into resistance to constituted authority. Cavite and Samar are instances of reposing too much confidence in the self-governing power of a people. The disturbances have all now been suppressed, and it is hoped that with these lessons local governments can be formed which will secure quiet and peace to the deserving inhabitants. The incident is another proof of the fact that if there has been any error as regards giving self-government in the Philippines it has been in the direction of giving it too quickly, not too slowly. A year from next April the first legislative assembly for the islands will be held. On the sanity and self-restraint of this body much will depend so far as the future self-government of the islands is concerned.

The most encouraging feature of the whole situation has been the very great interest taken by the common people in educa-

tion and the great increase in the number of enrolled students in the public schools. The increase was from 300,000 to half a million pupils. The average attendance is about 70 per cent. The only limit upon the number of pupils seems to be the capacity of the government to furnish teachers and schoolhouses.

The agricultural conditions of the islands enforce more strongly than ever the argument in favor of reducing the tariff on the products of the Philippine Islands entering the United States. I earnestly recommend that the tariff now imposed by the Dingley bill upon the products of the Philippine Islands be entirely removed, except the tariff on sugar and tobacco, and that that tariff be reduced to 25 per cent of the present rates under the Dingley Act; that after July 1, 1909, the tariff upon tobacco and sugar produced in the Philippine Islands be entirely removed, and that free trade between the islands and the United States in the products of each country then be provided for by law.

A statute in force, enacted April 15, 1904, suspends the operation of the coastwise laws of the United States upon the trade between the Philippine Islands and the United States until July 1, 1906. I earnestly recommend that this suspension be postponed until July 1, 1909. I think it of doubtful utility to apply the coastwise laws to the trade between the United States and the Philippines under any circumstances, because I am convinced that it will do no good whatever to American bottoms, and will only interfere and be an obstacle to the trade between the Philippines and the United States; but if the coastwise law must be thus applied, certainly it ought not to have effect until free trade is enjoyed between the people of the United States and the people of the Philippine Islands in their respective products.

I do not anticipate that free trade between the islands and the United States will produce a revolution in the sugar and tobacco production of the Philippine Islands. So primitive are the methods of agriculture in the Philippine Islands, so slow is capital in going to the islands, so many difficulties surround a large agricultural enterprise in the islands, that it will be many, many years before the products of those islands will have any effect whatever upon the markets of the United States. The problem of labor is also a formidable one with the sugar and tobacco producers in the islands. The best friends of the Filipino people and the people themselves are utterly opposed to the admission of Chinese coolie labor. Hence the only solution is the training of Filipino labor, and this will take a long time. The enactment of a law by the Congress of the United States making provision for free trade between the islands and the United States, however, will be of great importance from a political and sentimental standpoint; and while its actual benefit has doubtless been exaggerated by the people of the islands, they will accept this measure of justice as an indication that the people of the United States are anxious to aid the people of the Philippine Islands in every way, and especially in the agricultural development of their Archipelago. It will aid the Filipinos without injuring interests in America.

HAWAII.

In my judgment immediate steps should be taken for the fortification of Hawaii. This is the most important point in the Pacific to fortify in order to conserve the interests of this country. It would be hard to overstate the importance of this need. Hawaii is too heavily taxed. Laws should be enacted setting aside for a period of, say, twenty years 75 per cent of the internal revenue and customs receipts from Hawaii as a special fund to be expended in the islands for educational and public buildings, and for harbor improvements and military and naval defenses. It can not be too often repeated that our aim must be to develop the Territory of Hawaii on traditional American lines. That Territory has serious commercial and industrial problems to reckon with; but no measure of relief can be considered which looks to legislation admitting Chinese and restricting them by statute to field labor and domestic service. The status of servility can never again be tolerated on American soil. We can not concede that the proper solution of its problems is special legislation admitting to Hawaii a class of laborers denied admission to the other States and Territories. There are obstacles, and great obstacles, in the way of building up a representative American community in the Hawaiian Islands; but it is not in the American character to give up in the face of difficulty. Many an American Commonwealth has been built up against odds equal to those that now confront Hawaii.

No merely half-hearted effort to meet its problems as other American communities have met theirs can be accepted as final. Hawaii shall never become a Territory in which a governing class of rich planters exists by means of coolie labor. Even if the rate of growth of the Territory is thereby rendered slower, the growth must only take place by the admission of immigrants fit in the end to assume the duties and burdens of full American citizenship. Our aim must be to develop the Territory on the same basis of stable citizenship as exists on this continent.

PORTO RICO.

I earnestly advocate the adoption of legislation which will explicitly confer American citizenship on all citizens of Porto Rico. There is, in my judgment, no excuse for failure to do this. The harbor of San Juan should be dredged and improved. The expenses of the Federal court of Porto Rico should be met from the Federal Treasury, and not from the Porto Rican treasury. The elections in Porto Rico should take place every four years, and the legislature should meet in session every two years. The present form of government in Porto Rico, which provides for the appointment by the President of the members of the executive council or upper house of the legislature, has proved satisfactory and has inspired confidence in property owners and investors. I do not deem it advisable at the present time to change this form in any material feature. The problems and needs of the island are industrial and commercial rather than political.

INSULAR AFFAIRS IN GENERAL.

I wish also to call the attention of the Congress to one question which affects our insular possessions generally; namely, the need of an increased liberality in the treatment of the whole franchise question in these islands. In the proper desire to prevent the islands being exploited by speculators and to have them develop in the interest of their own people an error has been made in refusing to grant sufficiently liberal terms to induce the investment of American capital in the Philippines and in Porto Rico. Elsewhere in this Message I have spoken strongly against the jealousy of mere wealth, and especially of corporate wealth as such. But it is particularly regrettable to allow any such jealousy to be developed when we are dealing either with our insular or with foreign affairs. The big corporation has achieved its present position in the business world simply because it is the most effective instrument in business competition. In foreign affairs we can not afford to put our people at a disadvantage with their competitors by in any way discriminating against the efficiency of our business organizations. In the same way we can not afford to allow our insular possessions to lag behind in industrial development from any twisted jealousy of business success. It is, of course, a mere truism to say that the business interests of the islands will only be developed if it becomes the financial interest of somebody to develop them. Yet this development is one of the things most earnestly to be wished for in the interest of the islands themselves. We have been paying all possible heed to the political and educational interests of the islands, but, important though these objects are, it is not less important that we should favor their industrial development. The Government can in certain ways help this directly, as by building good roads; but the fundamental and vital help must be given through the development of the industries of the islands, and a most efficient means to this end is to encourage big American corporations to start industries in them, and this means to make it advantageous for them to do so. To limit the ownership of mining claims as has been done in the Philippines is absurd. In both the Philippines and Porto Rico the limit of holdings of land should be largely raised.

ALASKA.

I earnestly ask that Alaska be given an elective Delegate. Some person should be chosen who can speak with authority of the needs of the Territory. The Government should aid in the construction of a railroad from the Gulf of Alaska to the Yukon River, in American territory. In my last two Messages I advocated certain additional action on behalf of Alaska. I shall not now repeat those recommendations, but I shall lay all my stress upon the one recommendation of giving to Alaska some one authorized to speak for it. I should prefer that the Delegate was made elective, but if this is not deemed wise then make him appointive. At any rate, give Alaska some person whose business it shall be to speak with authortiy on her behalf to the Congress. The natural resources of Alaska are great. Some of the chief needs of the peculiarly energetic, self-reliant, and typically American white population of Alaska were set forth in my last Message. I also earnestly ask your attention to the needs of the Alaskan Indians. All Indians who are competent should receive the full rights of American citizenship. It is, for instance, a gross and indefensible wrong to deny to such hard-working, decent-living Indians as the Metlakahtlas the right to obtain licenses as captains, pilots, and engineers, the right to enter mining claims, and to profit by the homestead law. These particular Indians are civilized, and are competent

and entitled to be put on the same basis with the white men round about them.

ADMISSION TO STATEHOOD.

I recommend that Indian Territory and Oklahoma be admitted as one State and that New Mexico and Arizona be admitted as one State. There is no obligation upon us to treat territorial subdivisions, which are matters of convenience only, as binding us on the question of admission to statehood. Nothing has taken up more time in the Congress during the past few years than the question as to the statehood to be granted to the four Territories above mentioned, and after careful consideration of all that has been developed in the discussions of the question I recommend that they be immediately admitted as two States. There is no justification for further delay; and the advisability of making the four Territories into two States has been clearly established.

In some of the Territories the legislative assemblies issue licenses for gambling. The Congress should by law forbid this practice, the harmful results of which are obvious at a glance.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

The treaty between the United States and the Republic of Panama, under which the construction of the Panama Canal was made possible, went into effect with its ratification by the United States Senate on February 23, 1904. The canal properties of the French Canal Company were transferred to the United States on April 23, 1904, on payment of $40,000,000 to that company. On April 1, 1905, the Commission was reorganized, and it now consists of Theodore P. Shonts, chairman, Charles E. Magoon, Benjamin M. Harrod, Rear-Admiral Mordecai T. Endicott, Brig. Gen. Peter C. Hains, and Col. Oswald H. Ernst. John F. Stevens was appointed chief engineer on July 1 last. Active work in canal construction, mainly preparatory, has been in progress for less than a year and a half. During that period two points about the canal have ceased to be open to debate. First, the question of route; the canal will be built on the Isthmus of Panama. Second, the question of feasibility; there are no physical obstacles on this route that American engineering skill will not be able to overcome without serious difficulty, or that will prevent the completion of the canal within a reasonable time and at a reasonable cost. This is virtually the unanimous testimony of the engineers who have investigated the matter for the Government.

The point which remains unsettled is the question of type, whether the canal shall be one of several locks above sea level, or at sea level with a single tide lock. On this point I hope to lay before the Congress at an early day the findings of the Advisory Board of American and European Engineers, that at my invitation have been considering the subject, together with the report of the Commission thereon; and such comments thereon or recommendations in reference thereto as may seem necessary.

The American people is pledged to the speediest possible construction of a canal adequate to meet the demands which the commerce of the world will make upon it, and I appeal most earnestly to the Congress to aid in the fulfillment of the pledge. Gratifying progress has been made during the past year and especially during the past four months. The greater part of the necessary preliminary work has been done. Actual work of excavation could be begun only on a limited scale till the Canal Zone was made a healthful place to live in and to work in. The Isthmus had to be sanitated first. This task has been so thoroughly accomplished that yellow fever has been virtually extirpated from the Isthmus and general health conditions vastly improved. The same methods which converted the island of Cuba from a pest hole, which menaced the health of the world, into a healthful place of abode, have been applied on the Isthmus with satisfactory results. There is no reason to doubt that when the plans for water supply, paving, and sewerage of Panama and Colon and the large labor camps have been fully carried out, the Isthmus will be, for the Tropics, an unusually healthy place of abode. The work is so far advanced now that the health of all those employed in canal work is as well guarded as it is on similar work in this country and elsewhere.

In addition to sanitating the Isthmus, satisfactory quarters are being provided for employees and an adequate system of supplying them with wholesome food at reasonable prices has been created. Hospitals have been established and equipped that are without superiors of their kind anywhere. The country has thus been made fit to work in, and provision has been made for the welfare and comfort of those who are to do the work. During the past year a large portion of the plant with which the work is to be done has been ordered. It is confidently believed that by the middle of the approaching year a sufficient proportion of this plant will have been installed to enable us to resume the work of excavation on a large scale.

What is needed now and without delay is an appropriation by the Congress to meet the current and accruing expenses of the Commission. The first appropriation of $10,000,000, out of the $135,000,000 authorized by the Spooner Act, was made three years ago. It is nearly exhausted. There is barely enough of it remaining to carry the Commission to the end of the year. Unless the Congress shall appropriate before that time all work must cease. To arrest progress for any length of time now, when matters are advancing so satisfactorily, would be deplorable. There will be no money with which to meet pay-roll obligations and none with which to meet bills coming due for materials and supplies; and there will be demoralization of the forces, here and on the Isthmus, now working so harmoniously and effectively, if there is delay in granting an emergency appropriation. Estimates of the amount necessary will be found in the accompanying reports of the Secretary of War and the Commission.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I recommend more adequate provision than has been made heretofore for the work of the Department of State. Within a few years there has been a very great increase in the amount and importance of the work to be done by that Department, both in Washington and abroad. This has been caused by the great increase of our foreign trade, the increase of wealth among our people, which enables them to travel more generally than heretofore, the increase of American capital which is seeking investment in foreign countries, and the growth of our power and weight in the councils of the civilized world. There has been no corresponding increase of facilities for doing the work afforded to the Department having charge of our foreign relations.

Neither at home nor abroad is there a sufficient working force to do the business properly. In many respects the system which was adequate to the work of twenty-five, or even ten, years ago, is inadequate now, and should be changed. Our consular force should be classified, and appointments should be made to the several classes, with authority to the Executive to assign the members of each class to duty at such posts as the interests of the service require, instead of the appointments being made as at present to specified posts. There should be an adequate inspection service, so that the Department may be able to inform itself how the business of each consulate is being done, instead of depending upon casual private information or rumor. The fee system should be entirely abolished, and a due equivalent made in salary to the officers who now eke out their subsistence by means of fees. Sufficient provision should be made for a clerical force in every consulate, composed entirely of Americans, instead of the insufficient provision now made, which compels the employment of great numbers of citizens of foreign countries whose services can be obtained for less money. At a large part of our consulates the office quarters and the clerical force are inadequate to the performance of the onerous duties imposed by the recent provisions of our immigration laws as well as by our increasing trade. In many parts of the world the lack of suitable quarters for our embassies, legations, and consulates detracts from the respect in which our officers ought to be held, and seriously impairs their weight and influence.

Suitable provision should be made for the expense of keeping our diplomatic officers more fully informed of what is being done from day to day in the progress of our diplomatic affairs with other countries. The lack of such information, caused by insufficient appropriations available for cable tolls and for clerical and messenger service, frequently puts our officers at a great disadvantage and detracts from their usefulness. The salary list should be readjusted. It does not now correspond either to the importance of the service to be rendered and the degrees of ability and experience required in the different positions, or to the differences in the cost of living. In many cases the salaries are quite inadequate.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 5, 1905.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the message of the President will lie upon the table, and, together with the accompanying documents, will be printed.

DELAWARE RIVER AND BAY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for action by the Congress thereon, a certified copy of an act passed by the general assembly of the State of Delaware, entitled "An act to ratify and confirm a compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and Delaware respecting the Dela-

ware River and Bay and to authorize the execution thereof," which was submitted to me by Hon. Preston Lea, governor of the State of Delaware, in pursuance of the mandate of the law.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1905.*

CERTAIN SETTLERS ON NORTHERN PACIFIC LAND GRANT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, a draft of a bill for the relief of certain entrymen and settlers within the limits of the Northern Pacific land grant, together with a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, setting forth the reasons for the desired action.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1905.*

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON NATURALIZATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, the report of the Commission on Naturalization, appointed by Executive order of March 1, 1905.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1905.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, the Twenty-second Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1905.*

REPORT OF BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Third Report of the United States Board on Geographic Names, constituted by Executive order of September 4, 1890.

The attention of the Congress is invited to the recommendations of the Board that, in addition to the number of copies of the report printed for the use of the Congress, 2,500 copies be printed for the use of the Board, and that an annual appropriation of $2,500 be asked to enable the Board to conduct the necessary correspondence, make investigations of questions submitted, and prepare, print, and promptly distribute the decisions made by the Board.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1905.*

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BENJAMIN F. MARSH.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to submit to the Senate the action of the House relative to the death of Hon. BENJAMIN F. MARSH, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions indicated by the Senator from Illinois, which will be read.

The resolutions were read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVS,
December 4, 1905.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. BENJAMIN F. MARSH, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be directed to transmit this resolution to the Senate, and a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President, I submit resolutions and ask for their present consideration.

The resolutions were read; and by unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to their consideration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. BENJAMIN F. MARSH, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Illinois.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and in accordance with the second resolution (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 6, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 5, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. Humphreys of Mississippi and Mr. Claude Kitchin appeared at the bar of the House and qualified by taking the oath of office prescribed by law.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed by the House to wait upon the President of the United States in conjunction with a similar committee on the part of the Senate, to advise him that a quorum of the House is present and that Congress is ready to receive any message that he may have to communicate, has performed that duty, and the President has requested us to say that he will communicate with the Congress in writing in the very near future.

RECESS.

At 12 o'clock and 12 minutes, on motion of Mr. PAYNE, the House took a recess for ten minutes.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

ANNUAL MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the annual message from the President of the United States.

[For message see Senate proceedings, page 91.]

REFERENCE OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the President's message and accompanying documents be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

SWEARING IN A MEMBER.

Mr. Hardwick, a Representative from the State of Georgia, appeared at the bar and took the oath of office.

RESOLUTIONS EXPRESSIVE OF SYMPATHY WITH THE SUFFERERS BY THE MASSACRES IN RUSSIA.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of this House that the resolutions I have introduced, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs when appointed, and which I trust I will have the opportunity to speak to at some later day, may be now read by the Clerk and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the resolutions shall be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and also printed in the RECORD.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, without knowing the nature of the resolutions, I do not like to establish such a precedent as this, where the gentleman asks simply that the resolutions be read. It is out of the ordinary and against the rules of the House. I do not know anything about the nature of the resolutions. If the gentleman will state in substance the nature of his resolutions, perhaps we can get along with it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I think after I have stated it the gentleman from New York will withdraw any objection he might otherwise make. The resolutions express the sympathy of the American people with the sufferers from the massacres in Russia.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection this once.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolutions expressive of the sentiments of the American people respecting the recent massacres in Russia and extending their sympathy and requesting the President of the United States to use his good and friendly offices, etc.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States of America, That the Members of this House learned with profound sorrow and feeling akin to horror of the persecution and massacres of the Jews in Russia. The American people, ever animated by the spirit of justice and humanity, and strongly imbued with the recognition of the brotherhood of man, which is the crowning glory of our civilization, stand aghast at the base intolerance of brutalized men who, without provocation, have, in this age of enlightenment, committed unspeakable atrocities and crimes against life and property that outrage every human feeling, evoke our condemnation, and shame the civilization of the world. The American people have been deeply stirred with pity for

the unfortunate sufferers who have been plunged into a grief that beggars description, and tender them the expressions of their heartfelt sympathy.

Be it further resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby respectfully requested, if he finds it not incompatible with the public interests, to use such good and friendly offices with the Russian Government as the traditional and unbroken friendship between the two sections may justify, as may secure action by the Russian Government as may tend to prevent the recurrence of such outrages in the future.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the same may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 480 may be made the special order for to-morrow after the reading of the Journal, and that it may continue as such until disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 480 and that the same shall be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriations for Isthmian Canal construction, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall be subject to the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled "An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900, the same as though said bonds were issued under the provisions of said act of March 14, 1900.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $16,500,000 to continue the construction of the Isthmian Canal, to be expended under the direction of the President in accordance with the said act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, approved June 28, 1902, and for each and every purpose connected with the same, the said sum to continue available until expended: *Provided*, That all expenditures from the appropriation herein made shall be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds authorized in section 8 of the said act approved June 28, 1902.

SEC. 3. That a detailed statement of the expenditures from this and subsequent appropriations for the construction of the Isthmian Canal shall be made annually to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of my colleague——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, am I recognized?

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. To the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. It is a question of unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and announcing I would object now, I want to make a request of the gentleman from Iowa. It is that he permit his request for unanimous consent to go over until to-morrow. I have not had time to scrutinize the bill, and if the request were pushed now I should undoubtedly object. Perhaps after scrutinizing it I may not, but I would request him to permit the request for unanimous consent to go over until to-morrow, until we have time to consider the matter.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Mississippi I modified the request that it was my purpose to make. I did intend to ask that the bill might now come up for consideration, but the gentleman having suggested that he desired to see the bill, I thought that I was complying with the substance of his request by asking that it be considered to-morrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; the gentleman from Iowa, if he will excuse me, must have misunderstood me. The request I made of him was to permit his request for unanimous consent to go over. Without further information, I am not certain whether I would or would not object. I know I will object now and I am inclined to think I might object to-morrow, but I want time to consider it. Perhaps I may not object, and if I do not it would facilitate the public business.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, with the statement so positively made that the gentleman would object now, I do not see that there is any alternative for me except to postpone my request until to-morrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And to-morrow, when the gentleman prefers the request again, I will consider it on its merits.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama rose.

Mr. HEPBURN. In the meantime, in order that the bill may have——

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] allow me a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will the gentleman state whether or not the bill has been printed as yet?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I sent a few moments ago to get a copy of it, and I could not. It is a matter of very great importance, and we ought to have time to look into it. It has not been in the hands of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, because that committee has not been appointed as yet.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] whether it is his intention to ask unanimous consent to have the data printed also.

Mr. HEPBURN. I was about to say when I yielded to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON], that I have a statement of the expenditures under the appropriation heretofore made, up to the 13th of September of this year. And I have also a statement of the estimates that are involved, in the sum of $16,500,000, covered by this sum which it is proposed to be appropriated.

Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill and these two papers be printed in the RECORD, so that the gentlemen can have them before them in the morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] asks unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, together with the two statements of the expenditures that have been made and the estimates that are thought to be essential. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest also that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] ask that those estimates be printed in the usual pamphlet form, for convenience, as well as in the RECORD.

Mr. HEPBURN. I will ask that also.

The SPEAKER. To be printed as a document?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is reminded that it would be printed as a document anyway.

Mr. PAYNE. If they are addressed to the Speaker of the House, they would be. And, if that is so, I will withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. WILIAMS. It ought to be printed in the RECORD anyhow.

Mr. PAYNE. I will withdraw the suggestion, on the statement of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request that it be printed in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

The reports are as follows:

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

Summary of expenditures in all departments to September 30, 1905.

	To June 30, 1905.	July 1 to Sept. 30, 1905.	Total.
General expenses:			
Isthmian Canal Commission	$137,714.57	$47,542.41	$185,256.98
Office committee on engineering	5,783.67	3,535.48	9,319.15
Special commissioners	14,329.02	3,936.88	18,265.90
Department of administration:			
Office of administration	67,961.72	34,051.04	102,012.76
General auditor, Washington office	19,406.21	10,734.00	30,140.21
General auditor, Isthmus office	5,331.33	14,619.45	19,950.78
Disbursing officer, Washington office	8,714.28	2,567.14	11,281.42
Disbursing officer, Isthmus office	18,405.37	14,419.91	32,826.28
The land department	5,100.60	4,026.76	9,127.36
Department of government and sanitation:			
Executive office	29,223.05	23,148.84	52,371.89
Zone treasurer	665.00	25.00	690.00
Administration of justice	13,501.30	9,385.05	22,886.35
Collector of revenues	23,916.30	7,676.77	31,593.07
Sanitation	208,641.05	174,754.40	383,395.45
Hospitals and asylums	169,852.86	64,678.69	234,531.55
Construction of waterworks, sewers, and roads—			
Zone highway improvements	9,277.50	18,022.81	27,300.31
Street improvements, Panama	606.72	5,266.68	5,873.40
Construction of waterworks and sewers	186,154.16	135,673.61	321,827.77
Police and prisons	67,594.12	23,040.20	90,634.32
Department of construction and engineering:			
Office of chief engineer	182,485.22	27,234.48	209,719.70
Manager of labor and quarters and corrals	14,358.68	49,068.19	63,426.87
Bureau of waterworks, sewers, and roads	10,198.97	951.10	11,150.07
Bureau of telegraphs, telephones, and electric lights	2,348.28		2,348.28
Bureau of meteorology and river hydraulics	342.33	3,672.67	4,015.00
Canal construction	694,292.33	315,812.29	1,010,104.62
Machine-shop expenses	252,514.41	215,568.55	468,082.96

Summary of expenditures in all departments to September 30, 1905—Cont'd.

	To June 30, 1905.	July 1 to Sept. 10, 1905.	Total.
Purchase of Panama Railroad stock	$155,657.49		$155,657.49
Purchase of steamers Havana and Mexico		$1,300,000.00	1,300,000.00
Construction and repairs of buildings	311,836.75	285,343.51	597,180.26
Purchase of La Boca shops	8,425.79		8,425.79
Purchase of land and buildings	46,290.00		46,290.00
Material and supplies purchased	1,087,726.64	1,003,532.08	2,091,258.72
Cost of purchase, handling, and transportation of material and supplies—			
General purchasing officer, Washington	17,470.85	22,419.72	39,890.57
Assistant purchasing agent—			
New York	4,931.48	4,153.28	9,084.76
New Orleans	695.35	822.92	1,518.27
Tacoma		1,020.88	1,020.88
San Francisco		166.66	166.66
Division of material and supplies, Isthmus	206,750.71	135,630.36	342,381.07
Freight, advertising, etc.	21,038.65	123,046.58	144,085.23
Total	4,009,543.76	4,085,548.39	8,095,092.15

Estimated expenditures for October and November, 1905.

	October.	November.	Total.
At Washington:			
Salaries and wages	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	$60,000.00
Material and supplies	330,000.00	229,000.00	559,000.00
Miscellaneous items	40,000.00	23,000.00	63,000.00
On the Isthmus:			
Salaries and wages	530,000.00	550,000.00	1,080,000.00
Material and supplies	55,000.00	37,000.00	92,000.00
Miscellaneous items	20,000.00	18,000.00	38,000.00
Total, October and November	1,005,000.00	887,000.00	1,892,000.00

Total, entire period to December 1, 1905 ..... $9,987,092.15
Unpaid audited accounts, material and supplies charged to expenditures 250,000.00
Estimated amount of cash on hand December 1, 1905 ..... 300,000.00

E. S. BENSON, *General Auditor.*

DECEMBER 2, 1905.

ISTHMIAN CANAL AFFAIRS,
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION.
PANAMA CANAL BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., December 1, 1905.

Detailed statement of amounts composing the appropriation of $16,500,000 asked for, being estimated expenditures for the period from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906.

1. Estimated liabilities to December 1, 1905, covering material ordered and in transit		$4,000,000
Fuel	$185,000	
Explosives	45,920	
Household and office furnishings	165,773	
Lumber and lumber products	957,061	
Machinery	455,679	
Plumbing supplies	347,430	
Railway equipment, including repair parts	511,970	
Roofing and paving material	417,936	
Medical and sanitary supplies	229,452	
Steam shovels, dredges, and drills	157,183	
Water and sewer pipes	223,084	
Miscellaneous supplies	303,539	
	4,000,000	
2. Equipment purchased or contracted for delivery not later than June 30, 1906		3,350,000
1,100 steel flat cars	$1,071,100	
120 locomotives	1,367,000	
43 steam shovels	493,600	
18 unloading machines (plows, etc.)	151,794	
3 water tanks and towers	36,050	
3 earth spreaders	23,382	
2 dipper dredges	205,000	
Miscellaneous	2,074	
	3,350,000	
3. Estimated miscellaneous material purchases in United States from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906		2,300,000
4. Estimated miscellaneous material purchases on the Isthmus and miscellaneous expenditures from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, consisting of hotel and hospital and other supplies, transportation of laborers from West Indies, etc		800,000
5. Estimated amount due the Panama Railroad Company December 1, 1905, for material and services, covering fuel and other supplies, work done, constructing sidings and second main track, installment of telegraph and telephone lines, constructing new docks and wharves, etc		500,000
6. Estimated amount due the Panama Railroad Company December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, for material and services, including the construction of the second main track		500,000
7. Estimated Isthmus pay rolls from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, based on estimated pay roll for November, with increase of 25 per cent from January 1, 1906, on gold rolls and 50 per cent on silver rolls		4,875,000
8. Salaries, incidental expenses, rent, etc., in the United States from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, covering Washington office, including Commissioners, offices of assistant purchasing agents at New York New Orleans, and Tacoma; cable and telegraph service, estimated at $25,000 per month		$175,000
Estimated requirements for the balance of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906		16,500,000

E. S. BENSON, *General Auditor.*

REPRESENTATIVE ANTHONY MICHALEK.

Mr. RAINEY rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege affecting this House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I have here a protest which I have just received, numerously signed by the citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Illinois, protesting against being represented here in this body by ANTHONY MICHALEK, whom they allege is an alien. The petition is accompanied by affidavits, which certainly make at least a strong prima facie case.

I desire to present this petition now, and to accompany it with a resolution asking that the Speaker appoint a special committee of five to immediately investigate the claim made by these citizens of that district. I ask that the petition also be read. It is not a long one.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the petition and resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the honorable the House of Representatives of the Fifty-ninth Congress of the United States of America:

The undersigned citizens and legal voters of the Fifth Congressional district of Illinois respectfully represent unto your honorable body that at the last Congressional election held in said district one ANTHONY MICHALEK was elected as a Member of the Fifty-ninth Congress; that since said election it has come to the notice of the undersigned that said ANTHONY MICHALEK was not at the time he was elected nor is he now a citizen of the United States.

Wherefore we protest against being represented in your honorable body by one who has not deemed it worth while to become a citizen of the United States, and respectfully petition your honorable body to cause an investigation to be made, and if it is found that said MICHALEK is not a citizen of the United States to take such action in the premises as to your honorable body shall seem fit and proper.

And in support of this petition we herewith submit the affidavits of Julius M. Kahn, Enoch P. Morgan, and Joseph Pejsar, which affidavits are made part of this petition, and we offer to produce other and additional testimony on any hearing ordered by your honorable body.

And we will every pray.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, *County of Cook, ss:*

Julius M. Kahn, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that he is an attorney at law, and resides at 729 East Fiftieth place, in the city of Chicago; that he is a native-born citizen of the United States, and that he is thoroughly familiar with the records of the courts of Cook County, in the State of Illinois, and a competent person to examine the records of the courts; that in said county there are four courts which have the power to naturalize citizens, namely: The circuit court, superior court, county court, and criminal court, and no other court in said Cook County has such power, and that no other court had such power for more than thirty years last past; that he has carefully examined the records of each and every one of said four courts for the purpose of ascertaining whether one Vaclav Michalek ever became a citizen of the United States; that he carefully examined the records beginning with the year 1879 and ending with the year 1890, both inclusive, and that there is no record in any of said courts showing that one Vaclav Michalek became a naturalized citizen during said period of time, and that during all of said period of time no one by the name of Michalek became a citizen in said Cook County, except one Michael Michalek, who became a citizen on March 26, 1888, by naturalization and judgment of the superior court of Cook County; that said Michael Michalek, as appears from said records, was a native of Germany, and not a native of Bohemia, Austria, and that he took the oath renouncing allegiance to the Emperor of Germany.

And this affiant says that after a thorough investigation of the records he finds that Vaclav Michalek was never naturalized in the County of Cook during said period of time.

Affiant further says that under the election laws of the State of Illinois each voter must register and answer under oath certain questions in regard to his qualifications as a voter, and that the record of each voter's answers is kept; that this affiant examined the records so kept in the election commissioners' office in the city of Chicago, County of Cook, and State of Illinois, and finds that ANTHONY MICHALEK, Congressman-elect from the Fifth Illinois district, registered in the Eighth precinct of the Eleventh Ward in said city in the year 1905, and that his sworn answers to questions propounded were that he, ANTHONY MICHALEK, was born in Bohemia, and that he became a citizen of the United States by act of Congress.

And further affiant saith not.

JULIUS M. KAHN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of November, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] EDW. R. NEWMANN, *Notary Public.*

STATE OF ILLINOIS, *County of Cook, ss:*

Josef Pejsar, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that he is and for about thirty-five years last past has been a citizen of the United States; that he has resided in the city of Chicago for about thirty-nine years last past; that he is a householder and resides and has resided for more than ten years last past at No. 3437 Lowe avenue, in the city of Chicago; that he is acquainted with ANTHONY MICHALEK, Congressman-elect from the Fifth Congressional district; that the name of the father of said Congressman-elect was Vaclav

Michalek; that said Vaclav Michalek was by occupation a brewer; that this affiant was also by occupation a brewer; that both of them were natives of Bohemia, Austria, and that both of them were employed by the Seipp Brewing Company, in the city of Chicago, and that this affiant was well acquainted with said Vaclav Michalek, father of said Congressman-elect; that said Vaclav Michalek arrived in this country in 1879 as an immigrant from Bohemia, and brought said ANTHONY MICHALEK, his son, with him; that he came direct to Chicago, and remained here until the time of his death; that he died in the year 1883, and that he had not been fully five years in this country at the time of his death, and that at the time of his death the said Vaclav Michalek was at least 40 years of age; and that the said Vaclav Michalek had never been in the United States prior to the year 1879. That at an election held in the city of Chicago a few months preceding the death of said Vaclav Michalek this affiant had a conversation with said Vaclav Michalek in the Bohemian language, in which conversation this affiant desired said Michalek to become interested in the coming election, and asked him to become a citizen of the United States, and make application for his first papers, but that said Vaclav Michalek answered that elections could get along without him, and that he was not and did not care to become a citizen of the United States for some time to come.

And further affiant saith not.

JOSEF PEJSAR.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of November, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] ALFAR M. EBERHARDT,
Notary Public.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, *County of Cook, ss:*

Matous Sedlacek, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that he is by occupation a brewer; that he is a citizen of the United States and resides at 630 West Eighteenth street, in the city of Chicago, Cook County, Ill., and that he has been a resident of the city of Chicago for a period of not less than thirty-four years; that he was born in Bohemia, and speaks the Bohemian language.

Affiant further says that he became acquainted with one Vaclav Michalek about the time and during the same year that said Vaclav Michalek arrived in this country as an immigrant from Bohemia; that said Vaclav Michalek came here with his family, and was the father of ANTHONY MICHALEK, Congressman-elect from the Fifth Illinois district; that said Vaclav Michalek worked during his lifetime at Seipp Brewing Company and at Hauck's malt house; that for a period of about three years the said Vaclav Michalek and this affiant worked together and often conversed with each other in the Bohemian language.

Affiant further says that he well remembers the time of the death of said Vaclav Michalek, and that between the time of the arrival of said Vaclav Michalek as an immigrant in this country and the time of his death less than five (5) years elapsed.

And further affiant saith not.

MATOUS SEDLACEK.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of November, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] ALFAR M. EBERHARDT,
Notary Public.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, *County of Cook, ss:*

Enoch P. Morgan, being first duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that he resides at 495 South Hermitage avenue, in the city of Chicago, Ill.; that he is, and for the past seventeen years has been, a citizen of the United States, and for more than thirteen years last past has been a resident of the city of Chicago; that he is a resident of the Fifth Congressional district and is well acquainted with ANTHONY MICHALEK, Congressman-elect from said district; that during the last Presidential campaign this affiant was one of the Republican campaign speakers in the employ of the national committee; that said ANTHONY MICHALEK informed this affiant that he, MICHALEK, was born in Bohemia, and that his father emigrated to this country and brought said ANTHONY with him when said ANTHONY was a boy of tender years; that he, said ANTHONY MICHALEK, was not a citizen of the United States; that the said conversation took place at the time when said ANTHONY MICHALEK was a candidate for Congress at the last national election; that this affiant advised him that it was his duty to at once apply to become a citizen of the United States, and told him that he could obtain his papers easily, because he came to this country when he was under the age of 18 years, and that this affiant informed him that he should not under any circumstances omit to perform that duty at once or that he would surely get himself in trouble if he voted without being a citizen; that said ANTHONY MICHALEK replied that nobody would know anyway, and that it would not make any difference; that one of his relations, who was also not a citizen, had held office, and that he saw no reason why he could not hold office without going to the trouble of taking out his papers, and that nobody would know the difference.

And further affiant saith not.

ENOCH P. MORGAN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of November, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] JULIUS M. KAHN,
Notary Public.

Resolved, That the protest of citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Illinois against being represented in Congress by ANTHONY MICHALEK, declared by them to be an alien, be referred to a special committee of five Members of this House, to be appointed by the Speaker, for immediate investigation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out so much of the resolution as provides for the appointment of a special committee, and that the document be referred by the Speaker to the appropriate committee of this House when appointed.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman his motion in writing, or will he indicate it to the Clerk?

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out of the resolution the words "a special committee of five members of this House, to be appointed by the Speaker, for immediate investigation" and insert "be referred by the Speaker to the appropriate committee of this House when appointed."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, what committee would the gentleman from Illinois consider the appropriate committee, under the peculiar circumstances?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the precedents in all these questions are to the effect that matters of this sort have been referred to the Committee on Elections. The Committee on Elections, of course, as now constituted, is in three branches. No such case as this, except the Roberts case, where a special committee was appointed, has come up since the Committee on Elections was divided into three branches, and my proposition is to leave that to the Speaker.

Mr. PAYNE. I would suggest further to the gentleman from Illinois that in the Roberts case the protest was made before the Member had been sworn in. I understand this gentleman has been sworn in as one of the Members of the House. The protest in the Roberts case was made at the time he presented himself to take the oath.

Mr. MANN. The ground of protest is entirely different, and at any rate it is entirely within the province of the House to refer this matter to a special committee, to a particular committee, or to a committee to be selected by the Speaker. It is wholly a matter for the House to determine for itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is peculiarly a matter of high House privilege, and it is a peculiar case. If this gentleman is not a naturalized citizen of the United States, he is not now and never has been a Member of the Congress of the United States, because nothing that we can do in the shape of swearing him in or receiving him would undo the inhibition that lies against any one who is an alien, and not a citizen of the United States, from becoming a Member of this House. It is not a matter of election at all. There is no dispute about the fact that he was elected. The sole question is one of naturalization or citizenship. There is no more reason why it should go to the Committee on Elections than to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. It seems to me it would be a proper course to appoint a special committee; and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that that view is the more reenforced by the gravity of the question to be considered. It is not only sui generis, but one of the gravest questions to be considered. A whole shelf of law books may be necessary to be consulted in determining the question as to whether this peculiar situation is a situation of citizenship or not. I hope that the gentleman from Illinois will withdraw his amendment and permit the Speaker to appoint a select committee, so that the work may be gotten at at once. That is one reason I can see why a special committee should be appointed on the subject, so that it may deal with it at once owing to its peculiar circumstances.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. This is evidently a matter that should be heard at once. How can it be referred to the Committee on Elections and considered at once when the Committee on Elections has not yet been appointed?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many bills emanating from the brilliant mind of my distinguished friend from Tennessee were introduced yesterday—undoubtedly some that ought to be acted on at once—but unfortunately the House and the country will be compelled to wait until the committees are appointed and shall have considered them before that solicitude can be removed.

Now, this matter is no more important than others. There are a great many precedents in reference to these contests in such cases. In the very first House of Representatives a contest was made on the ground that one of the Members elected was not a citizen, and it was referred to the Commtitee on Elections. There have been constant references upon the same ground to the Committee on Elections. I do not feel absolutely certain in my own mind whether it ought to be referred to the Committee on Elections or to the Committee on the Judiciary; but the precedents have been to refer these matters to the Committee on Elections.

It is true that when the Roberts case was before the House, under a peculiar situation, a select committee was appointed; but this Member has been sworn in. He is as much a Member of the House now as though his seat were regularly contested by his opponent at the election, and in the end he should be declared not elected, as often happens in the House. That he is entitled to his seat for the present, until this question can be decided, there can be no question.

I can see no objection to referring this to the appropriate committee, and I see no more reason why a special committee should be appointed to investigate this matter than why a special committee should be appointed to take up every bill that is introduced into the House. I must insist upon the amendment which I offer. If the gentleman desires to discuss it, how much time does he desire?

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to suggest, in connection with the resolution I have presented, that this is not a case of a contested election. The resolution raises no question as to whether or not Mr. MICHALEK received more votes than his

opponent. The resolution raises a question under the Constitution of the United States, which provides expressly that in order to entitle a man to a seat in this body he must be a citizen of the United States, an inhabitant of the State from which he is elected, and that he must have been a citizen of the United States for the period of seven years.

Now, the elections committees are not appointed, none of them, and probably will not be for some time, and this is not a matter which comes peculiarly under their jurisdiction; but it is a matter which does affect not only the district that Mr. MICHALEK now assumes to represent in this body, but it affects all legislation to be passed upon by this body during the time he is permitted to vote here. Now, I insist that as a matter of good faith, and in order to preserve the privileges of this House, this matter ought to be referred to a special committee.

It will not occupy much time in its investigation. It is not a question as to what votes were cast for him, but the only question, and it is a simple one, is whether or not he is now a citizen of the United States.

The fact that he was sworn in yesterday can not make any difference. The fact that a man comes here and holds up his hand and takes the oath in this House does not establish his citizenship, and can never establish it; and until his citizenship is established, if contested, he is not entitled to a seat in this House, and it is a question that requires immediate investigation, and such investigation as only a special committee can give it.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the remainder of his time. The Chair recognizes the gentleman in front of the Chair [Mr. MANN], if he desires to be recognized.

Mr. MANN. I desire to ask whether my colleague [Mr. RAINEY] wishes to occupy any further time on this question?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; I desire to occupy time later.

Mr. MANN. Well, I hope the gentleman will proceed now. So far as I know, I shall ask for a vote.

Mr. PARKER. Will the gentleman yield to me for two minutes?

Mr. RAINEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] if he desires time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not desire to say anything. I did desire to say just about what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] has said.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. PARKER. Two minutes.

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is purely a question of an election. If votes are cast at an election for a person who is eligible, they are valid votes. If they are cast for a person who is absolutely ineligible, the votes are void, and some one else is elected. At least it would seem to me that it might be contended that that was so. It can not be insisted that because votes are cast for somebody who is ineligible, therefore the votes cast for somebody else shall be disregarded. Now that is one point that would make it a question fairly to go to an election committee. Another point, however, would be as to whether this question of citizenship can now be raised. Should not the question be raised when the certificate of election is made out when the votes are counted? When that is once passed, and the man without objection comes and takes his oath as a citizen to support the Constitution of the United States, there is a great deal of question as to whether that matter can come up again; and so I think this, like all other questions pertaining to an election, should go to an elections committee. Therefore I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, if I may be recognized——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED]?

Mr. OLMSTED. Two minutes.

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. I merely want to call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the provision of the sixtieth paragraph of Rule XI, giving to the committees on elections the right to report at any time on any matter "touching the right of a Member to his seat."

This is surely such a matter as that, and therefore clearly within the province of the elections committee of the House. Of course it is entirely within the power of the House, as the gentleman from Illinois has said, to take it into its own hands or to authorize the appointment of a select committee; but, under the rules of the House as they now stand, it is clearly referable to the elections committee.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, in reply to what has been said I simply desire to suggest that there is a way in which a man can become a citizen of the United States. He can not become a citizen of the United States by being a candidate for office; he can not become a citizen of the United States by receiving more votes when he is a candidate for Congress than his opponent; he can not become a citizen of the United States by standing here in front of the Speaker's desk and taking the oath which ordinarily entitles a man to a seat in Congress, provided he is a citizen of the United States. None of these things makes a man a citizen, and unless he is a citizen he has no right to a seat here. The only question raised here is as to his citizenship, and that being the only question, it occurs to me that as a matter of fairness and as a matter of privilege, in which every man in this House has an interest, whether he sits on this side of the House or on the other side of the House, this matter ought to be investigated at once, not by a committee to be appointed at some time in the future, which will be burdened with other business when it is appointed, but by a committee which will have nothing else before it and which can investigate this one matter now and speedily. Therefore I think the resolution ought to pass without this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 169, noes 121.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 178, nays 94, answered "present" 2, not voting 113, as follows:

YEAS—178.

Acheson	Dawes	Kennedy, Ohio	Reynolds
Allen, Me.	Dawson	Kinkaid	Rhodes
Allen, N. J.	Deemer	Klepper	Rives
Ames	Denby	Knapp	Roberts
Andrus	Dixon, Mont.	Knowland	Rodenberg
Bannon	Dovener	Lacey	Samuel
Barchfeld	Draper	Lafean	Schneebeli
Bartholdt	Dwight	Landis, Chas. B.	Scroggy
Bates	Edwards	Landis, Frederick	Smith, Cal.
Bennet, N. Y.	Esch	Law	Smith, Ill.
Bennett, Ky.	Flack	Le Fevre	Smith, Iowa
Birdsall	Fordney	Lilley, Conn.	Smith, Samuel W.
Bonynge	Foss	Lilley, Pa.	Smith, Wm. Alden
Boutell	Foster, Ind.	Littauer	Smyser
Bowersock	Fulkerson	Longworth	Southard
Bradley	Fuller	Loudenslager	Southwick
Brick	Gaines, W. Va.	McCall	Sperry
Brooks, Colo.	Gardner, Mass.	McCleary, Minn.	Stafford
Brown	Gardner, Mich.	McCreary, Pa.	Steenerson
Brownlow	Gardner, N. J.	McGavin	Sterling
Buckman	Gillett, Cal.	McKinney	Stevens, Minn.
Burke, Pa.	Graff	McMorran	Sulloway
Burleigh	Graham	Madden	Tawney
Burton, Del.	Greene	Mahon	Taylor, Ohio
Burton, Ohio	Gronna	Mann	Thomas, Ohio
Butler, Pa.	Grosvenor	Marshall	Tirrell
Calder	Hamilton	Miller	Townsend
Campbell, Kans.	Haugen	Minor	Tyndall
Campbell, Ohio	Hayes	Moon, Pa.	Van Winkle
Capron	Hedge	Mouser	Volstead
Chaney	Henry, Conn.	Murdock	Vreeland
Chapman	Hepburn	Needham	Wadsworth
Cocks	Higgins	Nevin	Waldo
Cole	Hill, Conn.	Norris	Wanger
Conner	Hinshaw	Olcott	Watson
Cooper, Pa.	Hoar	Olmsted	Webber
Cousins	Holliday	Otjen	Weeks
Cromer	Howell, N. J.	Overstreet	Welborn
Currier	Howell, Utah	Parker	Wharton
Curtis	Hubbard	Parsons	Wilson
Cushman	Hughes	Payne	Wood, N. J.
Dale	Humphrey, Wash.	Perkins	Woodyard
Dalzell	Jones, Wash.	Pollard	Young
Darragh	Kahn	Powers	
Davis, Minn.	Keifer	Reeder	

NAYS—94.

Adamson	Fitzgerald	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rucker
Aiken	Floyd	Lamar	Ruppert
Bankhead	Gaines, Tenn.	Lamb	Russell
Bartlett	Garber	Lee	Ryan
Beall, Tex.	Garner	Legare	Sheppard
Bell, Ga.	Garrett	Lester	Sherley
Bowers	Gilbert, Ky.	Little	Sims
Bowie	Gillespie	Lloyd	Small
Broocks, Tex.	Goldfogle	McDermott	Smith, Ky.
Brundidge	Goulden	McLain	Smith, Tex.
Burgess	Gudger	Macon	Spight
Burleson	Hardwick	Meyer	Stanley
Burnett	Heflin	Moon, Tenn.	Stephens, Tex.
Butler, Tenn.	Henry, Tex.	Moore	Thomas, N. C.
Candler	Hill, Miss.	Padgett	Towne
Clark, Mo.	Hopkins	Page	Trimble
Clayton	Houston	Patterson, S. C.	Wallace
Cockran	Howard	Pou	Watkins
Davis, W. Va.	Humphreys, Miss.	Pujo	Webb
De Armond	Hunt	Rainey	Wiley, Ala.
Dixon, Ind.	James	Randell, Tex.	Williams
Ellerbe	Johnson	Reid	Zenor
Field	Jones, Va.	Richardson, Ala.	
Finley	Kitchin, Claude	Robinson, Ark.	

NOT VOTING—113.

Lever	Patterson, N. C.		

NOT VOTING—112.

Adams, Pa.	Flood	Lewis	Robertson, La.
Adams, Wis.	Foster, Vt.	Lindsay	Scott
Alexander	Fowler	Littlefield	Shackleford
Babcock	French	Livingston	Shartel
Bede	Gilbert, Ind.	Lorimer	Sherman
Beidler	Gill	Loud	Sibley
Bingham	Gillett, Mass.	Lovering	Slayden
Bishop	Glass	McCarthy	Slemp
Blackburn	Goebel	McKinlay, Cal.	Smith, Md.
Brantley	Granger	McKinley, Ill.	Smith, Pa.
Broussard	Gregg	McLachlan	Snapp
Burke, S. Dak.	Griggs	McNary	Southall
Byrd	Hale	Martin	Sparkman
Calderhead	Haskins	Maynard	Sullivan, Mass.
Cassel	Hay	Michalek	Sullivan, N. Y.
Castor	Hearst	Mondell	Sulzer
Clark, Fla.	Hermann	Morrell	Swanson
Cooper, Wis.	Hitt	Mudd	Talbott
Crumpacker	Hogg	Murphy	Taylor, Ala.
Davey, La.	Huff	Palmer	Underwood
Davidson	Hull	Patterson, Pa.	Van Duzer
Dickson, Ill.	Jenkins	Patterson, Tenn.	Wachter
Dresser	Kellher	Pearre	Weems
Driscoll	Kennedy, Nebr.	Prince	Weisse
Dunwell	Ketcham	Ransdell, La.	Wiley, N. J.
Ellis	Kline	Rhinock	Williamson
Fassett	Knopf	Richardson, Ky.	Wood, Mo.
Fletcher	Lawrence	Rixey	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the vote:

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. BEDE with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. BIEDLER with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota with Mr. GILL.

Mr. CASSEL with Mr. GRANGER.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. GREGG.

Mr. CRUMPACKER with Mr. HAY.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. HOPKINS.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. KELIHER.

Mr. FRENCH with Mr. KLINE.

Mr. HASKINS with Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. HITT with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. HULL with Mr. MCNARY.

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. RIXEY.

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. RHINOCK.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky.

Mr. LOUD with Mr. SLAYDEN.

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCARTHY with Mr. SMITH of Maryland.

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. VAN DUZER.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. WEISSE.

Mr. PRINCE with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. FASSETT with Mr. WOOD of Missouri.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. DUNWELL with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.

For the session:

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania with Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina.

For the day:

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. SULLIVAN of New York.

For the balance of the day:

Mr. HALE with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. LEVER.

Mr. BISHOP with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. GLASS.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MANN, a motion to reconsider the last motion was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF ENTRYMEN AND SETTLERS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, a draft of a bill for the relief of certain entrymen and settlers within the limits of the Northern Pacific land grant, together with a letter from the Secretary of the Interior setting forth the reasons for the desired action.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1905.*

COMMISSION ON NATURALIZATION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, the report of the Commission on Naturalization, appointed by Executive order of March 1, 1905.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1905.*

COMPACT RESPECTING DELAWARE RIVER AND BAY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for action by the Congress thereon, a certified copy of an act passed by the general assembly of the State of Delaware, entitled "An act to ratify and confirm a compact or agreement between the States of New Jersey and Delaware respecting the Delaware River and Bay, and to authorize the execution thereof," which was submitted to me by Hon. Preston Lea, governor of the State of Delaware, in pursuance of the mandate of the law.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1905.*

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, the Twenty-second Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1905.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee for ten days, on account of important business.

JOHN M. PINCKNEY.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my painful duty to announce to the House of Representatives the death of Hon. JOHN M. PINCKNEY, of Texas, late a Member of this body. At a future day I shall ask that a suitable time be set apart for the passing of such eulogies upon him as Members desire.

I now move the adoption of the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. JOHN M. PINCKNEY, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be directed to transmit this resolution to the Senate, and a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Mr. PINCKNEY, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the contingent expenses of the Department for the year ended June 30, 1905—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting his annual report for the year 1905—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, with a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, an estimate of emergency appropriations for the Isthmian Canal Commission—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting papers in the pension claim of Emeline S. Gosline, now Hayner, with a recommendation of legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and letter only ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting

copies of the acts and journals of the twenty-third legislative assembly of Arizona—to the Committee on the Territories.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of the acts and journals of the second and third legislative assemblies of Porto Rico—to the Committee on the Territories.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of the laws and journals of the eighth legislative assembly of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of the laws and journals of the third legislative assembly of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of the acts and journals of the thirty-sixth legislative assembly of New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of the expenditures of his Department for contingent expenses for the year ended June 30, 1905—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Addie E. Bailey, sole heir of William G. Webber, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Henry O'Bannon and William A. O'Bannon, sole heirs of Alfred O'Bannon, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Sarah Bibby, Ada B. Ewing, Alice G. Warner, Benjamin M. Hord, Mildred Washington, and Thomas E. Hord, sole heirs of estate of Thomas Hord, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of J. W. Mitchell, administrator of estate of Thomas J. Mitchell, against The United States—to the Committeee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Edgar Cherry and James M. Head, executors of estate of William H. Cherry, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of J. Harrison Planck and P. S. Dudley, trustees of the Baptist Church of Flemingsburg, Ky., against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Zachariah D. Ridout, surviving executor of estate of Hester Ann Ridout, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Eliza Chambers, executrix of estate of Royall Chambers, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Cornelius Virts against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3013) for the relief of tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3014) to establish a subtreasury at Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3015) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Springfield, Tenn., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 3016) to make goods, wares, and merchandise, made in whole or in part by convicts, or in reformatories, subject to the laws of the State or Territory into which they may be transported—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3017) to amend an act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbance, and the Seminole war," approved June 27, 1902—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3018) to enlarge the United States court and post-office building at San Antonio, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 3019) to repeal the act providing for the sale of timber and stone lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3020) to organize a bureau of mines—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 3021) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Columbus, in the State of Indiana, and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 3022) to prevent Sunday banking in post-offices in the handling of money orders and registered letters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 3023) making it a capital offense to unlawfully, knowingly, and purposely kill or attempt to kill the President of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3024) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in the district of Indiana, for the establishment of judicial divisions in said district, and so forth—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3025) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 4766 of the Revised Statutes of the United States," approved March 3, 1899—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3026) to punish lynching of aliens—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3027) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Michigan City, in the State of Indiana—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3028) to erect a monument or memorial temple on the Tippecanoe battle ground, in Tippecanoe County, Ind.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 3029) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs in the military or naval service of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 3030) to fix a duty on zinc-bearing ores, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3031) for the erection of a public building at Carthage, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 3032) to prohibit officers and employees in the civil service of the Government of the United States from holding any office or employment in any corporation or joint stock company, and prescribing penalties therefor—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 3033) to repeal the national bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 3034) granting pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines confined in so-called Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 3035) granting a pension to soldiers and sailors in consideration of their services, and a uniform pension to widows of soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3036) in amendment of an act entitled "An act to increase pensions for total deafness"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 3037) for the erection of a public building at Amsterdam, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 3038) to construct a road from Fort McPherson, Ga., to the rifle range and military reservation near Waco, Ga.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3039) to provide for clean paper money—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 3040) for the erection of a public building at Saratoga Springs, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 3041) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Alpena, in the State of Michigan—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3042) making an appropriation for increasing the depth of the Cheboygan River from termination of present dredged channel up to and terminating at the dam and lock on said river—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3043) to increase the limit of the appropriation for a public building at Perth Amboy, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 3044) requiring shippers and manufacturers of medicine for interstate shipment to label said medicine and print thereon the ingredients contained in such medicine—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 3045) making an appropriation for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at the city of Greencastle and State of Indiana—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 3046) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Gulfport, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3047) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Laurel, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3048) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hattiesburg, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3049) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at a point on the Gulf of Mexico, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3050) to extend the provisions of "An act to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians, and for other purposes," to Mississippi Choctaws of mixed blood—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 3051) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the city of Sheboygan, Sheboygan County, State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 3052) to provide for a public building at Terrell, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3053) to provide for the enlargement and improvement of the public building at Tyler, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3054) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at East Orange, in the State of New Jersey—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 3055) for the erection of a monument to Andrew Lewis—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3056) to grant franking privilege to agricultural departments of States and Territories—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3057) to provide for enlarging the public building at Roanoke, Va., in order to accommodate the United States courts—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3058) for the erection of a public building at Radford, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3059) for the erection of a public building at Bedford City, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3060) to erect a custom-house and post-office building in the city of South Boston, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALLACE: A bill (H. R. 3061) to authorize the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Ouachita River and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 3062) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of telegraphic cables between the mainland of the United States of America and the Canal Zone on the Isthmus of Panama, and other places, and to promote commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 3063) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by requiring the use of the block system by common carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 3064) for a preliminary examination to determine the advisability of constructing a canal between Red River and Sulphur River, Texas, by way of Texarkana, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3065) to provide for the improvement of upper Red River by the construction of levees on the south bank thereof above Fulton, Ark.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3066) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to publish in his annual reports number and nature of reports of those to whom seeds are sent—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3067) to enable the Department of Agriculture to continue its investigations and experiments with reference to the cotton boll worm, cotton-wilt disease, and root rot—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3068) to provide for the improvement of Sulphur River by the construction of levees along both its banks from its mouth to the confluence of the Delta County forks—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 3069) for the improvement of Kentucky River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3070) to provide for the improvement of the Tug and Louisa forks of the Big Sandy River, in West Virginia and Kentucky—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 3071) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid tracts of land in the State of Montana and to provide relief for the owners of inundated lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDRUS: A bill (H. R. 3072) for the completion of East Chester Creek, New York, improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 3073) to appropriate $500,000 to deepen the channel and remove obstructions in the Alabama River, in the State of Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3074) to prevent the United States from issuing a license to any person to sell spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors or other intoxicating beverages in any community where the sale thereof is prohibited by State or local laws—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLETT of California: A bill (H. R. 3075) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Eureka, in the State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3076) to amend section 2325 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3077) to amend section 13 of an act of March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California"—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3078) to provide for the examination and classification of certain lands in the State of California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3079) for the construction of a light-house tender for use on the coast of California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 3080) to authorize the erection of a public building at Crookston, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 3081) to provide for a public building in the city of Marietta, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3082) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Dalton, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 3083) to provide for the erection of a public building at Macomb, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 3084) for the erection of a public building at Bar Harbor, State of Maine—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 3085) to authorize the appointment of official stenographic reporters for the several circuit and district courts of the United States, to provide compensation therefor, and to define the duties thereof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 3086) for the relief of farmers, merchants, and other dealers in leaf tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3087) for the relief of farmers and tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 3088) to provide for the allowance and payment to the employees of the Government Printing Office of the same leave of absence as is allowed to the clerks and employees of the Executive Departments of the Government—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3089) fixing the maximum length of rural routes hereafter to be established and increasing the salaries of rural carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 3090) to improve the civil-service system of the United States—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3091) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Greatfalls, Mont.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3092) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Missoula, Mont.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 3093) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Beaverdam, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3094) fixing the rate of pensions for persons eligible under section 2, act of June 27, 1890, who require the frequent and periodical attendance of another person—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3095) providing for the erection of a keeper's dwelling at the Sheboygan light station, Sheboygan, Wis.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 3096) to provide for the erection of a public building at Clarinda, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 3097) providing for the erection of an addition or extension to the post-office and court-house at Quincy, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3098) to provide an elastic currency by making it lawful for any or all holders of bonds of the United States to deposit said bonds with the Treasurer of the United States and to secure therefor certain legal-tender Government notes; providing for a tax on said depositors while said bonds remain on deposit; providing for the issue of bonds of the United States to maintain the parity of said notes, and authorizing national banking associations to hold United States bonds in lieu of money for half of their legally required reserves—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 3099) to fix the salary of the United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 3100) for the protection and improvement of harbor on Mississippi River at Natchez, Miss.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3101) for the protection and improvement of harbor on Mississippi River at Natchez, Miss.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3102) to provide for a survey of Natchez Harbor, on Mississippi River, at Natchez, Miss.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 3103) to protect the monuments already erected on the battlefields of Bull Run, Virginia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3104) for the protection of the Balls Bluff battlefield, in Loudoun County, Va., and the cemetery thereon—to the Committee on Miliary Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3105) to provide for the building of a public avenue on the south side of the Potomac River from the city of Washington to Mount Vernon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3106) to protect the monuments already erected on the battlefields of Bull Run, Virginia, and other monuments that may be there erected—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3107) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from Washington to Fort Myer and the national cemetery at Arlington—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3108) to forbid distilleries in local-option communities—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 3109) for the erection of a public building in the city of Manchester, State of Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 3110) to provide for the improvement and enlargement of the Fort Scott (Kans.) National Cemetery, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 3111) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Winchester, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 3112) to amend section 4289 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3113) to encourage and protect salmon culture in Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 3114) authorizing the appropriation of $250,000 to the Negro Development and Exposition Company of the United States of America—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: A bill (H. R. 3115) to authorize the establishment of a permanent national exposition in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 3116) establishing a United States court at Checotah, Ind. T., and conforming other districts therewith—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3117) providing for the erection of a United States land office and post-office building at Dardanelle, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3118) to provide for the building of extensions and additions to the Federal court and post-office building in the city of Little Rock, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3119) to provide for a macadamized approach and roadway to the national cemetery at Little Rock, Ark., and for a suitable wall or iron fence around said cemetery, and other improvements therein—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3120) for the erection of a Federal jail at Little Rock, Ark.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3121) to provide for the improvement of navigation on the Arkansas River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 3122) for the relief of the tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3123) to require city and street railway companies to use vestibule fronts in certain months—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3124) to create the Shenandoah Valley Park Commission, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 3125) to establish a library post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3126) for the erection of a public building at Pittsfield, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 3127) providing for the holding of Federal court at Grand Island, Nebr.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 3128) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 3129) for the erection of a public building at North Adams, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3130) to amend the act of March 2, 1903, increasing the pensions of those who have lost limbs or been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3131) providing a Territorial form of government for Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 3132) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fort Valley, in the State of Georgia, and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 3133) regulating the settlement of the accounts between the United States and the several States relative to the disposition of the public lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPERRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 3134) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in buildings, ships, navy-yards, parks, and other premises owned or controlled by the United States Government—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3135) for the erection of a public building at Ansonia, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 3136) authorizing the pur-

chase of a site for customs purposes and the construction of buildings at Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3137) authorizing rebate of duties on anthracite coal imported into the United States from October 6, 1902, to January 15, 1903, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINOR: A bill (H. R. 3138) to authorize the establishment of a fish-cultural and biological station on the west shore of Lake Michigan, or east shore of Green Bay, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3139) for the erection of a public building at Appleton, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3140) to erect a public building at Marinette, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 3141) to establish a national military park at Guilford battle ground, in North Carolina—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3142) to provide for furnishing the highest court of each State copies of the Supreme Court Reports hereafter published in exchange for the reports of the highest State courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 3143) to annex a portion of Arizona Territory to the State of Utah—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3144) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Logan, Utah—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 3145) to amend section 4 of an act passed December 27, 1894, entitled "An act to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Shiloh"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3146) to provide for a road to the Shiloh National Military Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3147) to provide for a road to the Shiloh National Military Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3148) authorizing survey of Beech River, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3149) authorizing survey of Big Sandy River, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3150) authorizing survey of Forked Deer River, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3151) authorizing a survey of the Obion River, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3152) authorizing survey of South Fork of Forked Deer River, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3153) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3154) for investigation of the chemical composition and economic uses of cotton seed and its products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3155) to erect a custom-house and post-office building in the city of Paris, State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3156) to regulate the mode and manner of taking proof in all civil cases, both at law and equity, in the circuit courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 3157) providing for the erection of a public building at Greeenville, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 3158) to authorize the Postmaster-General to establish a station, substation, or branch post-office in certain communities—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 3159) to limit the effect of the regulation of commerce between the several States and with foreign countries in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 3160) to prohibit the coming of Japanese and Korean laborers to the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 3161) for the erection of a public building at Greenville, Miss.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 3162) for the erection of a public building at North Tonawanda, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOWIE (by request): A bill (H. R. 3163) authorizing R. R. Asbury and associates to use the water power at Locks 1, 2, and 3, in Coosa River, Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3164) granting certain lands belonging to the United States and situated in the State of Alabama to the State of Alabama for the use and benefit of the common schools of that State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3165) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3166) to increase the pay of mail carriers on rural free-delivery routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3167) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Alabama—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 3168) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Colorado Springs, in the State of Colorado—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 3169) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office at Ithaca, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 3170) for improving, repairing, and the erection of an addition to the public building at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and for purchasing ground therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 3171) providing for the erection of a public building at Chillicothe, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3172) providing for the erection of a public building at Brookfield, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3173) providing for the erection of a public building at Carrollton, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama (by request): A bill (H. R. 3174) for the organization and maintenance of an expedition for the investigation of all phenomena connected with the sea, for the advancement of physical science—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3175) for the erection of a public building at Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 3176) for the erection of a monumental statue in the city of Washington, D. C., to Rear-Admiral Charles Stewart—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3177) for the erection of a monumental statue in the city of Washington, D. C., to Rear-Admiral John A. Dahlgren—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3178) extending the provisions of the pension laws of the United States to persons engaged in the operation and construction of military telegraph lines during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 3179) for improving and arching Hot Springs Creek in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3180) to grant to Oden's battery of artillery, Arkansas State Guards, the right to use and occupy lots 3, 4, and 5, block 94, Hot Springs, for an armory site—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3181) to authorize Centennial Lodge and Ozark Lodge, Knights of Pythias, to erect and maintain a sanitarium and bath house on the Government reservation at the city of Hot Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 3182) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Greensburg, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3183) to provide for the erection of a public building at Butler, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 3184) establishing the Franklin Military National Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3185) for the erection of a public building at Columbia, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 3186) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 3187) to construct and place a light-ship near the eastern end of Hedge Fence Shoal, at the entrance to Vineyard Sound, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3188) to construct and place a new light-ship at the entrance to Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts, to replace the one known as the Hen and Chickens light-ship—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEISSE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 30) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause a survey and examination to be made of the harbor at Fond du Lac, Wis., with a view to securing a depth sufficient to permit of the navigation of vessels with a draft equal to that of those vessels which ordinarily navigate Lake Winnebago—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WANGER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) relating to the badge of the Army and Navy Union—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 32) directing a suitable shaft to be placed at the grave of George Wythe—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FLOOD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 33) asking the President of the United States to make such investigations as will elicit all the facts in reference to the restrictions put upon the sale of American tobacco—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 34) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 36) proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to direct taxes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCKRAN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 37) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Representatives in Congress and fixing their term of office—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. LOUD: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 9) directing the Secretary of War to cause to be made a survey of the harbor at or near Rogers City, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 10) directing the Secretary of War to cause to be made a survey for a ship canal from Newark, N. J., to New York Bay—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 11) to print 10,000 additional copies of the Soil Survey of Montgomery County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A resolution (H. Res. 31) for the immediate consideration of H. R. 480, a bill supplemental to an act to provide for the construction of a canal, etc.—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A memorial from the legislature of the State of Texas to the Congress of the United States concerning the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 3189) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 3190) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Coty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3191) granting a pension to Ella J. Crosse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3192) granting an increase of pension to Brice S. Ramsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3193) granting an increase of pension to James R. Todd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3194) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Harvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3195) granting an increase of pension to Milton S. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3196) granting a pension to George W. Robb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3197) granting an increase of pension to Milo G. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3198) for the relief of Louis R. Newlands—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3199) granting a pension to Emma Pare—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3200) to provide compensation for injuries received by George E. Giles, of Watertown, Wis., at the Ford's Theater disaster, which occurred June 9, 1893—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3201) to grant an honorable discharge to Philip Graham from the military service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 3202) to remove the charge of desertion now existing on the records of the War Department against Jacob Breitwieser—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3203) granting an increase of pension to Peter Dippel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3204) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Anthony—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3205) granting a pension to John Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3206) to correct the military record of Francis Buerger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3207) to correct the military record of Jacob Gruen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 3208) granting a pension to Isabel T. Borthwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 3209) for the relief of the heirs of Nash L. Cox, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 3210) for the relief of Sarah H. Milvaney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3211) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Laforest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 3212) for the relief of William J. Robertson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 3213) for the relief of Nancy Gregg—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 3214) granting a pension to Maggie Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3215) granting a pension to Raymond P. Snow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3216) granting an increase of pension to John W. Seeber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3217) granting an increase of pension to Levi G. Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3218) granting an increase of pension to George V. Barnard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3219) granting an increase of pension to Casper J. Schoer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3220) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 3221) granting an increase of pension to Rufus I. Hitchcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3222) granting an increase of pension to George Merrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3223) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. McLaughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3224) granting a pension to Catherine Eberlein—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3225) granting an increase of pension to William B. Philbrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3226) granting an increase of pension to John E. Leahy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3227) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Tuttle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3228) granting an increase of pension to Michael Doyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3229) granting a pension to Jessie Marie Hester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3230) granting an increase of pension to James H. Beulen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3231) for the relief of John Feltes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3232) for the relief of Josiah P. Sanders—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 3233) granting an increase of pension to Lucius R. Simons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3234) granting an increase of pension to Rush Deskins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3235) granting an increase of pension to Russell B. Hyde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3236) granting a pension to William McClure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3237) granting an increase of pension to James M. Barnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3238) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hartley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3239) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3240) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Polk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3241) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3242) granting a pension to Susan J. Atkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3243) granting an increase of pension to John M. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3244) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Daniel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3245) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3246) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Baldwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3247) granting an increase of pension to Ethan A. Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3248) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel H. Patten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3249) granting a pension to John Hiet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3250) granting a pension to Harrison White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3251) granting a pension to Albert H. Rutledge—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3252) granting a pension to George W. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3253) for the relief of the heirs of Elijah S. Means—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3254) for the relief of Daniel F. Ritchie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3255) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Ray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 3256) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Seeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3257) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3258) to correct the military record of Cyrus S. Clason—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3259) granting a pension to John T. Wills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 3260) for the relief of Frank J. Ladner—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 3261) granting a pension to Mirah A. B. Miller, widow of George Miller, alias George Reynolds, late a soldier in the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3262) for the relief of Isaiah Friday—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3263) for the relief of the heirs of George O. Baker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3264) for the relief of John W. Ledbetter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3265) for the relief of S. R. Bell and S. H. Green—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3266) granting an increase of pension to J. J. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3267) for the relief of the estate of H. A. Wilson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3268) for the relief of Henry O. Bassett, heir of Henry Opeman Bassett, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3269) for the relief of the estate of William Johnson, deceased, late of Dallas County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3270) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Sullivan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3271) for the relief of Charles John Houser—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3272) for the relief of the estate of William Curtis, deceased, late of Dallas County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3273) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Levi—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3274) for the relief of the estate of J. E. Prestridge, deceased, late of Dallas County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3275) for the relief of Edward M. Boggs—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3276) granting a pension to Adelia Converse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3277) for the relief of John A. Harbour—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3278) for the relief of John Codman Soley—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3279) for the relief of W. J. Warren—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3280) for the relief of C. C. Huckabee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 3281) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Underwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3282) granting a pension to Charles B. Montgomery—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3283) granting an increase of pension to Bruno Tiesler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3284) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Callahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 3285) for the relief of Martin Young—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3286) granting a pension to William Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3287) granting a pension to James M. Hislip—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3288) granting a pension to John A. Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3289) granting a pension to Basil Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 3290) granting a pension to Edward McQueen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3291) granting an increase of pension to Josiah J. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3292) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3293) granting an increase of pension to Hattie A. Towle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3294) granting an increase of pension to Phillip Schnepp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3295) granting an increase of pension to George W. Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3296) granting an increase of pension to William Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3297) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lonergan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3298) granting an increase of pension to John Brugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3299) granting an increase of pension to William P. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3300) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rifenburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3301) granting a pension to Phoebe J. Sawdey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3302) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Rogers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3303) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert P. Horn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3304) to correct the military record of Daniel R. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3305) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. McIntyre—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3306) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles B. Steward, alias Edward S. Button—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3307) for the relief of C. T. Dibble—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3308) for the relief of John Ritter and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3309) for the relief of the legal representatives of Reuben Opp—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3310) for the relief of St. Genevive Talifaro, alias Neat—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3311) for the relief of Claude M. Waite—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3312) granting an increase of pension to William J. Abrams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3313) granting an increase of pension to George Willis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3314) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob H. Wager—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3315) granting an increase of pension to Lewis L. Dougherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3316) granting a pension to Anna Christie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3317) granting an increase of pension to James Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3318) granting a pension to Eunice M. Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3319) granting an increase of pension to William H. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3320) granting an increase of pension to Willard A. Place—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3321) granting an increase of pension to Oliver S. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3322) granting an increase of pension to William W. Storks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3323) granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Strumphford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3324) granting a pension to Patrick Feeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3325) granting an increase of pension to Philip Hawn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3326) granting an increase of pension to John O. McNabb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3327) granting a pension to Horace Stambaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3328) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Denny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3329) granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. Etnire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3330) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Gross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3331) granting an increase of pension to Elias Corns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3332) increasing the pension of William D. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3333) granting a pension to William Simmons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3334) granting an increase of pension to Daniel D. V. Rose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3335) granting an increase of pension to John C. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3336) granting a pension to Mary L. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3337) granting an increase of pension to William H. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 3338) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette F. Franks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3339) granting an increase of pension to Abram Van Riper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3340) granting an increase of pension to William Moorhead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3341) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3342) granting an increase of pension to Albin L. Ingram—to the Committtee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 3343) for the relief of Daniel W. Boutwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 3344) granting an increase of pension to Henry Sanborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 3345) granting an increase of pension to Christina White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3346) granting a pension to William H. Wolfe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3347) granting an increase of pension to Orestes B. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 3348) for the relief of Charles C. Bauman—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3349) for the relief of George Humphrey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3350) for the relief of Florence Lambert—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3351) granting a pension to George King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3352) granting an increase of pension to George R. Roraback—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3353) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Doolittle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3354) granting an increase of pension to F. A. Beranek—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3355) granting an increase of pension to James Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3356) to correct the military record of Timothy Lyons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3357) granting an honorable discharge to James B. Mulford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 3358) for the relief of James G. Carmack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3359) for the relief of Leonard Wilson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3360) for the relief of William Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3361) granting a pension to William L. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3362) granting a pension to Charles W. McMullen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3363) granting a pension to Joe B. Daniel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3364) granting a pension to John F. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3365) granting an increase of pension to James H. B. McDaniel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3366) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3367) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3368) granting an increase of pension to William McNair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 3369) granting an increase of pension to Albert Sriver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3370) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Beaty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3371) granting an increase of pension to Lee W. Putnam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3372) granting an increase of pension to James A. Cogle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill H. R. 3373) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Ogle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3374) granting an increase of pension to Hiram C. Wyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3375) granting an increase of pension to John E. Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3376) granting an increase of pension to David Lyton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3377) granting an increase of pension to Eli W. Cooley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3378) granting an increase of pension to Elias Disney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3379) granting an increase of pension to John C. Cahill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 3380) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wilburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 3381) referring to the Court of Claims for adjudication and determination the claims of the widow and family of Marcus P. Norton and the heirs at law of others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3382) to correct the military record of Brig. Gen. William Hull—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 3383) granting an increase of pension to Parmenas A. Norton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3384) granting a pension to Benjamin H. Decker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3385) granting an increase of pension to Marshall D. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3386) granting an increase of pension to Almon Craver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3387) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Stearns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3388) granting an increase of pension to John Dammer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3389) granting an increase of pension to Michael Campion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3390) granting an increase of pension to Emily A. Deuel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3391) granting an increase of pension to Milo W. Seeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3392) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 3393) granting an honorable discharge to Galen E. Green—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 3394) granting a pension to Helen A. Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3395) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Winfield S. Usher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3396) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Gilbert Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 3397) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Chrisler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3398) granting a pension to Edgar R. Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3399) granting an increase of pension to Henry Congdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 3400) granting an increase of pension to Anson K. Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3401) granting an increase of pension to Michael McKenzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3402) granting an increase of pension to Sidney S. Brigham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3403) granting an increase of pension to George A. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3404) granting an increase of pension to Henry Chiott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 3405) granting an increase of pension to David Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 3406) for the relief of John M. Lea—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3407) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert C. Hoggins and for the relief of his widow and children—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3408) for the relief of the estate of John J. Hamel—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3409) for the relief of Kinney, McLaughlin & Co., and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3410) for the relief of William N. Bilbo, jr., administrator—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3411) for the relief of Payne, James & Co.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3412) for the relief of James E. Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3413) for the relief of Robert G. Throne and the estate of A. G. Adams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3414) for the relief of Daniel Collins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3415) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Clarksville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3416) for the relief of the heirs of James M. Hinton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3417) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth McClure, deceased, late of Montgomery County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 3418) granting an increase of pension to John Snouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3419) granting an increase of pension to John Biddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 3420) for the relief of Jeremiah Lower—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3421) granting a pension to De Witt C. Foreman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3422) granting a pension to M. Olive Toner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3423) granting a pension to Thomas Watt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3424) to correct the military record of William Hommelsberg—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3425) granting a pension to Warren A. Blye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3426) to rerate the pension allowed to J. H. Braynard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3427) granting an increase of pension to William B. Kimball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3428) granting an increase of pension to S. E. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3429) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Donnelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3430) granting a pension to Peter M. Culins and conferring the rank of captain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3431) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of D. J. Mahoney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3432) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Jerry Horan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3433) to correct the military record of Hiram A. Keith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 3434) granting an increase of pension to George W. Darby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3435) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Sallade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 3436) granting a pension to Hedley D. Lefener—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 3437) for the relief of the estate of Harry Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 3438) for the relief of the trustees of the Opequon Presbyterian Church, of Kernstown, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3439) for the relief of the trustees of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, of Winchester, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3440) for the relief of the Muhlenburg Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Harrisonburg, Rockingham County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3441) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Middletown, Frederick County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3442) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Strasburg, Shenandoah County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3443) for the relief of the St. Thomas Episcopal Church, of Middletown, Frederick County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3444) for the relief of the Salem Baptist Church, of Clark County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3445) for the relief of the Mount Zion Church of United Brethren, Frederick County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3446) for the relief of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Stephen City, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 3447) granting an increase of pension to Adam C. Rarick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3448) granting an increase of pension to Delhu Norris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3449) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Gaskill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3450) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Roush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 3451) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Alonzo Rockwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 3452) granting an increase of pension to Jacob McGaughey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3453) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Reeves—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3454) granting an increase of pension to Francis Heath—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3455) granting an increase of pension to William R. Warden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3456) granting an increase of pension to David B. Ott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3457) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence Connelly—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 3458) granting a pension to Spencer Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3459) for the relief of John W. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3460) for the benefit of Emily Byrd, of Wolfe County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 3461) to reimburse

Robert Murdock for extra clerk hire paid by him as postmaster of Logan City, Utah—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3462) for the relief of Franklin Patterson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3463) for the relief of the widow and children of Henry C. Murphy, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 3464) for the relief of Robert D. Patterson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3465) for the relief of the heirs and distributees of H. W. Hargrove—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3466) for the relief of Charles W. Johnson, administrator of Lydia Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3467) for the relief of John G. Young—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 3468) for the relief of James T. Caldwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3469) for the relief of Margaret Myers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3470) for the relief of the heirs of Alfred R. Buffin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3471) for the relief of William M. Mantlo—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3472) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen H. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3473) for the relief of James T. Caldwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3474) for the relief of J. B. Chandler and D. B. Cox—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3475) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Ayres—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3476) for the relief of the trustees of Liberty Baptist Church, New Kent County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3477) for the relief of the trustees of Westover Church, Charles City County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3478) for the relief of the personal representatives of the estate of Alexander Myers, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3479) for the relief of the trustees of Fourmile Creek Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 3480) granting a pension to Edward T. Blodgett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3481) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cranston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3482) granting an increase of pension to Edwin W. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3483) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel P. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3484) granting an increase of pension to Edson J. Harrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3485) granting an increase of pension to Clinton H. Dodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3486) granting an increase of pension to George W. Thornily—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3487) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Weise—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3488) granting an increase of pension to Egbert J. Olds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3489) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3490) granting an increase of pension to Dwight Mallison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3491) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Paddock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3492) granting an increase of pension to Byron Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3493) granting an increase of pension to Almira A. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3494) granting an increase of pension to Albert A. Talham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3495) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Tower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3496) granting an increase of pension to Edward Walton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 3497) granting a pension to Martha Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3498) for the relief of Stephen M. Honeycut—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3499) for the relief of Lieut. James B. Fowler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 3500) granting a pension to William Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3501) granting a pension to Rachel Eaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3502) granting a pension to Morris Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3503) granting a pension to Neal Carey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3504) granting an increase of pension to Myron Bragg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3505) granting an increase of pension to John R. Mabee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3506) granting an increase of pension to George W. McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 3507) to correct the military record of George H. Keating—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 3508) for the relief of the estate of Francis Griffing, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3509) for the relief of the estate of Jesse M. Brent, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3510) for the relief of estate of the late James Makoy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3511) for the relief of the estate of John O'Ferrell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3512) for the relief of James W. Watson, captain in the Tenth Cavalry, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3513) for the relief of the estate of J. B. Lewis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3514) for the relief of Hampton Wall—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3515) for the relief of William R. Beach—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3516) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel G. Miller, deceased, and the estate of Mrs. E. C. Miller, deceased, late of Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3517) for the relief of Emily E. Bishop, of Pike County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3518) for the relief of Copiah County, Miss.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3519) for the relief of G. G. Butler—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3520) for the relief of Girard G. Butler—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3521) for the relief of the estate of Claham Blackman, deceased, late of Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3522) for the relief of James H. Shannon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3523) for the relief of the estate of William R. Tinsley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3524) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Nancy Mitchell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3525) for the relief of the estate of William M. Bowles, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3526) for the relief of Caleb Perkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3527) for the relief of the estate of William E. Bolls, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3528) for the relief of Samuel S. Coon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3529) for the relief of D. O. Perkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3530) for the relief of George Rea, deceased, late of Copiah County, Miss.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3531) for the relief of the estate of John R. Powers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3532) for the relief of the estate of George G. Noland, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3533) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine P. Byrnes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3534) for the relief of Ann M. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3535) for the relief of the estate of Isaac Jones, of Adams County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3536) for the relief of John A. Brent—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3537) for the relief of the estate of Edward McGehee, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of the estate of Isaac

Jones, deceased, late of Adams County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3539) for the relief of Hampton Wall—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3540) for the relief of the estate of F. W. Harris, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3541) granting a pension to Dora Weathersby—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3542) granting a pension to John Walter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3543) granting an increase of pension to E. G. De Lap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 3544) granting a pension to Josiah M. Grier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3545) granting a pension to Harvey Ranck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3546) granting a pension to Casper Wickey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3547) granting a pension to Thomas Laramore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3548) granting a pension to Loui Catharine McMullen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3549) granting a pension to Margaret Eleanor McCoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3550) granting a pension to David Hixson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3551) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3552) granting an increase of pension to David F. McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3553) granting an increase of pension to Levi Pick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3554) granting an increase of pension to William F. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3555) granting an increase of pension to John A. Speck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3556) granting an increase of pension to David H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3557) granting an increase of penison to James B. Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3558) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3559) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. Reamer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3560) granting an increase of pension to Henry Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3561) for the relief of Henry C. Wolfe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3562) for the relief of Alexander Everhart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3563) for the relief of Peter L. Carbaugh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3564) for the relief of Jacob J. Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3565) for the relief of Levi Neitz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3566) to correct the military record of Micaiah R. Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 3567) for the relief of John Kircher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3568) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Burch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3569) granting a pension to Ada A. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3570) granting an increase of pension to Susan Whorton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3571) granting a pension to Eber Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3572) granting a pension to William L. Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3573) granting a pension to John V. Sanders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3574) granting an increase of pension to Jesse McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3575) granting an increase of pension to Silas B. Hovious—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 3576) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Bub—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3577) for the relief of Barclay H. Warburton—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3578) for the relief of Hamilton D. South—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 3579) granting a pension to John R. C Tucker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3580) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Hubbard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3581) granting a pension to William F. Monday—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3582) granting a pension to P. B. Pulley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3583) granting a pension to Joseph A. Nimmo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3584) granting a pension to A. E. Durham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3585) granting a pension to Mary Wilder—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3586) to correct the military record of Robert W. Marr—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3587) granting an increase of pension to M. V. B. Amos—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3588) granting an increase of pension to William H. Riggin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3589) granting an increase of pension to Jabez Goodman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3590) granting an increase of pension to Edward E. Ousborne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3591) granting an increase of pension to Roten Burchfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3592) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Hartman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3593) removing charge of desertion from military record of Charles Branstetter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3594) for the relief of John W. Watkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3595) authorizing the President to reinstate William C. McCaskill as a cadet in the United States Military Academy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 3596) for the relief of James M. Blackburn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3597) granting a pension to Charles M. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3598) granting a pension to Anna Bever—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3599) granting a pension to Georgiana Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3600) granting a pension to Lucretia Barlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3601) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Benjamin T. Buford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3602) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Hiram B. Bell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3603) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph G. Dennis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3604) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Joseph S. Stoop—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 3605) granting an increase of pension to Albert Lathrop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3606) granting an increase of pension to John S. Hoover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 3607) for the relief of Frank M. Dooley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3608) for the relief of James W. Hardin and to remove the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3609) for the relief of the estate of J. J. Brison, deceased, late of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3610) for the relief of W. S. Reid, administrator of Mrs. F. M. Harris, deceased, late of Franklin, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3611) for the relief of the estate of Lemuel Long—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3612) for the relief of the estate of N. E. Perkins, deceased, late of Williamson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3613) for the relief of Thomas J. Lawson, sr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3614) for the relief of the estate of Isaac Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3615) for the relief of the estate of S. J. Stockard, late of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3616) for the relief of Richard Workman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3617) for the relief of the estate of William B. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3618) for the relief of John D. Reed, administrator of J. P. C. Reed, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3619) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Pulaski, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3620) for the relief of the estate of William Grigsby, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3621) for the relief of the heirs of Michael Holoran—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3622) for the relief of the estate of Jonathan Mills—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3623) for the relief of P. H. Nelson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3624) for the relief of Mrs. Jane Henry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3625) for the relief of the estate of Edwin Grant—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3626) for the relief of William G. Tidwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3627) for the relief of the estate of N. M. Buyers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3628) for the relief of the estate of B. H. Caldwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3629) for the relief of H. J. Brewer, of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3630) for the relief of the estate of James H. Huey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3631) for the relief of John V. Wright—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3632) for the relief of the estate of F. T. McLaurine—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3633) for the relief of Alexander Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3634) for the relief of Jonathan Amis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3635) for the relief of the estate of E. C. Overton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3636) for the relief of the estate of Nathan Perry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3637) for the relief of the estate of D. S. Phelan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3638) for the relief of the estate of Andrew Roberts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3639) for the relief of Calvin Hardison—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3640) for the relief of the estate of J. A. Milhous, deceased, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3641) for the relief of the estate of Andrew Scott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3642) for the relief of William M. Beasley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3643) for the relief of the estate of Nancy P. Garrison, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3644) for the relief of the estate of Robert Thompson Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3645) for the relief of G. W. Outlaw—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3646) for the relief of William G. Tidwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3647) for the relief of James P. Sprott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3648) for the relief of the estate of Blythe Sprott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3649) for the relief of Zenas Parker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3650) for the relief of the vestry of St. Peter's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Columbia, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3651) for the relief of the estate of Henry Kelly, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3652) for the relief of the estate of Washington W. Miller, late of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3653) for the relief of the estate of John H. Grimes, deceased, late of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3654) for the relief of the Maury County Fair Association—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3655) for the relief of J. S. Woody, Martins Mills, Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3656) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Bolton, late of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3657) for the relief of the estate of William Johnson, late of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3658) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Triune, Williamson County, Tenn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3659) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Henly Patton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3660) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3661) granting an increase of pension to Jane Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3662) granting an increase of pension to Freeling H. Amick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3663) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Beiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3664) granting an increase of pension to Gustave Freudenthal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3665) granting a pension to Israel W. Bennett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3666) to pay the estate of J. J. Walker for stores and supplies—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3667) to pay to the heirs of Pleasant Hines, deceased, the sum of $1,000, the value of property taken from him by the troops of the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3668) to pay to the heirs of Nathan Curry, deceased, the sum of $1,503, for property taken and used by the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3669) to pay Josephine O. Anderson the sum of $175, the value of property from her taken and used by the troops of the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3670) to pay Thomas S. Truett the sum of $340, the value of property taken from him by the troops of the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3671) to pay the heirs of James Ramsy, deceased, the sum of $250, the value of property from him taken and used by the troops of the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3672) authorizing the Secretary of War to have erected at Hohenwald, Tenn., a monument in honor of Meriwether Lewis—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3673) to remove charge of desertion standing against William M. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3674) to remove the charge of desertion against J. W. Teas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3675) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Merida Mealor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3676) to remove the charge of desertion against W. A. Kilburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3677) to correct the military record of Edward W. Gobble—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAGE: A bill (H. R. 3678) granting an increase of pension to J. C. S. Twitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3679) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3680) for the relief of Martha A. Moffitt—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3681) granting an increase of pension to Sanders M. Ingram—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 3682) granting an increase of pension to E. N. Melton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3683) granting an increase of pension to Michael Brannan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 3684) granting an increase of pension to Erastus L. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3685) granting an increase of pension to James O. Tobey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3686) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Cowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3687) granting an increase of pension to Dominicus J. Wardwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3688) granting an increase of pension to Frank Rollins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3689) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Lyons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3690) granting an increase of pension to Warren S. Rand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3691) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3692) granting an increase of pension to John W. Pressley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3693) granting an increase of pension to D. J. Wardwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3694) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Emery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3695) granting an increase of pension to Wilson M. Mayo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3696) granting an increase of pension to Hiram E. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3697) granting an increase of pension to George N. Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3699) granting an increase of pension to Randall Eldridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3700) granting a pension to Harriet N. Rounds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 3701) granting a pension to Rebecca Prince—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3702) granting a pension to Joseph Geraghty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3703) granting a pension to Mrs. C. L. Rouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3704) granting a pension to Mary E. Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3705) granting a pension to William L. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3706) granting a pension to Calvin Sturtz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3707) granting a pension to Sarah J. Stephenson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3708) granting a pension to William Mollenkamp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3709) granting a pension to Mary Murnane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3710) granting a pension to Samantha A. Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3711) granting a pension to George W. Collins, alias George C. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3712) granting a pension to J. M. Cruson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3713) granting a pension to Albert Donaldson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3714) granting a pension to Susannah Dunlop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3715) granting a pension to Samuel Dolloff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3716) granting a pension to A. Foss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3717) granting a pension to S. A. Burges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3718) granting a pension to Henry Hooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3719) granting a pension to Peter M. Jumper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3720) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McNulty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3721) granting an increase of pension to William H. Mize—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3722) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester C. Limbocker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3723) granting an increase of pension to R. G. Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3724) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Likins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3725) granting an increase of pension to George Kreigh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3726) granting an increase of pension to Benton A. Joiner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3727) granting an increase of pension to Edwin J. Joy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3728) granting an increase of pension to George W. Husted—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3729) granting an increase of pension to William J. Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3730) granting an increase of pension to Austin Gill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3731) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3732) granting an increase of pension to John Cline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3733) granting an increase of pension to Simeon D. Chelf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3734) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Carte—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3735) granting an increase of pension to Myrtle Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3736) granting an increase of pension to John Costello—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3737) granting an increase of pension to William C. Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3738) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Baughman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3739) granting an increase of pension to Edward O. C. Anthony—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3740) granting an increase of pension to John G. H. Armistead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3741) granting increase of pensions to certain persons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3742) granting an increase of pension to William Gilmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3743) granting an increase of pension to William C. Garner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3744) granting an increase of pension to Zachary Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3745) granting an increase of pension to Elias Fought—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3746) granting an increase of pension to David Essick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3747) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3748) granting an increase of penison to Sarah E. Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3749) granting an increase of pension to Harry R. Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3750) granting an increase of pension to Philo S. Darling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3751) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3752) granting an increase of pension to Vincent Dancer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3753) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda M. Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3754) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3755) granting an increase of pension to John A. Clayton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3756) granting an increase of pension to Felix Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3757) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Oldson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3758) granting an increase of pension to George Nulton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3759) granting an increase of pension to Sires B. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3760) granting an increase of pension to Hollis K. May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3761) granting an increase of pension to John McCaslin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3762) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3763) granting an increase of pension to D. T. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3764) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. McKinley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3765) granting an increase of pension to David Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3766) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3767) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Mark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3768) granting an increase of pension to N. B. McKay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3769) granting an increase of pension to Francis O'Leary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3770) granting an increase of pension to Joel F. Terry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3771) granting an increase of pension to William Sweet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3772) granting an increase of pension to Peter Sumner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3773) granting an increase of pension to Bird Solomon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3774) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Stuart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3775) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Z. Stump—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3776) granting an increase of pension to Archie P. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3777) granting an increase of pension to David C. Stotts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3778) granting an increase of pension to Jesse F. Snow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3779) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Shirt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3780) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3781) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3782) granting an increase of pension to Henry O. Pixley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3783) granting an increase of pension to John Travis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3784) granting an increase of pension to Reall A. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3785) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Wagner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3786) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor A. Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3787) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Alzor A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3788) granting an increase of pension to William Richards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3789) granting an increase of pension to David Shively—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3790) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3791) granting an increase of pension to William T. Fix—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3792) to correct the military record of Thomas Keating—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3793) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Kunkle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3794) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Sebastian Kerber—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3795) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of John Minster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3796) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of John S. Whitaker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3797) to correct the military record of Andrew J. Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3798) for the relief of Enoch Baker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3799) for the relief of Jonathan R. Blair—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3800) for the relief of Jonathan R. Blair—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3801) for the relief of William A. Grogan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3802) granting a pension to August W. Diercks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 3803) for the relief of W. A. Galloway, of Jacksonville, Ark.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3804) for the relief of the legal representatives of Wiley J. Davis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3805) granting a pension to Mollie Kupperle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3806) granting a pension to Ena L. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3807) granting an increase of pension to William Stewart—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3808) to remove the charge of desertion against Owen J. Owen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 3809) granting an increase of pension to Orville T. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3810) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3811) granting an increase of pension to James White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 3812) for the relief of veterans of the Confederacy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3813) for the relief of M. F. Snider—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3814) for the relief of acting (volunteer) officers of the United States Navy in the civil war—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3815) for the relief of W. J. Tapp & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3816) for the relief of Paris Simms and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3817) for the relief of John H. Hammill—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3818) for the relief of Lucy J. Sullivan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3819) for the relief of the estate of Mary E. Binns, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3820) for the relief of the legal representatives of Charles W. Adams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3821) for the relief of the estate of Catharine R. Moore, deceased, late of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3822) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander F. Butler, late of Louisa County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3823) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alfred Carter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3824) for the relief of Mason Shipman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3825) for the relief of the estate of John B. Brown, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3826) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander F. Butler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3827) for the relief of Luther H. Potterfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3828) for the relief of John Young—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3829) for the relief of Mrs. Elvira Moore, executrix of J. L. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3830) for the relief of the estate of George Hickman, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3831) for the relief of heirs of James W. Stone—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3832) for the relief of the estate of W. H. Stringfellow, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3833) for the relief of George S. Ayre, administrator of Thomas Ayre, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3834) for the relief of Francis M. Brabham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3835) for the relief of Annie E. Hughlett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3836) for the relief of the heirs at law of Griffith W. Paxson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3837) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mason James, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3838) for the relief of the estate of James T. Ball, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3839) for the relief of the estate of James M. Catlett, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3840) for the relief of Richard K. Hughlett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3841) for the relief of the legal representatives of Charles W. Adams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3842) for the relief of William Knight—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3843) for the relief of the estate of Robert Brockett, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3844) for the relief of the heirs of Robert Green—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3845) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mrs. S. W. Skinker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3846) for the relief of Thomas J. Nichols—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3847) for the relief of George Gorham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3848) for the relief of Thomas J. Fannon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3849) for the relief of George S. Ayre—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3850) for the relief of the estate of James P. Yancey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3851) for the relief of John A. Fairfax—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3852) for the relief of the legal representatives of Kitty Douglass—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3853) for the relief of Sarah J. Walker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3854) for the relief of Mason Shipman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3855) for the relief of Charles Clarkson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3856) for the relief of the estate of Robert N. Blake, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3857) for the relief of the estate of Emanuel Wenner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3858) for the relief of Lavinia M. Payne—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3859) for the relief of Seth R. Cooper—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3860) for the relief of John A. Fairfax—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3861) for the relief of the legal representatives of David Scott, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3862) for the relief of Miss L. E. Bowen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3863) for the relief of the legal representatives of William Hough, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3864) for the relief of Mary E. Macgregor—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3865) for the relief of James Downs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3866) for the relief of Hezekiah T. Embrey, administrator—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3867) for the relief of the legal representatives of E. A. W. Hooe, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3868) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eli Tavenner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3869) for the relief of the legal representatives of James M. Streshley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3870) for the relief of George H. Shaver—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3871) for the relief of the estate of William A. Bowen, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3872) for the relief of John H. Haws—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3873) for the relief of the legal representatives of S. A. Buckner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3874) for the relief of the legal representatives of James B. McNair, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3875) for the relief of George Umbaugh—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3876) for the relief of Sarah A. Skinner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3877) for the relief of the estate of William Shreve, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3878) for the relief of Jane L. Follin, widow of Joseph N. Follin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3879) for the relief of the estate of Dr. Bailey Shumate, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3880) for the relief of H. M. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3881) for the relief of the estate of Lewis Shumate, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3882) for the relief of William Ketland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3883) for the relief of the estate of John Sullivan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3884) for the relief of the estate of James Follin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3885) for the relief of the estate of Maria Gibson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3886) for the relief of John C. Newton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3887) for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Newlon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3888) for the relief of Mrs. L. A. Lynn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3889) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander F. Butler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3890) for the relief of the estate of Henry S. Williams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3891) for the relief of the legal representatives of William Burley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3892) for the relief of John Doherty—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3893) for the relief of the estate of Alexander F. Dulin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3894) for the relief of the personal representatives of B. P. Tolson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3895) for the relief of loyal citizens therein named of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3896) for the relief of Stonewall Cockrill, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3897) for the relief of Anna S. Frobel—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3898) for the relief of the estate of Amos Jones, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3899) for the relief of the estate of William Fletcher, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3900) for the relief of Jane D. Galleher, widow of T. H. Galleher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3901) for the relief of Lucy B. Legrande, Catharine Jameson, Elizabeth H. Lester, Shirley B. Shackelford, Edwin A. Gibson, and the heirs of Henry Shackelford, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3902) for the relief of Napoleon B. Watkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3903) for the relief of George M. Fry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3904) for the relief of Thomas Sherman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3905) for the relief of Granville J. Kelly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3906) for the relief of Emma C. Franner, George W. Seaton, Hiram K. Seaton, Howard Seaton, Mary Seaton, Blanche Seaton, George W. Taylor, Edward Taylor, and Catharine Pomeroy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3907) for the relief of Catharine Makely—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3908) for the relief of Susan J. Stegler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3909) for the relief of the estate of Sina Hughlett, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3910) for the relief of the heirs of the late Mrs. Mary Ann Randolph Custis Lee, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3911) for the relief of Benjamin M. Yancey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3912) for the relief of John C. Newton, of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3913) for the relief of Newton Woodyard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3914) for the relief of the heirs of Carter B. Butler, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3915) for the relief of Charles Clarkson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3916) for the relief of the estate of John Poland, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3917) for the relief of John Mann—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3918) for the relief of Henry Priest, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3919) for the relief of Virginia E. Ficklin and James W. Ficklin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3920) for the relief of the heirs of Ambrose Hord, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3921) for the relief of administrator of James B. Beavers, deceased, of Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3922) for the relief of John H. Haws—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3923) for the relief of the estate of Susan Richards, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3924) for the relief of John S. Mann and the estate of Lewis W. Mann, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3925) for the relief of the executors of the

estate of Sarah M. Sewall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3926) for the relief of James K. Skinker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3927) for the relief of the legal representatives of James Follin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3928) for the relief of the estate of Lewis Shumate, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3929) for the relief of the estate of William Y. Dulin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3930) for the benefit of the estate of John Linton—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3931) to compensate Arthur M. Chichester and W. B. Chichester, heirs of Mary Chichester—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3932) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Samuel W. Hough, administrator of William N. Hough, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3933) granting a pension to J. P. Flewellen—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3934) granting an increase of pension to Albert Drew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3935) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3936) to correct the naval record of Commander Sidney Smith Lee—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3937) for the relief of the legal representatives of John B. Humphreys—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 3938) for the relief of the estate of Holliday S. Ravell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3939) for the relief of the estate of J. H. Moseby, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3940) for the relief of Elvy Brewer, of Saline County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3941) for the relief of the heirs of George M. Campbell, deceased, late of Hot Springs County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3942) for the relief of the widow and heirs of the late D. G. Hineman, late of Fayette County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3943) for the relief of Mrs. Mary L. Bryan, of Grant County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3944) for the relief of the estate of Samuel J. Jones, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3945) for the relief of Mary L. Bryan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3946) for the relief of Elizabeth M. Chastain, now Elizabeth M. Harlow—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3947) for the relief of the heirs of Jennie Hunter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3948) for the relief of Eliza J. Brockville—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3949) for the relief of Thomas J. Estes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3950) for the relief of Bayles E. Cobb, of Dallas County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3951) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Pine Bluff, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3952) for the relief of the heirs of Levander Jenkins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3953) for the relief of the heirs of the late Jennie Hunter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3954) for the relief of William M. West—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3955) for the relief of J. F. Steel—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3956) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. E. J. Davis, late of Drew County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3957) for the relief of John McDermott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3958) for the relief of Mrs. Fannie E. Owens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3959) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Pine Bluff, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3960) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Pine Bluff, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3961) for the relief of the heirs of Olive Coppock, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3962) for the relief of the firm of Bertrand & Scull, late of Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3963) for the relief of J. E. Caldwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3964) for the relief of the estate of James Scull—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3965) granting a pension to Rachael C. Golden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3966) granting an increase of pension to S. D. Jester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3967) granting an increase of pension to William J. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3968) granting a pension to Fannie Hay Maffitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3969) to correct the military record of the late Ezekiel Golden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3970) for the relief of Kate H. Kavanaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 3971) granting a pension to John T. Horner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3972) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3973) granting an increase of pension to Isaac P. Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3974) for the relief of Alexander Clapp—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3975) for the relief of M. F. Thomas—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 3976) to refund to the State of New York certain duties paid by said State in 1863 to arm State troops organized to aid in suppressing the then existing insurrection against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 3977) granting an increase of pension to John Vorous—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3978) granting a pension to Samuel Greenlee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3979) granting a pension to Paul Stang—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3980) granting a pension to Frank G. Hammond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3981) granting an increase of pension to John McKeever—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3982) granting an increase of pension to Jason T. Geibner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3983) granting a pension to Blanche Douglass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3984) granting a pension to George T. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3985) granting an increase of pension to L. M. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3986) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Kuhns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3987) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Kiester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3988) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3989) granting an increase of pension to Hiram T. Houghton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 3990) for the relief of the estate of William Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3991) for the relief of Marmon Spence Pope—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3992) for the relief of the estate of L. D. Crawley, deceased, late of Decatur County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3993) for the relief of W. T. Newbill—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3994) for the relief of R. R. Aycock—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3995) for the relief of the legal representatives of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3996) for the relief of the estate of John H. Grimes, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3997) for the relief of John A. Meroney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3998) for the relief of the legal representatives of George W. Wray, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3999) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jack Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4000) for the relief of S. S. Littlejohn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4001) for the relief of W. T. Newbill—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4002) for the relief of the legal representatives of A. K. Jones, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4003) for the relief of the legal representatives of James H. Napier, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4004) for the relief of Houston Medlin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4005) for the relief of the legal representatives of Richard Odle, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4006) for the relief of the legal representatives of B. J. Young, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4007) for the relief of R. H. Carter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4008) for the relief of the estate of S. M. Davidson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4009) for the relief of J. M. Elston—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4010) for the relief of J. M. Rice—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4011) for the relief of the legal representatives of James Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4012) for the relief of Frederick Webb—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4013) for the relief of John Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4014) for the relief of D. C. Savells—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4015) for the relief of the estate of W. W. Savells, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4016) for the relief of Simon Witkowski—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4017) for the relief of W. E. Mitchum—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4018) for the relief of B. J. Young—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4019) for the relief of the estate of Elijah Williams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4020) for the relief of John Mincey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4021) for the relief of the estate of Dr. J. M. Walker, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4022) for the relief of the estate of Isaac F. Huddleston, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4023) for the relief of James D. Lane—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4024) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Hayes, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4025) for the relief of Mary J. Moody—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4026) for the relief of T. M. D. Coln—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4027) for the relief of John Zimmerman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4028) for the relief of the estate of David Hurst—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4029) for the relief of the estate of Robert Edwards, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4030) for the relief of M. Robison, administrator of T. E. Robison, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4031) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Morton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4032) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. C. Williamson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4033) for the relief of Mary W. Ridley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4034) for the relief of A. G. Hawkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4035) for the relief of the estate of John Richards, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4036) for the relief of James Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4037) for the relief of Jesse Cobb (colored)—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4038) for the relief of Edmund W. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4039) for the relief of Sidney Plunk—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4040) for the relief of Goerge Plunk—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4041) for the relief of the estate of O. F. Hendricks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4042) for the relief of the legal representatives of John C. Trice, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4043) for the relief of the estate of Tucker Jackson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4044) for the relief of the estate of R. H. Crider—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4045) for the relief of the legal representatives of Malinda Swink, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4046) for the relief of the estate of F. M. Hagy, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4047) for the relief of John F. Leach, administrator of estate of R. H. Carter, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4048) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. M. McAuley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4049) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Morton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4050) for the relief of the legal representatives of O. F. Hendricks, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4051) for the relief of the estate of Cloa Giles—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4052) for the relief of W. M. Brevard & Co.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4053) for the relief of the estate of Jesse Giles—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4054) for the relief of P. E. Parker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4055) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jennings H. Courts, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4056) for the relief of the estate of James T. Clement, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4057) for the relief of the estate of Richard L. Hendrix, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4058) for the relief of the estate of Walter W. Melton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4059) for the relief of the estate of John Sanford, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4060) for the relief of the estate of Hudson Muse, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4061) for the relief of the estate of John S. Burrows, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4062) for the relief of the legal representatives of William Kendall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4063) for the relief of the estate of R. D. Freeland, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4064) for the relief of Eli Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4065) for the relief of J. F. Allison—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4066) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. M. McAuley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4067) for the relief of the estate of John A. Criner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4068) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah M. King—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4069) for the relief of the estate of James Hendrix—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4070) for the relief of W. T. Wade, guardian of the minor heir at law of Archibald B. Womble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4071) for the relief of Jesse J. Clemmons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4072) for the relief of James M. Brandon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4073) for the relief of B. F. Walpole—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4074) for the relief of Benjamin F. Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4075) for the relief of Thomas Cary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4076) for the relief of James Kerby—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4077) for the relief of Zelpha Watson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4078) for the relief of Cullen C. Argo—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4079) for the relief of William H. Carrington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4080) for the relief of Jefferson Franks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4081) for the relief of Levi G. Ballard, of Chester County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4082) granting a pension to William B. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4083) granting a pension to Hannah Gage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4084) granting a pension to R. B. White—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4085) granting a pension to Martha A. Sanders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4086) granting a pension to John R. Costen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4087) granting a pension to Robert M. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4088) granting a pension to John Riggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4089) granting a pension to Thomas Cary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4090) granting a pension to Mary C. Quinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4091) granting a pension to William J. Manley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4092) granting a pension to George W. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4093) granting a pension to James R. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4094) granting a pension to William C. Mullins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4095) granting a pension to Rebecca Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4096) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4097) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4098) granting an increase of pension to Persia M. Hawkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4099) granting an increase of pension to John H. Reed—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4100) granting an increase of pension to John W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4101) granting an increase of pension to John K. McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4102) for the benefit of H. C. Ruth—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4103) to muster in certain members of Col. Frank W. Harrison's regiment of West Tennessee recruits, and to grant them an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4104) granting an honorable discharge to John W. Harwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4105) to muster William H. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4106) to correct the military record of John Turnbo, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4107) to correct the military record of George W. Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4108) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Quinn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4109) to remove the charge of desertion against Elias C. Phillips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4110) to remove the charge of disobedience of orders against William W. Kirby—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4111) to remove the charge of desertion against John A. Lawler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4112) for the relief of James B. Phillips—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4113) for the relief of John Heberer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4114) for the relief of Edward A. Buder—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4115) for the relief of the city of Cairo, in the State of Illinois—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4116) for the relief of John A. Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4117) for the relief of James Walden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4118) for the relief of William H. Thedford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4119) for the relief of John R. Nelson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4120) for the relief of John, alias Henry, Ridenbaugh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4121) for the relief of John Ballard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4122) for the relief of Adam Miller—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4123) for the relief of Leonard P. C. Binkley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4124) for the relief of Abraham Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4125) for the relief Robert T. Shipley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4126) for the relief of Alfred McNeely—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4127) for the relief of Gabriel W. Arnold—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4128) for the relief of Edward B. Haynie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4129) granting an increase of pension to George W. Ruble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4130) granting an increase of pension to Rederick S. Nickens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4131) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Tyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4132) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4133) granting a pension to Alexander Laughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4134) granting a pension to Walter M. Corn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4135) granting a pension to Napoleon B. Greathouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4136) granting a pension to Nancy C. Provence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4137) granting a pension to Elijah Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4138) granting a pension to Sidney D. Mackey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4139) granting a pension to Virginia E. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4140) granting a pension to Sarah Aldrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4141) granting a pension to Elizabeth Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4142) granting a pension to Jacob F. Blessing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4143) granting a pension to Alice F. Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4144) granting a pension to Alfred U. Whiffen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4145) granting a pension to William H. Tate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4146) granting a pension to William Mathis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4147) granting a pension to Helen M. Hamilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4148) granting a pension to Alfred Hayton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4149) granting an increase of pension to Thompson Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4150) granting an increase of pension to John C. McGinis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4151) granting an increase of pension to John W. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4152) granting an increase of pension to William T. McMillan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4153) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Wildy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4154) granting an increase of pension to Beal Pickett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4155) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Dial—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4156) granting an increase of pension to Noah S. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4157) granting an increase of pension to Alford A. Fulford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4158) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Hamilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4159) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Summers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4160) granting an increase of pension to John T. McGown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4161) granting an increase of pension to Robert Beatty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4162) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4163) granting an increase of pension to Alfred D. Mandrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4164) granting an increase of pension to Oregon Boughner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4165) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Sternberg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4166) granting an increase of pension to John G. V. Herndon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4167) granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Couch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4168) granting an increase of pension to Esther A. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4169) granting an increase of pension to Jesse McBride—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4170) granting an increase of pension to William B. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4171) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James W. Cline, alias Eugene L. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4172) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William Deniston—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4173) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Stephen J. Simpson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4174) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Casey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4175) to compensate George K. Kirchner for his stock of goods taken and destroyed by Federal soldiers in the year A. D. 1862—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4176) granting an increase of pension to Michael Mohan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 4177) granting a pension to Susan H. Chadsey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4178) granting an increase of pension to J. Loomis Gould—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4179) granting an increase of pension to Owen Donohoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4180) for the relief of Frederick See—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4181) for the relief of Edmund F. Jenkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4182) for the relief of Pain's Fireworks Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4183) for the relief of Rittenhouse Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4184) for the relief of the Selma and Meridian Railroad Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4185) for the relief of Hannah J. Jones, executrix of Emanuel Jones, deceased, a British subject—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4186) for the relief of the Medical College of Alabama—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4187) for the relief of the Mobile Marine Dock Company—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4188) for the relief of Ella L. Demouy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4189) for the relief of the heirs at law of Patrick H. Burnett, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4190) for the relief of the creditors of the Deposit Savings Association, of Mobile, Ala.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4191) granting a pension to Julia H. Lyle and Willie Elizabeth Lyle—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4192) granting an increase of pension to John C. Cavanaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4193) granting an increase of pension to James H. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4194) granting a pension to Mary McMullen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4195) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Se Cheverell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4196) granting an increase of pension to James J. Winans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4197) granting an increase of pension to Lucy J. Smetts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4198) granting an increase of pension to John C. Lindsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 4199) for the relief of George W. Flack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4200) to authorize the President to place the name of John Roop on the retired list of the United States Navy with the rank of first assistant engineer, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4201) for the relief of A. Louisa Corson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4202) granting an increase of pension to John C. Umstead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4203) granting a pension to Mary Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4204) for the relief of the owner or owners of the barge *Charlie*—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4205) granting an increase of pension to Amanda W. Ritchie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4206) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Henry Ober—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4207) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4208) granting an increase of pension to William B. Worthington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4209) granting an increase of pension to Martin Callahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4210) granting an increase of pension to Taylor Wanamaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4211) granting an increase of pension to John Roop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4212) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4213) granting an increase of pension to George F. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4214) for the recognition of the military service of the officers and enlisted men of certain Pennsylvania military organizations—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 4215) granting an increase of pension to John A. Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4216) granting an increase of pension to Robert Boon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4217) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Rose—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4218) granting an increase of pension to John M. Williamson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4219) granting an increase of pension to John C. Keener—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4220) granting a pension to W. J. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 4221) granting an increase of pension to William Foat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4222) granting an increase of pension to Otto Boesewetter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4223) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Schultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4224) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Pletzke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4225) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4226) granting an increase of pension to William Painter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4227) to remove the charge of desertion against John Walther—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4228) to remove the charge of desertion against George Richard Hasson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 4229) granting a pension to Harry B. Robb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4230) granting an increase of pension to William H. Miles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4231) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Rardin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4232) to correct the military record of William M. Cheuvrout—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 4233) to reimburse the Harpswell Steamboat Company, of Portland, Me., for expenses incurred and for repairing damages sustained by its steamer *Sebascodegan* in collision with the United States steamer *Woodbury*—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4234) for the relief of Clement C. Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4235) for the relief of Robert M. Williams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4236) for the relief of the estate of John B. Russell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4237) for the relief of S. H. Tison—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request) a bill (H. R. 4238) for the relief of Jane Lemaster—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 4239) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States revenue cutter *Gallatin* off the coast of Massachusetts—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4240) granting an increase of pension to James F. Chipman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4241) granting an increase of pension to David B. Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4242) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4243) for the relief of Hannah W. Millard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4244) granting an increase of pension to John Spaulding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4245) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Wilson B. Strong captain and quartermaster in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 4246) granting an increase of pension to George D. Street—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4247) granting an increase of pension to Bridget A. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4248) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4249) granting an increase of pension to James J. Lowden—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4250) granting an increase of pension to Rose Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4251) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4252) granting an increase of pension to Giles R. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4253) granting an increase of pension to Anderson L. Gill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4254) granting an increase of pension to Edson D. Bemis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4255) granting an increase of pension to Philip T. Greeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4256) granting a pension to Antoinette I. Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4257) granting a pension to Alice M. Durney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4258) granting a pension to Georgia A. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4259) granting a pension to Emma F. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4260) granting a pension to Louisa J. Arey—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4261) granting a pension to Louise S. McWhinnie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4262) granting a pension to Augustus James Norwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4263) granting a pension to Eben N. Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4264) granting a pension to Frances E. Maloon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4265) granting a pension to Lowell M. Maxham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4266) granting a pension to Andrew L. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4267) granting a pension to John D. Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4268) granting a pension to George D'Vys—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4269) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Lauriat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4270) for the relief of Arthur R. Henderson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4271) for the relief of Patrick J. Madden—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4272) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph E. Wakefield—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4273) for the relief of Paul B. Walbridge—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4274) for the relief of the legal representatives of Paul Curtis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4275) for the relief of Samuel M. Blair—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4276) for the relief of Alexander Sutherland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4277) to correct the military record of James J. Mahegan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4278) to correct the military record of Josiah Leathe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4279) to correct the military record of Wilbur C. Stephens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4280) placing upon the retired list the name of Joseph H. Burrows—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4281) to amend the military record of John H. Lamson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4282) to amend the military record of Henry Quick—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4283) to correct the military record of Seth Bonney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4284) granting an honorable discharge to James Woods—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4285) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Julius F. Hill, alias Franklin J. Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4286) donating an obsolete mortar to the Somerville Historical Society—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4287) to appropriate the sum of $4,000, to be paid to Alfred Roberts for personal injuries received at the United States custom-house in Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4288) to correct the war record of Edward J. Gallagher, late first lieutenant Company G, Thirty-third Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4289) to authorize the President to revoke the order dismissing William T. Godwin, late first lieutenant, Tenth Infantry, United States Army, and to place the said William T. Godwin on the retired list with the rank of first lieutenant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4290) granting an increase of pension to William T. Godwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4291) granting a pension to Emma Worrall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4292) granting a pension to George W. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4293) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hagerty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4294) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. E. Nesbitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4295) for the relief of Mary Jane Pollard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4296) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Buckley McCready—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4297) granting an increase of pension to Jacob G. Orth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4298) granting a pension to Thomas F. Walter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 4299) for the relief of John Stinson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4300) for the relief of A. J. Stinson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4301) for the relief of Burwell J. Curry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4302) for the relief of L. B. Wyatt—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4303) for the relief of Robert D. Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4304) for the relief of the estate of Reuben Street, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, A bill (H. R. 4305) for the relief of the estate of Peter S. Baker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4306) for the relief of the heirs of John Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4307) for the relief of Margaret L. Watkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4308) for the relief of William B. Olive—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4309) for the relief of the heirs of Kennon H. Steger, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4310) for the relief of Calvin S. Hill—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4311) for the relief of Xantippe Jackson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4312) for the relief of the heirs of John Meals, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4313) for the relief of the estate of Caswell B. Derrick, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4314) for the relief of William M. Hilliard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4315) for the relief of William M. Hilliard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4316) for the relief of Mrs. Cassa Simpson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4317) for the relief of the estate of Preston Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4318) for the relief of the estate of Sidney F. Tate, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4319) for the relief of the estate of James Woosley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4320) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Ward, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also a bill (H. R. 4321) for the relief of the heirs of the estate of Melissa Gathright, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4322) for the relief of Joseph Lightfoot—to the Commitee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4323) for the relief of J. M. Curtis, of Morgan County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4324) for the relief of the trustees of the Chestnut Grove Church, of Morgan County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4325) for the relief of the heirs of the estate of Melissa Gathright, deceased, of Colbert County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4326) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Thomas F. Brumby—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4327) for the relief of Mary J. Bailey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4328) for the relief of the heirs of James T. Anderson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4329) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Hughes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4330) for the relief of Felix Weeden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4331) for the relief of Mrs. H. H. Cribbs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4332) for the relief of Mrs. Bathsheba Gordon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4333) for the relief of L. B. Wyatt—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4334) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Pace—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4335) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4336) granting a pension to Martha E. Gilbreath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4337) to provide for the payment of the claim of the Walnut Grove Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Madison County, Ala., against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4338) to donate certain lands in Alabama for educational purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4339) to provide for the payment of the claim of the Florence Masonic Lodge, of Florence, Ala., against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4340) to provide for the payment of the claim of the Primitive Baptist Church, of Huntsville, Ala., against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4341) to pay the claim against the United States of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Athens, Limestone County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4342) to refer the claim against the United States of the heirs of Fabian Varin to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 4343) to donate and grant to the public schools of Hot Springs, Ark., all lots and blocks owned by the Government and unsold—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4344) to grant to the public school board of Hot Springs, Ark., the right to use and occupy block 114 of said city as a site for a school building—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4345) to donate certain lots in the city of Hot Springs, Ark., to the National Christian Library Association of said city—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 4346) granting an increase of pension to T. H. B. Schooling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4347) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Burchett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4348) granting an increase of pension to William McCraw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4349) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Buckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4350) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Vance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4351) granting an increase of pension to George A. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4352) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wolcott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

Also, a bill (H. R. 4353) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4354) granting an increase of pension to J. D. Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4355) granting an increase of pension to Elijah G. Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4356) granting an increase of pension to Simeon McKinstray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4357) granting an increase of pension to Cassius M. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4358) granting an increase of pension to Ferguson M. Carnahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4359) granting an increase of pension to George W. Sorrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4360) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel H. Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4361) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4362) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4363) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4364) granting an increase of pension to George W. Neece—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4365) granting an increase of pension to Ambrosia Senecal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4366) granting a pension to Taylor Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4367) granting a pension to Archibald Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4368) granting a pension to James W. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4369) granting a pension to Samuel T. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4370) granting a pension to John T. Burriss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4371) granting a pension to Jackson Lambert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4372) for the relief of Louis Benecke—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4373) for the relief of McCarty & Collins—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4374) for the relief of Martin Daughenbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4375) for the relief of Mrs. Mollie Bissell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4376) for the relief of Francis M. Sheppard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4377) for the relief of the estate of Josiah White, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4378) to remove the charge of desertion against Lewis Jenkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4379) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles W. Miller, alias Charles Nowack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4380) to correct the military record of John Loney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4381) to correct the military record of John P. Griffith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 4382) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain expenditures incurred by the State of New York for the defense and protection of the frontier from an invasion from Canada in the year 1864—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 4383) for the relief of the estate of Eliza A. White—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4384) for

the relief of the heirs of Elijah D. Guthrie—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4385) for the relief of the heirs of John S. Askin, Arthur Ipock, and John T. Ipock, of Craven County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4386) granting an increase of pension to Zelinda E. Odenbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 4387) granting a pension to Charles H. Bunge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4388) granting a pension to Laura Hilgeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4389) for the relief of Martha A. Murphy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4390) for the relief of the estate of Dewitt Slawson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 4391) granting an increase of pension to William John Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4392) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 4393) granting an increase of pension to Henry Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 4394) for the relief of Patrick Doran—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 4395) granting an increase of pension to Zeralda Phares—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4396) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Wiley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4397) granting an increase of pension to John W. Byers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4398) granting a pension to Charles C. Kilburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4399) granting an increase of pension to Charles Croddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4400) granting an increase of pension to Enoch P. Updike—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 4401) for the relief of estate of Joseph M. Witt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4402) for the relief of D. W. Jarrett—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4403) granting a pension to John H. Pepper—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4404) granting a pension to J. L. Marbut, alias John Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4405) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Denson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4406) granting a pension to Albert M. Ryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4407) granting an increase of pension to John Watts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4408) granting a pension to G. M. McCurry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4409) for the relief of Isaac Chadwick, of Dekalb County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4410) for the relief of the estate of Green Guest, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4411) granting a pension to Daniel B. Norwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4412) granting a pension to Thomas K. C. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4413) for the relief of the heirs of John Edwards, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4414) granting a pension to Josiah Campbell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4415) for the relief of James Pitts—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4416) for the relief of the estate of James L. Romine, deceased, Winston County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4417) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Joseph A. Choate—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4418) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Robert A. Godsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4419) for the relief of the estate of J. C. West—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4420) for the relief of William D. Clay and others—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4421) for the relief of J. B. Roberson, administrator of the estate of J. P. Roberson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4422) for the relief of David W. Hollis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4423) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James W. Gutherie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of P. C. Erzinger and 15 other citizens of Chicago, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Barbers' Union Association of Savannah, Ga., favoring creation of national commission—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Painters, Paper Hangers, and Decorators' Union No. 467, of Kankakee, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of city council of Santa Fe, N. Mex., for admission of New Mexico and Arizona as States—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church, Allegheny, Pa., for suppression of polygamy in the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, favoring admission to United States of Chinese travelers and visitors not of cooly class—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Reformed Presbyterian Church of Beaverfalls, Pa., for suppression of polygamy in the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the First United Presbyterian Church of Rochester, Pa., for the suppression of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Jane Lancaster, Robert W. McMillan, and S. H. Tyson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of J. P. Flewellen—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John L. D. Borthwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, for legislation to admit Chinese visitors and travelers not of cooly class—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Nome Chamber of Commerce, for representation in Congress by Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition favoring preservation of trees in California and New Hampshire—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Council, No. 196, Knights of Columbus, for statue of Commodore Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition for appropriations to improve Columbia River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Ptition of citizens of South Dakota, for a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Morancy Council, No. 58, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CASSEL: Resolutions of Local Union No. 380, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, of Lancaster, Pa., favoring the removal of the tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Conestoga Council, No. 22, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring a restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CASTOR: Petition of Garden Council, No. 18, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of residents of Kenosha, Wis., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of View Cliff Council and Purity Council, of Pennsylvania, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration; also, of the Trade League of Philadelphia, relative to Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of McKeesport (Pa.) Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics; General McClennan Council, of

Verona, Pa., and Elizabeth Lodge, Knights of Pythias, of Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Excelsior Division, No. 359, Order of Railway Conductors, against Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, favoring admission of Chinese travelers and visitors—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, relative to admission of Chinese travelers and visitors on equal terms with other nations—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the National German Alliance of the United States, favoring the canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John A. Smith and William S. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: Petition of citizens of Tennessee, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: Petition of J. W. Campbell and others, for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition and resolution of Local Union No. 111, of Lynn, Mass., Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARBER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of M. B. Barbee, of Raleigh, N. C.; Jesse A. B. Thorne, of Macclesfield, N. C., and Herbert Williams, of McCullers, N. C.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Warren A. Blye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of the Dames of 1846, relative to House bill for relief of Mexican war veteran survivors—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, favoring change of laws relating to Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the board of trustees of the New York Soldiers and Sailors' Home, Bath, N. Y., favoring restoration of the canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petitions of Star of the West Council, No. 465; Pride of the West Council, No. 157, and Hillsdale Council, No. 235, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Portland Board of Trade, for appropriation for improvement of Columbia River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Patterson Coal and Supply Company, for postal law favoring two classes of mail matter only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of the Providence Medical Association, favoring reorganization of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Washington Council, No. 2, and Eagle Council, No. 8, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Providence, R. I., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Hedley D. Lefever—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petitions of citizens of Nora Springs, Elkader, West Union, and Osage, Iowa, favoring enlarging of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Retail Merchants' Association of Fayette County, Iowa, for repeal of bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of New Hampton, Iowa, against passage of the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of Ben Miller Council, No. 11, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Danbury, Conn., concerning immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petitions of the Junior Order United American Mechanics of Maryland, residents of New Brunswick, N. J.; and the Trades and Labor Federation of New Brunswick, N. J., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Woman's Club of Westfield, N. J., for legislation to preserve Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of residents of Hopewell and New Brunswick, N. J., for legislation to prevent use of Indian trust funds for contract schools organized by any church or sect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of citizens of Utah, for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petitions of Harvey G. Eastman Council, No. 97, and Victory Council, No. 82, of New York—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAHON: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Levi Neitz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bills for the relief of Casper Wickey, Harvey Ranck, Josiah M. Grier, and David F. McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 415, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Mount Pleasant, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of the United Presbyterian Church of Dayton, Ohio, for law prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Albert Drew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the admission of Chinese visitors and travelers—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petitions of Rasselas Grange, of Elk County, Pa., and Columbus Grange, of Warren County, Pa., for amending of the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of citizens of Tennessee, for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of various manufacturers of the Second Congressional district of Connecticut, asking for two classes of mail matter only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of New Haven, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, protest of brewers of Hartford, Conn., against any increase of tax on beer and ale—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the trustees of the New York State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, favoring restoration of canteen to the Home, for malt liquors—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Resolutions of the general assembly of North Carolina, requesting Senators and Representatives to use their united influence to secure the passage of a law that will permit farmers and growers of tobacco to manufacture and sell the same in any quantity or form free from any tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany war claims of heirs of John S. Askin and others, of Craven County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of Vandemere Council, No. 110; Oriental Council, No. 107, and Pender Council, No 59, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of Wyandotte Council, No. 28, of Wyandotte, Mich., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Webster Farmers' Club, of Dexter, Mich., favoring a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Resolution of the board of trustees of the Soldiers and Sailors' Home of Bath, N. Y., favoring reestablishment of the canteen at said Home—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Princeville Grange, No. 507, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bucks County, Pa., for amendment of act to define butter, approved August 6, 1886, by striking out the word "knowingly" from section 6, line 15—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Patrons of Husbandry, farmers, and dairymen of central Pennsylvania, for passage of a pure-food law and for amendment of act defining butter by striking out the word "knowingly" from section 6—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Penns Park Council, No. 973, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Penns Park, Pa., for the restric-

tion of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Springtown Council, No. 929, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Springtown, Pa., demanding restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Pipersville Council, No. 620, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pipersville, Pa., for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Henry Seybert Council, No. 520, of Abington, Pa., in favor of restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of American Star Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, No. 53, of Bryn Mawr, Pa., for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of A. T. Vandegrift, T. E. Gusman, and other members of Camp No. 215, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Ambler, Pa., for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEBB: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John C. Keener, of Ingalls, N. C.; John M. Williamson, of Lowesville, N. C.; Daniel M. Rose, of Charlotte, N. C.; John A. Roberts, of Howards Creek, N. C., and Robert Boon, of Wing, N. C.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of Davidson (N. C.) Council, No. 56, and Park Council, No. 90, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEISSE: Papers to accompany a bill for an increase of pension to Christopher Pletzke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting an increase of pension to Willis Painter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Sanspree—to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 6, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

ANSELM J. MCLAURIN, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REPORTS OF SECRETARY OF SENATE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, a full and complete statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate of public moneys remaining in his possession from July 1, 1904, to June 30, 1905; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting a full and complete account of all property, including stationery, belonging to the United States in his possession on the 4th day of December, 1905; which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

REPORTS OF SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms, transmitting a statement of the receipts from the sale of condemned property in his possession since December 5, 1904; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms, giving a full and complete account of all property belonging to the United States in his possession December 4, 1905; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

INDEX OF PRIVATE CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a record and index of private claims before the Senate in the Fifty-eighth Congress, made through the chairman of the Committee on Claims, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], in accordance with the act of March 3, 1905. The record and index have already been printed, and the document is ready for distribution, as provided in the statute.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Attorney-General for the fiscal year 1905; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the operations of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1905; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

LAWS OF OKLAHOMA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the journals of the council and house proceedings of the eighth legislative assembly of the Territory of Oklahoma, together with a copy of the session laws of 1905, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

LAWS OF HAWAII.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the house journal of the third legislature of Hawaii, regular and extra sessions, 1905, submitted, pursuant to law, through the Department by the secretary of the Territory of Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

LAWS OF PORTO RICO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, one copy each of the acts and resolutions of the second legislative assembly, convened in extraordinary session, and of the first session of the third legislative assembly of Porto Rico, and journal of the executive council of Porto Rico, third legislative assembly, first session, 1905, submitted through the Department by the secretary of Porto Rico, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

LAWS OF NEW MEXICO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, one copy each of the laws and the council and house journals of the thirty-sixth legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, 1905; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

LAWS OF ARIZONA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the acts, resolutions, and memorials of the twenty-third legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, together with the journals of the council and house proceedings for the session; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

INDIAN DEPREDATION CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of all final judgments in Indian depredations rendered in favor of claimants and against the United States under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1891, not heretofore appropriated for; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

In the cause of The Trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Moorefield, W. Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of The Trustees of the Calvary Protestant Episcopal Church, of Culpeper County, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of The County Court of Berkeley County, W. Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of The Trustees of St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Harpers Ferry, W. Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of The Trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Wytheville, Va., *v.* The United States.

In the cause of the Trustees of the Methodist Protestant Church of Middleway, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Vestry of Aquia Protestant Episcopal Church, of Stafford County, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of Berea Baptist Church, of Stafford County, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of James W. Adams *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Wardens and Vestrymen of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, of Culpeper County, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Wardens and Vestrymen of Merchants Hope Protestant Episcopal Church, of Prince George County, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of Elk Branch Presbyterian Church, of Duffields, W. Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Baptist Church of Redbanks, Miss., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Colored Baptist Church of Lebanon, Ky., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Strawberry Plains, Tenn., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of Oak Grove Methodist Episcopal Church, of Norfolk County, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Christian Church of Danville, Ky., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of George W. Gall, jr., administrator of Elam D. Talbott, deceased, *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Baptist Church of Gauley Bridge, W. Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Springfield, Mo., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of Ebenezer Methodist Episcopal Church, of Culpeper County, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Morrisville, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Summit Point, W. Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of Oak Grove Methodist Episcopal Church, of Reams Station, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of New Salem Baptist Church, of Culpeper County, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of Union Church of Falmouth, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Vestry of St. Stephen's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Culpeper, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of Shiloh (old site) Baptist Church, of Fredericksburg, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Prospect, Tenn., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of Opequon Presbyterian Church, of Kernstown, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Christian Church of Fredericksburg, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Christian Church of Pleasant Hill, Mo., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Missionary Baptist Church of Waterloo, Ala., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of Cedar Run Baptist Church, of Culpeper County, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the First Baptist Church of Pine Bluff, Ark., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Harrisonville, Mo., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the County Court Cass County, Mo., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of James E. Broy and George H. Hartley, trustees of the Old School Baptist Church, and William P. Hamrick and Edward T. Keyser, trustees of the Regular Baptist Church, known as the Thornton Gap Baptist Church, *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Clarksburg, W. Va., *v.* The United States; and

In the cause of the Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Clarksville, Ark., *v.* The United States.

The communications and accompanying papers were referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

STREET RAILWAY FRANCHISES, TAXATION, ETC.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in response to a resolution of February 20, 1905, a report showing the conditions and restrictions under which franchises are granted to street-railway companies in the several cities of the United States which contain a population exceeding 200,000 and the basis on which the companies are taxed, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented the petition of Gus Boltz, of Nome, Alaska, praying for the enactment of legislation to punish certain persons in that Territory for perjury and false testimony given in connection with mining suits; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of the First Presbyterian Church of Lincoln, Nebr., praying for the establishment of an international congress to consider questions of common interest; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Sarah Miranda Clymer, of Bridgeton, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation granting relief to those who are alone in the world and unable to maintain themselves; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Linton, Ind., and Allegheny, Pa.; of sundry citizens of Dubuque, Iowa, and Mansfield, Ohio; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Madison, Wis.; Ulrichsville, Ohio; St. Paul, Minn.; Enid, Okla.; Mason City, Ill.; Farmer City, Ill., and University Park, Colo., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented sundry petitions of Benny Bernstein, of New York City, relative to the penal code of the Constitution of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the legislature of the State of Maine, praying for the repeal of section 20, title 33, of the Revised Statutes, admitting free of duty certain lumber manufactured in New Brunswick; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolves of the legislature of the State of Maine, requesting the repeal by Congress of section 20 of title 33 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, admitting certain lumber manufactured in New Brunswick into the ports of the United States free of duty.

Whereas for a period of more than seventy-five years, and for a period of forty years, by virtue of a special act of the Congress of the United States, lumber grown in the forests of Maine, to an amount exceeding one hundred millions per year, has been driven down the St. John River into the Province of New Brunswick, and after being manufactured has been admitted to the markets of the United States free of duty, to the great advantage of the inhabitants of New Brunswick, and with the effect of building up the city of St. John, New Brunswick, and the provincial cities and towns, at the expense of and to the detriment of the inhabitants of northern Maine, especially of those living in the St. John and Aroostook valleys; and whereas the inhabitants of New Brunswick, and especially those interested in the lumber business in said province and more especially those residing in the city of St. John, which city has been chiefly benefited and enriched as a result of said special act of Congress, have proven themselves utterly ungrateful and disposed to harass and annoy those who are engaged in the manufacture of lumber on the upper St. John in Maine, as shown by measures presented in the legislature of New Brunswick at the two last sessions, and further indicated by numerous newspaper articles published in the New Brunswick papers and by various other acts and circumstances: Therefore,

Resolved, That it is the earnest wish of the legislature of Maine that the act of Congress hereinbefore referred to be repealed, and our Senators and Representatives in Congress are requested to use all reasonable efforts to obtain a repeal of said law in the interests of and as a measure of justice to our own citizens engaged in the lumber business on the northern border and of all of the citizens of that region generally; and further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be requested to forward a copy of these resolutions to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *March 21, 1905.*

Read and passed finally.

MORRILL N. DREW, *Speaker.*

IN SENATE, *March 22, 1905.*

Read and passed finally.

FORREST GOODWIN, *President.*

MARCH 22, 1905.

Approved.

W. T. COBB, *Governor.*

A true copy.
Attest:

KENDALL M. DUNBAR,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of Local Division No. 40, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend bill" regulating railway rates; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Council of Cumberland County, Me., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Fresno, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Morancy Council, No. 58, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of East Sullivan, Me., and a petition of William T. Sherman Council, No. 55,

Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Bluehill, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Rockingham Council, No. 2, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of Local Division No. 45, Order of Railway Telegraphers, of Littleton, N. H., and of Mount Lafayette Division, No. 572, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Woodsville, N. H., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend bill" regulating railway rates; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PLATT presented petitions of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the North River Presbytery, of New Hamburg; of the Central New York Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Clifton Springs, and of the Woman's Republican Club of New York City, all in the State of New York, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented the petition of S. H. Bradley, of Olean, N. Y., and a petition of the Friday Afternoon Club, of New York City, praying for the passage of the so-called "child-labor bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented memorials of the Business Men's Association of Saratoga Springs; of the general grievance committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen of Plattsburg, and of Maple City Division, No. 25, Order of Railway Conductors, of Ogdensburg, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of any legislation to diminish the power of railroads to make their own rates and control their earnings; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Sherman Lodge, No. 143, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of East Syracuse; of Local Union No. 187, Carpenters and Joiners' Union of America, of Geneva; of Local Union No. 280, International Cigar Makers' Union, of Oswego; of Central Labor Council, American Federation of Labor, of Jamestown; of Local Union No. 246, International Iron Molders' Union, of Frankfort, and of Local Councils Nos. 4, 6, 9, 11, 16, 20, 23, 27, 32, 37, 52, 58, 61, 64, 68, 82, and 97, of Canarsie, Maspeth, Port Jervis, Brooklyn, Auburn, Southampton, Shelter Island, Riverhead, Syracuse, Rome, Sag Harbor, and Poughkeepsie, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Elkins, W. Va., praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented petitions of Berkeley Springs Council, No. 117; Stewartstown Council, No. 52; Valley Star Council, No. 60, of Limestone; of Summers Council, No. 150; of Liberty Council, No. 137, of Bedington; of Tanner Council, No. 87; of New Haven Council, No. 175; of Chester Council, No. 81; of Elkins Council, No. 154; of Cabell Council, No. 196, of Huntington; of Fidelity Council, No. 182, of Central City; of Columbian Council, No. 101, of Hacker Valley; of White Pine Council, No. 8; of St. Albans Council, No. 220; of United Council, No. 2, of Alton, all of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, and of Elm Grove Local Council, No. 1217, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the Rhode Island Horticultural Society, praying for the enactment of legislation to place basic slag meal on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Rhode Island Horticultural Society, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the appropriation for the maintenance of agricultural experiment stations; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Rhode Island State Federation of Women's Clubs, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of the Providence Medical Association, of Providence, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reorganization of the Medical Corps of the Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Councils Nos. 7, 2, 14, 8, and 12, of Providence, Wakefield, and Central Falls, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HOPKINS presented the petition of Donald G. Fraser, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation placing certain excursion launches on Lake Michigan under the inspection of the United States Government and compelling same to be equipped with necessary life-saving apparatus; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of a joint committee of the organized railway employees of Illionis, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend bill," regulating railway rates; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of James S. Kirk & Co., of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation removing the duty on tallow; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 89, International Association of Machinists, of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. MILLARD presented petitions of Ingraham Subdivision, No. 303, of Chadron; of Subdivision No. 431, of Blue Valley; of Subdivision No. 623, of McCook; of Subdivision No. 98, of Lincoln, and of Subdivision No. 621, of Wymore, all of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, in the State of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the employment of any man as a locomotive engineer who has had less than three years' experience as a fireman; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Westfield, Me., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Bryant Pond, Me., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to require certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of William T. Sherman Council, No. 55, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Bluehill, Me., and a petition of Washington Council, No. 9, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Springvale, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of 21 citizens of the State of Maine, remonstrating against the repeal of the present oleomargarine law; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of 21 citizens of the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of a parcels post and postal currency; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of 126 citizens of the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation granting an increase of pension to $12 per month to all soldiers' widows; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Council of Portland, Me., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Division No. 40, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Portland, Me., and a memorial of Aroostook Lodge, No. 393, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of the State of Maine, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Chickasaw County, Iowa, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Improved Stock Breeders' Association, of Newton, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Fayette County Retail Merchants' Association, of Oelwein, Iowa, praying for the repeal of the law establishing a uniform system of bankruptcy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Muscatine, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to

regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquor; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FULTON presented petitions of Local Union No. 1313, Carpenters' and Joiners' Union of America, of Pendleton; of sundry citizens of Portland; of the Central Labor Council, American Federation of Labor, of Astoria, and of Local Lodge No. 63, International Association of Machinists, of Portland, all in the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Farmers and Shippers' Congress, of McMinnville, Oreg., praying that an appropriation be made to deepen the entrance to Coos Bay, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Astoria, Oreg., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a north jetty at the mouth of the Columbia River, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of Pioneer Council, No. 58, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Boundbrook, N. J., and a petition of Local Union No. 169, American Federation of Labor, of Elizabeth, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Women's Club of Westfield, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the preservation of Niagara Falls as a national park; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the professors of the public schools of Montclair, N. J., praying for the repeal of the present duty on works of art; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Current News Club, of Morristown, N. J., and a petition of the New Jersey Federation of Women's Clubs, of Hoboken, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. SMOOT presented a petition of the legislature of Utah, praying that pensions be granted to veterans of the Indian wars; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Senators and Representatives of Utah in the Congress of the United States of America be, and are hereby, requested to use their efforts to the end that Congress shall recognize the faithful services of the Indian war veterans of Utah by accepting records of such service between the years 1850 to 1872, inclusive, from the State of Utah, and filed with the Secretary of War, and by granting pay for thirty days as privates of volunteer militia to such Indian war veterans of Utah as shall file such proof, and that the provisions of the act of July 27, 1892, as amended by the act of June 27, 1902, shall be applicable to said Indian war veterans.

S. H. LOVE, *President of the Senate.*
THOMAS HULL, *Speaker of the House.*

Approved this 9th day of March, 1905.

JOHN C. CUTLER, *Governor.*

Attest:
[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

STATE OF UTAH, *Office of the Secretary of State, ss:*

I, Charles S. Tingey, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of senate concurrent resolution No. 7, adopted by the legislature of the State of Utah on March 9, 1905, and on said day approved by the governor and filed in my office, as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 17th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. SMOOT presented a petition of the legislature of Utah, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the adulteration and misbranding of foods; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorializing Congress to enact such legislation as will better protect the people against adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines.

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the governor and legislature of the State of Utah, represent that the legislature of the State of Utah, having heretofore enacted laws for the protection of the people against adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines, realizing the necessity for adequate legislation by Congress to protect the States against interstate commerce, which is beyond the control of the State, in such prohibited articles, hereby memorializes Congress to speedily enact efficient legislation prohibiting interstate commerce in adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines, to the end that the laws of our State relative thereto may be more effective.

S. H. LOVE, *President of the Senate.*
THOMAS HULL, *Speaker of the House.*
JOHN C. CUTLER, *Governor.*

Attest:
[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

STATE OF UTAH, *Office of the Secretary of State, ss:*

I, Charles S. Tingey, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 3, passed by the legislature of the State of Utah and filed in my office March 9, 1905, as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 9th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. SMOOT presented a petition of the legislature of Utah, praying that certain lands be granted in that State for a national park; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A memorial to Congress praying for a grant of lands for a State park.

To the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the governor and legislature of the State of Utah, respectfully represent that the land included in the Uintah Indian Reservation is about to be opened for settlement; that that part of said reservation which is included in the Strawberry Valley, and is hereinafter more particularly described, is of such an altitude that it is valueless for agricultural purposes; that it is admirably situated for a public park and reservoir purposes; that this State has passed an act creating a board to manage and control any lands acquired for a State park, and making an appropriation to carry the same into effect, contingent upon the granting of this petition.

Wherefore your memorialists pray that that part of the Uintah Indian Reservation known as the Strawberry Valley and more particularly described as follows, to wit: Townships 2 and 3 south and ranges 10 and 11 west and fractional townships 4 south and ranges 10 and 11 west of the Uintah special meridian be granted to the State of Utah to be used perpetually as a State park, the National Government reserving the right to construct a reservoir or reservoirs with appropriate canals within the limits of the proposed grant, and your memorialists will ever pray.

THOMAS HULL, *Speaker of the House.*
S. H. LOVE, *President of the Senate.*
JOHN C. CUTLER, *Governor.*

Attest:
[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

STATE OF UTAH, *Office of the Secretary of State, ss:*

I, Charles S. Tingey, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a memorial to Congress praying for a grant of lands for a State park, filed in my office March 6, 1905, as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 7th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.]

Secretary of State.

Mr. MARTIN presented sundry petitions of citizens of Charlottesville, Elkton, Richmond, Vienna, Waterford, Mount Crawford, Manassas, Fairport, Gilmerton, Locustville, Danville, Quicksburg, Norfolk, Roanoke, and Martinsville, all in the State of Virginia, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CLARK of Montana presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of Lewiston, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate railroad freight rates; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MALLORY presented a petition of Local Union No. 74, Carpenters and Joiners' Union of America, of Pensacola, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. STONE presented a petition of the legislature of Missouri, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the upper Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and St. Paul, Minn.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution petitioning Congress to approve of and support appropriation for the permanent improvement of the upper Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and St. Paul, Minn., by maintaining a channel of 6 feet in depth at low water.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein): Whereas the permanent improvement of the upper Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and St. Paul, Minn., by maintaining a channel of 6 feet in depth at low water will be in the interest of commerce and for the benefit of all people of the five States contiguous: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That we request the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Missouri to approve of and support the request and petition of the Upper Mississippi Improvement Association now pending before Congress for the improvement.

I, B. F. Russell, chief clerk of the house of representatives of the forty-third general assembly of Missouri, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true copy of this joint resolution, passed by the forty-third session of the general assembly of the State of Missouri.

Witness my hand as chief clerk this 18th day of March, A. D. 1905, at the city of Jefferson, county of Cole, and State of Missouri.

B. F. RUSSELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STONE presented a petition of the legislature of Missouri, praying that an appropriation be made to improve the Mississippi River at or near the foot of the Des Moines River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution.

Whereas the improvement of the Mississippi River is of great importance to the State of Missouri, as well as other States bordering on its shores, and our country at large; and

Whereas the making of a deep-water channel would materially improve the navigation of such river; and

Whereas at various points along said river there are places where it

is necessary to make such deep channels, or build canals in order to carry on navigation at certain times of the year and certain stages of the water in order to successfully pass the rapids in said river at certain points within the territory of Missouri, Illinois, and Iowa; and

Whereas there is at this time great need of the betterment of the navigation of Des Moines Rapids, which are in the Mississippi River from Keokuk, Iowa, and Hamilton, Ill., north to Fort Madison, Iowa; and

Whereas there is now pending before Congress a bill in relation to the erection of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the foot of the said Des Moines Rapids, and the building of a proper lock to facilitate the navigation of said river under the supervision and direction of the United States Government, which measure is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for examination and discussion; and

Whereas the accomplishment of a deep-water channel at such point would materially aid in the navigation of said river and thereby benefit all the citizens of this country, and especially the citizens of the States bordering thereon: Therefore, in view of the general utility and great importance of such measure to Missouri, as well as our country at large, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the general assembly of Missouri (the senate concurring therein), That we approve of all measures to promote the improvement of the Mississippi River and the navigation of the same, and to that end commend to the favorable consideration of Congress the measure under consideration and now before its Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Missouri Senators and Representatives in Congress.

I, B. F. Russell, chief clerk of the house of representatives of the forty-third general assembly of Missouri, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true copy of this joint resolution, passed by the forty-third session of the general assembly of the State of Missouri.

Witness my hand as chief clerk this 18th day of March, A. D. 1905, at the city of Jefferson, county of Cole, and State of Missouri.

B. F. RUSSELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STONE presented a petition of the legislature of Missouri, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Missouri River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint and concurrent resolution.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein): Whereas the people of the State of Missouri are particularly interested in the improvements of the Missouri River, which flows across the State from its western to its eastern border, through a country remarkable for its fertility and commercial development, in order that it may be made a highway of commerce and that disastrous floods from the rise of said river damaging to the agricultural and commercial interests of the State, may be prevented; and in view of the fact that with reasonable and just appropriations for the improvement of the Missouri River, as a highway of commerce, cheap transportation would be afforded to the people who live in the territory tributary thereto, and railroad rates would thereby be reduced, or advance therein prevented; and in view of the fact that the failure to improve the Missouri River has caused the same to be subject to overflow, to the great damage of the cities and farming territory along its banks; and

Whereas the truth of all the facts herein asserted is generally conceded, yet the policy of the National Congress in the past has resulted in discrimination against the interests of the people of the Missouri Valley and in neglect of any improvements of this river, while lavish expenditures have been made upon creeks and small streams in other parts of the country, a result largely due to the fact that no Representative from any of the States on the Missouri River has been appointed a member of the Committee of the National House of Representatives on Rivers and Harbors: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Missouri (the senate thereof concurring herein), as follows: That the Representatives in Congress and the Senate or Senators from the State of Missouri be, and they are hereby, urged and requested to make every possible effort to secure from the National Congress appropriations for the improvement of the Missouri River for the accomplishment of the purpose as herein set forth.

Second. That the Speaker of the next House of Representatives and the minority leader of said House be, and they are hereby, urged and requested to place upon the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives Representatives from those States bordering on the Missouri River.

I, B. F. Russell, chief clerk of the house of representatives of the forty-third general assembly of Missouri, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true copy of joint and concurrent resolution passed by the forty-third session of the general assembly of the State of Missouri.

Witness my hand as chief clerk this 18th day of March, A. D. 1905, at the city of Jefferson, county of Cole, and State of Missouri.

B. F. RUSSELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STONE presented a petition of the legislature of Missouri, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint and concurrent resolution No. 5.

Whereas a large number of State legislatures have, at various times, adopted memorials and resolutions in favor of the election of United States Senators by popular vote; and

Whereas the National House of Representatives has, on four separate occasions within recent years, adopted resolutions in favor of this proposed change in the method of electing United States Senators, which were not adopted by the Senate; and

Whereas Article V of the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the Several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, and believing there is a general desire upon the part of the citizens of the State of Missouri that the United States Senators should be elected by a direct vote of the people: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the legislature of the State of Missouri favors the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution which shall provide for the election of United States Senators by popular vote, and joins with other States of the Union in respectfully requesting that a convention be called for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as provided for in Article V of the said Constitution, which amendment shall provide for a change in the present method of electing United States Senators, so that they can and shall be chosen in each State by a direct vote of the people.

Resolved, That a copy of this joint and concurrent resolution and application to Congress for the calling of said convention be sent to the secretary of state of each State of the United States, and that a similar copy be sent to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the National House of Representatives.

Introduced by Mr. Dorris, of Oregon County.

Originated in the house.

DAVID W. HILL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
B. F. RUSSELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
EMMETT B. FIELDS,
President Pro Tem. of the Senate.
CORNELIUS ROACH,
Secretary of the Senate.

I, B. F. Russell, chief clerk of the house of representatives of the forty-third general assembly of Missouri, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true copy of joint and concurrent resolution No. 5, passed by the forty-third session of the general assembly of the State of Missouri.

Witness my hand as chief clerk this 18th day of March, A. D. 1905, at the city of Jefferson, county of Cole, and State of Missouri.

B. F. RUSSELL,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. STONE presented petitions of Reminal Lodge, No. 427, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of St. Louis; of Mark Twain Lodge, No. 537, Independent Order of United Mechanics, of Hannibal, and of Local Union No. 16, Travelers' Goods and Leather Novelty Workers, of Kansas City, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SPOONER presented petitions of Carpenters and Joiners' Local Union No. 161, of Kenosha; of Local Union No. 141, Amalgamated Woodworkers' International Union of America, of La Crosse; of Coopers' Union No. 35, of the Coopers' International Union of North America, of Milwaukee; of Sheet Metal Workers' Union No. 351, of Racine, and of Chequamegon Lodge, No. 621, International Association of Machinists, of Ashland, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation restricting immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 89, International Association of Machinists, of Cheyenne, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the National League of Women's Organizations, and of the Wyoming Mission, Methodist Episcopal Church, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Central Committee of the National Live Stock Association, praying that ample appropriations be made for the aid of experiment stations for the use of the Bureau of Animal Industry, the extension of meat inspection, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

He also presented a petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the admission of Chinese visitors and travelers into the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Grand Division of the Order of Railway Conductors, of Portland, Oreg., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate railway rates; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Grand Division of the Order of Railway Conductors, of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate railway rates; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FRYE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Wadleigh;

A bill (S. 3) granting an increase of pension to William P. Damon (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4) granting a pension to Neda S. Thornton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Hogan;

A bill (S. 6) granting an increase of pension to Ella N. Harvey;

A bill (S. 7) granting an increase of pension to Edwin B. Lufkin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 8) granting an increase of pension to William M. Hall (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 9) granting an increase of pension to David P. Bolster (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 10) granting an increase of pension to Roswell Prescott (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 11) granting an increase of pension to Ruth B. Gurney (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 12) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Littlefield;

A bill (S. 13) granting an increase of pension to Huntville A. Johnson;

A bill (S. 14) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Young;

A bill (S. 15) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie E. Shehan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 16) granting a pension to Susan H. Cutler;

A bill (S. 17) granting an increase of pension to Levi A. Tripp (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 18) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Weston (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 19) granting an increase of pension to Alphonso B. Holland (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 20) granting an increase of pension to Edward Higgins (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 21) granting a pension to Mary G. Bright (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 22) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Smith; and

A bill (S. 23) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Bradbury (with accompanying papers).

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 24) to establish the University of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the University of the United States.

He also introduced a bill (S. 25) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Auburn, in the State of Maine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 26) to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service;

A bill (S. 27) to amend section 4463 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the complement of crews of vessels;

A bill (S. 28) providing for the appointment of a commission on marine construction;

A bill (S. 29) to amend section 4399 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the regulation of steam vessels;

A bill (S. 30) to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade; and

A bill (S. 31) to amend certain sections of Title LII of the Revised Statutes of the United States, entitled "Regulation of steam vessels," and acts amendatory thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 32) for the relief of the State of New Hampshire; and

A bill (S. 33) to refer to the Court of Claims the war claims of the State of New Hampshire.

Mr GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 34) for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the White Mountains, to be known as the National White Mountain Forest Reserve; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also introduced a bill (S. 35) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Dover, in the State of New Hampshire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 36) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint a commission to study and make report upon the commercial and industrial conditions of China and Japan, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 37) to fix the allowances and percentages of the collector at the port of Portsmouth, N. H.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Library:

A bill (S. 38) for the erection of a statue to the memory of Gen. James Miller at Peterboro, N. H.;

A bill (S. 39) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.; and

A bill (S. 40) for the erection of a monument in the city of Washington, D. C., to the memory of the private soldiers of the Union Armies and Navy.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 41) to protect the President, Vice-President, persons in the line of Presidential succession, and ambassadors and foreign ministers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 42) providing for the appointment of a commission on the alcoholic liquor traffic; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 43) to extend the lines of the Capital Traction Company;

A bill (S. 44) to provide a temporary home for ex-volunteer Union soldiers and sailors in the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 45) to amend section 653 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to assessment companies;

A bill (S. 46) to classify the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 47) to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 48) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations respecting the public hay scales (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 49) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations respecting the rights and privileges of the fish wharf (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 50) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 51) to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 52) to preserve Sixteenth street NW. as a residence street, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 53) to provide for the abatement of nuisances in the District of Columbia by the Commissioners of said District, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 54) to provide a public park on Georgetown Heights, in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 55) for the widening of Bladensburg road, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 56) authorizing the extension of Rhode Island avenue NE. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 57) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia in relation to the issuance of warrants (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 58) authorizing the extension of Seventeenth street NW. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 59) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish building lines (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 60) authorizing the extension of Kalorama road NW. (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 61) amendatory of an act entitled "An act to provide for payment of damages on account of changes of grade due to construction of the Union Station, District of Columbia," approved April 22, 1904 (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 62) for the opening of a connecting parkway along Piney Branch between Sixteenth street and Rock Creek Park, District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 63) to amend sections 713 and 714 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to savings banks (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 64) for the extension of Seventh street and Franklin street NE., and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 65) to require the erection of fire escapes in certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 66) to regulate the operation of street railways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 67) for the opening of a connecting highway between Water Side drive and Park road, District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 68) for the widening of a section of Columbia road east of Sixteenth street (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 69) regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 70) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901 (with an accompanying paper; and

A bill (S. 71) requiring the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare a report upon the improvement of the Anacostia River flats (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 72) repealing a provision of section 13 of an act approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 73) in amendment of an act entitled "An act to increase pension for total deafness";

A bill (S. 74) granting an increase of pension to Aaron T. Currier;

A bill (S. 75) granting an increase of pension to Urial J. Streeter (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 76) granting an increase of pension to Hartwell C. Keyes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 77) granting an increase of pension to Granville P. Mason (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 78) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Blethen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 79) granting an increase of pension to James F. Tilton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 80) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Stanyan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 81) granting an increase of pension to David E. Everett (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 82) granting an increase of pension to Curtis A. Carpenter (with accompanying papers).

Mr. CLARK of Montana introduced a bill (S. 83) to establish and create an additional circuit court of appeals of the United States, to be known as the tenth circuit court of appeals, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 84) for the relief of Samuel H. Pipes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 85) granting an increase of pension to Edward Keaster; which was read twice by its title, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KNOX introduced a bill (S. 86) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 87) providing for the withdrawal from public entry of lands needed for town-site purposes in connection with irrigation projects under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 88) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also introduced a bill (S. 89) to authorize the sale and disposition of surplus or unallotted lands of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in the State of Idaho; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 90) providing for the deposit of a model of any vessel of war of the United States Navy bearing the name of a State of the United States in the capitol building of said State; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 91) granting leaves of absence to homesteaders on lands to be irrigated under the provisions of the act of June 17, 1902; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 92) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Idaho; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced a bill (S. 93) to amend section 2326 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to mining claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 94) granting an increase of pension to Albert Wines;

A bill (S. 95) granting an increase of pension to Justin H. Wixom;

A bill (S. 96) granting an increase of pension to George A. Francis;

A bill (S. 97) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Carey;

A bill (S. 98) granting an increase of pension to Doris Florence Clegg;

A bill (S. 99) granting an increase of pension to Eugene P. Kingsley; and

A bill (S. 100) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Durfee.

Mr. SCOTT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 101) authorizing the issuance of bonds to erect public buildings in cities of 5,000 or more population;

A bill (S. 102) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Bluefield, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 103) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Grafton, in the State of West Virginia; and

A bill (S. 104) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Hinton, in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 105) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Webster, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 106) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of St. Albans, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 107) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church at Frenchcreek, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 108) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Fayette County, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 109) for the relief of Edward Tearney; and

A bill (S. 110) for the relief of L. S. Strauss.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 111) to aid in the erection of a monument or memorial at Point Pleasant, W. Va., to commemorate the battle of the Revolution fought at that point between the colonial troops and Indians October 10, 1774; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 112) to make use of the money due the estates of deceased colored soldiers of the late civil war; which was read twice by its title, and with accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 113) granting an increase of pension to John D. McFadden (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 114) granting pensions to officers and enlisted men of the military and naval service of the United States who served ninety days or more during the war of the rebellion, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 115) for the relief of Capt. Sampson Snyder's company, West Virginia Volunteer Militia;

A bill (S. 116) for the relief of Capt. John Bond's company, West Virginia Volunteer Militia;

A bill (S. 117) for the relief of Capt. John Bogg's company, West Virginia Volunteer Militia;

A bill (S. 118) for the relief of Capt. Isaac Alt's company (B), Forty-sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Militia;

A bill (S. 119) for the relief of Capt. E. C. Harper's company (A), Forty-sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Militia;

A bill (S. 120) granting an increase of pension to John M. Buckley;

A bill (S. 121) granting an increase of pension to John Cook (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 122) granting an increase of pension to Michael Stump (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 123) granting an increase of pension to William M. Morgan (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 124) granting an increase of pension to Curtis B. McIntosh;

A bill (S. 125) granting an increase of pension to John E. Hadsall;

A bill (S. 126) granting an increase of pension to William J. Street;

A bill (S. 127) granting an increase of pension to Anthony H. Crawford;

A bill (S. 128) granting an increase of pension to Waldo W. Gifford (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 129) granting a pension to Rebecca Straus.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 130) for preventing the adulteration, misbranding, and imitation of foods, beverages, candies, drugs, and condiments in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for regulating interstate traffic therein, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also introduced a bill (S. 131) to provide for the purchase of a tract of land in the city of Shanghai, Empire of China, suitable for the construction of wharves, docks, piers, and warehouses for the purpose of facilitating American exports, and for the erection and maintenance of a building for the display of American exports in said city, including consular offices, for the appointment of a commissioner in charge thereof, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 132) to establish a fish-culture station at the city of Fargo, in the State of North Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced a bill (S. 133) authorizing the joining of Twenty-third street NW. and Kalorama avenue; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 134) establishing an additional recording district in Indian Territory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 135) granting an increase of pension to Peter P. Chacey;

A bill (S. 136) granting an increase of pension to Sabastian Laudner;

A bill (S. 137) granting an increase of pension to Robert Wiper (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 138) granting an increase of pension to Michael Linehan (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 139) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Le Hundra (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 140) granting an increase of pension to Maitland J. Freeman (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 141) granting an increase of pension to Orlinda A. Edick;

A bill (S. 142) granting an increase of pension to William Furlong;

A bill (S. 143) granting an increase of pension to James W. Calvert;

A bill (S. 144) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Briggs;

A bill (S. 145) granting an increase of pension to Wellington Marlatt;

A bill (S. 146) granting an increase of pension to David McKee;

A bill (S. 147) granting an increase of pension to Patrick McCue;

A bill (S. 148) granting an increase of pension to Patrick McCue;

A bill (S. 149) granting an increase of pension to Cassius Lisk (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 150) granting an increase of pension to Lucius A. Lincoln (with accompanying papers).

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 151) to provide for fixing a uniform standard of classification and grading of wheat, flax, corn, oats, barley, rye, and other grains, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 152) to provide for the building of a public avenue on the south side of the Potomac River from the city of Washington to Mount Vernon; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. DANIEL. I desire simply to utter one sentence in respect to the bill which I have just introduced. It is the transfer of a claim which Virginia has against the United States. I have examined the claim very carefully, and it is my opinion that it ought to be paid by the United States, although it is a very old claim and it might be regarded as simply the revival of a claim which had been passed on. That is not the fact altogether. I believe it to be a valid claim, and I have examined it carefully. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 153) for the relief of Edward S. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 154) for the relief of the heirs of the late Mrs. Mary Ann Randolph Custis Lee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 155) to complete the execution of the ninth article of the treaty of 1819 between the United States and Spain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 156) relating to liability of common carriers by railroads in the District of Columbia and Territories and common carriers by railroads engaged in commerce between the States and between the States and foreign nations to their employees; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MILLARD introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 157) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie G. Reynolds;

A bill (S. 158) granting an increase of pension to John Ard Gordon (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 159) granting an increase of pension to Edgar Zabriskie;

A bill (S. 160) granting an increase of pension to Charles Adams (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 161) granting an increase of pension to Ruth E. Rogers;

A bill (S. 162) granting an increase of pension to David D. Griffith;

A bill (S. 163) granting an increase of pension to Susanna V. Wells;

A bill (S. 164) granting a pension to Helen A. Frederick;

A bill (S. 165) granting an increase of pension to Henry Russell;

A bill (S. 166) granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Minturn;

A bill (S. 167) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Hughes (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 168) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Davis (with accompanying papers).

Mr. MILLARD introduced a bill (S. 169) to provide for macadamizing Fort Crook military boulevard from Fort Crook, Nebr., to the city limits of South Omaha, Nebr., and appropriating money therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 170) for the relief of John T. Wertz and Walter H. Shupe; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 171) for the relief of the Omaha National Bank; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 172) to fix the salary of the collector of customs at Omaha, Nebr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 173) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish the Department of Commerce and Labor," approved February 14, 1903, being chapter 552 of the United States Statutes enacted by the Fifty-seventh Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 174) granting a pension to Melvina R. Chesley;

A bill (S. 175) granting a pension to Verona Harriman;

A bill (S. 176) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Marsh;

A bill (S. 177) granting an increase of pension to Alvah D. Wilson;

A bill (S. 178) granting an increase of pension to Irene A. Cochrane;
A bill (S. 179) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Mayhew;
A bill (S. 180) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Legro;
A bill (S. 181) granting an increase of pension to Francis E. Stevens;
A bill (S. 182) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Smith;
A bill (S. 183) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Hunt;
A bill (S. 184) granting an increase of pension to Lyman Marsh;
A bill (S. 185) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Cate;
A bill (S. 186) granting an increase of pension to George P. Howe; and
A bill (S. 187) granting an increase of pension to James H. Kane.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:
A bill (S. 188) for the relief of the legal representatives of George W. Soule;
A bill (S. 189) to authorize the readjustment of the accounts of Army officers in certain cases, and for other purposes; and
A bill (S. 190) for the relief of L. K. Scott.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced a bill (S. 191) to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph and telephone line in the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 192) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Walla Walla, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 193) granting an increase of pension to John C. Eberly;
A bill (S. 194) granting an increase of pension to James L. Cowell;
A bill (S. 195) granting an increase of pension to John Pieper; and
A bill (S. 196) granting an increase of pension to William H. Satterthwaite.

Mr. KITTREDGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:
A bill (S. 197) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Watertown, in the State of South Dakota;
A bill (S. 198) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Huron, in the State of South Dakota; and
A bill (S. 199) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Mitchell, in the State of South Dakota.

Mr. KITTREDGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 200) granting an increase of pension to Fredrich Behrens;
A bill (S. 201) granting an increase of pension to Lyman E. Farrand;
A bill (S. 202) granting an increase of pension to Allen Amburn;
A bill (S. 203) granting an increase of pension to Edward E. Needham;
A bill (S. 204) granting an increase of pension to John F. Walter;
A bill (S. 205) granting an increase of pension to Francis Gee;
A bill (S. 206) granting an increase of pension to Gordon H. Shepard;
A bill (S. 207) granting an increase of pension to Marion F. Howe;
A bill (S. 208) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Smith;
A bill (S. 209) granting an increase of pension to George F. Ross;
A bill (S. 210) granting an increase of pension to Silas P. Hall.
A bill (S. 211) granting an increase of pension to Wilson J. Pool;
A bill (S. 212) granting an increase of pension to John T. Liddle; and
A bill (S. 213) granting an increase of pension to John M. Doersch.

Mr. FULTON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 214) granting an increase of pension to John McElroy (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 215) granting a pension to Elias Phelps (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 216) granting a pension to John W. Sage (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 217) granting an increase of pension to William C. Breckenridge (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 218) granting an increase of pension to James White (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 219) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Collins (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 220) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan F. Gates (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 221) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Shearer;
A bill (S. 222) granting a pension to John O'Brien;
A bill (S. 223) granting a pension to Martha W. Hargadine;
A bill (S. 224) granting a pension to Victoria St. C. E. C. Mickelson;
A bill (S. 225) granting a pension to Thomas R. Smith;
A bill (S. 226) granting a pension to Reuben F. Canterbury;
A bill (S. 227) granting an increase of pension to Raauf W. Traver;
A bill (S. 228) granting an increase of pension to George A. Clark;
A bill (S. 229) granting a pension to Victorius G. Haag;
A bill (S. 230) granting an increase of pension to Alfred A. Woodin;
A bill (S. 231) granting an increase of pension to Clark Walter;
A bill (S. 232) granting a pension to Belle V. Shaw;
A bill (S. 233) granting a pension to Lucy J. Bennett;
A bill (S. 234) granting an increase of pension to Israel A. Benner;
A bill (S. 235) granting an increase of pension to Harvey A. Smith (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 236) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Sims;
A bill (S. 237) granting an increase of pension to Orlando S. Murray (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 238) granting an increase of pension to John Savage (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 239) granting an increase of pension to George L. Freeman (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 240) granting an increase of pension to Vincent de Frietas (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 241) granting an increase of pension to Robert Sturgeon;
A bill (S. 242) granting an increase of pension to Charles Duggan;
A bill (S. 243) granting a pension to Joseph B. Doan;
A bill (S. 244) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bramel;
A bill (S. 245) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Stoddard;
A bill (S. 246) granting a pension to Eda W. McCammon;
A bill (S. 247) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hartman (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 248) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Elwood (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 249) granting an increase of pension to Alfred F. Sears (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 250) granting an increase of pension to David D. Garrison (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 251) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Adams;
A bill (S. 252) granting an increase of pension to Frank Kasshafer (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 253) granting a pension to Chancy Akin;
A bill (S. 254) granting a pension to James McDonald;
A bill (S. 255) granting a pension to William L. Moloy;
A bill (S. 256) granting a pension to Charles H. Ellis (with an accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 257) granting an increase of pension to Caleb T. Bowen (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 258) for the relief of

Henry H. Woodward; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 259) for a light-house at Cape Arago, Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 260) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 261) for the relief of the heirs of M. C. Mordecai;

A bill (S. 262) for the relief of John Thurman; and

A bill (S. 263) for the relief of the Muir Glacier Packing Company.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 264) to correct the naval record of Charles Specht, alias Charles Spaert; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 265) to correct the record of discharge of Amos Dahuff; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 266) creating a United States district court for China, and prescribing the jurisdiction thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foregn Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 267) to prohibit aliens from taking fish in the waters of the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 268) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the citizens of Colorado, Nevada, and the Territories to fell and remove timber on the public domain for mining and domestic purposes," approved June 3, 1878, so that the provisions of said act shall be extended to and include the States of Oregon, Washington, and California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 269) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 270) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Oregon City, in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 271) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lagrande, in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 272) to provide for an Alaska government board, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced a bill (S. 273) prohibiting the introduction into any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, from any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia, or from any foreign country, or shipment to any foreign country, any misbranded salmon fish prepared or intended for use as an article of food; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced a bill (S. 274) for the relief of the Lower band of Chinook Indians of the State of Washington and the Kathlamet band of Chinook Indians of the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 275) to divide the State of Oregon into two judicial districts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 276) providing for the purchase and condemnation of irrigable lands in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. WETMORE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 277) granting an increase of pension to David A. Carpenter;

A bill (S. 278) granting a pension to Almie C. Smith; and

A bill (S. 279) granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Barker (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 280) to provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 281) to provide for the construction and equipment of a revenue cutter for service in Narragansett Bay and adjacent waters; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 282) for the relief of George R. Frye; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 283) for the relief of Capt. E. St. John Greble and other officers and enlisted men of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 284) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Rhode Island; which was read by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 285) to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States, and to amend the laws on that subject now in force; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 286) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Henry Shaver; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 287) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the military record of James E. Fuller; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 288) for the relief of Alexander Stoddart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 289) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Sanford Wood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 290) to amend the act approved March 15, 1878, entitled "An act for the relief of William A. Hammond, late Surgeon-General of the Army;" which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 291) for the relief of the county court of Randolph County, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 292) for the relief of the heirs of John W. Warwick;

A bill (S. 293) for the relief of the legal representatives of Paul McNeel;

A bill (S. 294) for the relief of Leroy Douglass;

A bill (S. 295) for the relief of Elizabeth Muhleman, widow, and the heirs at law of Samuel A. Muhleman, deceased; and

A bill (S. 296) for the relief of the county court of Randolph County, W. Va.

Mr. ELKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 297) granting a pension to Robert A. Chaffins;

A bill (S. 298) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Skeens;

A bill (S. 299) granting a pension to Catharine L. Chaney;

A bill (S. 300) granting a pension to America Lawrence;

A bill (S. 301) granting a pension to Jacob H. Wetzel (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 302) granting a pension to William Hall;

A bill (S. 303) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Arbogast;

A bill (S. 304) granting an increase of pension to Edward Hart;

A bill (S. 305) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Trough (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 306) granting a pension to Cassy Cottrill;

A bill (S. 307) granting a pension to Edgar Travis;

A bill (S. 308) granting a pension to Charles H. Gebert (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 309) granting an increase of pension to Pary McNair.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 310) for the relief of the heirs of Richard R. Mosley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 311) regulating the settlement of the accounts between the United States and the several States relative to the disposition of the public lands, and for

other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 312) to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across the Missouri River at Yankton, S. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 313) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to put down an artesian well or wells on the Yankton Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Inidan Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 314) granting a pension to Aletha E. Reynolds (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 315) granting an increase of pension to George Pike.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 316) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Watertown, in the State of South Dakota;

A bill (S. 317) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Mitchell, in the State of South Dakota; and

A bill (S. 318) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Huron, in the State of South Dakota.

Mr. SMOOT introduced a bill (S. 319) to reimburse Abram Johnson, formerly postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Utah; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 320) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced a bill (S. 321) to provide for the extension of time within which homestead settlers may establish their residence upon certain lands which were heretofore a part of the Uinta Indian Reservation, within the counties of Uinta and Wasatch, in the State of Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 322) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Workman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 323) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Goddard (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 324) granting a pension to Patience Rosa Archer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 325) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Burton (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 326) granting an increase of pension to Nancy G. Beasley (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 327) granting an increase of pension to Walter Barney (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 328) granting an increase of pension to John W. Warner (with accompanying papers).

Mr. DRYDEN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 329) granting an increase of pension to William E. Blewitt; and

A bill (S. 330) granting an increase of pension to Kemenskio A. N. L. Collins.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 331) for the relief of George Serrell; and

A bill (S. 332) for the relief of George B. Hughes.

Mr. KEAN introduced a bill (S. 333) in regard to a monumental column to commemorate the battle of Princeton, and appropriating $30,000 therefor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 334) to correct the military record of Joseph A. Blanchard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 335) for the relief of Stephen W. Stryker; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 336) granting a pension to Abraham M. Cory; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 337) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Ann Jones; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULBERSON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 338) making an appropriation for a public building at Houston, Tex.;

A bill (S. 339) to provide for the enlargement and improvement of the public building at Fort Worth, Tex.;

A bill (S. 340) to authorize the extension and enlargement of the post-office and court-house building in the city of San Antonio, Tex.; and

A bill (S. 341) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States courts at Texarkana, Tex.

Mr. CULBERSON introduced a bill (S. 342) to prohibit the use of money or other thing of value belonging to or held in trust or otherwise by insurance companies or other corporations or joint stock companies in elections for electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, or for Senators or Representatives in the Congress of the United States; to preserve the integrity of said elections; to provide adequate punishment for any violation of the act, and for other purposes; which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled: SECTION 1. That it shall be unlawful for any person who may be at the time an officer, director, trustee, or clerk of any fire, marine, or life insurance company or other corporation or joint stock company, or who may hold at the time any other official, clerical, or fiduciary relation whatsoever to such fire, marine, or life insurance company or other corporation or joint stock company, to use, expend, or disburse himself or to subscribe, contribute, give, loan, or donate to any person or persons to be used, expended, or disbursed in any manner or for any purpose whatsoever, directly or indirectly, in or with reference to any election for electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, or in or with reference to any election for a Senator of the United States from any State by the legislature thereof, or in or with reference to any elections for a Representative in the Congress of the United States, any money, fund, credit, or other thing of value whatsoever belonging to or held in trust or otherwise by any such fire, marine, or life insurance company or other corporation or joint stock company. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this section or any of them shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be confined in the penitentiary for a term not less than two nor more than twenty years.

SEC. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to accept, receive, or take from any person who may be at the time an officer, director, trustee, or clerk of any fire, marine, or life insurance company or other corporation or joint stock company, or who may hold at the time any other official, clerical, or fiduciary relation whatsoever to such fire, marine, or life insurance company or other corporation or joint stock company, to be used, expended, or disbursed in any manner or for any purpose whatsoever directly or indirectly in or with reference to any election for electors for President and Vice-President of the United States or in or with reference to any election for a Senator of the United States from any State by the legislature thereof, or in or with reference to any election for a Representative in the Congress of the United States, any money, fund, credit, or other thing of value whatsoever belonging to or held in trust or otherwise by any such fire, marine, or life insurance company or other corporation or joint stock company. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this section or any of them shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be confined in the penitentiary for a term not less than two nor more than twenty years.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so referred in the absence of objection.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 343) concerning a public building in Selma, Ala.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 344) for the relief of the Mobile Marine Dock Company;

A bill (S. 345) for the relief of the estate of Simeon Houk, deceased; and

A bill (S. 346) for the relief of the creditors of the Deposit Savings Association, of Mobile, Ala.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 347) for the relief of the estate of S. W. Lancaster, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 348) for the relief of the estate of S. W. Lancaster, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MALLORY introduced a bill (S. 349) to further enlarge the powers and authority of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, and to impose further duties thereon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 350) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Sierra, deceased;

A bill (S. 351) for the relief of the heirs of Celestine Sarra, deceased;

A bill (S. 352) for the relief of the heirs of Fernando J. Moreno, deceased;

A bill (S. 353) for the relief of Sarah E. Callahan; and

A bill (S. 354) for the relief of the legal representatives of Fletcher McQueen.

Mr. MALLORY introduced a bill (S. 355) for the establishment of a fish-cultural station in the State of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced a bill (S. 356) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Fernandina, Fla., and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 357) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish and cause to be maintained two free public schools for children under 17 years of age, at the town of Warrington, on the naval reservation on Pensacola Bay, in the State of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 358) to provide for the erection and maintenance of a beacon light near Fair Point, in Pensacola Bay, in the State of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 359) to provide for free lectures to the people in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 360) to relinquish the interest of the United States in and to certain land in the city of Pensacola, Fla., to the Right Rev. Edwin P. Allen, Catholic bishop of the diocese of Mobile, Ala., in trust for the Catholic congregation of Pensacola, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 361) granting an increase of pension to John J. Driscoll;

A bill (S. 362) granting an increase of pension to James M. Bullard;

A bill (S. 363) granting a pension to Elizabeth Prigon; and

A bill (S. 364) granting a pension to Annie M. Kelly.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced a bill (S. 365) to create a commission to annually investigate the several Executive Departments of the Government, and to make report to Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments.

He also introduced a bill (S. 366) authorizing the Commissioner-General of Immigration, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, to establish in connection with the immigrant station at Ellis Island an information and display bureau, for the purpose of aiding in the distribution of immigrants, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced a bill (S. 367) for the relief of Andrew H. Plemmons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 368) to correct the military record of Shadrack F. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 369) to authorize the appointment of Acting Assistant Surgeon Reuben A. Campbell, United States Navy, as an assistant surgeon in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 370) for the relief of William B. Duncan, administrator de bonis non of David S. Jones, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 371) for the relief of W. F. Sanderson;

A bill (S. 372) for the relief of Mary J. Tatham, heir of Robert D. McCombs, deceased;

A bill (S. 373) for the relief of Martha A. Moffitt, widow of Eli A. Moffitt;

A bill (S. 374) for the relief of T. L. Love;

A bill (S. 375) for the relief of John Wise; and

A bill (S. 376) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Everitt, deceased.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 377) granting an increase of pension to C. Q. Lemmond;

A bill (S. 378) granting an increase of pension to Zebulon A. Shipman;

A bill (S. 379) granting an increase of pension to William Flinn;

A bill (S. 380) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus W. Simpson;

A bill (S. 381) granting a pension to Stephen Rice;

A bill (S. 382) granting a pension to Mrs. Stapelton Hayes;

A bill (S. 383) granting an increase of pension to W. A. Moore;

A bill (S. 384) granting an increase of pension to G. P. Edney;

A bill (S. 385) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gearey; and

A bill (S. 386) granting an increase of pension to Orange G. Jones (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 387) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Somerset, Ky.;

A bill (S. 388) for the relief of the trustees of the First Presbyterian Church, of Harrodsburg, Ky.;

A bill (S. 389) for the relief of the estate of Spencer Hudson, deceased;

A bill (S. 390) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Princeton, Ky.; and

A bill (S. 391) for the relief of the estate of Thomas J. Jones, deceased (with accompanying papers).

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 392) granting an increase of pension to Kephart Wallace;

A bill (S. 393) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Stamper; and

A bill (S. 394) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Lucas.

Mr. LATIMER introduced a bill (S. 395) to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the western judicial district of South Carolina, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 396) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and to provide for national aid in the improvement of the public roads; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. FOSTER introduced a bill (S. 397) to fix the grade on retired list of the Army of Col. James W. Powell, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BAILEY introduced a bill (S. 398) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Greenville, in the State of Texas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 399) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Denison, in the State of Texas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (by request) (S. 400) for the relief of the estate of Andrew J. Joyce, deceased (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (by request) (S. 401) for the relief of the estate of Johnson Miller, deceased;

A bill (by request) (S. 402) for the relief of S. H. Tison (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (by request) (S. 403) for the relief of the estate of H. West, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (by request) (S. 404) for the relief of the heirs of Nash L. Cox, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (by request) (S. 405) for the relief of the estate of John S. Sturdy, deceased (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (by request) (S. 406) for the relief of the estate of Lee Arnold, deceased (with accompanying papers).

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 407) granting an increase of pension to George W. Purvis; which was read twice by its title, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. OVERMAN introduced a bill (S. 408) for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the Southern Appalachian Mountains, to be known as the National Appalachian Forest Reserve; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also introduced a bill (S. 409) to provide a world market commission to consider ways and means for enlarging the export trade in cotton products and other manufactures of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas introduced a bill (S. 410) to authorize the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Ouachita River and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 411) to extend the limits of the port of entry of New Orleans; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 412) for the relief of the estate of Isabella Ann Fluker, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 413) to reimburse the legal heirs of the late John George Bauer; and

A bill (S. 414) for the relief of Mark A. Chamberlain.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

A bill (S. 415) to limit the effects of the regulations of commerce between the several States and with foreign countries in certain cases; and

A bill (S. 416) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898, and amended February 5, 1903.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 417) to remove the charge of desertion against James Boyle;

A bill (S. 418) removing charge of desertion from John H. Jaques;

A bill (S. 419) removing charge of desertion from Robert Redmon;

A bill (S. 420) to correct the military record of Solomon W. Kyle;

A bill (S. 421) to correct the military record of William R. Van Note (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 422) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Levi Wright; and

A bill (S. 423) to recognize the military services of George R. Burnett, late first lieutenant, Ninth United States Cavalry.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 424) granting pensions to certain soldiers and sailors who served in the war of the rebellion, and their widows;

A bill (S. 425) granting an increase of pension to John Allman;

A bill (S. 426) granting an increase of pension to Daniel P. Andrus;

A bill (S. 427) granting an increase of pension to John M. Barnes;

A bill (S. 428) granting an increase of pension to Simon A. Bendon;

A bill (S. 429) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Bowsher;

A bill (S. 430) granting an increase of pension to John M. Box;

A bill (S. 431) granting a pension to Nancy J. Brister (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 432) granting an increase of pension to Salem Bruner;

A bill (S. 433) granting an increase of pension to Edwin W. Bunce;

A bill (S. 434) granting an increase of pension to William H. Campbell;

A bill (S. 435) granting an increase of pension to L. H. Canfield;

A bill (S. 436) granting an increase of pension to Eliza K. Carpenter;

A bill (S. 437) granting an increase of pension to David M. Caviness;

A bill (S. 438) granting an increase of pension to John Chase;

A bill (S. 439) granting a pension to Elizabeth Cleaver (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 440) granting a pension to Benjamin C. Coffey (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 441) granting a pension to Rebecca E. Collins;

A bill (S. 442) granting an increase of pension to Francis Colton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 443) granting an increase of pension to William Crawford;

A bill (S. 444) granting an increase of pension to Francis W. Crumpton;

A bill (S. 445) granting an increase of pension to Girden C. Day (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 446) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Duane (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 447) granting a pension to Maggie Swan Engler;

A bill (S. 448) granting an increase of pension to William E. Ferree (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 449) granting a pension to Michael Fitzpatrick;

A bill (S. 450) granting an increase of pension to James Flynn (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 451) granting a pension to Thomas Glynn;

A bill (S. 452) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Gregory;

A bill (S. 453) granting an increase of pension to George K. Green;

A bill (S. 454) granting an increase of pension to James G. Hannard;

A bill (S. 455) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Hart;

A bill (S. 456) granting an increase of pension to Howard Haworth;

A bill (S. 457) granting an increase of pension to David Hawkins;

A bill (S. 458) granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Haynes;

A bill (S. 459) granting a pension to Ellis C. Helmer;

A bill (S. 460) granting an increase of pension to John R. Henry;

A bill (S. 461) granting an increase of pension to Elias P. Huffman;

A bill (S. 462) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hussey;

A bill (S. 463) granting an increase of pension to Justin C. Kennedy;

A bill (S. 464) granting an increase of pension to David M. Lemon;

A bill (S. 465) granting an increase of pension to Anna H. B. Lewis;

A bill (S. 466) granting an increase of pension to James H. Lewis;

A bill (S. 467) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Liming;

A bill (S. 468) granting an increase of pension to William H. McCalla;

A bill (S. 469) granting a pension to Martha J. McCormick;

A bill (S. 470) granting a pension to James M. McKain;

A bill (S. 471) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McLaughlin;

A bill (S. 472) granting an increase of pension to David F. Magee (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 473) granting an increase of pension to John Masmar (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 474) granting an increase of pension to Emma Mudgett;

A bill (S. 475) granting an increase of pension to James Patrick;

A bill (S. 476) granting an increase of pension to Emily Peterson;

A bill (S. 477) granting a pension to Malinda A. Powell;

A bill (S. 478) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Quinn;

A bill (S. 479) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Rankin (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 480) granting an increase of pension to Silas A. Reynolds (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 481) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Roush (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 482) granting an increase of pension to Amos M. Runkle;
A bill (S. 483) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Russell;
A bill (S. 484) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Shannon;
A bill (S. 485) granting an increase of pension to Otis H. Shurtliff;
A bill (S. 486) granting an increase of pension to A. H. Slocum;
A bill (S. 487) granting an increase of pension to William Sprouse;
A bill (S. 488) granting a pension to Eliza Stone;
A bill (S. 489) granting an increase of pension to Nelson B. Toole (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 490) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Toops;
A bill (S. 491) granting an increase of pension to Rufus B. Tucker;
A bill (S. 492) granting an increase of pension to Barney Whitney (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 493) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Wittig;
A bill (S. 494) granting an increase of pension to Philander S. Wright;
A bill (S. 495) granting an increase of pension to William W. Wright; and
A bill (S. 496) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Young.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 497) to authorize the President to revoke the order dismissing William T. Godwin, late first lieutenant, Tenth Infantry, United States Army, and to place the said William T. Godwin on the retired list with the rank of first lieutenant;
A bill (S. 498) for the relief of James E. Byram (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 499) to revoke sentence and establish the military record of Capt. George G. Lovett, Company K, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, war of the rebellion of 1861 to 1865; and
A bill (S. 500) to correct the military record of John Flaherty.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 501) to authorize the President to place the name of John Roop on the retired list of the United States Navy with the rank of first assistant engineer, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 502) for the relief of James A. Russell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 503) to reimburse James M. McGee, M. D., for expenses incurred in the burial of Mary J. De Lange, a deceased pensioner;
A bill (S. 504) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank, of Philadelphia, Pa.; and
A bill (S. 505) for the relief of Jacob Livingston & Co.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 506) granting an increase of pension to James Wilson (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 507) granting a pension to Charles Dougherty (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 508) granting an increase of pension to William Kress;
A bill (S. 509) granting a pension to Annie L. Tredick;
A bill (S. 510) granting a pension to Delia White;
A bill (S. 511) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Carter;
A bill (S. 512) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. E. Nesbitt;
A bill (S. 513) granting a pension to Alexander Hendricks;
A bill (S. 514) granting a pension to Thomas F. Walter;
A bill (S. 515) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Buckley McCready, alias Dennis McCready, alias Thomas Buckley;
A bill (S. 516) granting a pension to Harriet P. Lynch;
A bill (S. 517) granting an increase of pension to Wesley C. Pryor;
A bill (S. 518) granting an increase of pension to William T. Godwin;
A bill (S. 519) granting a pension to Ellwood I. Beatty;
A bill (S. 520) granting an increase of pension to William D. Johnson;
A bill (S. 521) granting an increase of pension to John L. Janeway;
A bill (S. 522) granting a pension to Emma Worrall;
A bill (S. 523) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hood;
A bill (S. 524) granting an increase of pension to Lestina M. Gifford (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 525) granting an increase of pension to Michael Brady;
A bill (S. 526) granting a pension to George Evans;
A bill (S. 527) granting an increase of pension to Alfred McPherran (with an accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 528) granting a pension to Robert M. McCormick (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PILES introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 530) granting an increase of pension to Sophia A. Knapp;
A bill (S. 531) granting an increase of pension to William H. Satterthwait;
A bill (S. 532) granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Doty (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 533) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Munson (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 534) granting an increase of pension to Dennis A. Davis (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming introduced a bill (S. 535) to amend and reenact section 1 of chapter 77 of volume 27 of the United States Statutes at Large, being "An act to provide for a term of the United States circuit and district courts at Evanston, Wyo.," approved May 23, 1892; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 536) amending the act of August 3, 1892, clause 361, entitled "An act fixing the fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts in certain States and Territories," (27 Stat. L., p. 347); which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 537) for the relief of Patrick Donnelly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CARTER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (S. 538) for the relief of Charles T. Rader;
A bill (S. 539) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to restore to public entry lands embraced in whole or in part within segregations for reservoirs;
A bill (S. 540) to establish an additional land district in the State of Montana; and
A bill (S. 541) for the relief of certain citizens of Montana claiming the benefit of the homestead laws.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 542) for the relief of the county of Flathead, State of Montana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 543) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Missoula, Mont.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 544) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Great Falls, Mont.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 545) for the relief of the county of Custer, State of Montana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 546) to divide Montana into two judicial districts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 547) granting an increase of pension to David B. Todd;
A bill (S. 548) granting an increase of pension to William Carr; and
A bill (S. 549) granting a pension to Louis T. Frech.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 550) providing that the act of May 19, 1902, entitled "An act for the protection of cities

and towns of the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," shall be applicable to any incorporated town in Indian Territory having a population of 1,000 or over; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 551) extending to Indian Territory certain provisions of the laws of the Territory of Oklahoma relating to rates of interest, and making the same operative therein; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 552) for the relief of James W. Morgan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 553) for the relief of J. W. Patterson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 554) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Newton, in the State of Kansas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 555) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Hill;

A bill (S. 556) granting an increase of pension to William H. Egolf;

A bill (S. 557) granting an increase of pension to Mariot Losure;

A bill (S. 558) granting an increase of pension to Abijah Chamberlain;

A bill (S. 559) granting an increase of pension to Seth M. Tucker;

A bill (S. 560) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Reed;

A bill (S. 561) granting an increase of pension to Leander Smith;

A bill (S. 562) granting a pension to Daisy E. Burrill;

A bill (S. 563) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Martin;

A bill (S. 564) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Hyatt;

A bill (S. 565) granting an increase of pension to Lumbard D. Aldrich; and

A bill (S. 566) granting an increase of pension to George Wiley.

Mr. WARNER introduced a bill (S. 567) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to make an examination of certain claims of the State of Missouri; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 568) to amend section 714 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BULKELEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 569) granting a pension to Edith A. Hawley;

A bill (S. 570) granting an increase of pension to John W. Crane;

A bill (S. 571) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Knight;

A bill (S. 572) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Salisbury;

A bill (S. 573) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Braman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 574) granting an increase of pension to Lee H. Buckland (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 575) granting an increase of pension to John Flynn (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 576) granting an increase of pension to Frederick J. Shelley (with accompanying papers).

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 577) granting to the State of Idaho 50,000 acres of land to aid in the continuation, enlargement, and maintenance of the Idaho State Soldiers and Sailors' Home; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 578) to establish a Government building in the town of Lewiston, Idaho;

A bill (S. 579) to establish a Government building in the town of Pocatello, Idaho; and

A bill (S. 580) to establish a Government building at the town of Moscow, Idaho.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 581) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to condemn and turn over to the State of Idaho two Krupp field guns captured from the enemy by the First Regiment Idaho Volunteer Infantry at the battle of Santa Ana, Philippine Islands, February 5, 1899; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 582) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Denver, in the State of Colorado; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 583) to aid the State of Colorado to support a school of mines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 584) for the relief of David H. Moffat; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 585) for the relief of Joshua T. Reynolds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 586) granting an increase of pension to Corydon W. Sanborn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 587) granting a pension to Mary J. Chenoweth (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 588) granting a pension to Priscilla L. Hamill;

A bill (S. 589) granting a pension to Joseph L. Prentiss;

A bill (S. 590) granting a pension to John White;

A bill (S. 591) granting a pension to William C. Banks;

A bill (S. 592) granting a pension to Madison M. Burnett;

A bill (S. 593) granting a pension to Thomas Tobens;

A bill (S. 594) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Tappan;

A bill (S. 595) granting an increase of pension to James U. Marlow (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 596) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Harding (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 597) granting an increase of pension to David M. Pearson;

A bill (S. 598) granting an increase of pension to James S. Bush;

A bill (S. 599) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Megrue;

A bill (S. 600) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Pitts (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 601) granting an increase of pension to George Ebert;

A bill (S. 602) granting an increase of pension to John Wilder;

A bill (S. 603) granting an increase of pension to Lide S. Leonard;

A bill (S. 604) granting an increase of pension to Wilbert B. Teters;

A bill (S. 605) granting an increase of pension to Henry Schafnit; and

A bill (S. 606) granting an increase of pension to John Houston Crowell (with accompanying papers).

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 607) to amend the act of August 3, 1892, fixing the fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts in certain States and Territories; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 608) granting to the State of Wyoming 50,000 acres of land to aid in the continuation, enlargement, and maintenance of the Wyoming State Soldiers and Sailors' Home; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 609) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Wyoming; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced a bill (S. 610) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sheridan, in the State of Wyoming; which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 611) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Rawlins, in the State of Wyoming; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 612) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of a national sanitarium of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Thermopolis, in the State of Wyoming; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 613) repealing an act entitled "An act to extend the time for presenting claims for additional bounties," and its amendments and extensions, so far as they limit the time for presenting claims for additional bounties granted to soldiers by the twelfth and thirteenth sections of the act of July 28, 1866; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 614) for the relief of Frank Bond;

A bill (S. 615) for the relief of the New York and Cuba Mail Steamship Company;

A bill (S. 616) authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to examine and settle the claim of the Wales Island Packing Company;

A bill (S. 617) for the relief of John W. Heavey (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 618) for the relief of Mrs. Davis Foster (with accompanying papers).

Mr. WARREN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to James F. Prater;

A bill (S. 620) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Law;

A bill (S. 621) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Reimann;

A bill (S. 622) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Swain;

A bill (S. 623) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Evans;

A bill (S. 624) granting an increase of pension to Abbie C. Moore;

A bill (S. 625) granting an increase of pension to Phebe J. Bennett;

A bill (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Allen J. Nash;

A bill (S. 627) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hiler;

A bill (S. 628) granting an increase of pension to Martin Connor;

A bill (S. 629) granting a pension to Daniel Fallen;

A bill (S. 630) granting a pension to Minnie Haas;

A bill (S. 631) granting a pension to Melinda Morford;

A bill (S. 632) granting a pension to Vincent L. McGuire;

A bill (S. 633) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Edwards;

A bill (S. 634) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia M. Clagett;

A bill (S. 635) granting an increase of pension to Edward Burns;

A bill (S. 636) granting an increase of pension to Matthew T. Ulen;

A bill (S. 637) granting an increase of pension to John D. O'Brien;

A bill (S. 638) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Mahar;

A bill (S. 639) granting an increase of pension to George M. Bradley;

A bill (S. 640) granting an increase of pension to Hugh P. Buffon;

A bill (S. 641) granting an increase of pension to James M. Conrad;

A bill (S. 642) granting an increase of pension to John A. B. Apperson;

A bill (S. 643) granting an increase of pension to Jane McMahon;

A bill (S. 644) granting an increase of pension to William R. Hubbell; and

A bill (S. 645) granting a pension to Isabella W. Campbell.

Mr. STONE introduced a bill (S. 646) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Cape Girardeau, in the State of Missouri; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 647) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Harmony; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 648) for the relief of the estate of Saphira E. Stalcup;

A bill (S. 649) for the relief of Isaac Stover;

A bill (S. 650) for the relief of M. A. Shelton;

A bill (S. 651) for the relief of R. L. Foster, surviving partner; and

A bill (S. 652) for the relief of the heirs of Alfred Lea, deceased.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced a bill (S. 653) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Illinois; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 654) granting a pension to Clara J. Swain;

A bill (S. 655) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Bishop;

A bill (S. 656) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Walters;

A bill (S. 657) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Reynolds; and

A bill (S. 658) granting a pension to Henry M. Hewitt.

Mr. SPOONER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 659) granting an honorable discharge to William S. Dunn;

A bill (S. 660) granting an honorable discharge to Peter Green; and

A bill (S. 661) for the relief of Levi J. Billings.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 662) to provide compensation for injuries received by George E. Giles, of Watertown, Wis., at the Ford's Theater disaster, which occurred June 9, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 663) granting a pension to Joseph Ellmore;

A bill (S. 664) granting an increase of pension to John W. Shetter;

A bill (S. 665) granting an increase of pension to Royal E. Dake;

A bill (S. 666) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Patrick;

A bill (S. 667) granting an increase of pension to James O. Ackerman;

A bill (S. 668) granting an increase of pension to John C. Rassbach;

A bill (S. 669) granting an increase of pension to Laurence Mericle;

A bill (S. 670) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Barrett (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 671) granting an increase of pension to Charles Conine (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 672) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hubbard;

A bill (S. 673) granting a pension to Peter Freund (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 674) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Agur (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 675) granting a pension to Ulricke Boettcher (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 676) granting an increase of pension to Joshua W. Tolford (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 677) granting an increase of pension to Albert G. Peabody, jr. (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 678) granting an increase of pension to Albert Butler (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 679) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Kelly.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 680) to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 681) to amend section 3878 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 682) for the relief of Andrew H. Russell and William R. Livermore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 683) providing for the erection of a building in the city of Boston, State of Massachusetts, for customs purposes; and

A bill (S. 684) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Quincy, Mass.

Mr. LODGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Library:

A bill (S. 685) for the erection of a monument to the memory of John Paul Jones; and

A bill (S. 686) to establish a United States historical commission.

Mr. LODGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance:

A bill (S. 687) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897;

A bill (S. 688) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897; and

A bill (S. 689) to amend section 2871, Revised Statutes, and the act of June 26, 1884.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 690) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint John Gibbon captain and quartermaster in the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 691) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 692) to authorize the United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries to convey certain land to Joseph S. Fay, jr., Sarah B. Fay, and Henry H. Fay; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 693) for the relief of the First National Bank of Newton, Mass.; and

A bill (S. 694) making appropriation to pay the estate of Samuel Lee, deceased, in full for any claim for pay and allowances made by reason of the election of said Lee to the Forty-seventh Congress and his services therein.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 695) increasing the pensions of Army nurses; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 696) to prevent and punish the desecration, mutilation, or improper use of the flag of the United States of America; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

A bill (S. 697) providing for the award of medals of honor to certain officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps;

A bill (S. 698) to provide for the examination of certain officers of the Navy, and to regulate promotions and retirements therein (with an accompanying paper, which was ordered to be printed);

A bill (S. 699) to promote the administration of justice in the Navy (with an accompanying paper, which was ordered to be printed);

A bill (S. 700) providing for the promotion of warrant officers; providing that all officers of the Navy shall be entitled to the pay of the grade to which promoted from the date on which they take rank therein; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper, which was ordered to be printed); and

A bill (S. 701) providing for the admission of Arthur Mervyn Whitton to the character and privileges of a citizen of the United States.

Mr. HALE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 702) granting an increase of pension to Richard Dearborn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 703) granting an increase of pension to Edmund T. Connolly, alias John Marks (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 704) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Pray;

A bill (S. 705) granting an increase of pension to Ashley St. Clair;

A bill (S. 706) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Saltar;

A bill (S. 707) granting a pension to Alice E. Gilley;

A bill (S. 708) granting an increase of pension to Maurice Downey;

A bill (S. 709) granting a pension to Hattie C. Sawtelle;

A bill (S. 710) granting a pension to Amos S. Hodgkins;

A bill (S. 711) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Wentworth;

A bill (S. 712) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie M. McLauchlan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 713) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim A. Gordon;

A bill (S. 714) granting an increase of pension to Susie Place;

A bill (S. 715) granting a pension to Georgia A. Rollins;

A bill (S. 716) granting an increase of pension to Theodore H. Hanson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 717) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Tuck (with accompanying papers).

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 718) for the relief of the Downings Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Oak Hall, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 719) granting a pension to William R. Dority;

A bill (S. 720) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Jickling (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 721) granting an increase of pension to Orange S. Mason (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 722) restoring to the pension roll the name of Annis Bailey, widow of Abram R. Ward (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 723) to amend section 4708 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in relation to pensions to remarried widows;

A bill (S. 724) granting an increase of pension to George A. Parker;

A bill (S. 725) granting an increase of pension to William M. Smith;

A bill (S. 726) granting an increase of pension to Ransom M. Fillmore; and

A bill (S. 727) granting an increase of pension to Jasper H. Keys.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 728) to correct the military record of James W. Houser; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 729) for the relief of George H. White; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CLAPP introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 730) for the relief of Charles T. Trowbridge, George D. Walker, and John A. Trowbridge;

A bill (S. 731) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Daniel W. Seal;

A bill (S. 732) for the establishment of a national park and cemetery at Fort Ridgely, in the State of Minnesota;

A bill (S. 733) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob Niebels;

A bill (S. 734) for the relief of Sylvester D. Foss; and

A bill (S. 735) to correct the military record of Maurice J. O'Brine.

Mr. CLAPP introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 736) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota;

A bill (S. 737) to provide for the purchase of an additional site for the enlargement of the Federal building at Duluth, in the State of Minnesota;

A bill (S. 738) for the erection of a public building at Red Wing, Minn.; and

A bill (S. 739) for the erection of a public building at Faribault, Minn.

Mr. CLAPP introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (S. 740) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to fulfill certain treaty stipulations with the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior and the Mississippi, and making appropriation for the same;

A bill (S. 741) for the relief of Rev. Charles Wright; and

A bill (S. 742) for the relief of Samuel J. Brown and Susan F. Brown.

Mr. CLAPP introduced the following bills; which were sever-

ally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 743) for the relief of Henry C. Block;

A bill (S. 744) for the relief of Edward H. Ozmun;

A bill (S. 745) for the relief of Herman W. Reichow;

A bill (S. 746) for the relief of Porter Brothers; and

A bill (S. 747) for the relief of the heirs of Rinaldo Johnson and Ann E. Johnson, deceased.

Mr. CLAPP introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

A bill (S. 748) to provide for the distribution of the reports of the United States circuit courts of appeals and of the United States circuit and district courts to certain officers of the United States, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 749) to provide for the distribution of the Federal Cases in the United States courts; and

A bill (S. 750) to amend chapter 109 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, approved January 30, 1897, relating to the sale of intoxicating drinks to Indians, providing penalties therefor, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 751) to authorize the erection of a monument at Lundys Lane to the memory of Capt. Abraham F. Hull; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 752) to extend the United States pension laws to the participants in the battles of New Ulm and Fort Ridgely, Minn., in the Sioux war of 1862;

A bill (S. 753) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890;

A bill (S. 754) granting an increase of pension to L. P. Storms;

A bill (S. 755) granting an increase of pension to Marzovan J. Secord;

A bill (S. 756) granting a pension to Jacob Niebels;

A bill (S. 757) granting a pension to Eliza Houghton;

A bill (S. 758) granting a pension to Aletta Joel;

A bill (S. 759) granting a pension to Adoniram C. Harper;

A bill (S. 760) granting a pension to Sophia Hutchins;

A bill (S. 761) granting an increase of pension to David P. R. Strong;

A bill (S. 762) granting a pension to Frederick S. Chamberlain;

A bill (S. 763) granting a pension to Ernestine Lavigne;

A bill (S. 764) granting an increase of pension to Robert Carney;

A bill (S. 765) granting a pension to Hannah C. Mowry;

A bill (S. 766) granting an increase of pension to John Burns;

A bill (S. 767) granting a pension to Frances E. Truesdell;

A bill (S. 768) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rhoads;

A bill (S. 769) granting an increase of pension to Charles Stewart;

A bill (S. 770) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Starrett;

A bill (S. 771) granting an increase of pension to S. G. Kreidler;

A bill (S. 772) granting an increase of pension to Jerusha Hayward Brown;

A bill (S. 773) granting a pension to George F. Steffens;

A bill (S. 774) granting an increase of pension to August Krueger;

A bill (S. 775) granting a pension to Margaret S. Sturges;

A bill (S. 776) granting a pension to Isabella McGookin; and

A bill (S. 777) granting an increase of pension to Byron Lent.

Mr. HEMENWAY introduced a bill (S. 778) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in the district of Indiana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced a bill (S. 779) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Wallingford, in the State of Connecticut; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 780) for the relief of the estate of Eliza A. White; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

A bill (S. 781) authorizing the President to appoint Lieut. Commander Frederick Augustus Miller, retired, United States Navy, a commander on the retired list; and

A bill (S. 782) relating to appointments to the Naval Academy, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 783) granting an increase of pension to Moses H. Sawyer;

A bill (S. 784) granting an increase of pension to George L. Cooley;

A bill (S. 785) granting an increase of pension to Franklin C. Pierce;

A bill (S. 786) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Garvey;

A bill (S. 787) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Ernst;

A bill (S. 788) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Metcalf;

A bill (S. 789) granting a pension to Mary E. Wolf;

A bill (S. 790) granting an increase of pension to William Benkler;

A bill (S. 791) granting an increase of pension to William S. Ely;

A bill (S. 792) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Ward; and

A bill (S. 793) granting an increase of pension to George A. Martinus.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced a bill (S. 794) to remove the charge of desertion against Robert Burnet; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CLAY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 795) for a public building at the city of Albany, Ga., and appropriating money therefor;

A bill (S. 796) to provide for a public building in the city of Marietta, Ga.;

A bill (S. 797) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Americus, Ga., and appropriating money therefor;

A bill (S. 798) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Griffin, Ga.;

A bill (S. 799) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Dalton, in the State of Georgia; and

A bill (S. 800) to provide for the erection of a public building at Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. CLAY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 801) for the relief of the heirs of Augustus and Christine Rich, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 802) for the relief of Wellborn Echols (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 803) for the relief of Elizabeth A. C. Galloway;

A bill (S. 804) for the relief of the heirs of George Winfrey, deceased; and

A bill (S. 805) for the relief of Sibini Jones.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 806) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Gainesville, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 807) authorizing the erection of a court-house and post-office building at Valdosta, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 808) for the relief of the estate of John McCullough, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 809) for the relief of the estate of Ira W. McCutchen, deceased;

A bill (S. 810) for the relief of the heirs at law of Charles Evans, deceased;

A bill (S. 811) for the relief of the heirs at law of John G. Lawton, deceased;

A bill (S. 812) for the relief of B. C. Green;

A bill (S. 813) for the relief of the heirs at law of Allen Tarver, deceased;

A bill (S. 814) for the relief of the heirs at law of Mary A. Cameron and John Cameron, deceased;

A bill (S. 815) for the relief of Virgil H. Burns;

A bill (S. 816) for the relief of the heirs at law of Emily R. Hathorn, deceased;

A bill (S. 817) for the relief of the heirs at law of William C. Dixon, deceased;

A bill (S. 818) for the relief of the legal representatives of J. P. Lamar, deceased;

A bill (S. 819) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad and Banking Company; and

A bill (S. 820) for the relief of John Scarborough.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 821) for the relief of Edwin Bell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 822) granting a pension to Michael V. Hennessy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FRYE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 1) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Dorothea Lynde Dix; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 2) requesting the President to acquire, by annexation or otherwise, the island of Santo Domingo and the dependencies of Santo Domingo and Haiti; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULBERSON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 3) setting aside one-half of the unappropriated public lands in the Philippine Islands belonging to the United States as a permanent public free school fund; which was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas according to the report of the War Department there are in the Philippine Islands 69,000,000 acres of unappropriated public lands belonging to the United States; and

Whereas under existing law said land may be disposed of by the government of the Philippine Islands on such terms as it may prescribe consistently with the provisions of said law; and

Whereas there is no existing law setting apart any portion of said lands or the proceeds of the sale or lease thereof exclusively for educational purposes; and

Whereas it is essential now, before said lands are appropriated for other purposes, to create therewith a permanent fund for the support of an efficient system of public free schools: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States (the House of Representatives concurring) That one-half of the said unappropriated public lands in the Philippine Islands belonging to the United States is hereby set apart as a permanent public free school fund for the inhabitants of said islands, and no part of said lands shall hereafter be granted, sold, or in any other manner disposed of unless at the same time an equal quantity shall be set apart and segregated as a permanent public free school fund for the inhabitants of said islands in a manner to be prescribed by a general law of the government of the Philippine Islands and approved by the President and the Congress of the United States.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. WARREN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 4) to provide for the printing of a digest of the decisions of the Court of Claims, together with the rules of practice of and the statutes relating to that court; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 5) granting permission for the erection of a monument in Washington, D. C., for the ornamentation of the national capital and the honor of Gen. Montgomery Cunningham Meigs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. MALLORY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 6) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause a survey or surveys to be made to determine the practicability and cost of a tide-water ship canal across the State of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 7) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to present the bell of the late United States sloop of war *Germantown* to the Site and Relic Society, of Germantown, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am directed by the Merchant Marine Commission to introduce a bill, which I ask shall be read twice, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to present the final report of the Merchant Marine Commission in support of the bill which I have just introduced.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent to present, in connection with the bill just introduced, the final report of the Merchant Marine Commission. Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. GALLINGER. The report will be printed?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be referred to the Committee on Commerce and printed.

REPORT ON LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State covering statements showing the receipts and disbursements of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company for the months of November and December, 1904, and the months of January, February, March, and April, 1905, furnished by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission, in pursuance of section 11 of the "Act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory," etc., approved March 3, 1901.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1905.*

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PORTO RICO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed.

The Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Fifth Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico, covering the period from July 1, 1904, to June 30, 1905.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1905.*

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—ANN P. KILBOURNE.

On motion of Mr. WARREN, it was

Ordered, That on the application of Ann P. Kilbourne she is authorized to withdraw from the files of the Senate all papers accompanying Senate bill 3629, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, entitled "A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Ann P. Kilbourne," there having been no adverse report thereon.

INTERSTATE RAILROAD INCORPORATION.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask that it may lie upon the table. I give notice that I shall hereafter call it up in order that I may submit some remarks upon it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Nevada will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission frame and report to the Congress of the United States, within twenty days after the passage of this resolution, a national incorporation act for railroads engaged in interstate commerce, providing, among other things, as follows:

First. For the construction of interstate railroads throughout the United States, the amount of bonds and stock to be issued by such national corporations to be determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and not to exceed in any event the actual cost of such railroads.

Second. For the consolidation of railroads now engaged in interstate commerce, the amount of stock and bonds issued for such consolidation to be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and not to exceed in any event the actual value of the railroads consolidated, such value to be determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Third. For the increase of the issues of bonds or stock by such corporations for the purchase of connecting or intersecting lines, for new construction, or for betterment of the roads, the amount of such issue of stock and bonds to be determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and not to exceed in any event the cost of such new construction, the betterments, or the value of the intersecting or connecting lines acquired.

Fourth. For the imposition of a percentage tax upon the gross receipts of all such corporations in lieu of all taxes upon the property of such railroad corporations and their bonds and capital stock, and in lieu of all taxes upon the bonds and shares of stock of such railroad companies in the hands of bondholders or stockholders, the property of such railroads and their bonds and stocks to be entirely exempt from State, county, or municipal taxation, save as permitted by such incorporation act, and for a just plan of distributing such taxes among the States in which such railroads operate upon some equitable basis, such percentage to be so adjusted, if practicable, as to yield in the aggregate an amount equal to the taxes now paid by such railroads, and to be increased gradually through a period of ten years, until it reaches an aggregate of 5 per cent upon the gross receipts of such corporations.

Fifth. For a limitation of the dividends of such corporations to 4 per cent on the capital stock, three-fourths of all surplus earnings over 4 per cent per annum to be applied, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to betterments, increase of wages, or reduction in rates, and one-fourth thereof to be applied from time to time, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to extra dividends, no reduction of rates to be made by the Interstate Commerce Commission which will imperil such dividends of 4 per cent.

Sixth. For the creation of a pension fund for railroad employees disqualified either by injury or by age for active service, by setting aside a percentage of the gross receipts of the railroads in a fund in the Treasury, to be invested according to rules and regulations made by the Interstate Commerce Commission, such pension system to be devised, changed, and modified from time to time by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Seventh. For the exercise by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the powers of a board of conciliation in all disputes between such railroad corporations and their employees as to compensation, hours of labor, and protection of life and limb.

Eighth. For the deposit in the United States Treasury by such railroad companies of all sums collected in excess of the rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission pending the determination of suits arising from rate reduction, such deposit to remain in the Treasury until the final determination of the suit, and to be returned to the railroad if such determination is in its favor, but if the decision is against the railroad such deposit to be turned over to the pension fund for railroad employees.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. At the request of the Senator from Nevada, the resolution will lie over.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution lie upon the table, and I give notice that I will ask leave to address the Senate on the resolutions on Monday next.

Mr. SPOONER. I want to ask the Senator if that is really a serious proposition?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Entirely so.

Mr. SPOONER. It would be hard to believe, but for the Senator's statement. I think he has large views upon this subject and plan, and he evidently knows very precisely what he wants in a bill. I should much dislike, Mr. President, to vote for a resolution instructing or requesting—it ought to be requesting and not instructing, because we have no right to instruct the Interstate Commerce Commission—requesting the Commission to draw for the Senate a bill which the Senator's resolution indicates he himself could draw with perfect accuracy. I think there has never been, certainly there never has been since I have been a member of the Senate, any precedent for such a proposition—I am not talking about the merits of the Senator's proposed bill—but I certainly have no knowledge of any previous proposition in which the Senate has requested some outside body—a commission or anybody else outside of the Senate—to draw for it a bill. That is why I asked the Senator if he really meant seriously to have this resolution passed requesting the Interstate Commerce Commission to draw such a bill as he has indicated.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say in answer to the Senator that it is immaterial to me whether the Interstate Commerce Commission frames the bill or whether the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate frames the bill, or whether an individual member of this body frames the bill. In any event it will be considered by the proper committee and in the Senate, and can then be rejected or amended or modified.

I have given serious consideration to the question of framing a national incorporation act, but I feared that if I attempted to present such a bill to this body its attention might be directed to the details of the bill rather than to the essential principles, and that the latter might be lost sight of in the confusion of debate. Hence I concluded to present the essential principles, of a national incorporation act to the Senate in some form without all the details that are involved in a long incorporation act. Senators are aware how long these acts are and how many details they cover, and as I wished to address myself simply to the essential principles, I thought this would be the simplest form.

I might have suggested that a joint commission frame and report such a bill—a commission composed of Senators and Representatives—and to such a commission possibly might have been added experts in railroad management; but my observation of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the hearings we have had before the Interstate Commerce Committee is that there is no body anywhere in this country better qualified to frame an incorporation act than that Commission, which certainly has had more experience with railroads than any other body in the service of the United States. I do not see why we should hesitate to avail ourselves of their knowledge and experience in the mere framing of a bill. I do not see how it detracts at all from the dignity of the Senate to call upon an executive body to give the Senate the benefit of their knowledge and of their experience in a matter of this kind. But that, of course, is to be left to the Senate. If they should approve of the principles involved in this resolution, and if some Senator can suggest some other method of framing a bill, or some other body by which it shall be framed, of course it makes no difference to me. My only concern is that we should enter upon legislation involving the essential principles to which I have called attention in the resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. May I ask the Senator what power the Senate has to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to draft bills for the Senate? Of course the Senate might request it, being in need, probably, as the Senator thinks, of outside assistance in regard to drafting such legislation.

Mr. NEWLANDS. So far as I am concerned, I will say that I am very glad to have any competent man aid me in drawing a bill.

Mr. SPOONER. Of course the Senator has a right to ask such assistance in drafting a bill, but this is a resolution of the Senate directing the Commission—"requesting" would be just the same, only a little worse, from my standpoint—to draw such a bill for the use of this body.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. I want to know what our condition would be if the Interstate Commerce Commission should decline to draw the bill?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will consider that question when the contingency arises. I am sure it is the commonest thing in legislation, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, to consider bills that have been presented by the Executive Departments of the Government. Such bills go to the proper committees and receive consideration. It would be entirely within the province of this Commission, which is charged by law with the duty of making recommendations to Congress regarding such matters, to frame a bill and to send it to the Congress of the United States urging its passage. It can do that, and it seems to me it would be entirely proper for us to ask them to frame such a bill; but that is a matter of detail to which I attach no importance. The resolution is here and can be amended in any form so as to secure the framing of such a bill by a committee if the Senate so desires.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not want to interfere, but I merely wish to say that I shall offer an amendment to that resolution when I have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I suppose the resolution has gone over under the rule?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed and lie on the table.

RULES FOR PRESENTATION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that, in accordance with the provision of Rule XL, I propose to move an amendment to the rules, which will modify Rule VII. For that purpose I submit a resolution and ask that it be read, printed, and referred to the Committee on Rules.

The resolution was read, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the Senate be amended by adding thereto the following:

Senators having petitions or memorials or bills of a private nature to present may deliver them to the Secretary of the Senate, indorsing upon them their name and the reference or disposition to be made thereof, and said petitions, memorials, and bills of a private nature shall, with the approval of the presiding officer, be entered on the Journal with the names of the Senators presenting them, and the Secretary of the Senate shall furnish a transcript of such entries to the Official Reporter of Debates for publication in the RECORD. Reports of private pension bills from the Committee on Pensions may be delivered to the Secretary of the Senate, and by him, with the approval of the presiding officer of the Senate, be placed upon the Calendar and entered on the Journal with the names of the Senators reporting them, and the Secretary of the Senate shall furnish a transcript of such entries to the Official Reporter of Debates for publication in the RECORD.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I present a resolution with respect to the insurance question, and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not know the nature of the resolution, but I merely want to state to the Senator that it is very important we should have a short executive session in order to refer a great body of nominations.

Mr. CULBERSON. The resolution is very short, and I think there will be no objection to it.

Mr. LODGE. I thought it might be a resolution of adjournment.

Mr. CULBERSON. No.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate be, and is hereby, directed to consider and report to the Senate as soon as may be practicable whether the Congress has authority under the Constitution to supervise and regulate the business of marine, fire, or life insurance.

EXAMINATIONS OF NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. TILLMAN. I offer a resolution which I send to the desk, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Comptroller of the Currency be directed to inform the Senate (1) whether all the reports of the examinations of the national banks made by the bank examiners since March 4, 1893, have

been preserved in his office; (2) how often the regular examinations have been made; (3) whether it is the duty of every bank examiner to examine the records and vouchers showing the expenditures for all purposes of each bank visited by him; (4) whether it is his duty, if he finds that moneys have been illegally or wastefully expended by the bank, to state the facts in his report; (5) whether the reports now on file made since said date show any payments by any bank to any political committee or to any chairman, treasurer, or other officer of a political committee; and (6) whether such reports show any payments of the moneys of a bank to any person upon any voucher, or without any voucher, where the circumstances of the payments suggest that the money paid was to be used to carry on a political campaign or for any political purpose; and if any reports now on file show any such payments to any political committee, or to a chairman, treasurer, or other officer of a political committee, or any payments suggesting a use of money for a political campaign or any political purpose, said Comptroller of the Currency is directed to report all the facts in all such cases to the Senate, and to inform the Senate what action, if any, has been taken as the result of the discovery of any such payments as aforesaid.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, let the resolution go over under the rule.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under objection, the resolution will go over and be printed.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to suggest that the resolution should be directed not to the Comptroller of the Currency, but to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am indifferent as to that, so that I get the information I am after.

Mr. TELLER. The Comptroller of the Currency has no right, unless directed by the Secretary of the Treasury, to make a report of that character.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am perfectly willing to change the resolution and direct it to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. LODGE. Let the resolution go over, Mr. President.

Mr. TELLER. I suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that he modify his resolution to-morrow in the way I have indicated.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will do that. I am indifferent as to the form of the resolution; it is the matter I am after.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over and be printed.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be, and is hereby, directed to make inquiry and report to the Senate whether since March 4, 1893, any payments have been made by any national bank or banks to any political committee, or to the chairman, treasurer, or other officer of a political committee, or to carry on any political campaign, or for any political purpose; and said committee, if such payments have been made, is directed to report all the facts in detail to the Senate.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR ORVILLE H. PLATT.

Mr. BULKELEY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President of the Senate in arranging for and attending the funeral of the late Senator from Connecticut, Hon. ORVILLE H. PLATT, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOHN M. PINCKNEY, late a Representative from the State of Texas, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twelve minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. PINCKNEY.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives relative to the death of Hon. JOHN M. PINCKNEY, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions referred to by the Senator from Texas. They will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 5, 1905.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. JOHN M. PINCKNEY, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be directed to transmit this resolution to the Senate, and a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk, and ask for their present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas submits for present consideration resolutions which will be read.

The resolutions were read, and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sensibility the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN M. PINCKNEY, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That as an additional mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Texas.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 7, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 6, 1905.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

Elihu Root, of New York, to be Secretary of State, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John Hay, deceased.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Charles Joseph Bonaparte, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Navy, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Paul Morton, resigned.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

Robert Bacon, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of State, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Francis B. Loomis, retired.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

John Barrett, of Oregon, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Colombia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice William W. Russell, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Venezuela.

John Hicks, of Wisconsin, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Chile, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Henry L. Wilson, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Belgium.

Joseph W. J. Lee, of Maryland, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Ecuador, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Archibald J. Sampson, resigned.

Charles E. Magoon, of Nebraska, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Panama, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John Barrett, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Colombia.

William W. Russell, of the District of Columbia, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Venezuela, to which office he was appointed during the last session of the Senate, vice Herbert W. Bowen, dismissed.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES.

R. S. Reynolds Hitt, of Illinois, to be secretary of the embassy of the United States at Rome, Italy, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Lewis M. Iddings, appointed agent and consul-general at Cairo, Egypt.

John W. Garrett, of Maryland, to be second secretary of the embassy of the United States at Berlin, Germany, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice R. S. Reynolds Hitt, appointed secretary of the embassy at Rome, Italy.

Paxton P. Hibben, of Indiana, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at St. Petersburg, Russia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill an original vacancy.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATIONS.

George L. Lorillard, of Rhode Island, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Copenhagen, Denmark, to which office he was appointed during the lase recess of the Senate, vice Nelson O'Shaughnessy, appointed third secretary of the embassy at Berlin, Germany.

William F. Sands, of the District of Columbia, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Panama, Panama, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Joseph W. J. Lee, appointed consul-general at Panama.

Henry L. Janes, of Wisconsin, to be second secretary of the

legation of the United States at Habana, Cuba, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice George L. Lorillard, appointed secretary of the legation at Copenhagen, Denmark.

CONSULS-GENERAL.

Lewis M. Iddings, of New York, to be agent and consul-general of the United States at Cairo, Egypt, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John W. Riddle, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Roumania and Servia.

Leo Allen Bergholz, of New York, to be consul-general of the United States at Beirut, Turkey, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Gabriel Bie Ravndal, appointed consul at Dawson City, Yukon Territory, Canada.

George C. Cole, of West Virginia, to be consul-general of the United States at Buenos Aires, Argentine Republic, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Daniel Mayer, whose nomination was not acted upon by the Senate.

Alfred L. M. Gottschalk, of New York, lately consul at Callao, to be consul-general of the United States at Callao, Peru, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

William A. Prickitt, of New Jersey, to be consul-general of the United States at Auckland, New Zealand, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice J. Martin Miller, appointed consul at Rheims, France.

Arnold Shanklin, of Missouri, to be consul-general of the United States at Panama, Panama, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Joseph W. J. Lee, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Ecuador.

CONSULS.

Theodosius Botkin, of Utah, to be consul of the United States at Port Louis, Mauritius, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John B. Campbell, resigned.

G. Jarvis Bowens, of Virginia, to be consul of the United States at Guadeloupe, West Indies, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice George B. Anderson, appointed consul at Antigua, West Indies.

George N. Ifft, of Idaho, to be consul of the United States at Chatham, Ontario, Canada, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Charles E. Monteith, resigned.

Felix S. S. Johnson, of New Jersey, to be consul of the United States at Puerto Cortes, Honduras, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice William E. Alger, appointed consul at Tegucigalpa, Honduras.

Francis B. Keene, of Wisconsin, to be consul of the United States at Geneva, Switzerland, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Horace Lee Washington, appointed consul-general at Cape Town, Cape of Good Hope.

James C. Kellogg, of Louisiana, to be consul of the United States at Colon, Panama, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Oscar Malmros, appointed consul at Rouen, France.

Albert Leffingwell, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Warsaw, Russia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Clarence Rice Slocum, appointed consul at Weimar, Germany.

John McMackin, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Georgetown, Guiana, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Winfield S. Boynton, declined.

Dominic I. Murphy, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Bordeaux, France, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Albion W. Tourgee, deceased.

J. Martin Miller, of New Jersey, to be consul of the United States at Rheims, France, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice William A. Prickitt, appointed consul-general at Auckland, New Zealand.

Mason Mitchell, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Chungking, China, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Harold S. Lyon, declined.

Maxwell K. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at St. Thomas, Ontario, Canada, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Roland J. Hemmick, appointed commercial agent at Peterborough, Ontario, Canada.

Thomas P. Moffat, of New York, to be consul of the United States at La Guaira, Venezuela, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Carl Bailey Hurst, appointed consul at Plauen, Germany.

Gabriel Bie Ravndal, of South Dakota, to be consul of the United States at Dawson City, Yukon Territory, Canada, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Leo Allen Bergholz, appointed consul-general at Beirut, Turkey.

Bertil M. Rasmusen, of Iowa, to be consul of the United States at Stavanger, Norway, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill an original vacancy.

John B. Richardson, of Kansas, to be consul of the United States at Jalapa, Mexico, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill an original vacancy.

Edwin W. Trimmer, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Cape Gracias á Dios (Port Deitrick), Nicaragua, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill an original vacancy.

Thomas B. Van Horne, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Rosario, Argentine Republic, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice James M. Ayers, resigned.

Howard D. Van Sant, of New Jersey, to be consul of the United States at Kingston, Ontario, Canada, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Marshall H. Twitchell, deceased.

Herbert R. Wright, of Iowa, to be consul of the United States at Utilla, Honduras, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John B. Richardson, appointed consul at Jalapa, Mexico.

Evan E. Young, of South Dakota, to be consul of the United States at Harput, Turkey, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Thomas H. Norton, appointed consul at Smyrna, Turkey.

William Harrison Bradley, of Illinois, now consul-general at Manchester, to be consul of the United States at Manchester, England. This is a change of grade.

Frank Dillingham, of California, now consul at Aix la Chapelle, to be consul of the United States at Stuttgart, Würtemberg, vice Edward H. Ozmun, nominated to be consul-general at Coburg.

Pierre Paul Demers, of New Hampshire, to be consul of the United States at Barranquilla, Colombia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice James C. Kellogg, declined.

Chester Donaldson, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Port Limon, Costa Rica, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Pierre Paul Demers, appointed consul at Barranquilla, Colombia.

Milo A. Jewett, of Massachusetts, now consul at Sivas, to be consul of the United States at Trebizond, Turkey, vice Edward J. Sullivan, retired.

John Edward Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Dalny, Manchuria, vice Edwin V. Morgan, appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Korea.

Pendleton King, of North Carolina, to be consul of the United States at Aix la Chapelle, Germany, vice Frank Dillingham, nominated to be consul at Stuttgart.

Gebhard Willrich, of Wisconsin, to be consul of the United States at St. John, New Brunswick, Canada, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Ira B. Myers, resigned.

Harry A. Conant, of Michigan, to be consul of the United States at Windsor, Ontario, Canada, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Roland J. Hemmick, appointed consul at St. Thomas, Ontario, Canada.

Benjamin F. Chase, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Catania, Italy, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Alexander Heingartner, appointed consul at Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

Edward A. Creevey, of Connecticut, to be consul of the United States at Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Martin J. Carter, deceased.

James W. Davidson, of Minnesota, to be consul of the United States at Antung, China, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. This is a reappointment.

James E. Dunning, of Maine, to be consul of the United States at Milan, Italy, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Harlan W. Brush, retired.

Thomas D. Edwards, of South Dakota, to be consul of the United States at Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, to which office he was

appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Charles W. Kindrick, deceased.

William W. Handley, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Trinidad, West Indies, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Alvin Smith, removed.

Ernest L. Harris, of Illinois, to be consul of the United States at Chemnitz, Saxony, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Joseph F. Monaghan, resigned.

Joseph A. Howells, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Turks Island, West Indies, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Thomas P. Moffat, appointed consul at La Guaira, Venezuela.

Alexander Heingartner, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Guelph, Ontario, Canada, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Howard D. Van Sant, appointed consul at Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

Carl Bailey Hurst, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Plauen, Germany, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Hugo Muench, resigned.

Thornwell Haynes, of South Carolina, to be consul of the United States at Nanking, China, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Daniel S. Kidder, removed.

Louis Hostetter, of Nebraska, to be consul of the United States at Hermosillo, Mexico, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to fill an original vacancy.

William H. Michael, of Nebraska, to be consul-general of the United States at Calcutta, India, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Stanley Stoner, declined.

Edward H. Ozmun, of Minnesota, now consul at Stuttgart, to be consul-general of the United States at Coburg, Germany, vice Henry D. Saylor, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

George H. Lyman, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts. (Reappointment.)

Rufus A. Soule, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of New Bedford, in the State of Massachusetts, in place of George F. Bartlett, deceased. Mr. Soule is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

James E. B. Stuart, of Virginia, to be collector of customs for the district of Newport News, in the State of Virginia, in place of Jesse W. Elliott, deceased. Mr. Stuart is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

ASSISTANT COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John Doscher, of New Jersey, to be assistant collector of customs at Jersey City, N. J., in the district of New York, in the State of New York, to succeed John Rotherham, resigned. Mr. Doscher is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Thomas B. McLemore, of Tennessee, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Knoxville, in the State of Tennessee, to succeed Elijah W. Adkins, resigned. Mr. McLemore is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. Johnstone Hamilton Quinan to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from July 1, 1905, to succeed David H. Jarvis, resigned. Mr. Quinan is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

First Lieut. Byron L. Reed to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 29, 1905, to succeed Charles A. Abbey, retired. Mr. Reed is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

First Lieut. James L. Sill to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 1, 1905, to succeed Orin D. Myrick, retired. Mr. Sill is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Second Lieut. Leonard Taylor Cutter to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 29, 1905, to succeed Byron Laverne Reed, promoted. Mr. Cutter is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Second Lieut. Harry G. Hamlet to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 28, 1905, to succeed David H. Jarvis, promoted. Mr. Hamlet is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Second Lieut. William Edwin At Lee to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from July 1, 1905, to succeed Johnstone Hamilton Quinan, promoted. Mr. At Lee is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Second Lieut. Randolph Ridgely, jr., to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 1, 1905, to succeed James Louis Sill, promoted. Mr. Ridgely is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Third Lieut. Thaddeus Greaves Crapster to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 16, 1905, to succeed Richard Matthews Sturdevant, resigned. Mr. Crapster is now serving under a temporary commission issued duing the recess of the Senate.

Third Lieut. Cecil Maunsel Gabbett to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 1, 1905, to succeed Randolph Ridgley, jr., promoted. Mr. Gabbett is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Third Lieut. William Albert Whittier to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 28, 1905, to succeed Harry Gabriel Hamlet, promoted. Mr. Whittier is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Frank Lynn Austin, of Michigan, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from August 4, 1905, to succeed Thaddeus Greaves Crapster, promoted. Mr. Austin is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

James Albert Alger, of Massachusetts, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from August 4, 1905, to succeed Cecil Maunsell Gabbett, promoted. Mr. Alger is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Ralph Waldo Dempwolf, of Pennsylvania, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from October 23, 1905. Mr. Dempwolf is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Le Roy Reinburg, of the District of Columbia, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from October 23, 1905. Mr. Reinburg is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Howard Eugene Rideout, of Massachusetts, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from October 23, 1905. Mr. Rideout is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William Clayton Ward, of the District of Columbia, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from October 27, 1905. Mr. Ward is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Roger Chew Weightman, of California, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from October 23, 1905. Mr. Weightman is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William Benjamin Cothran, of South Carolina, to be a second assistant engineer, with the rank of third lieutenant, in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States to succeed George Melvin Kohler, resigned. Mr. Cothran is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John Thomas Carr, of Massachusetts, to be a second assistant engineer, with the rank of third lieutenant, in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States. Mr. Carr is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Charles Iven Day, of Maine, to be a second assistant engineer, with the rank of third lieutenant, in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to succeed Robert Bradford Adams, promoted. Mr. Day is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

PROMOTIONS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Thomas D. Berry to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 24, 1905. Mr. Berry

is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asst. Surg. Baylis H. Earle to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 13, 1905. Mr. Earle is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asst. Surg. Edward Francis to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 23, 1905. Mr. Francis is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asst. Surg. Mervin W. Glover to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 13, 1905. Mr. Glover is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asst. Surg. John D. Long to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 14, 1905. Mr. Long is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asst. Surg. George W. McCoy to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 27, 1905. Mr. McCoy is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asst. Surg. Allan J. McLoughlin to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 10, 1905. Mr. McLoughlin is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asst. Surg. Claude C. Pierce to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 27, 1905. Mr. Pierce is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Asst. Surg. Benjamin S. Warren to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 25, 1905. Mr. Warren is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Hugh de Valin, of the District of Columbia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. de Valin is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Marshall C. Guthrie, of North Carolina, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Guthrie is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry D. Long, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Long is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Egil T. Olsen, of Illinois, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Mr. Olsen is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Edwin V. Morgan, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Cuba, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Herbert G. Squiers, resigned.

Henry W. Furniss, of Indiana, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Haiti, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice William F. Powell, resigned.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATIONS.

Roger Sherman Gates Boutell, of Illinois, now secretary of the legation at Berne, Switzerland, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to the Netherlands and Luxemburg, vice Paul Grand d'Hauteville, nominated to be secretary of the legation at Berne.

Paul Grand d'Hauteville, of Rhode Island, now secretary of the legation to the Netherlands and Luxemburg, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Berne, Switzerland, vice Roger Sherman Gates Boutell, nominated to be secretary of the legation to the Netherlands and Luxemburg.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Joseph L. B. Alexander, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the Territory of Arizona, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, in the place of Frederick S. Nave, nominated to be associate justice of the supreme court of Arizona.

Daniel W. Baker, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, in the place of Morgan H. Beach, resigned.

Farish Carter Tate, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia, vice Edgar A. Angier, whose term will expire December 17, 1905.

Wade S. Stanfield, of Indian Territory, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indian Territory, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, in the place of Pliny L. Soper, resigned.

Harry J. Bone, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas, vice John S. Dean, whose term will expire December 16, 1905.

James H. Tinsley, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky. A reappointment, his term expiring December 16, 1905.

Reuben D. Hill, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky. A reappointment, his term expiring February 21, 1906.

Arba S. Van Valkenburgh, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the western district of Missouri, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of William Warner, resigned.

A. George Avery, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. An original appointment under the provisions of the act approved March 2, 1905, entitled "An act to divide Washington into two judicial districts."

Elliott Northcott, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia, who was appoined during the last recess of the Senate in the place of George W. Atkinson, resigned.

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Elmer B. Adams, of Missouri, to be United States circuit judge for the eighth judicial circuit, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of Amos M. Thayer, deceased.

ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Milton D. Purdy, of Minnesota, to be assistant to the Attorney-General, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in place of William A. Day, resigned.

JUDGE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

George W. Atkinson, of West Virginia, to be judge of the Court of Claims, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, in the place of Lawrence Weldon, deceased.

COMMISSIONER TO REVISE THE LAWS.

John L. Lott, of Ohio, to be a commissioner to revise the laws of the United States, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, in the place of Alexander C. Botkin, deceased.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Charles W. Russell, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Attorney-General, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, in the place of Milton D. Purdy, nominated to be assistant to the Attorney-General.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

James Wickersham, of Alaska, to be judge of the district court of the district of Alaska, and assign him to division No. 3. Mr. Wickersham was nominated for reappointment to this position at the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, but failed of confirmation.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICES.

Frederick S. Nave, of Arizona, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of Eugene A. Tucker, resigned.

Louis E. McComas, of Maryland, to be associate justice of the court of appeals of the District of Columbia, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of Martin F. Morris, resigned.

DISTRICT JUDGES.

Gustavus A. Finkelnburg, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of Elmer B. Adams, nominated to be circuit judge for the eighth circuit.

Charles E. Wolverton, of Oregon, to be United States district

judge for the district of Orgeon, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of Charles B. Bellinger, deceased.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL OF PORTO RICO.

Frank Feuille, of Porto Rico, to be attorney-general of Porto Rico, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of A. G. Stewart, resigned.

MARSHALS.

Pope M. Long, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama, vice Daniel N. Cooper, whose term will expire January 13, 1906.

James H. Judkins, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama, vice Leander J. Bryan, whose term will expire January 30, 1906.

Benjamin F. Daniels, of Arizona, to be United States marshal for the Territory of Arizona, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of Myron H. McCord, resigned.

Walter H. Johnson, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia. A reappointment, his term expiring December 17, 1905.

George W. Long, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky, vice Addison D. James, whose term will expire December 16, 1905.

Stephen G. Sharp, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky. A reappointment, his term expiring January 12, 1906.

James F. Shea, of North Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota, vice John E. Haggart, deceased.

Charles J. Reed, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in place of Walter F. Matthews, removed.

Harry S. Hubbard, of Porto Rico, to be United States marshal for the district of Porto Rico, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of Edward S. Wilson, resigned.

Seth Bullock, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota, vice Edward G. Kennedy, whose term will expire January 12, 1906.

Morgan Treat, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of J. E. B. Stuart, resigned.

George H. Baker, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. An original appointment under the provisions of the act approved March 2, 1905, entitled "An act to divide Washington into two judicial districts."

Frank H. Tyree, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of West Virginia, vice John K. Thompson, whose term will expire December 16, 1905.

Henry C. Pettit, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the district of Indiana. A reappointment, his term expiring December 10, 1905.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Joseph B. Kealing, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the district of Indiana. A reappointment, his term expiring December 10, 1905.

William C. Bristol, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Francis J. Heney, resigned.

Lunsford L. Lewis, of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Robert H. Talley, resigned.

COMMISSIONER OF THE INTERIOR OF PORTO RICO.

Laurance H. Grahame, of New York City, who was appointed November 3, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be commissioner of the interior of Porto Rico, vice John Stuart Elliott, resigned.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Fen S. Hildreth, of Arizona, who was appointed July 31, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Phoenix, Ariz., a newly established office.

George W. Detamore, of Clayton, N. Mex., to be receiver of public moneys at Clayton, N. Mex., vice Albert W. Thompson, whose term will expire January 12, 1906.

George W. Bibee, of Oregon, who was appointed May 15, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Portland, Oreg. Said land office was removed from Oregon City July, 1905.

James M. Lawrence, of Bend, Oreg., who was appointed November 29, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Roseburg, Oreg., vice James H. Booth, removed.

Frank W. Cockburn, of Devils Lake, N. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Devils Lake, N. Dak., vice Henry E. Baird, resigned.

Don B. Colton, of Vernal, Utah, who was appointed June 1, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Vernal, Utah, a newly established office.

SURVEYORS-GENERAL.

William G. Lewis, of Edgewater, Colo., who was appointed July 15, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be surveyor-general of Colorado, vice John F. Vivian, resigned.

Thomas Hull, of Salt Lake City, Utah, who was appointed July 26, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be surveyor-general of Utah, vice Edward H. Anderson, term expired.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Benjamin L. Eddy, of Tillamook, Oreg., who was appointed November 29, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Roseburg, Oreg., vice Joseph T. Bridges, removed.

Milton R. Moore, of Arizona, who was appointed July 31, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Phoenix, Ariz., a newly established office.

Frank G. Prescott, of San Bernardino, Cal., who was appointed November 25, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Los Angeles, Cal., vice Angus J. Crookshank, resigned.

George W. Fisher, of Topeka, Kans., who was appointed March 31, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Topeka, Kans., vice Charles H. Titus, resigned.

Robert J. Montague, of Crookston, Minn., who was appointed May 15, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Crookston, Minn., vice Sylvester Peterson, term expired.

Sylvanus M. Ferris, of Medora, N. Dak., who was appointed September 7, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Dickinson, N. Dak., vice Alexander C. McGillivray, resigned.

Algernon S. Dresser, of Oregon, who was appointed May 15, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Portland, Oreg. Said land office was removed from Oregon City July 1, 1905.

Charles De Moisy, of Salt Lake City, Utah, who was appointed June 1, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Vernal, Utah, a newly established office.

Thomas V. Davis, of Rock Springs, Wyo., who was appointed November 6, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Evanston, Wyo., vice Charles Kingston, resigned.

INDIAN AGENTS.

Dana H. Kelsey, of the Indian Territory, who was appointed May 17, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Union Agency in the Indian Territory, vice J. Blair Shoenfelt, resigned.

John P. Blackmon, of Oklahoma, who was appointed October 7, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Kiowa Agency in Oklahoma, vice James F. Randlett, resigned.

Edward B. Kelley, of Madison, S. Dak., who was appointed October 7, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Rosebud Agency in South Dakota, vice Charles E. McChesney, term expired and transferred.

PENSION AGENTS.

William V. Willcox, of Des Moines, Iowa, who was appointed October 5, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be pension agent at Des Moines, Iowa, vice Richard P. Clarkson, deceased, and Alvah H. Thompson, temporary appointee.

Wilder S. Metcalf, of Kansas, to be pension agent at Topeka, Kans., to take effect January 30, 1906, at the expiration of his term. Reappointment.

GOVERNOR OF OKLAHOMA.

Frank Frantz, of Enid, Okla., to be governor of Oklahoma, vice Thompson B. Ferguson, whose term will expire January 13, 1906.

GOVERNOR OF NEW MEXICO.

Herbert J. Hagerman, of Roswell, N. Mex., to be governor of New Mexico, vice Miguel A. Otero, whose term will expire January 22, 1906.

PUBLIC PRINTER.

Charles A. Stillings, of Massachusetts, to be Public Printer, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Frank W. Palmer, removed.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Jesse E. Wilson, of Rensselaer, Ind., who was appointed August 28, 1905, during the recess of the Senate, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Melville W. Miller, resigned.

AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Benjamin F. Harper, of Indiana, to be Auditor for the War Department, to succeed Frederick E. Rittman, resigned. Mr. Harper is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

DEPUTY AUDITOR FOR THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Charles A. McGonagle, of Indiana, to be Deputy Auditor for the Post-Office Department, to succeed Nolen L. Chew, resigned. Mr. McGonagle is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Elam H. Neal, of Indiana, to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Indiana, to succeed Ambrose E. Nowlin, resigned. Mr. Neal is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

J. Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to be collector of internal revenue for the eighth district of Kentucky, to succeed James Denton, resigned. Mr. Cooper is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Henry P. Bardshar, of Arizona, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of New Mexico, to succeed Alexander L. Morrison, resigned. Mr. Bardshar is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Herman F. Cellarious, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Ohio, to succeed Bernhard Bettmann, resigned. Mr. Cellarious is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

David H. Moore, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eleventh district of Ohio, in place of John C. Entrekin, deceased. Mr. Moore is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Marion K. Lowry, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Virginia, to succeed Asa Rogers, resigned. Mr. Lowry is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

William E. Glasscock, of West Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of West Virginia, in place of Thomas E. Davis, deceased. Mr. Glasscock is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

William P. Luck, of Louisiana, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, in place of Algernon S. Badger, deceased. Mr. Luck is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Theodore D. Kalbfell, of Missouri, to be appraiser of merchandise at the port of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, to succeed John H. Walkenhorst, resigned. Mr. Kalbfell is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

ASSISTANT APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

William F. Comly, of New Jersey, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York, in place of Thomas C. Wording, deceased. Mr. Comly is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John W. Burgess, of Delaware, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York, to succeed Harwood Huntington, resigned. Mr. Burgess is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

Franklin Lane, of California, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner from January 1, 1906, for the term ending December 31, 1909, vice Joseph W. Fifer, resigned.

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Henry L. West, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for the term of three years. This is a reappointement.

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF CHARITIES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Charles P. Neill, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the board of charities of the District of Columbia for the term of three years from July 1, 1905, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. This is a reappointment.

Simon Wolf, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the board of charities of the District of Columbia for the term of three years from July 1, 1905, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. This is a reappointment.

JUDGE OF POLICE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Alexander R. Mullowney, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the police court of the District of Columbia, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, in the place of Charles F. Scott, deceased.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Truman Handy Newberry, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice Charles H. Darling, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Assistant Naval Constructors Stuart F. Smith and William G. Groesbeck to be naval constructors in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1905, upon the completion of eight years' service in their present grade.

Naval Constructors George H. Rock and Thomas F. Ruhm to be naval constructors in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Naval Constructors Frank B. Zahm, Horatio G. Gillmor, and Richard M. Watt to be naval constructors in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 8th day of July, 1905.

Assistant Naval Constructors William McEntee, William B. Ferguson, and John A. Spilman to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant, from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Midshipman George F. Blair to be an ensign in the Navy from the 2d day of May, 1904.

Midshipman Kirby B. Crittenden to be an ensign in the Navy from the 1st day of November, 1904.

Commander Richard G. Davenport to be a captain in the Navy from the 21st day of March, 1905, vice Capt. John A. B. Smith, retired.

Lieut. Commander John T. Newton to be a commander in the Navy from the 21st day of March, 1905, vice Commander Richard G. Davenport, promoted.

Lieut. Kenneth McAlpine to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 21st day of March, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander John T. Newton, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles W. Forman to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 21st day of March, 1905, vice Lieut. William W. Bush, promoted.

Capt. George C. Reiter to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Rear-Admiral Albert S. Barker, retired.

Commander John A. Norris to be a captain in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Capt. George C. Reiter, promoted.

Commander Edward B. Barry to be a captain in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Capt. John A. Norris. An additional number in grade.

Lieut. Commander Benjamin Tappan to be a commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Commander John A. Norris, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Charles F. Pond to be a commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Commander Benjamin Tappan. An additional number in grade.

Lieut. Commander Walter McLean to be a commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Commander Edward B. Barry, promoted.

Lieut. Benton C. Decker to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Benjamin Tappan, promoted.

Lieut. Mark L. Bristol to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Charles F. Pond, promoted.

Lieut. Benjamin W. Wells to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Walter McLean, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Zachariah H. Madison to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Lieut. Benton C. Decker, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry B. Soulé to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Lieut. Mark L. Bristol, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Francis Martin to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905, vice Lieut. Benjamin W. Wells, promoted.

Commander Herbert Winslow to be a captain in the Navy from the 22d day of April, 1905, vice Capt. George W. Baird, retired.

Lieut. Commander Washington I. Chambers to be a commander in the Navy from the 22d day of April, 1905, vice Commander Herbert Winslow, promoted.

Lieut. Commander James C. Gillmore to be a commander in the Navy from the 30th day of April, 1905, vice Commander George M. Stoney, deceased.

Lieut. Levi C. Bertolette to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 30th day of April, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander James C. Gillmore, promoted.

Capt. Willard H. Brownson to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 6th day of May, 1905, vice Rear-Admiral Yates Stirling, retired.

Commander William H. Turner to be a captain in the Navy from the 6th day of May, 1905, vice Capt. Willard H. Brownson, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Charles A. Gove to be a commander in the Navy from the 6th day of May, 1905, vice Commander William H. Turner, promoted.

Lieut. George W. Logan to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 6th day of May, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Charles A. Gove, promoted.

Commander Albert G. Berry to be a captain in the Navy from the 16th day of June, 1905, vice Capt. Henry B. Mansfield, retired.

Lieut. Commander De Witt C. Coffman to be a commander in the Navy from the 16th day of June, 1905, vice Commander Albert G. Berry, promoted.

Lieut. Henry F. Bryan to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 16th day of June, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander De Witt Coffman, promoted.

Commander Nathaniel J. K. Patch to be a captain in the Navy from the 21st day of June, 1905, vice Captain Harry Knox, retired.

Lieut. Commander Richard Henderson to be a commander in the Navy from the 21st day of June, 1905, vice Commander Nathaniel J. K. Patch, promoted.

Lieut. Andrew T. Long to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 21st day of June, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Richard Henderson, promoted.

Commander Thomas S. Phelps to be a captain in the Navy from the 26th day of June, 1905, vice Capt. Ebenezer S. Prime, retired.

Lieut. Commander Thomas D. Griffin to be a commander in the Navy from the 26th day of June, 1905, vice Commander Thomas S. Phelps, promoted.

Lieut. Edward H. Durell to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 26th day of June, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Thomas D. Griffin, promoted.

Commander Karl Rohrer to be a captain in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1905, vice Capt. John V. B. Bleecker, retired.

Lieut. Commander Henry Minett to be a commander in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1905, vice Commander Karl Rohrer, promoted.

Lieut. Archibald H. Scales to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Henry Minett, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Richard T. Mulligan to be a commander in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1905, vice Commander John A. H. Nickels, promoted.

Commander Theodoric Porter to be a captain in the Navy from the 30th day of June, 1905, vice Capt. Francis H. Delano, retired.

Lieut. Commander William Braunersreuther to be a commander in the Navy from the 30th day of June, 1905, vice Commander Theodoric Porter, promoted.

Lieut. Thomas Washington to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 30th day of June, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander William Braunersreuther, promoted.

Commander Daniel D. V. Stuart to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Capt. Charles T. Hutchins, retired.

Commander Kossuth Niles to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Capt. Joseph G. Eaton, retired.

Commander Warner B. Bayley, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Kossuth Niles, promoted.

Lieut. Commander William S. Hogg to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Kossuth Niles, promoted.

Lieut. Archibald H. Davis to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander William S. Hogg, promoted.

Lieut. Guy H. Burrage to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Humes H. Whittlesey, retired.

Commander Dennis H. Mahan to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Capt. William W. Mead, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Reynold T. Hall to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Dennis H. Mahan, promoted.

Lieut. Commander William F. Fullam to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Reynold T. Hall. An additional number in grade.

Lieut. Frank M. Russell to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Reynold T. Hall, promoted.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, after having completed three years' service in that grade:

Charles P. Snyder.
Carleton R. Kear.
Joseph R. Defrees.
Willis G. Mitchell.
Samuel W. Bryant.
Edward S. Jackson.
William F. Bricker.
Henry L. Wyman.
John W. Timmons.
John G. Church.
Charles N. Freeman.
Robert L. Berry.
Robert A. Abernathy.
Ward K. Wortman.
Hayne Ellis.
Frank D. Berrien.
Arthur B. Keating.
Frederick R. Naile.
Emil P. Svarz.
Wilbert Smith.
Julius F. Hellweg.
Sinclair Gannon.
Robert Morris.
John D. Wainwright.
George W. Steele, jr.
Stafford H. R. Doyle.
William K. Riddle.
William N. Jeffers.
James H. Comfort.
Paul Foley.
Carlos A. Gardiner.
Edison E. Scranton.
John W. Schoenfeld.
Clarence L. Arnold.
Stanley Woods.
Edwin H. Dodd.
Charles P. Huff.
Charles R. Train.
Hugo W. Osterhaus.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles P. Snyder to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Newton A. McCully, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Carleton R. Kear to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Levi C. Bertolette, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Joseph R. Defrees to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. George W. Logan, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Willis G. Mitchell to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Henry F. Bryan, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Samuel W. Bryant to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Edward H. Durell, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward S. Jackson to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Archibald H. Scales, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William F. Bricker to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Victor Blue, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry L. Wyman to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Clarence M. Stone, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Arthur B. Keating to be a lieutenant

in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Francis Boughter, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frederick R. Naile to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Frank M. Russell, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Emil P. Svarz to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Frank Marble, promoted.

Commander Albert F. Dixon to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Capt. Holland N. Stevenson, retired.

Commander Samuel P. Comly to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Capt. Nathaniel J. K. Patch, retired.

Lieut. Commander Albert G. Winterhalter to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Albert F. Dixon, promoted.

Lieut. Commander John M. Orchard to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Samuel P. Comly, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Augustus F. Fechteler to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Clinton K. Curtis, retired.

Lieut. Commander Edward E. Wright to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander John E. Roller, retired.

Lieut. Commander Albert Gleaves to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Carlos G. Calkins, retired.

Lieut. Commander James P. Parker to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Asher C. Baker, retired.

Lieut. Commander Ben W. Hodges to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Frank H. Holmes, retired.

Lieut. Commander Herbert O. Dunn to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Edward J. Dorn, retired.

Lieut. Commander Arthur W. Dodd to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Henry T. Cleaver, retired.

Lieut. Commander Albert W. Grant to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander James P. S. Lawrence, retired.

Lieut. Commander Horace W. Harrison to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Albon C. Hodgson, retired.

Lieut. Commander Valentine S. Nelson to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Charles Laird, retired.

Lieut. Commander William S. Benson to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Walter S. Hughes, retired.

Lieut. Commander Frank M. Bostwick to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Harry M. Hodges, retired.

Lieut. Commander Harry M. Dombaugh to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Theodore F. Burgdorff, retired.

Lieut. Commander Thomas S. Rodgers to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Richard Henderson, retired.

Lieut. Ashley H. Robertson to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Albert G. Winterhalter, promoted.

Lieut. Carlo B. Brittain to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander John M. Orchard, promoted.

Lieut. William M. Crose to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Edward E. Wright, promoted.

Lieut. John F. Hubbard to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Albert Gleaves, promoted.

Lieut. Lloyd H. Chandler to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Ben W. Hodges, promoted.

Lieut. Oscar W. Koester to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Herbert O. Dunn, promoted.

Lieut. George N. Hayward to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Arthur W. Dodd, promoted.

Lieut. Samuel S. Robison to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Albert W. Grant, promoted.

Lieut. Charles F. Hughes to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Horace W. Harrison, promoted.

Lieut. Albert L. Norton to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Valentine S. Nelson, promoted.

Lieut. James H. Reid to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander William S. Benson, promoted.

Lieut. Edward L. Beach to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Frank M. Bostwick, promoted.

Lieut. Herman O. Stickney to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Harry M. Dombaugh, promoted.

Lieut. Henry A. Wiley to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Thomas S. Rodgers, promoted.

Lieut. Frederic B. Bassett, jr., to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Franklin J. Schell, promoted.

Lieut. Herbert G. Gates to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Horace M. Witzel, retired.

Lieut. Richard H. Jackson to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander George W. Denfeld, retired.

Lieut. Arthur B. Hoff to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander James H. Oliver, retired.

Lieut. Nathan C. Twining to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Simon Cook, retired.

Lieut. Benjamin F. Hutchison to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Charles N. Atwater, retired.

Lieut. Thomas P. Magruder to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander William L. Burdick, retired.

Lieut. Sumner E. W. Kittelle to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, with Lieut. Commander Thomas P. Magruder, an additional number in grade.

Lieut. William V. Pratt to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Harry Kimmell, retired.

Lieut. Louis McC. Nulton to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Howard Gage, retired.

Lieut. George R. Marvell to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander George H. Stafford, retired.

Lieut. John B. Patton to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Allen G. Rogers, retired.

Lieut. George B. Bradshaw to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Augustus C. Almy, retired.

Lieut. Cleland N. Offley to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander John B. Blish, retired.

Lieut. Louis R. de Steiguer to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, with Lieut. Commander Cleland N. Offley, an additional number in grade.

Lieut. William W. Phelps to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Thomas W. Ryan, retired.

Lieut. Louis A. Kaiser to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Walter J. Sears, retired.

Lieut. William C. Cole to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Edward H. Scribner, retired.

Lieut. Charles A. Brand to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander John A. Bell, retired.

Lieut. Philip Williams to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Edwin H. Tillman, retired.

Lieut. Warren J. Terhune to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Samuel H. Leonard, jr., retired.

Lieut. George G. Mitchell to be a lieutenant-commander in the

Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Homer C. Poundstone, retired.

Lieut. Cleland Davis to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander William C. P. Muir, retired.

Lieut. William K. Harrison to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Edwards F. Leiper, retired.

Lieut. Frank H. Schofield to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander William H. Allderdice, retired.

Lieut. Urban T. Holmes to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Joseph H. Rohrbacher, retired.

Lieut. Jehu V. Chase to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Theodore G. Dewey, retired.

Lieut. Henry J. Ziegemeier to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Clarence H. Mathews, retired.

Lieut. Matt H. Signor to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander De Witt C. Redgrave, retired.

Lieut. Claude B. Price to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Bias C. B. Sampson, retired.

Lieut. Montgomery M. Taylor to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Martin A. Anderson, retired.

Lieut. Carl T. Vogelgesang to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Albert Moritz, retired.

Lieut. Charles B. McVay, jr., to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander William H. Chambers, retired.

Lieut. John H. Dayton to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Wiley R. M. Field, retired.

Lieut. Lucius A. Bostwick to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Harry G. Leopold, retired.

Lieut. William A. Moffett to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Ward P. Winchell, retired.

Lieut. Julian L. Latimer to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Charles P. Eaton, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Julius F. Hellweg to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Carlo B. Brittain, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Sinclair Gannon to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Casey B. Morgan, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Robert Morris to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. William M. Crose, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John D. Wainwright to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. John F. Hubbard, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) George W. Steele, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Lloyd H. Chandler, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Stafford H. R. Doyle to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Oscar W. Koester, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William K. Riddle to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. George N. Hayward, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William N. Jeffers to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Samuel S. Robison, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John W. Timmons to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Charles F. Hughes, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles S. Freeman to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. James H. Reid, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ward K. Wortman to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Frederic B. Bassett, jr., promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Hayne Ellis to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Herbert G. Gates, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) James H. Comfort to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Arthur B. Hoff, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Carlos A. Gardiner to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Benjamin F. Hutchison, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John W. Schoenfeld to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Louis McC. Nulton, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clarence L. Arnold to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. George R. Marvell, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Stanley Woods to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. John B. Patton, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edwin H. Dodd to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. William D. MacDougall, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles P. Huff to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. George B. Bradshaw, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles R. Train to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Cleland N. Offley, promoted.

Capt. Edwin Longnecker to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 8th day of July, 1905, vice Rear-Admiral William H. Whiting, retired.

Commander John Hubbard to be a captain in the Navy from the 8th day of July, 1905, vice Capt. Edwin Longnecker, promoted.

Lieut. Commander John G. Quinby to be a commander in the Navy from the 8th day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Hubbard, promoted.

Lieut. John R. Edie to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 8th day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander John G. Quinby, promoted.

Lieut. Reginald R. Belknap to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 18th day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Francis Boughter, deceased.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the acts of March 3, 1903, and April 27, 1904:

Boatswain Charles H. Bullock,
Gunner John Grady,
Gunner Arthur C. Kail,
Gunner William D. Greetham, and
Gunner Robert W. Kessler.

Ensign Louis J. Connelly to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1905, having completed three years' service in his present grade.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Louis J. Connelly to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

Capt. Thomas Perry to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 8th day of September, 1905, vice Rear-Admiral Charles J. Barclay, retired.

Commander Alexander McCrackin to be a captain in the Navy from the 8th day of September, 1905, vice Capt. Thomas Perry, promoted.

Lieut. Commander James H. Glennon to be a commander in the Navy from the 8th day of September, 1905, vice Commander Alexander McCrackin, promoted.

Lieut. De Witt Blamer to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 8th day of September, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander James H. Glennon, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Percival J. Werlich to be a commander in the Navy from the 9th day of September, 1905, vice Commander Bernard O. Scott, dismissed.

Lieut. John K. Robinson to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 9th day of September, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Percival J. Werlich, promoted.

Commander Corwin P. Rees, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 30th day of September, 1905, with Commander George L. Dyer, promoted.

Lieut. Commander William R. Rush to be a commander in the Navy from the 30th day of September, 1905, vice Commander George L. Dyer, promoted.

Lieut. Arthur L. Willard to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 30th day of September, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander William R. Rush, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Hugo W. Osterhaus to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Louis R. de Steiguer, promoted.

Paymaster Frank T. Arms to be a pay inspector in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1905, to correct the date of his promotion, as confirmed on the 16th day of March, 1905, caused by the failure of Paymaster Henry E. Jewett to qualify for promotion.

Paymaster Thomas H. Hicks to be a pay inspector in the Navy from the 13th day of March, 1905, vice Pay Inspector Eustace B. Rogers, promoted.

Paymaster Ziba W. Reynolds to be a pay inspector in the Navy from the 14th day of June, 1905, vice Pay Inspector John C. Sullivan, dismissed.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Rishworth Nicholson to be a paymaster in the Navy from the 14th day of June, 1905, vice Paymaster Ziba W. Reynolds, promoted.

Passed Assistant Paymaster John D. Barber to be a paymaster in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Paymaster Franklin W. Hart, resigned.

Assistant Paymaster Jere Maupin to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Passed Assistant Paymaster John D. Barber, promoted.

Paymaster Henry E. Jewett to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Paymaster Eugene D. Ryan to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 8th day of July, 1905.

Passed Assistant Paymasters Edward T. Hoopes, Walter A. Greer, and Cecil S. Baker to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Passed Assistant Paymasters Donald W. Nesbit, Arthur M. Pippin, John S. Higgins, and Ignatius T. Hagner to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1905.

The following-named passed assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 30th day of July, 1905:

George P. Auld,
James S. Beecher,
Henry A. Wise, jr.,
Henry de F. Mel,
John A. B. Smith, jr.,
Felix R. Holt,
Emmett C. Gudger,
Stewart E. Barber,
Howard D. Lamar,
Frederic H. Lemly,
Ervin A. McMillan,
Eugene H. Tricou,
Alvin Hovey-King,
George A. Deering, and
William C. Fite.

Harold W. Browning, a citizen of New York, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 15th day of March, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

The following-named citizens to be assistant paymasters in the Navy from the 8th day of July, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Benjamin H. Brooke, a citizen of Pennsylvania,
Thomas J. Bright, a citizen of Pennsylvania,
Emory D. Stanley, a citizen of Nevada,
Lewis W. L. Jennings, a citizen of Virginia,
Brantz Mayer, a citizen of Iowa,
Swinton L. Bethea, a citizen of South Carolina,
Edward R. Wilson, a citizen of California,
William G. Neill, a citizen of West Virginia,
Harry E. Collins, a citizen of the District of Columbia,
John H. Gunnell, a citizen of New York,
Emmett H. Tebeau, a citizen of South Carolina,
Charles E. Parsons, a citizen of Maryland,
William J. Hine, a citizen of Tennessee,
Kenneth C. McIntosh, a citizen of Indiana,
Francis J. Daly, a citizen of New Jersey,
Roland W. Schumann, a citizen of New York,
Franklin P. Williams, a citizen of Pennsylvania,
Leon N. Wertenbaker, a citizen of Ohio,
John J. Luchsinger, jr., a citizen of California,
Eugene H. Douglass, a citizen of Massachusetts,
Robert K. Van Mater, a citizen of New Jersey,
William S. Zane, a citizen of Pennsylvania, and
James C. Hilton, a citizen of Maryland.

The following-named gunners to be chief gunners in the Navy from the 6th day of March, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904:

James T. Roach,
David F. Diggins,
David Hepburn, and
Edwin N. Fisher.

The following-named gunners to be chief gunners in the Navy from the 10th day of April, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904:

James C. McDermott,
John Kenyon, and
Charles Hierdahl.

Gunner James Donald to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 27th day of April, 1905, after having completed six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

Gunner Adolpth Hasler to be chief gunner in the Navy from the 19th day of July, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

Boatswains Charles T. Chase, Christopher J. Cooper, and James H. Doyle to be chief boatswains in the Navy from the 6th day of March, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy from the 10th day of April, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904:

George B. Hendry,
Arthur R. Nickerson,
John Mahoney,
Ernest V. Sandstrom,
John McGrath, and
Christian Crone.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy from the dates set opposite their names, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904:

Frederick Muller, from May 26, 1905;
John W. Stoakley, from August 15, 1905; and
John D. Walsh, from August 29, 1905.

Lieut. Victor Blue to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1905, vice Lieutenant-Commander Richard T. Mulligan, promoted.

Capt. William W. Mead to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Rear-Admiral William M. Folger, retired.

Lieut. Casey B. Morgan to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Augustus F. Fechteler, promoted.

Ensign Hollis T. Winston to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, after having completed three years' service in his present grade.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Hollis T. Winston to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Guy H. Burrage promoted.

Gunner Joseph Hill to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 27th day of April, 1905, after having completed six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the "navy personnel act," approved March 3, 1899, as amended by the act of April, 1904.

Gunner William Zeitler to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1904, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the "navy personnel act," approved March 3, 1899, as amended by the act of April 27, 1904.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Wilbert Smith to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Oscar D. Duncan, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Robert L. Berry to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Edward L. Beach, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Robert A. Abernathy to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Henry A. Wiley, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank D. Berrien to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Richard H. Jackson, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Paul Foley to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Nathan C. Twining, promoted.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy

from the 3d day of February, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Alexander H. Van Keuren,
William W. Smyth,
Paul H. Fretz,
Stephen C. Rowan,
Walter S. Anderson,
Roy W. Ryden,
Henry D. Cooke, jr.,
Samuel M. Robinson,
Leo Sahm,
Ralston S. Holmes,
Ernest Friedrick,
William J. Giles,
Ralph A. Koch,
Lamar R. Leahy,
Milton S. Davis,
Charles C. Moses,
Sam C. Loomis,
Alfred T. Brisbin,
Lindsay H. Lacy,
Charles A. Blakely,
Macgillivray Milne,
Wilbur R. Van Auken,
Harold R. Stark,
James D. Willson,
John S. Arwine, jr.,
Austin S. Kibbee,
Martin K. Metcalf,
William Ancrum,
Hugh M. Walker,
Frank H. Sadler,
John Rodgers, and
Daniel T. Ghent.

Surg. Charles M. De Valin to be a surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 3d day of March, 1903.

P. A. Surgs. Joseph C. Thompson and Frederick L. Benton to be surgeons in the Navy from the 3d day of March, 1903, to correct the dates of their promotions as confirmed on April 27, 1904.

P. A. Surg. Joseph A. Guthrie to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 15th day of December, 1904, to correct the date of his promotion as confirmed on April 27, 1904.

P. A. Surg. Ralph T. Orvis to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 1st day of March, 1905, to correct the date of his promotion as confirmed on April 27, 1904.

P. A. Surg. Will M. Garton to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 12th day of March, 1903, vice Surg. Frederick A. Hesler, deceased.

P. A. Surg. Frank E. McCullough to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 9th day of June, 1903, vice Surg. Phillips A. Lovering, promoted.

P. A. Surg. Francis M. Furlong to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 20th day of June, 1903, vice Surg. William R. Du Bose, promoted.

Medical Inspector Daniel N. Bertolette to be a medical director in the Navy from the 5th day of April, 1905, vice Medical Director William G. Farwell, retired.

Surg. Henry G. Beyer to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 5th day of April, 1905, vice Medical Inspector Daniel N. Bertolette, promoted.

P. A. Surg. David B. Kerr to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 5th day of April, 1905, vice Surg. Henry G. Beyer, promoted.

P. A. Surg. Granville L. Angeny to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 24th day of April, 1905, vice Surg. Samuel H. Griffith, deceased.

Asst. Surg. Robert E. Hoyt to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 8th day of May, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Carl Frederick von dem Bussche for appointment as second lieutenant of infantry, United States Army, with rank from February 2, 1901. The person named is now serving as a second lieutenant of the Eighteenth Infantry under the name of Carl F. Bussche and desires to resume his true name as nominated.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Mark L. Ireland, Eleventh Infantry, from the Infantry Arm to the Artillery Corps, March 30, 1905, with rank from June 9, 1904.

Infantry Arm.

Second Lieut. Byrd Alston Page, Artillery Corps, from the Artillery Corps to the Infantry Arm, March 30, 1905, with rank from June 9, 1904.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

Medical Department.

William Adolphus Duncan, of Kentucky, to be assistant surgeon with rank of first lieutenant, from May 1, 1905, vice Beal, resigned.

Earl Harvey Bruns, of Indiana, to be assistant surgeon with rank of first lieutenant, from May 1, 1905, vice Chaffee, resigned.

Herbert Charles Gibner, of Connecticut, to be assistant surgeon with rank of first lieutenant, from May 1, 1905, vice Ireland, promoted.

Clarence Le Roy Cole, of Kansas, to be assistant surgeon with rank of first lieutenant, from May 10, 1905, vice Wells, promoted.

Chaplains.

Rev. Francis Patrick Joyce, of Kansas, to be chaplain with rank of first lieutenant, from March 21, 1905, vice Vattmann, retired from active service.

Rev. Joseph Casey, of Missouri, to be chaplain with rank of first lieutenant, from April 22, 1905, vice Robinson, retired from active service.

Rev. Simon Michael Lutz, of Illinois, to be chaplain with rank of first lieutenant, from May 1, 1905, vice Granville, resigned.

Rev. Herbert Stanley Smith, of New Jersey, to be chaplain with rank of first lieutenant, from June 19, 1905, vice Nave, retired from active service.

Artillery Corps.

William Thomas Carpenter, of California, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Locke, promoted.

John Lee Holcombe, of Virginia, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Whitthorne, deceased.

Frank Huntington Phipps, jr., of Massachusetts, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Steger, promoted.

Thomas Duncan, of Pennsylvania, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Oakes, dismissed.

Infantry Arm.

Benjamin Mart Bailey, of New York, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Robinson, Thirtieth Infantry, promoted.

Charles Walker McClure, of Illinois, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Hall, Seventeenth Infantry, killed in action.

Lewis Carleton Leftwich, of Texas, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Roberts, Fourteenth Infantry, resigned.

Chester Henning Loop, of Tennessee, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Wilson, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

William Perkins Currier, of Virginia, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Berry, Twenty-seventh Infantry, deceased.

Pickens Evans Woodson, of Texas, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice McConnell, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Ambrose Robert Emery, of Indiana, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Chandler, Thirtieth Infantry, promoted.

Albert Leas Hall, of Indiana, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Stewart, Tenth Infantry, detailed in the Ordnance Department.

Edmund Clivious Waddill, of Virginia, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Gibert, Tenth Infantry, detailed in the Ordnance Department.

John Hanckel Ellerson, of Virginia, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Quackenbush, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

The following-named cadets, graduates of the United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Army of the United States, to date from June 13, 1905:

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

Corps of Engineers.

Cadet De Witt Clinton Jones.
Cadet Ernest Graves.
Cadet Francis Bowditch Wilby.
Cadet Clarence Self Ridley.
Cadet Alvin Barton Barber.
Cadet William Fitzhugh Endress.
Cadet Jarvis Johnson Bain.
Cadet Thomas Henry Emerson.
Cadet Robert Spencer Thomas.

Cadet Carlos John Stolbrand.
Cadet Roger Garfield Powell.
Cadet John Neal Hodges.
Cadet Arthur Rudolph Ehrnbeck.

Artillery Corps.

Cadet Douglas Imrie McKay.
Cadet Thomas Marshall Spaulding.
Cadet Thomas Bartwell Doe.
Cadet Louis Herbert McKinlay.
Cadet Benjamin Henderson Lorne Williams.
Cadet Thomas Dewey Osborne.
Cadet Otho Vaughan Kean.
Cadet Halsey Dunwoody.
Cadet David Curtis Seagrave.
Cadet William Henry Dodds, jr.
Cadet Le Roy Bartlett.
Cadet John Lund.
Cadet Robert Collins Eddy.
Cadet Patrick Henry Winston.
Cadet Julius Charles Peterson.
Cadet John Stevens Hammond.
Cadet Basil Gordon Moon.
Cadet James Frederick Walker.
Cadet Charles Roemer.
Cadet Ellery Willis Niles.
Cadet Adelno Gibson.
Cadet Charles Dudley Daly.
Cadet Albert Terrell Bishop.
Cadet Haldan Urling Tompkins.
Cadet James Saye Dusenbury.
Cadet Lloyd Burns Magruder.
Cadet Robert Henry Lewis.
Cadet Francis Bowen Upham.
Cadet Arthur Hazleton Carter.
Cadet Sidney Howland Guthrie.
Cadet Walter Evans Prosser.

Cavalry Arm.

Cadet John de Barth Walbach Gardiner.
Cadet George Dillman.
Cadet Philip John Radcliffe Kiehl.
Cadet Clarence Kumukoa Lyman.
Cadet Charles Lewis Scott.
Cadet William Adams Dallam.
Cadet James Hoop Dickey.
Cadet Ralph Talbot, jr.
Cadet William Nicholas Hensley, jr.
Cadet Charles Exton Bamford.
Cadet Louis Piaget Schoonmaker.
Cadet Karl Daenzer Klemm.
Cadet Edward Cornelius Hanford.
Cadet Berkeley Thorne Merchant.
Cadet Hugh Hunt Broadhurst.
Cadet Arthur William Holderness.
Cadet Louis Albert O'Donnell.

Infantry Arm.

Cadet Dolland Webster Case.
Cadet Charles Stuart Donavin.
Cadet Norman Foster Ramsey.
Cadet De Witt Clinton Tucker Grubbs.
Cadet Thomas West Hammond.
Cadet Calvin Pearl Titus.
Cadet William Charles Miller.
Cadet Frederick Willis Manley.
Cadet Arthur Willis Lane.
Cadet Bernard Lentz.
Cadet Frederick Coleman Test.
Cadet Arthur Charles Tipton.
Cadet Owen Stedman Albright.
Cadet Fred Hendrickson Baird.
Cadet Clifford Cabell Early.
Cadet George Frank Waugh.
Cadet Allan Rutherford.
Cadet William Henry Hawes.
Cadet Oscar Arden Russell.
Cadet William Seward Weeks.
Cadet Avery Duane Cummings.
Cadet Charles Smith Caffery.
Cadet Allen Wyant Gullion.
Cadet Louis Albert Kunzig.
Cadet John Pearson Bubb.
Cadet John George Hotz.
Cadet Clarence Andrew Mitchell.
Cadet John Roy Starkey.
Cadet Felix Waggoner Motlow.
Cadet Joseph Edward Barzynski.
Cadet Ralph Dwight Bates.
Cadet William Eaton Merritt.
Cadet Ben Waller Feild.
Cadet Robert Morrisson, jr.
Cadet Bloxham Ward.
Cadet Paul Hedrick Clark.
Cadet Thomas Hixon Lowe.
Cadet Herndon Sharp.
Cadet Torrey Borden Maghee.
Cadet William Whitehead West, jr.

TO BE ADDITIONAL SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

Artillery Corps.

Cadet Henry Tacitus Burgin.
Cadet Nathan Horowitz.
Cadet Clifford Lee Corbin.

Cavalry Arm.

Cadet Joseph Ray Davis.
Cadet Sherman Miles.

Infantry Arm.

Cadet George Washington Maddox.
Cadet Walter Eldridge Pridgen.
Cadet James Wilson Hemphill Reisinger, jr.
Cadet Rupert Algernon Dunford.
Cadet Charles Carr Bankhead.

I nominate the officers herein named for appointment in the Army of the United States:

Judge-Advocate-General's Department.

Brig. Gen. George B. Davis, Judge-Advocate-General, to be Judge-Advocate-General, with the rank of brigadier-general, for the period of four years beginning May 23, 1905, with rank from May 24, 1901, his former appointment as Judge-Advocate-General having expired May 23, 1905.

Subsistence Department.

Col. Henry G. Sharpe, Assistant Commissary-General, to be Commissary-General, with the rank of brigadier-general, for the period of four years beginning October 12, 1905, with rank from that date, vice Weston, appointed major-general.

Ordnance Department.

Brig. Gen. William Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, to be Chief of Ordnance, with the rank of brigadier-general, for the period of four years beginning November 22, 1905, with rank from November 22, 1901, his former appointment as Chief of Ordnance having expired November 22, 1905.

I nominate the officers herein named for promotion in the Army of the United States.

Subsistence Department.

Capt. William L. Geary, commissary, to be commissary, with the rank of major, from October 13, 1905, vice West, promoted.

Cavalry Arm.

First Lieut. Grayson V. Heidt, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be captain, from November 28, 1905, vice Koester, Fifteenth Cavalry, detailed as commissary.

Second Lieut. Kerr T. Riggs, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, from November 18, 1905, vice Fortescue, Tenth Cavalry, resigned.

Second Lieut. Carl H. Müller, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant, from November 28, 1905, vice Heidt, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Artillery Corps.

Capt. Adelbert Cronkhite, detailed quartermaster, to be major, from November 24, 1905, vice Randolph, retired from active service.

I nominate the officers herein named for promotion in the Army of the United States.

The Military Secretary's Department.

Lieut. Col. James T. Kerr, military secretary, to be military secretary with the rank of colonel from June 17, 1905, vice Wagner, deceased.

Maj. Alexander O. Brodie, military secretary, to be military secretary with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from June 10, 1905, vice Tweedale, retired from active service.

Maj. Benjamin Alvord, military secretary, to be military secretary with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from June 17, 1905, vice Kerr, promoted.

Subsistence Department.

Lieut. Col. Edward E. Dravo, deputy commissary-general, to be assistant commissary-general with the rank of colonel from October 6, 1905, vice Nye, deceased.

Lieut. Col. Abiel L. Smith, deputy commissary-general, to be assistant commissary-general with the rank of colonel from October 13, 1905, vice Sharpe, appointed commissary-general.

Maj. David L. Brainard, commissary, to be deputy commissary-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from August 28, 1905, vice Baldwin, deceased.

Maj. George B. Davis, commissary, to be deputy commissary-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from October 6, 1905, vice Dravo, promoted.

Maj. Barrington K. West, commissary, to be deputy commissary-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from October 13, 1905, vice Smith, promoted.

Capt. George W. Ruthers, commissary, to be commissary with the rank of major from August 28, 1905, vice Brainard, promoted.

Capt. Harry E. Wilkins, commissary, to be commissary with the rank of major from October 6, 1905, vice Davis, promoted.

Medical Department.

Lieut. Col. George W. Adair, deputy surgeon-general, to be assistant surgeon-general with the rank of colonel from April 6, 1905, vice Girard, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Maj. William W. Gray, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from April 6, 1905, vice Adair, promoted.

Maj. Louis Brechemin, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from July 1, 1905, vice Comegys, retired from active service.

Capt. Frederick P. Reynolds, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major from March 31, 1905, vice Wells, retired from active service.

Capt. Robert S. Woodson, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major from April 6, 1905, vice Gray, promoted.

Capt. Harry M. Hallock, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major from July 1, 1905, vice Brechemin, promoted.

Pay Department.

Capt. Manly B. Curry, paymaster, to be paymaster with the rank of major from April 13, 1905, vice Bullis, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Capt. James W. Dawes, paymaster, to be paymaster with the rank of major from Augsut 12, 1905, vice Howell, retired from active service.

Capt. James Canby, paymaster, to be paymaster with the rank of major from October 4, 1905, vice Becker, retired from active service.

Corps of Engineers.

Lieut. Col. Henry M. Adams, Corps of Engineers, to be colonel from June 26, 1905, vice Jones, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Charles E. L. B. Davis, Corps of Engineers, to be colonel from October 15, 1905, vice Hanbury, retired from active service.

Maj. William M. Black, Corps of Engineers, to be lieutenant-colonel from June 26, 1905, vice Adams, promoted.

Maj. Walter L. Fisk, Corps of Engineers, to be lieutenant-colonel from October 15, 1905, vice Davis, promoted.

Capt. Eugene W. Van C. Lucas, Corps of Engineers, to be major from June 26, 1905, vice Black, promoted.

Capt. Henry Jervey, Corps of Engineers, to be major from October 15, 1905, vice Fisk, promoted.

First Lieut. Lewis H. Rand, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from June 26, 1905, vice Lucas, promoted.

First Lieut. Edward M. Markham, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from October 15, 1905, vice Jervey, promoted.

Second Lieut. Lewis M. Adams, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from June 26, 1905, vice Rand, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles R. Pettis, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from October 15, 1905, vice Markham, promoted.

Signal Corps.

Capt. Eugene O. Fechét, Signal Corps, to be major from August 22, 1905, vice Maxfield, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Mack K. Cunningham, Signal Corps, to be captain from August 22, 1905, vice Fechét, promoted.

Cavalry Arm.

Lieut. Col. William Stanton, Eleventh Cavalry, to be colonel from March 18, 1905, vice Smith, Sixth Cavalry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Edward A. Godwin, Ninth Cavalry, to be colonel from June 22, 1905, vice Lebo, Fourteenth Cavalry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Lieut. Col. Frederick K. Ward, detailed inspector-general, to be colonel from June 23, 1905, vice Edgerly, Second Cavalry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Maj. Edward J. McClernand, unassigned, to be lieutenant-colonel from March 18, 1905, vice Stanton, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.

Maj. Levi P. Hunt, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 7, 1905, vice Beck, Third Cavalry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Maj. Cunliffe H. Murray, Fourth Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 8, 1905, vice Robinson, Thirteenth Cavalry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Maj. Charles A. Varnum, Ninth Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 10, 1905, vice Fountain, Fourth Cavalry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Maj. Herbert E. Tutherly, detailed inspector-general, to be lieutenant-colonel from June 22, 1905, vice Godwin, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

Maj. Thaddeus W. Jones, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel from October 20, 1905, vice Pearson, Seventh Cavalry, retired from active service.

Capt. Lloyd M. Brett, Seventh Cavalry, to be major from March 30, 1905, vice Lockett, Fourth Cavalry, detailed as inspector-general.

Capt. Elon F. Willcox, Sixth Cavalry, to be major from April 7, 1905, vice Hunt, Thirteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Henry J. Goldman, Fifth Cavalry, to be major from April 8, 1905, vice Murray, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Augustus C. Macomb, Fifth Cavalry, to be major from April 10, 1905, vice Varnum, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Thomas J. Lewis, Second Cavalry, to be major from April 22, 1905, vice Kendall, Twelfth Cavalry, retired from active service.

Capt. William A. Mercer, Seventh Cavalry, to be major from June 26, 1905, vice Galbraith, Eleventh Cavalry, detailed as inspector-general.

Capt. Charles H. Grierson, Tenth Cavalry, to be major from August 2, 1905, vice Gresham, Fifteenth Cavalry, detailed as inspector-general.

Capt. Harry C. Benson, Fourth Cavalry, to be major from October 20, 1905, vice Jones, Thirteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. George H. Sands, Sixth Cavalry, to be major from October 20, 1905, vice Scott, Tenth Cavalry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Robert R. Wallach, Third Cavalry, to be captain from March 30, 1905, vice Brett, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. George Williams, Eighth Cavalry, to be captain from April 7, 1905, vice Willcox, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles S. Haight, Fourth Cavalry, to be captain from April 8, 1905, vice Goldman, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. William D. Forsyth, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be captain from April 10, 1905, vice Macomb, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. John J. Boniface, Fourth Cavalry, to be captain from April 22, 1905, vice Lewis, Second Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Warren Dean, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be captain from May 2, 1905, vice Brooks, Eleventh Cavalry, resigned.

First Lieut. Fitzhugh Lee, jr., Twelfth Cavalry, to be captain from June 26, 1905, vice Mercer, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. James F. McKinley, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be captain from July 7, 1905, vice Perry, Eleventh Cavalry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Patrick W. Guiney, Sixth Cavalry, to be captain from July 17, 1905, vice McDonald, Third Cavalry, detailed as quartermaster.

First Lieut. Leon B. Kromer, Eleventh Cavalry, to be captain from August 2, 1905, vice Grierson, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles A. Romeyn, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be captain from August 8, 1905, vice Trout, Second Cavalry, deceased.

First Lieut. Evan H. Humphrey, Seventh Cavalry, to be captain from August 16, 1905, vice Vestal, Seventh Cavalry, detailed as quartermaster.

First. Lieut. George V. H. Moseley, First Cavalry, to be captain from September 22, 1905, vice Whipple, Fifth Cavalry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Charles C. Farmer, jr., Tenth Cavalry, to be captain from October 20, 1905, vice Benson, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Stuart Heintzelman, Sixth Cavalry, to be captain from October 20, 1905, vice Sands, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. John D. Long, Twelfth Cavalry, to be captain from November 7, 1905, vice Hardeman, Eleventh Cavalry, detailed as quartermaster.

Second Lieut. William C. Gardenhire, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 6, 1905, vice Pershing, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Benjamin O. Davis, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 30, 1905, vice Wallach, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward C. Wells, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 7, 1905, vice Williams, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George A. F. Trumbo, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 8, 1905, vice Haight, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Taylor M. Reagan, Twelfth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 10, 1905, vice Forsyth, Fifteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Goss L. Stryker, Sixth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 22, 1905, vice Boniface, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert F. Tate, Twelfth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from May 2, 1905, vice Dean, Fifteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Sebring C. Megill, Eighth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from June 26, 1905, vice Lee, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Walter D. Smith, Eleventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from July 7, 1905, vice McKinley, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harry B. Jordan, detailed in the Ordnance Department, to be first lieutenant from July 15, 1905, vice Hart, Tenth Cavalry, dismissed.

Second Lieut. Frank P. Lahm, Sixth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from July 15, 1905, vice Jordan, detailed in the Ordnance Department.

Second Lieut. Orlando C. Troxel, Twelfth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from July 17, 1905, vice Guiney, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Creed F. Cox, Eleventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from July 31, 1905, vice Neilson, Twelfth Cavalry, resigned.

Second Lieut. Robert McC. Beck, jr., Twelfth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from August 2, 1905, vice Kromer, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. George M. Russell, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from August 3, 1905, vice Ross, Fifteenth Cavalry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Lewis Brown, jr., Seventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from August 8, 1905, vice Romeyn, Thirteenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Jerome G. Pillow, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from August 16, 1905, vice Humphrey, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Ralph N. Hayden, Seventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from September 2, 1905, vice Reynolds, Third Cavalry, deceased.

Second Lieut. Leonard W. Prunty, Fourth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from September 22, 1905, vice Moseley, First Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. E. Kearsley Stirling, Third Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from October 20, 1905, vice Farmer, Tenth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Wiley P. Mangum, jr., Fifteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from October 20, 1905, vice Heintzelman, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles J. Naylor, Fourth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from November 7, 1905, vice Long, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.

Artillery Corps.

Lieut. Col. Ephraim T. C. Richmond (since retired from active service), Artillery Corps, to be colonel from May 20, 1905, vice Hubbell, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Ramsay D. Potts, Artillery Corps, to be colonel from June 8, 1905, vice Richmond, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Elbridge R. Hills, detailed military secretary, to be colonel from June 19, 1905, vice Roberts, appointed chief of artillery.

Lieut. Col. Sydney W. Taylor, Artillery Corps, to be colonel from June 20, 1905, vice Mills, appointed chief of artillery.

Lieut. Col. Luigi Lomia, Artillery Corps, to be colonel from November 7, 1905, vice Ennis, retired from active service.

Maj. John D. C. Hoskins, detailed inspector-general, to be lieutenant-colonel from March 22, 1905, vice Humphreys, deceased.

Maj. Henry L. Harris, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 12, 1905, vice Hobbs, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Maj. Arthur Murray, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 14, 1905, vice Wood, detailed as military secretary.

Maj. William E. Birkhimer, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from May 20, 1905, vice Richmond, promoted.

Maj. John A. Lundeen, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from June 8, 1905, vice Potts, promoted.

Maj. Medorem Crawford, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from June 20, 1905, vice Taylor, promoted.

Maj. Garland N. Whistler, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from June 30, 1905, vice Pratt, detailed as inspector-general.

Maj. Hugh A. Reed, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from September 16, 1905, vice Schenck, deceased.

Maj. Albert S. Cummins, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from November 7, 1905, vice Lomia, promoted.

Capt. Albert C. Blunt, Artillery Corps, to be major from April 12, 1905, vice Harris, promoted.

Capt. William C. Rafferty, Artillery Corps, to be major from April 14, 1905, vice Murray, promoted.

Capt. Warren P. Newcomb, Artillery Corps, to be major from May 20, 1905, vice Birkhimer, promoted.

Capt. Charles L. Phillips, Artillery Corps, to be major from June 8, 1905, vice Lundeen, promoted.

Capt. Charles J. Bailey, Artillery Corps, to be major from June 11, 1905, vice Bush, deceased.

Capt. Clarence P. Townsley, detailed quartermaster, to be major from June 20, 1905, vice Crawford, promoted.

Capt. George F. Barney, Artillery Corps, to be major from June 30, 1905, vice Whistler, promoted.

Capt. David J. Rumbough, Artillery Corps, to be major from September 16, 1905, vice Reed, promoted.

Capt. Millard F. Harmon, Artillery Corps, to be major from November 7, 1905, vice Cummins, promoted.

First Lieut. Gwynn R. Hancock, Artillery Corps, to be captain from April 12, 1905, vice Blunt, promoted.

First Lieut. Dan T. Moore, Artillery Corps, to be captain from April 14, 1905, vice Rafferty, promoted.

First Lieut. Clarence B. Smith, Artillery Corps, to be captain from May 20, 1905, vice Newcomb, promoted.

First Lieut. Russell P. Reeder, Artillery Corps, to be captain from June 8, 1905, vice Phillips, promoted.

First Lieut. Robert F. McMillan, Artillery Corps, to be captain from June 11, 1905, vice Bailey, promoted.

First Lieut. Godwin Ordway, Artillery Corps, to be captain from June 30, 1905, vice Barney, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles E. Kilbourne, Artillery Corps, to be captain from July 17, 1905, vice Kelton, detailed as quartermaster.

First Lieut. Edward Hill, Artillery Corps, to be captain from September 3, 1905, vice Parker (Charles F.), deceased.

First Lieut. William H. Monroe, Artillery Corps, to be captain from September 16, 1905, vice Catlin, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Richard T. Ellis, Artillery Corps, to be captain from September 16, 1905, vice Rumbough, promoted.

Second Lieut. Wesley W. K. Hamilton, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from January 23, 1905, vice Embick, promoted.

Second Lieut. Hugh S. Brown, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from February 2, 1905, vice Granger, promoted.

Second Lieut. Henry H. Scott, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from February 24, 1905, vice Chance, resigned.

Second Lieut. Benjamin H. Kerfoot, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from April 12, 1905, vice Evans, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. William S. Browning, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from April 12, 1905, vice Hancock, promoted.

Second Lieut. Francis W. Clark, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from April 14, 1905, vice Moore, promoted.

Second Lieut. Joseph F. Barnes, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from May 7, 1905, vice Ross, deceased.

Second Lieut. Edward Canfield, jr., Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from May 10, 1905, vice Strebler, deserted.

Second Lieut. William P. Ennis, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from May 20, 1905, vice Smith, promoted.

Second Lieut. Arthur H. Bryant, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from June 8, 1905, vice Reeder, promoted.

Second Lieut. Willis G. Peace, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from June 11, 1905, vice McMillan, promoted.

Second Lieut. William P. Platt, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from June 19, 1905, vice Smith (Frederick McC.), dismissed.

Second Lieut. Guy E. Carleton, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from June 30, 1905, vice Ordway, promoted.

Second Lieut. Herbert G. Millar, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from July 17, 1905, vice Kilbourne, promoted.

Second Lieut. Dennis H. Currie, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from August 6, 1905, vice Orr, deceased.

Second Lieut. Beverly F. Browne, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from August 9, 1905, vice Wilhoit, dismissed.

Second Lieut. Edward M. Shinkle, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from August 24, 1905, vice Barry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. William R. Bettison, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from September 3, 1905, vice Hill, promoted.

Second Lieut. Raymond S. Pratt, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from September 16, 1905, vice Monroe, promoted.

Second Lieut. Alfred A. Maybach, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from September 16, 1905, vice Ellis, promoted.

Infantry Arm.

Lieut. Col. Calvin D. Cowles, Fourth Infantry, to be colonel from April 11, 1905, vice Adams, Fifth Infantry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. George P. Borden, Fifth Infantry, to be colonel from April 14, 1905, vice Buchanan, Twenty-fourth Infantry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Lieut. Col. William B. Wheeler, Second Infantry, to be colonel from October 11, 1905, vice Wygant, Twenty-second Infantry, retired from active service.

Lieut. Col. Walter S. Scott, Eleventh Infantry, to be colonel from October 30, 1905, vice Ward, Fifteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Maj. James A. Irons, Sixteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 9, 1905, vice Taylor, Nineteenth Infantry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Maj. Leonard A. Lovering, detailed inspector-general, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 11, 1905, vice Cowles, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Robert K. Evans, detailed military secretary, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 14, 1905, vice Borden, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. George F. Cooke, Twenty-sixth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel from July 28, 1905, vice Robinson, Twenty-second Infantry, detailed as military secretary.

Maj. Charles St. J. Chubb, Fifteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel from October 11, 1905, vice Wheeler, Second Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Palmer G. Wood, Twelfth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel from October 30, 1905, vice Scott, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Capt. William F. Blauvelt, detailed paymaster, to be major from April 9, 1905, vice Irons, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Henry C. Hodges, jr., detailed quartermaster, to be major from July 15, 1905, vice Carrington, First Infantry, dismissed.

Capt. Robert L. Hirst, Twelfth Infantry, to be major from July 20, 1905, vice Chandler, Twenty-fourth Infantry, detailed as inspector-general.

Capt. Harris L. Roberts, Second Infantry, to be major from July 28, 1905, vice Cooke, Twenty-sixth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Walter H. Chatfield, Fifth Infantry, to be major from August 15, 1905, vice Tyler, Twenty-seventh Infantry, deceased.

Capt. John F. Morrison, Twentieth Infantry, to be major from October 6, 1905, vice Black, Thirteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Capt. Andrew S. Rowan, Nineteenth Infantry, to be major from October 11, 1905, vice Chubb, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Frank B. Andrus, Eighth Infantry, to be major from October 30, 1905, vice Wood, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Benjamin H. Watkins, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be captain from February 11, 1905, vice Ferguson, Thirteenth Infantry, detailed as commissary.

First Lieut. Robert M. Brambila, Fourteenth Infantry, to be captain from February 18, 1905, vice Mulliken, Twenty-seventh Infantry, dismissed.

First Lieut. Harry F. Dalton, Sixth Infantry, to be captain from April 11, 1905, vice Moody, Sixteenth Infantry, detailed as paymaster.

First Lieut. John N. Straat, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be captain from April 29, 1905, vice Raibourn, Twenty-ninth Infantry, deceased.

First Lieut. George de G. Catlin, Second Infantry, to be captain from May 13, 1905, vice Holden, Twenty-eighth Infantry, detailed as paymaster.

First Lieut. Marshall Childs, Twelfth Infantry, to be captain from June 17, 1905, vice Kirkman, Twenty-fifth Infantry, dismissed.

First Lieut. Henry S. Wagner, Fourteenth Infantry, to be captain from June 30, 1905, vice Donovan, Twenty-second Infantry, resigned.

First Lieut. Frederick G. Knabenshue, Fifteenth Infantry, to be captain from July 20, 1905, vice Hirst, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. George H. Knox, Seventh Infantry, to be captain from July 28, 1905, vice Lloyd, Fifteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Thomas J. Powers, Twentieth Infantry, to be captain from July 28, 1905, vice Scott, Thirteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. James E. Bell, Seventeenth Infantry, to be captain from July 28, 1905, vice Roberts, Second Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Martin L. Crimmins, Nineteenth Infantry, to be captain from August 8, 1905, vice Maginnis, Sixteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Marion M. Weeks, Twenty-first Infantry, to be captain from August 15, 1905, vice Chatfield, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. James M. Love, jr., Twenty-first Infantry, to be captain from August 21, 1905, vice Arrowsmith, Twenty-sixth Infantry, detailed as paymaster.

First Lieut. Paul H. McCook, Second Infantry, to be captain from September 22, 1905, vice Barlow, Twenty-sixth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. Frederick W. Coleman, Thirteenth Infantry, to be captain from October 4, 1905, vice Purssell, Tenth Infantry, detailed as paymaster.

Second Lieut. James L. Craig, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from December 31, 1904, vice Macnab, Second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward K. Massee, Seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant from January 15, 1905, vice Parrott, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Joseph A. Marmon, Fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from February 3, 1905, vice Ford, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James A. Higgins, Thirtieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from February 11, 1905, vice Watkins, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Rinaldo R. Wood, Fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from February 18, 1905, vice Brambila, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Leonard H. Cook, Fifteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Dalton, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Horatio I. Lawrence, Twentieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from April 11, 1905, vice Willcoxon, Ninth Infantry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. William B. Wallace, Twentieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from April 29, 1905, vice Straat, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Wylie T. Conway, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 1, 1905, vice Plummer, Sixth Infantry, deserted.

Second Lieut. Shepard L. Pike, Eighteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 4, 1905, vice Boyle, Fourth Infantry, deceased.

Second Lieut. George A. Wieczorek, Second Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 4, 1905, vice Woodhouse, Fourth Infantry, deceased.

Second Lieut. Henry G. Stahl, Sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 13, 1905, vice Catlin, Second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Roy C. Kirtland, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 18, 1905, vice Chapman, Twenty-fifth Infantry, deceased.

Second Lieut. Alfred C. Arnold, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 20, 1905, vice Osborn, Twenty-sixth Infantry, dismissed.

Second Lieut. Wallace McNamara, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant from June 17, 1905, vice Childs, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William J. Schmidt, Twenty-sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from June 30, 1905, vice Wagner, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. David A. Henkes, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from July 17, 1905, vice Harris, Twenty-second Infantry, resigned.

Second Lieut. Guy E. Bucker, Second Infantry, to be first lieutenant from July 20, 1905, vice Knabenshue, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert G. Peck, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant from July 28, 1905, vice Knox, Seventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert J. Binford, Fifteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from July 28, 1905, vice Powers, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John A. Brockman, Seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant from July 28, 1905, vice Bell, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert W. Adams, Second Infantry, to be first lieutenant from July 29, 1905, vice Clark, Ninth Infantry, resigned.

Second Lieut. Sheldon W. Anding, Eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from August 8, 1905, vice Drouillard, Thirtieth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. William G. Murchison, Eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from August 8, 1905, vice Crimmins, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles C. Finch, Eleventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant from August 11, 1905, vice Wills, Twelfth Infantry, resigned.

Second Lieut. John S. McCleery, Twentieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from August 15, 1905, vice Weeks, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Elvin H. Wagner, Seventeenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from August 21, 1905, vice Love, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas W. Brown, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant from August 30, 1905, vice Richards, Twenty-third Infantry, dismissed.

Second Lieut. Otis R. Cole, Nineteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from September 2, 1905, vice Harrison, Twenty-first Infantry, resigned.

Second Lieut. Shelby C. Leasure, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from September 10, 1905, vice Waldo, Seventeenth Infantry, resigned.

Second Lieut. Daniel E. Shean, Sixteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from September 12, 1905, vice McConnell, Ninth Infantry, deceased.

Second Lieut. Charles F. Herr, Nineteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from September 22, 1905, vice Patterson, Twenty-ninth Infantry, retired from active service.

I nominate the officers herein named for appointment in the Army of the United States.

General officers.

Brig. Gen. John P. Story (since retired from active service), Chief of Artillery, to be major-general from June 17, 1905, vice Gillespie, retired from active service.

Brig. Gen. George M. Randall (since retired from active service) to be major-general from June 19, 1905, vice Story, retired from active service.

Brig. Gen. John F. Weston, Commissary-General, to be major-general from October 8, 1905, vice Randall, retired from active service.

Col. Thomas C. Lebo (since retired from active service), Fourteenth Cavalry, to be brigadier-general from June 22, 1905, vice Randall, appointed major-general.

Col. Winfield S. Edgerly, Second Cavalry, to be brigadier-general from June 23, 1905, vice Lebo, retired from active service.

Military secretary's department.

Capt. Benjamin Alvord, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be military secretary, with rank of major, from June 10, 1905, vice Brodie, promoted.

Capt. Eugene F. Ladd, detailed quartermaster, to be military secretary, with rank of major, from June 23, 1905, vice Alvord, promoted.

Artillery Corps.

Col. Benjamin K. Roberts (since retired from active service), Artillery Corps, to be Chief of Artillery, with rank of brigadier-general, from June 19, 1905, vice Story, appointed major-general, United States Army.

Col. Samuel M. Mills, Artillery Corps, to be Chief of Artillery, with rank of brigadier-general, from June 20, 1905, vice Roberts, retired from active service.

Under the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 23, 1904, I nominate the officers herein named to be placed on the retired list of the Army.

With the rank of brigadier-general.

Col. Henry H. Adams, retired, with rank from April 11, 1905.
Col. William A. Jones, retired, with rank from June 26, 1905.
Col. Henry W. Hubbell, retired, with rank from May 20, 1905.
Col. Henry C. Ward, retired, with rank from October 30, 1905.
Col. William Ennis, retired, with rank from November 7, 1905.

With the rank of colonel.

Lieut. Col. John Tweedale, retired, with rank from June 10, 1905.

With the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

Maj. Seymour Howell, retired, with rank from August 12, 1905.

Chaplain (Maj.) George Robinson, retired, with rank from March 19, 1905.

Maj. Otto Becker, retired, with rank from October 4, 1905

With the rank of major.

Chaplain (Capt.) Orville J. Nave, retired, with rank from April 30, 1905.

Chaplain (Capt.) Joseph A. Potter, retired, with rank from October 19, 1905.

With the rank of brigadier-general.

Under the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 23, 1904, I nominate Col. Butler D. Price, Sixteenth Infantry, to be placed on the retired list of the Army, with the rank of brigadier-general from the date upon which he shall be retired from active service.

MEMBERS ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

Theodore P. Shonts for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and its chairman, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Charles E. Magoon for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Benjamin M. Harrod for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of Congress.

Col. Oswald H. Ernst, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Rear-Admiral Mordecai T. Endicott, United States Navy, for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Brig. Gen. Peter C. Hains, United States Army (retired), for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Stephan C. Fitch to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Jackson and State of Alabama. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

William A. Heck to be postmaster at Cullman, in the county of Cullman and State of Alabama, in place of John Sutterer, resigned.

George F. Schad to be postmaster at Brewton, in the county of Escambia and State of Alabama, in place of Charles F. Rankin, resigned.

John J. Stephens to be postmaster at Attalla, in the county of Etowah and State of Alabama, in place of Lucius S. Gray, resigned.

Theodore S. Lanz to be postmaster at Florala, in the county of Covington and State of Alabama, in place of Hugh R. Duggan, removed.

Daniel McDonald to be postmaster at Carbon Hill, in the county of Walker and State of Alabama. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Ella G. Nix to be postmaster at Fort Payne, in the county of Dekalb and State of Alabama, in place of Ella G. Nix. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1904.

William H. Woodruff to be postmaster at Andalusia, in the county of Covington and State of Alabama, in place of Jesse W. Barnes, removed.

ALASKA.

Frank M. Boyle to be postmaster at Valdez, in the district of Alaska, in place of Gustav Spongberg, resigned.

ARKANSAS.

Robert B. Board to be postmaster at Mena, in the county of Polk and State of Arkansas, in place of Francis M. Reeves, resigned.

Edgar H. Finch to be postmaster at Crossett, in the county of Ashley and State of Arkansas. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

ARIZONA.

M. E. Cassidy to be postmaster at Bisbee, in the county of Cochise and Territory of Arizona, in place of George J. McCabe, resigned.

Edward A. Folsom to be postmaster at Naco, in the county of Cochise and Territory of Arizona, in place of Benjamin Goldman, removed.

James M. Hill, jr., to be postmaster at Hartford (late Gwynn), in the county of Sebastian and State of Arkansas, in place of James M. Hill, jr., to change name of office.

Frank H. Kennedy to be postmaster at Cottonplant, in the county of Woodruff and State of Arkansas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

CALIFORNIA.

Adaline Bailhache to be postmaster at Coronado, in the county of San Diego and State of California, in place of Elizabeth S. Newcomb, deceased.

Edmund L. Brown to be postmaster at San Fernando (late Fernando), in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, in place of Edmund L. Brown, to change name of office.

Daniel H. Coates to be postmaster at Campbell, in the county of Santa Clara and State of California, in place of Alexander P. Merrill. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

Angus J. Drynan, to be postmaster at Redding, in the county of Shasta and State of California, in place of John E. Reynolds, removed.

Frank H. Duden, to be postmaster at Jackson, in the county of Amador and State of California, in place of George C. Folger, deceased.

Albert B. Hill, to be postmaster at Coalinga, in the county of Fresno and State of California, in place of William J. Kilby, removed.

William A. Long, to be postmaster at Hanford, in the county of Kings and State of California, in place of Frank Hickman, removed.

CONNECTICUT.

Willard Baker, to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Litchfield and State of Connecticut. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

George B. French, to be postmaster at Ivoryton, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut, in place of Theodore F. Rose, deceased.

Edward D. Gilbert to be postmaster at Higganum, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Wilson M. Reynolds to be postmaster at Newtown, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

FLORIDA.

William F. Barrett to be postmaster at Dunnellon, in the county of Marion and State of Florida, in place of James G. Baskin, resigned.

Andrew Green to be postmaster at Arcadia, in the county of De Soto and State of Florida, in place of Daniel T. Carlton, resigned.

Hettie B. Spencer to be postmaster at Dade City, in the county of Pasco and State of Florida. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

GEORGIA.

John B. Dunagan to be postmaster at Jefferson, in the county of Jackson and State of Georgia. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

Emma B. Dyar to be postmaster at Calhoun, in the county of Gordon and State of Georgia, in place of Samuel M. Davis, jr., deceased.

Richard O. Rogers to be postmaster at Lafayette, in the county of Walker and State of Georgia. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Albert M. Smith to be postmaster at Brunswick, in the county of Glynn and State of Georgia, in place of Franklin McC. Brown, removed.

IDAHO.

William W. Stephens to be postmaster at Rexburg, in the county of Fremont and State of Idaho, in place of Dora Clegg, removed.

George L. Wall to be postmaster at Blackfoot, in the county of Bingham and State of Idaho, in place of Mary A. Wall, resigned.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

Adolphus D. Orcutt to be postmaster at Coweta, in district 7, Indian Territory. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Rena Russell to be postmaster at Krebs, in district 15, Indian Territory, in place of Rena Winnett, name changed by marriage.

INDIANA.

Fremont M. Neal to be postmaster at Jonesboro, in the county of Grant and State of Indiana, in place of Elam H. Neal, resigned.

Frank Sheets to be postmaster at Mooresville, in the county of Morgan and State of Indiana, in place of Harry H. Thompson, deceased.

John A. Zahm to be postmaster at Notre Dame, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana, in place of Andrew Morrissey, resigned.

IOWA.

Bert E. Bower to be postmaster at Traer, in the county of Tama and State of Iowa, in place of Daniel T. Bower, resigned.

Albert S. Burnett to be postmaster at Valley Junction, in the county of Polk and State of Iowa, in place of James F. Jordan, removed.

Gordon W. Laflar to be postmaster at Manning, in the county of Carroll and State of Iowa, in place of John G. Beal. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

Esther M. McFarlan to be postmaster at Cumberland, in the county of Cass and State of Iowa, in place of Charles M. Reed, resigned.

Isaiah A. Mains to be postmaster at Charter Oak, in the county of Crawford and State of Iowa, in place of Patrick D. McMahon, resigned.

Stephen C. Maynard to be postmaster at Grand Junction, in the county of Greene and State of Iowa, in place of Jacob D. Kirby, deceased.

Thomas W. Purcell to be postmaster at Hampton, in the county of Franklin and State of Iowa, in place of Theodore Haecker, deceased.

Belle Sherwood to be postmaster at Shellrock, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa, in place of Lovett E, Sherwood, deceased.

KANSAS.

Thomas C. Babb to be postmaster at Fredonia, in the county of Wilson and State of Kansas, in place of Leonidas V. Fulghum, removed.

Willis E. Bodley to be postmaster at Quenemo, in the county of Osage and State of Kansas. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Lewis W. Breyfogle to be postmaster at Olathe, in the county of Johnson and State of Kansas, in place of Charles Sprague, removed.

Eben Carlsson to be postmaster at Lindsborg, in the county of McPherson and State of Kansas, in place of Luther Swensson, resigned.

Robert I. Hillman to be postmaster at Peru, in the county of Chautauqua and State of Kansas. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Irwin C. McDowell to be postmaster at Phillipsburg, in the county of Phillips and State of Kansas, in place of John Q. Royce, resigned.

James T. Miller to be postmaster at Altoona, in the county of Wilson and State of Kansas. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

John C. Petty to be postmaster at Strong, in the county of Chase and State of Kansas. Office become Presidential July 1, 1905.

KENTUCKY.

Charles H. Berryman to be postmaster at Lexington, in the county of Fayette and State of Kentucky, in place of Fielding C. Elkin, deceased.

James M. Carey to be postmaster at Morehead, in the county of Rowan and State of Kentucky. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

James L. Grissom to be postmaster at Burnside, in the county of Pulaski and State of Kentucky. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

LOUISIANA.

Arthur A. Boudreaux to be postmaster at Thibodaux, in the parish of Lafourche and State of Louisiana, in place of Euphemie Aucoin. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1905.

Benjamin S. Gallup to be postmaster at Hammond, in the parish of Tangipahoa and State of Louisiana, in place of Fillmore M. Brist, resigned.

Rudolph A. Gehringer to be postmaster at Napoleonville, in

the parish of Assumption and State of Louisiana, in place of August V. Bulow, deceased.

Cora Sharpless to be postmaster at De Ridder, in the parish of Calcasieu and State of Louisiana. Office became Presidential July 1, 1904.

MARYLAND.

Philip T. Harman to be postmaster at Ellicott City, in the county of Howard and State of Maryland, in place of Hamilton Oldfield. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1902.

William F. Lankford to be postmaster at Princess Anne, in the county of Somerset and State of Maryland, in place of Milton S. Lankford, resigned.

Alfred W. Thompson to be postmaster at Ridgely, in the county of Caroline and State of Maryland, in place of Alfred Sigler, resigned.

Gustavus B. Timanus to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Prince George and State of Maryland, in place of Charles F. Shaffer, jr., resigned.

George Tise to be postmaster at Hyattsville, in the county of Prince George and State of Maryland. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Emma E. Zimmerman to be postmaster at Emmitsburg, in the county of Frederick and State of Maryland, in place of Ezra R. Zimmerman, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Charles W. Abbott to be postmaster at Reading, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in place of Harley Prentiss, deceased.

George B. Bennett to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts, in place of Allen T. Holmes, deceased.

Charles A. Chase to be postmaster at Holyoke, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts, in place of Henry A. Chase, resigned.

William F. Craig to be postmaster at Lynn, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in place of Howard K. Sanderson, deceased.

Henry A. Hutchinson to be postmaster at Dedham, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in place of Charles H. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1905.

MICHIGAN.

Isadore J. Barnett to be postmaster at Onaway, in the county of Presque Isle and State of Michigan, in place of John M. Clark, removed.

Thomas E. Dawson to be postmaster at Sandusky (late Sanilac Center), in the county of Sanilac and State of Michigan, in place of Thomas E. Dawson, to change name of post-office.

Arthur J Gibson to be postmaster at Central Lake, in the county of Antrim and State of Michigan, in place of Charles E. Ramsey, removed.

James G. Hines to be postmaster at Stockbridge, in the county of Ingham and State of Michigan, in place of Clarence S. Mills, deceased.

George L. Lusk to be postmaster at Bay City, in the county of Bay and State of Michigan, in place of Frank C. Merrill, resigned.

Otis Miner to be postmaster at Lake Odessa, in the county of Ionia and State of Michigan, in place of Frank W. Clark, removed.

MINNESOTA.

Ferdinand H. Berning to be postmaster at Renville, in the county of Renville and State of Minnesota, in place of Loren A. Brooks, resigned.

Ivan R. Gillpatrick to be postmaster at Biwabik, in the county of St. Louis and State of Minnesota, in place of Nicholas B. Shank.

Owen Wangensteen to be postmaster at Lake Park, in the county of Becker and State of Minnesota, in place of Frank B. Higley. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1905.

MISSISSIPPI.

Margaret N. Cabaniss to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Hinds and State of Mississippi. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

James G. Cammack to be postmaster at Rolling Fork, in the county of Sharkey and State of Mississippi. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Anna D. Cook to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Jones and State of Mississippi, in place of John McDuffie, deceased.

Henry E. Davis to be postmaster at Wiggins, in the county of Harrison and State of Mississippi. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

George W. Field to be postmaster at Grenada, in the county of Grenada and State of Mississippi, in place of Augustus S. Weigert, resigned.

MISSOURI.

Julian Courteol to be postmaster at Granby, in the county of Newton and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Roscoe N. Dean to be postmaster at Norborne, in the county of Carroll and State of Missouri, in place of John H. Jacobs, resigned.

George K. Gwathmey to be postmaster at Lathrop, in the county of Clinton and State of Missouri, in place of Cassius M. Gilchrist, resigned.

Guersant P. Herriott to be postmaster at Novinger, in the county of Adair and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Clyde M. Hudson to be postmaster at Hale, in the county of Carroll and State of Missouri, in place of M. J. Hudson, deceased.

Frank P. Kitchen to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Henry and State of Missouri, in place of Harry H. Mitchell, removed.

William T. Lessley to be postmaster at Glasgow, in the county of Howard and State of Missouri, in place of Albert A. Marshall, resigned.

Nellie B. Shelton to be postmaster at Puxico, in the county of Stoddard and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

Theodore Walther to be postmaster at De Soto, in the county of Jefferson and State of Missouri, in place of William E. Crow, resigned.

MONTANA.

James McTaggart to be postmaster at Belgrade, in the county of Gallatin and State of Montana. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

Orson B. Prickett to be postmaster at Billings, in the county of Yellowstone and State of Montana, in place of Lewis F. Babcock, deceased.

NEBRASKA.

Robert R. Douglas to be postmaster at Clarks, in the county of Merrick and State of Nebraska, in place of Marion E. Richardson, resigned.

Charles H. Hodges to be postmaster at Collegeview, in the county of Lancaster and State of Nebraska, in place of Zalmon Nicola, resigned.

Amanda Wille to be postmaster at Neligh, in the county of Antelope and State of Nebraska, in place of Charles Wille, deceased.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Harry M. Eaton to be postmaster at Littleton, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire, in place of Charles Eaton, deceased.

NEW JERSEY.

John A. Ackerman to be postmaster at Orange, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey, in place of Herman B. Walker, resigned.

Jacob Feldman to be postmaster at Woodbine, in the county of Cape May and State of New Jersey. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

John Hiller, jr., to be postmaster at Kenilworth (late New Orange), in the county of Union and State of New Jersey. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

William Jeffers to be postmaster at Hackensack, in the county of Bergen and State of New Jersey, in place of John J. Anderson, resigned.

William B. Livezey to be postmaster at Wildwood, in the county of Cape May and State of New Jersey. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

Horace E. Richardson to be postmaster at Cape May Court House, in the county of Cape May and State of New Jersey. Office became Presidential July 1, 1904.

NEW YORK.

Emerson W. Addis to be postmaster at Brewster, in the county of Putnam and State of New York, in place of Levi A. Shove, resigned.

Samuel G. Barton to be postmaster at Gasport, in the county of Niagara and State of New York. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Abram E. Depuy to be postmaster at Mariner Harbor, in the county of Richmond and State of New York, in place of William E. Lissenden. removed.

Adam N. Finucan to be postmaster at Pittsford, in the county of Monroe and State of New York, in place of Benjamin C. Eaton, resigned.

Charles A. Fowler to be postmaster at Rome, in the county of

Oneida and State of New York, in place of George C. McAdam, deceased.

Addison A. Gardner to be postmaster at Broadalbin, in the county of Fulton and State of New York. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

George C. Lane to be postmaster at Fishers Island, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York. Office became Presidential July 1, 1904.

Robert R. McLane to be postmaster at St. Regis Falls, in the county of Franklin and State of New York. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

William E. Mills to be postmaster at Rose Hill, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York. Office became Presidential July 1, 1903.

John N. Parsons to be postmaster at Yonkers, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in place of Henry Osterheld, removed.

Sylvester Pearsall to be postmaster at Lynbrook, in the county of Nassau and State of New York. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

Harry H. Pratt to be postmaster at Corning, in the county of Steuben and State of New York, in place of John S. Kennedy, resigned.

Charles J. Shults to be postmaster at Cherry Creek, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York, in place of Richard C. Bullock. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1905.

Alexander S. Taylor to be postmaster at Westbury Station, in the county of Nassau and State of New York. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

Henry P. Tuthill to be postmaster at Mattituck, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

Willis G. C. Wood to be postmaster at Whitehall, in the county of Washington and State of New York, in place of Charles W. Harding, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Drury W. Deweese to be postmaster at Murphy, in the county of Cherokee and State of North Carolina. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

James D. Dorsett to be postmaster at Spencer, in the county of Rowan and State of North Carolina. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Carlos McLeod to be postmaster at Carthage, in the county of Moore and State of North Carolina, in place of Julia A. Ritter. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1905.

Albert Miller to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county of Lenoir and State of North Carolina. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Malinda A. Renigar to be postmaster at Shore, in the county of Yadkin and State of North Carolina. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

William E. Snow to be postmaster at High Point, in the county of Guilford and State of North Carolina, in place of Walter B. Steele, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Lyman Brandt to be postmaster at Park River, in the county of Walsh and State of North Dakota, in place of George K. McEwan, resigned.

Minnie L. Budge to be postmaster at Grand Forks, in the county of Grand Forks and State of North Dakota, in place of William Budge, resigned.

Clarence M. Condit to be postmaster at Westhope, in the county of Bottineau and State of North Dakota. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Jeremiah H. Dooley to be postmaster at Leeds, in the county of Benson and State of North Dakota, in place of Frederick Johnson, resigned.

James E. Galehouse, jr., to be postmaster at Carrington, in the county of Foster and State of North Dakota, in place of Wallace Galehouse, deceased.

Ole Helseth to be postmaster at Balfour, in the county of McHenry and State of North Dakota. Office became Presidential October 1, 1903.

Nelson C. Lawrence to be postmaster at Dickinson, in the county of Stark and State of North Dakota, in place of Jared C. Thompson, deceased.

Emily D. Prairie to be postmaster at Portal, in the county of Ward and State of North Dakota. Office became Presidential July 1, 1904.

OHIO.

Orrin C. Andre to be postmaster at Waverly, in the county of Pike and State of Ohio, in place of Charles W. Jones, deceased.

Charles W. Brainerd to be postmaster at Mantua (late Mantua Station), in the county of Portage and State of Ohio, in place of Charles W. Brainerd, to change name of office.

Betsey Erskine to be postmaster at Lowellville, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio, in place of Porter Watson, resigned.

Lewis T. Marrott to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Summit and State of Ohio, in place of Charles H. Ellsworth, deceased.

John C. McManus to be postmaster at Jewett, in the county of Harrison and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Emma Metzger to be postmaster at Oakharbor, in the county of Ottawa and State of Ohio, in place of John C. Metzger, deceased.

George W. Nickels to be postmaster at Galion, in the county of Crawford and State of Ohio, in place of John W. Cupp, resigned.

Ralston Russell to be postmaster at Pomeroy, in the county of Meigs and State of Ohio, in place of Samuel F. Smith, removed.

Tom J. Smith to be postmaster at West Salem, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Judson N. Stone to be postmaster at Oberlin, in the county of Lorain and State of Ohio, in place of John W. Steele, deceased.

David B. Wilson to be postmaster at Corning, in the county of Perry and State of Ohio, in place of George T. Drake, resigned.

OKLAHOMA.

David Barrett to be postmaster at Prague, in the county of Lincoln and State of Oklahoma. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

George Brophy to be postmaster at Woodward, in the county of Woodward and Territory of Oklahoma, in place of Jonathan McGrath, deceased.

OREGON.

Merritt A. Baker to be postmaster at Weston, in the county of Umatilla and State of Oregon. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

Harvey S. Buck to be postmaster at Sumpter, in the county of Baker and State of Oregon, in place of Frank G. Jewett, resigned.

Louis J. Simpson to be postmaster at North Bend, in the county of Coos and State of Oregon. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

Frank W. Welcome to be postmaster at Burns, in the county of Harney and State of Oregon, in place of Harrison Kelly, deceased.

Arthur Wheelhouse to be postmaster at Arlington, in the county of Gilliam and State of Oregon, in place of Robert H. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1905.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Samuel M. Altdoerffer to be postmaster at Ambridge, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

David Dalton to be postmaster at Sharon Hill, in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

James T. Dunfee to be postmaster at Newville, in the county of Cumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in place of James T. Dunfee. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1905.

Malin Ewing to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Mercer and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Daniel Williams, resigned.

William H. Fretz to be postmaster at Jenkintown, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Anna H. Griscom, removed.

William D. Gerlach to be postmaster at Hazleton, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania, in place of William M. Powell, removed.

Sallie B. Gregory to be postmaster at Meshoppen, in the county of Wyoming and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

Daniel L. Grier to be postmaster at Watsontown, in the county of Northumberland and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Dan C. Hogue, deceased.

Solomon G. Krepps to be postmaster at Cadwallader, in the county of Fayette and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential April 1, 1903.

Alfred P. Laubach to be postmaster at Siegfried, in the county of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Adam Laubach, deceased.

Albert J. Matson to be postmaster at Delta, in the county of

York and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Oliver E. Mayhew to be postmaster at Export, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Robert M. Swisher to be postmaster at Mount Jewett, in the county of McKean and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Charles W. Oberg, resigned.

PORTO RICO.

Juan Padovani to be postmaster at Guayama, in the county of Guayama, P. R. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

RHODE ISLAND.

Edgar E. Matteson to be postmaster at Apponaug, in the county of Kent and State of Rhode Island. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

John E. Heustess to be postmaster at Hartsville, in the county of Darlington and State of South Carolina, in place of Simon Beckham, removed.

Isham A. Mayfield to be postmaster at Greer, in the county of Greenville and State of South Carolina. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Ira S. Pitts to be postmaster at Westminster, in the county of Oconee and State of South Carolina, in place of Charles J. Mulkey, removed.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Erick Olson to be postmaster at Fairfax, in the county of Gregory and State of South Dakota. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

William Toomey to be postmaster at Gettysburg, in the county of Potter and State of South Dakota, in place of Lewis Tillotson. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1905.

TENNESSEE.

David A. Munn, jr., to be postmaster at Halls, in the county of Lauderdale and State of Tennessee. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

William S. Raulston to be postmaster at Chattanooga, in the county of Hamilton and State of Tennessee, in place of Robert S. Sharp, resigned.

Frances D. Robertson to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Robertson and State of Tennessee, in place of Susan C. Cheatham. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1904.

Euclid W. Smartt, jr., to be postmaster at Manchester, in the county of Coffee and State of Tennessee. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

James W. Taylor to be postmaster at Lafollette, in the county of Campbell and State of Tennessee, in place of Evan T. Warner, resigned.

TEXAS.

Harry H. Barkham to be postmaster at Plano, in the county of Collin and State of Texas, in place of John M. Moody, resigned.

Jefferson D. Bell to be postmaster at Bartlett, in the county of Williamson and State of Texas, in place of Edward G. Armstrong, resigned.

Belle W. Bridges to be postmaster at Mason, in the county of Mason and State of Texas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

Thomas F. Calhoon to be postmaster at Liberty, in the county of Liberty and State of Texas. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Gerald W. Calrow to be postmaster at Boerne, in the county of Kendall and State of Texas. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

George W. Cash to be postmaster at Hubbard, in the county of Hill and State of Texas, in place of William E. Connelly, deceased.

Joshua W. Cunningham to be postmaster at De Kalb, in the county of Bowie and State of Texas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

Dallas Harbert to be postmaster at Commerce, in the county of Hunt and State of Texas, in place of Charles W. Rush. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1902.

William A. Hawn to be postmaster at Athens, in the county of Henderson and State of Texas, in place of Charles K. Miller, removed.

Clara I. Lockwood to be postmaster at Sealy, in the county of Austin and State of Texas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

Richard T. Polk to be postmaster at Killeen, in the county of Bell and State of Texas. Office became Presidential October 1, 1904.

Anna J. Roach to be postmaster at Atlanta, in the county of Cass and State of Texas, in place of Joseph E. Roach, deceased.

David A. Robinson to be postmaster at Dallas, in the county of Dallas and State of Texas, in place of William M. O'Leary, deceased.

Charlie Simmons to be postmaster at Valley Mills, in the county of Bosque and State of Texas, in place of Marion D. Townley, resigned.

Harvey H. Twyman to be postmaster at Rosebud, in the county of Falls and State of Texas, in place of Lula M. Brewington, resigned.

UTAH.

George W. Bryan to be postmaster at Mercur, in the county of Tooele and State of Utah, in place of Robert W. Watt, resigned.

VIRGINIA.

William E. Cunningham to be postmaster at Louisa, in the county of Louisa and State of Virginia. Office became Presidential July 1, 1904.

William C. Pendleton to be postmaster at Tazewell, in the county of Tazewell and State of Virginia, in place of William G. Young, resigned.

John W. Thompson to be postmaster at Dayton, in the county of Rockingham and State of Virginia, in place of John L. Thompson, deceased.

WASHINGTON.

Daniel Crowley to be postmaster at Vancouver, in the county of Clarke and State of Washington, in place of Lloyd Du Bois. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1903.

Jacob F. Hill to be postmaster at Davenport, in the county of Lincoln and State of Washington, in place of Lawrence A. Inkster, resigned.

Robert H. Stapleton to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Snohomish and State of Washington. Office became Presidential October 1, 1904.

Frank L. Turner to be postmaster at South Bend, in the county of Pacific and State of Washington, in place of Joseph H. Turner, deceased.

Henry L. Votaw to be postmaster at Tacoma, in the county of Pierce and State of Washington, in place of John B. Cromwell. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1903.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Columbus W. Law to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of Harrison and State of West Virginia, in place of Jesse J. Flanigan, removed.

WISCONSIN.

Ole K. Anderson to be postmaster at Superior, in the county of Douglas and State of Wisconsin, in place of Kirby Thomas, resigned.

Lydia Chapman to be postmaster at Horicon, in the county of Dodge and State of Wisconsin, in place of William W. Chapman, deceased.

Nettie J. Danielson to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Taylor and State of Wisconsin, in place of Peter Danielson, deceased.

Frank C. Densmore to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Walworth and State of Wisconsin, in place of Clayton H. Underhill, resigned.

Ida E. Gilbert to be postmaster at Blair, in the county of Trempealeau and State of Wisconsin. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

Byron R. Godfrey to be postmaster at North Milwaukee, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin. Office became Presidential April 1, 1904.

Edward Morrissey to be postmaster at Delavan, in the county of Walworth and State of Wisconsin, in place of Adele E. Barnes, removed.

Hans S. Olson to be postmaster at Weyauwega, in the county of Waupaca and State of Wisconsin, in place of J. F. Corbett, resigned.

Horatio S. Tipple to be postmaster at West Allis, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin. Office became Presidential July 1, 1904.

Charles E. Wood to be postmaster at Mukwonago, in the county of Waukesha and State of Wisconsin, in place of Laurel G. Andrews, deceased.

WYOMING.

Ida Fowkes to be postmaster at Cumberland, in the county of Uinta and State of Wyoming. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

Frank O. Thompson to be postmaster at Cody, in the county of Bighorn and State of Wyoming, in place of William P. Webster, resigned.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

I nominate the person herein named for appointment as an associate justice of the supreme court of the Philippine Islands,

provided for in the act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes."

James F. Tracey, of New York, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John T. McDonough, resigned.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Edward J. Rodrigue, of Louisiana, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, to succeed Thomas S. Sholars, removed.

INDIAN INSPECTOR.

Frank C. Churchill, of Grafton, N. H., to be an Indian inspector, to fill the vacancy made by his temporary appointment June 1, 1905, as a special agent. (Reappointment.)

SECRETARY OF NEW MEXICO.

James W. Raynolds, of New Mexico, to be secretary of New Mexico, to take effect January 13, 1906, at expiration of his present term. (Reappointment.)

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn December 6, 1905.

Frederick S. Nave, of Arizona, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 6, 1905.

SECRETARY OF STATE.

Elihu Root, of New York, to be Secretary of State.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE.

Robert Bacon, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, COURT OF APPEALS.

Louis E. McComas, of Maryland, to be associate justice of the court of appeals of the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 6, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. Robertson and Mr. Ransdell, Representatives from the State of Louisiana, appeared before the bar and took the oath of office.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Printing:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Third Report of the United States Board on Geographic Names, constituted by Executive order of September 4, 1890.

The attention of the Congress is invited to the recommendations of the Board that, in addition to the number of copies of the report printed for the use of the Congress, 2,500 copies be printed for the use of the Board, and that an annual appropriation of $2,500 be asked to enable the Board to conduct the necessary correspondence, make investigations of questions submitted, and prepare, print, and promptly distribute the decisions made by the Board.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1905.*

CORRECTION OF JOURNAL.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I arise to propose a correction of the Journal of the House. I find on page 59 of the RECORD that two bills were introduced giving American registry to two steamers, one called the *Success* and the other the *Marie*, and it appears that they were sent to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I ask to correct the Journal so as to have it appear that the bills were sent to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will be so corrected. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act to provide for the construction of a canal, etc., be now laid before the House for immediate consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and that it may remain the special order until concluded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the bill referred to be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union under the rules of the House, and that its consideration be a continuing order until completed. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, pending the request——

The SPEAKER. Do I understand the gentleman from Iowa desires also to limit debate?

Mr. HEPBURN. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. I mean to limit debate upon this subject—that is, debate upon this bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. Upon the bill, yes, sir; not general debate in the ordinary sense of that term.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, pending the consideration of the request, will the gentleman grant me a few minutes—three or five minutes—in which to make a statement?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather unusual request, but it is also a rather unusual condition with which we are faced. Nobody upon this side of the House has any desire to delay or to obstruct the speedy construction of a transisthmian canal. We are very anxious not only to avoid an actuality of that sort, but any appearance of that sort. The request is somewhat unusual in this, that ten million dollars—a rather large amount from my section of the country at any rate, and not a contemptible one for any part of the world—has been spent within a short time. We have no detailed account of how it has been expended. I myself do not doubt it has been honestly expended. I might perhaps criticise the wisdom of the expenditure in some respects. The detailed statement in the RECORD this morning is not a detailed statement, but a summary of summaries; that is to say, the amount expended for sanitation is stated in one column and the amount expended for supplies in another, and the amount spent for another object in another, etc., and these were added up, giving the sum total in the RECORD. Now, Mr. Speaker, the sole difference between the request and the ordinary operation of the House is that the matter has not been considered by one of the standing committees. The matter, when it comes before the House, if the unanimous consent is granted, will come before it for its consideration with the usual right of amendment, with the usual right of debate in the Committee of the Whole and in the House, the only restriction upon that being that the general debate shall be confined to the subject-matter under consideration, namely, the bill itself. Under all the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] and I, acting for the minority upon the Committee on Rules, have concluded that we ought to give unanimous consent to the request, and we shall make no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTAUER. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] yield me a moment?

Mr. HEPBURN. I will.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration is stated in its title to be—

A bill supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriations for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes.

As a supplemental bill it was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The first section of the bill is supplemental to the Panama Canal act, but the second section of the bill, the one which appeals to me to be the more important, and surely the one which justifies immediate consideration of the bill, carries an appropriation of $16,500,000 and is clearly a deficiency item. It is referred to by the President in his message as "an emergency appropriation." It comes under the head of a deficiency appropriation, and consequently under the rule is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. I surely do not want to interpose any delay in the consideration of this act, as I approve its object thoroughly. Moreover, the estimate for the appropriation came to the House in the regular form of an item of deficiency, and which has been properly referred to the Committee on Appropriations. My only object is that, as an old member of the Committee on Appropriations, I desired to call the attention of the House to this matter, in order that this section may not at any future date be referred to as a precedent for the reference of Panama Canal appropriations to any other committee than the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the House and to my colleague [Mr. LITTAUER] that the second section of the

bill—I believe it is the second section—refers to the taxation of the United States bonds. Of course, that subject is a subject that is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, but I have not raised any objection, and should not have said a word about it in the House, because the bill comes before the House as a bill without reference to its having been referred to any committee. If the request was to take the bill from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I should still be in favor of it, because I do not believe that either of these sections of the bill belong to that committee, or that they have jurisdiction over them. But this is an easy method of getting at the bill for action, and I think that the House ought to act upon it as speedily as possible. Therefore, I hope there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] includes in his request for unanimous consent, if the Chair understands it, the proposition to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. I did not make that motion, Mr. Speaker, for the reason that there is no Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I would have no authority to make that request.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, would not the proper request be to vacate the reference?

The SPEAKER. Probably that would be the better request, namely, to vacate the reference. The suggestion of the Chair is that there is no question about the bill being before the House.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I will put that in my request, namely, that the reference to the committee be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, the bill, I believe, has already been read?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then I will attempt to discuss briefly——

The SPEAKER. The bill is upon the Union Calendar.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 480.

The motion of Mr. HEPBURN was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (with Mr. VREELAND in the chair).

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for Isthmian Canal construction, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall be subject to the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled "An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900, the same as though said bonds were issued under the provisions of said act of March 14, 1900.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $16,500,000 to continue the construction of the Isthmian Canal, to be expended under the direction of the President in accordance with the said act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, approved June 28, 1902, and for each and every purpose connected with the same, the said sum to continue available until expended: *Provided*, That all expenditures from the appropriation herein made shall be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds authorized in section 8 of the said act approved June 28, 1902.

SEC. 3. That a detailed statement of the expenditures from this and subsequent appropriations for the construction of the Isthmian Canal shall be made annually to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding briefly to a discussion of this bill I want to say a word or two in order that the gentleman from New York in my front [Mr. LITTAUER] and the gentleman from New York on my left [Mr. PAYNE] may be able to possess their souls in patience. There is no subtle attempt upon the part of gentlemen who have heretofore been connected with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to interfere with the jurisdiction of the respective committees that they so long have ornamented. We do not want to assume any of their functions. There is no purpose upon the part of the membership of that committee as it may be constituted to commit any act of violence upon their jurisdiction. We recognize the fact that these matters are disposed of by rules rather than by the preferences of gentlemen, and we find that the rule provides that all of those matters relating to commerce shall be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and it is because this great subject of the canal has relation to commerce that Congress thought it had the power under the Constitution to authorize its construction. It is part of the commerce of the country. It relates to that; and as this measure relates to that great enterprise, it has been thought probably just by the Speaker that in this particular case at least that committee should have jurisdiction. There is no usurpation upon their part, nor desire to usurp anything——

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. HEPBURN. And I hope gentlemen will be quiet and be able to sleep peaceably in their beds without being disturbed by fears that their prerogatives, just and proper, are in any way to be abridged.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, no one has charged that there was any subtle or surreptitious or felonious intent to get away with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. No one has ever supposed up to five minutes ago that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] would claim for a moment that there was a word or line in this bill which indicated that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had any jurisdiction whatever of the subject-matter. One section relates to appropriation, the other to taxation. Why, the gentleman may just as well claim that any bill relating to revenue, which raised the tariff or imposed a tax, was under the jurisdiction of that committee, the chairmanship of which he has so signally ornamented for the past few years in connection with this canal project. He might just as well claim that every such bill was subject to the jurisdiction of that committee, because a customs duty is supposed to bear some relation to the commerce—to the foreign commerce—of the United States.

I do not think the gentleman will try to maintain any such position as that when he reflects upon the matter. I was not even disposed to raise the question or suggest it until it was suggested by my friend formerly upon the Committee on Appropriations, because the request of the gentleman from Iowa was to oust his committee of the jurisdiction of this bill, to which they were not entitled, and bring it before the House, so that we might have speedy consideration and speedy action upon this question.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has shown in this last remark of his that he perhaps does not understand this subject. [Laughter.] "The gentleman from Iowa" did not attempt to oust his committee or the Committee on Appropriations from jurisdiction of this matter. It was shown a moment ago, when he was addressed by the Speaker of the House; he recognized the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did not have an existence now—has not been appointed. I think the gentleman knew that. The gentleman is perhaps unhappy in the broad statement that he makes—"that up to five minutes ago no one supposed that a contention of this kind would be made." He ought to have changed that language, and said that those who were unfamiliar with the rules of the House might have had such a notion. [Laughter.] I get my idea from a reading of the rule, which says that all subjects relating to commerce shall be referred to that committee; and if this matter relates to commerce, then I submit that it has jurisdiction, notwithstanding the argument of my friend. I would not assume to attempt to discharge any of the duties of the Committee on Ways and Means. Oh, no! Those belong to the white-buttoned mandarins of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. I do not like to be personal, but the gentleman does not think he is out of place, then, to be at the head of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee instead of on the Ways and Means Committee, if the white-button mandarins of the House are the people who are to be on the Committee on Ways and Means. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEPBURN. May I ask the Chair if that is an occult and hidden compliment to me? [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the committee will remember that the bill to which this is supplemental provided for the issuance of $135,000,000 of bonds, the proceeds of the sale of which was to meet the expenditures authorized in the construction of this canal. Those bonds at 2 per cent were not placed upon the same footing as other 2 per cent bonds, in this, that if used as a basis for circulation, the tax on that circulation would be 1 per cent a year, whereas under the other issues that tax would be but one-half of 1 per cent a year. The first section of the bill is to rectify that error and to place the bonds that may be issued under the act of June 28, 1902, upon the same footing as other 2 per cent bonds.

This bill makes an appropriation for $16,500,000, estimated to

be necessary to meet the expenditures between this date and the 30th of June next. Ten million dollars have already been expended by the Commission, but a large portion of that was not expended by those gentlemen who are now charged with responsibility for the management of canal affairs. A detailed statement of those expenditures was printed in the RECORD of this morning, and a statement of the estimates necessary for the next seven months is also printed in the RECORD.

This aggregate sum seems to be a large one, but gentlemen must remember that this work is now being inaugurated, and extraordinary expenditures are necessary in the way of providing quarters for the vast army of men who must be employed, in providing proper machinery, and gathering together the laborers who are to conduct the work. It seems to be a large sum, and yet it is a necessary one. I want to remind the committee that they must not fall into the error of supposing that the machinery, the housing, and other items of expenditure of that kind were all covered and paid for in the $40,000,000 paid to the French company. The work done, the buildings erected, and the materials assembled were supposed to be, in the aggregate, in the neighborhood of $40,000,000 in value; but, as a matter of fact, when we came to take possession of those houses—three or four thousand of them in number—it was found that they were practically worthless. They were wooden houses; they had been unusued for ten or twelve years. Buildings decay rapidly in that climate and under that intense rainfall of one hundred and thirty-odd inches a year. Many of them were abandoned as worthless, and all of the remainder had to undergo extensive and expensive repairs.

The machinery that was purchased turned out to be almost absolutely worthless. There were old-fashioned, obsolete dredges and digging machines, railroad locomotives of a pattern undesirable for use, and many of them having been exposed to the weather without any care or protection for a dozen years. When we attempted to use them they were found to be practically worthless.

The same might be said of the cars that were there in such great numbers—thousands of them, perhaps, but small, inefficient, and weather-worn to the extent of uselessness.

Our Commission has been compelled to replace these obsolete and worthless machines, to renew the buildings, and to provide generally the material that must be used in the construction from the stores of to day.

There is a pay roll containing the names of over 13,000 people. The payments are monthly and twice a month. The laborers are paid in the middle and at the end of each month. There is no sufficient fund for the payment that becomes due on the 15th of this month. If that payment is not made these laborers, being largely strangers to our people and our nation and our customs, will be fearful; the labor will be disturbed, and harm will be the result. Therefore we have asked that this emergency bill be passed.

I believe I have nothing more that I desire to say, unless some gentlemen have questions that I may be able to answer.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Iowa what relation the item of $1,080,000 found on page 40 for salaries and wages has to the item of the Isthmian Canal Commission, $185,256.98, general expenses?

Mr. HEPBURN. Where is that item?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The gentleman will find it on the right-hand side of the page. It says, "For salaries and wages, $1,080,000." I would like to know what relation that item has to the item of $185,256.98, being the first item in the schedule, "Isthmian Canal Commission, general expenses." I want to know what relation that item has to canal construction.

Mr. HEPBURN. I find the first item the gentleman alludes to, "General expenses, Isthmian Canal Commission, $185,256.98." I suppose that that is the cost to the Government of the Commission prior to June 30, 1905, and for the three months following. But the first items in the left-hand column are the expenditures of the $10,000,000 up to that date, from the very earliest, commencing, perhaps, as early as July, 1902.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is when we took charge of the enterprise.

Mr. HEPBURN. Immediately after the passage of the authorizing act. Now, the other item——

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The first item I called the gentleman's attention to is on the top of the page, on the right-hand column—$1,080,000 for salaries and wages.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is the estimate of the expenditures for October and November, 1905, $1,080,000.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Then that simply includes salaries and wages only for those two months?

Mr. HEPBURN. The first seven or eight lines of the second column on page 40 are estimates for October and November, and the others are expenditures that are in the first column.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I see. One is the actual expenditures and the other are the estimates only.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes; they have not got the report here yet.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Now, has the gentleman from Iowa information so that he can give anything like the details for salaries from the beginning until now?

Mr. HEPBURN. I am not sure that I can give a detailed statement of the salaries, but I can give this general statement, that of the salaries over $5,000 there are 26, possibly 28. Salaries of $5,000, 6; of $4,000 and under $5,000, 6; of $3,000 and under $4,000, 55; $2,000 to $3,000, 126. That includes engineers——

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. All the personnel.

Mr. HEPBURN. And the higher skilled men. Salaries, you will remember, must necessarily be much higher there than here.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Undoubtedly.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Will the gentleman explain what is the total amount of expenditures, approximately, thus far made toward the construction of this canal?

Mr. HEPBURN. The total known expenditures are $8,095,092.15. The estimates for October and November that are now known, the expenditures being there and the office here, are $1,892,000.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Does the gentleman pretend to say that only $9,000,000 has been expended in all matters relating to the construction of this canal?

Mr. HEPBURN. Nearly $10,000,000.

Mr. OVERSTREET. What is the total amount of bonds that has been authorized to issue?

Mr. HEPBURN. Authorized? No bonds have been issued.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am speaking of the authority to issue bonds.

Mr. HEPBURN. One hundred and thirty-five million dollars.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. I will.

Mr. ALEXANDER. On page 40, at the top of the second column, it says, "Unpaid audited accounts." What Department has the auditing of these accounts?

Mr. HEPBURN. The Commission has an auditor here in the city of Washington and one on the Isthmus.

Mr. ALEXANDER. And distinct from any Department?

Mr. HEPBURN. That is my understanding. These expenditures are not made through a Department, excepting as the President makes them. The authority for the construction of this work is given to him, and the responsibility imposed upon him.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Then these accounts do not go regularly to any Department, but go to a board that has been or is yet to be created to be audited?

Mr. HEPBURN. It goes to an auditor already appointed and already performing that duty, as I understand. The gentleman will find that his name is signed here—E. S. Benson, general auditor.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa what valuation was originally placed upon the machinery and equipment of the railroad when this bargain was made with the French Government, if he can tell us?

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, it is a long time since I was familiar with those estimates. I think the estimated value of the stock of the railway was something in excess of $7,000,000.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I am speaking of the equipment.

Mr. HEPBURN. The other material I can not now from memory state.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. As a matter of fact, was it not represented that this machinery was valuable?

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. And that the equipment was of such a character as would enable us to utilize it in the construction of this work?

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, utilize it to a considerable extent; yes.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. But it now turns out to be practically all valueless?

Mr. HEPBURN. I think that is the conclusion that most people have arrived at.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that detailed statements of the expenditures hereafter made shall be submitted to Congress. Is it the intention that the statements submitted shall be in the same form as the statement which appears in to-day's RECORD as to those already made?

Mr. HEPBURN. I have no knowledge that I can impart to the gentleman on that subject.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask the gentleman for this reason: It is impossible to tell for what purpose any amount stated here has been expended, except as stated under a general head. It is reported quite commonly, I understand, that this Commission to-day is employing a so-called "press agent," located in this city, at a salary of $10,000 a year. It may be a very necessary position, but how could Congress ascertain if a thing like that was so; and if it be a fact and it was deemed improper, how could Congress prevent it?

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, this statement to which the gentleman refers as being in the RECORD does not assume to be a detailed statement. That is a mere summary. I suppose that a detailed statement would be a very different matter, and if I were called upon to perform that duty and had to define that word I would think that a very much fuller statement than the one that we have before us would be required by the language of the third section of this act.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I had hoped that the gentleman himself would have insisted upon some such detailed statement for the information of this House before he asked for this appropriation of $16,000,000, so that the House could be informed of the particular items which make up the summary; and I now ask the gentleman if he knows whether it is a fact that this Commission has employed in this city a so-called "press agent" at a salary of $10,000 a year?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Could the gentleman think that that was a necessary and proper expenditure by this Commission?

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, I would not think that a personage of that kind would equal in usefulness an Irishman who could well wield a shovel. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. That may be quite interesting to the House, but it is hardly a good defense of an appropriation of $10,000 for such a purpose in any department of this Government. Everybody desires that this canal be built properly, and I am convinced the gentleman from Iowa wishes the money properly expended, and I believe that with his power of acquiring information it seems strange that this slight detail should escape his keen observation.

Mr. HEPBURN. Why, Mr. Chairman, the duty of the gentleman from Iowa to obtain information upon the very interesting subject that the gentleman from New York has referred to is no greater than the obligation to secure that information which rests upon the gentleman from New York; and as long as he has started in that direction, as long as he has given ear to rumor of that kind and knows where probably to put his finger upon those who know, why did the gentleman not pursue it? Why does he come here and attempt to encumber this debate and give a partisan aspect——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all.

Mr. HEPBURN. To this debate by a query of that kind? The gentleman knows who to ask; he knows he has authority here as a Member of this House to bring a response to a question of that kind.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HEPBURN. There is something in the nature of a charge of misappropriation of funds——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all.

Mr. HEPBURN. Toward some one responsible for the distribution of those funds in the query that the gentleman has made. Why did not you, sir, exercise your right and learn the facts and bring home the charge to the man who misappropriated the funds of this nation if this is a misappropriation? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield; yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to think that perhaps my colleague from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was correct in suggesting that some other committee than the gentleman's should have taken jurisdiction of this matter. Whom else would I ask for information regarding the items making up these summaries of expenditures when an appropriation of $16,000,000 is asked of this House other than the gentleman who comes here and submits the statement printed in the RECORD in order to obtain from this House the appropriation? I am reliably informed, not alone taking my information from the newspapers of the cities, but from other reliable sources [laughter on the Republican side], that there is a gentleman sitting in an office in this city, a gentleman appointed by this Commission, whose title, so far as can be ascertained, is that of "press agent"——

Mr. HEPBURN. Who is he; what is his name?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know his name.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, yet you are "reliably informed."

Mr. FITZGERALD. If I did I would not have asked the gentleman. But I understand that this gentleman's sole business is to distribute information——

Mr. HEPBURN. I never heard of it before; that is the difference between the gentleman and myself.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If it be true that this Commission is paying $10,000 a year to a gentleman for such services, it does not seem to me to be a proper use of this money. I am not seeking this information for a partisan purpose; I am asking the gentleman to act with me to have this money properly expended.

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, I will go just as far as the gentleman in reprobation if such a condition exists. I do not believe that is a proper appropriation of this money if it has been made. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am not a friend of that kind of expenditure, but I know nothing of it, as I told the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; the gentleman abused me because I tried to find out if he knew it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Abused you? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes, or attempted to; and the gentleman attempted to put me in the position of making political capital out of this matter.

Mr. HEPBURN. No, I did not try anything of that kind. I thought the gentleman probably had placed himself in that position.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all. The gentleman from New York will not be misunderstood when he tries to make political capital out of anything; he will be able to make his position very plain. There is an item here to which I desired to call the attention of the gentleman, namely, estimated expenditures for October and November, 1905, at Washington, salaries and wages, $30,000 for each month. It was to ascertain whether those items included provision for such an officer as I have mentioned that I started to interrogate the gentleman. I will ask the Commission within a day or two myself and see if they know more about it than the gentleman who asks for the appropriation.

Mr. HEPBURN. They certainly know more about it. Of course they know more about it; and I am only surprised that the gentleman from New York should have waited to be instructed by me in this manner with regard to who would know most about this business, the men who attend to it or the men who only occasionally have their attention called to it.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] yield to me for an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED]?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. OLMSTED. I desire to ask, Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can tell us as to the item entitled "Estimated expenditures for October and November, 1905," at Washington, "Material and supplies, $559,000?"

Mr. HEPBURN. I suppose that those are purchases that are made by the purchasing agent located at Washington.

Mr. OLMSTED. Not for use at Washington?

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, no, sir.

Mr. OLMSTED. I would like to ask one or two further questions, with the gentleman's permission.

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. OLMSTED. I notice the item "Estimated miscellaneous material purchases in the United States" down at the right-hand column on page 40 of the RECORD, $2,300,000. And then above that the first item is $4,000,000. Are we to infer from

the fact that one item is to be expended in the United States that the $4,000,000 item is to be expended elsewhere?

Mr. HEPBURN. The first item, if the gentleman will notice, is "Estimated liabilities to December 1, 1905, covering material ordered and in transit." The other item is "Estimated miscellaneous material purchases in the United States from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906." That is property, as I understand it, not yet delivered, but to be delivered and paid for in the interim between December 1 and June 30.

Mr. OLMSTED. My inquiry was directed more particularly—it may not be within the information of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—as to whether the $4,000,000 item was for material purchases in the United States.

Mr. HEPBURN. I presume so; yes, sir. I think that is true.

Mr. OLMSTED. I would like to ask one or two further questions. Can the chairman state what proportion of the capital stock of the Panama Railway Company is now owned by the United States?

Mr. HEPBURN. It is all owned by the United States.

Mr. OLMSTED. And then the items numbered 4, 5, and 6, aggregating $1,800,000, we are really paying to ourselves?

Mr. HEPBURN. Items 5 and 6. They are for improvements to our own property. That road was found to be in quite a dilapidated condition. The rails were light and had been in use for a long time. The locomotives and cars were old and insufficient in number. The track is being relaid, and a large amount of the necessary equipment is being procured.

Mr. OLMSTED. I wish to make a further inquiry, without any reflection upon the chairman or his committee, or upon anybody else, and that is whether in these days when we are insisting upon greater publicity in the affairs of corporations—and recent events have shown its importance—whether he thinks that in a matter involving so large an expediture of money as we are now called upon to make we are not entitled to a fuller detailed statement of the expenditures already made than is herein contained?

I might take up time by calling attention to numerous items, but I will simply refer to the one on the bottom of the left-hand column of page 40 of the RECORD, which is merely illustrative of the lumping together of a good many items in other particulars, which is this: "Freight, advertising, etc., $144,085.23." Now, that seems to me to be a very incongruous grouping of items. How much of it was for freight, and how much of it was for advertising? It gives ground for such suggestions as have been made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], that there might be something covered up here that ought not to be covered. I do not charge that there is, I do not suppose that there is, but I think we ought to have from the proper department a detailed statement of these expenditures, so that we may know more fully in what direction the money has been used.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have no doubt at all that there is a complete statement in detail attached to the annual report the gentleman has in his mind. I am told that is the case.

Mr. OLMSTED. Ought not the House to have that information in passing upon this important matter?

Mr. HEPBURN. That is a question for the House to determine. This amount is due in a little while, and we do not want to make two bites of a cherry.

Mr. OLMSTED. I am going to support your bill under all the circumstances of the case, but I am not at all satisfied with the manner in which previous expenditures are accounted for in the only statement thus far submitted to the House, and I am making these remarks in the hope that they may lead to a better accounting hereafter of the money we are now asked to appropriate in what appears to be a pressing emergency.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, to lay the foundation for the question which I wish to ask, I will say that I understand that there is a very critical condition down on the Isthmus now. There is very little money left, and we will not be able to meet out of the appropriation their labor-roll obligations on the 15th day of December. We all want to give to the Canal Commission all that is necessary to continue the work without cessation. I know the character of colored labor, and I know that if some day, some Saturday evening, they do not receive pay—they are a suspicious lot of creatures and might come to the conclusion that the whole United States was bankrupt and a bad employer of labor, might move away. Now, the question I want to get at after laying this foundation is, Can the gentleman give the House some idea of the amount of money that will be absolutely necessary in order to carry on the work up to January 1 and meet the payments necessary to be met on the 1st day of January; because I propose to speak out perfectly frankly and say—and an explanation might help elucidate that question—that I propose later to offer an amendment reducing the amount which this bill carries to the amount absolutely necessary to carry on the work without stoppage or cessation beyond the 1st day of January, and thus let the balance of the money contemplated to be appropriated by this bill to come in its regular order under consideration and investigation by the committee, and, after scrutiny, a regular report by the committee to the House. So that I ask the gentleman to give me some idea, if he can, of the amount of money necessary to meet the urgent expenditures that must be met for labor and for machinery to be paid for, that are due now or will be on or before the 1st day of January.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have no information that would allow me to state that. I will say this: I find that there is an estimate for October of $1,005,000; for November of $887,000. December, I understand, would be in excess of either of those months, for the reason that there is a constantly increasing number of employees, and that it would probably be something in excess of the estimate for October. Now, what there is carried for machinery furnished I am unable to say; but I understand that these sums amount to somewhere in excess of $2,000,000.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Does not the estimate show——

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman from Maine will permit me to conclude. I find here under the head of estimates and expenditures for October and November the sum of $1,892,000, and if there were added to that a proportionate amount for the month of December, which would carry the work up to and beyond the 1st of January, until the mid-January payments on the 15th, the pro rata share of December, $600,000, would run the total now required to $2,400,000. I have concluded that $2,500,000 would cover all the expenditures for October, November, and December.

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman is in error. If he will read a little further, the first item in the detailed statement composing the appropriation of $16,500,000, just below where his eye has rested, he will find this: "Estimated liabilities to December 1, 1905, covering material ordered and in transit, $4,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. That, however, is an estimate.

Mr. HEPBURN. No, sir; a liability to December 1, 1905.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Already incurred?

Mr. HEPBURN. A liability already incurred for property.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the gentleman is of the opinion that $4,000,000 would cover that?

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, I do not know that I am at all sure of that. That is an item that is due December 1.

Mr. TAWNEY. That does not include labor?

Mr. HEPBURN. No.

Mr. PAYNE. Look at No. 3.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then there is another item, the gentleman will notice, of $500,000. It is the fifth item in the estimate. Then there is another, the sixth item, amount due the Panama Railway Company December 1.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask the gentleman, then, for my information and for the use of the House, to get the Canal Commission to give us an estimate of that sort, roughly, to come in to-day or to-morrow. I do not mean a detailed statement, but just the amount of money that they think will be necessary to run the work up to and including payments necessary to be made on January 1.

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman can get that information just as readily as I can.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman overestimates my weight with the Commission and underestimates his own. A request from the gentleman will be answered at once, and a request from me probably would not be.

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, I must say this, that I do not know anyone on that Commission, and I have never been in the rooms of the Commission since its reorganization.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I notice, on page 40, "purchase of steamers *Havana* and *Mexico*, $1,300,000." That is a rather large item. Will the chairman give us any information as to the need for the purchase of those steamers and the purposes for which they are used? I take it they are purchased for the transportation of freight. I wanted to find out whether it would not have been better to do that work by contract.

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, I do not know. This is the method that has been adopted by the Commission.

When the United States became the owner of the Panama Railway, they found that that corporation was engaged in the carrying of freight and passengers between New York and Colon. They were the owners of three steamers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They were a part of the Panama Railway Company's property.

Mr. HEPBURN. A part of the railroad. That business, as

I understand it, has been continued. In fact, it was the only regular means of communication between those two cities. There seems to be a public necessity for a continuance of it, and that there would have been a great derangement of large business interests in our coastwise trade if it had not been continued. When the new work began, and the assembling of new material, it was found that these three steamers were insufficient to carry on the business of the Government and this other service, so that in their judgment these two additional steamers were necessary and they were purchased, and are now engaged in that traffic at no expense, as I understand, to the United States, but with some profit to the United States and great convenience to the shipping public.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understand that these steamers owned by the United States are now engaged in the carrying of freight and passengers for hire from Colon to New York.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is my understanding.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I did not know that before.

Mr. WANGER. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. WANGER. As I remember the explanation of the purchase of the steamers *Havana* and *Mexico*, it was that the old steamers of the Panama Railway Steamship Company were not able to carry the larger machinery and supplies necessary on the Isthmus. These two steamers have very large hatchways and are in every respect the best adapted for shipping the necessary materials for the construction of the canal and reconstruction of the railway that the Commission could discover, and it was in order promptly to ship the materials which the Commission, and the railway company through the Commission, required that the two steamers were acquired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Are they being operated as part of the Canal Commission or part of the railroad corporation?

Mr. WANGER. The steamers are being run by the Panama Railway Steamship Company under an arrangement with the Commission. The Commission has purchased the steamers, as I understand it, and leased them to the steamship company.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Do we own the transportation company also?

Mr. WANGER. We own the transportation company also.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Then it is all the same thing?

Mr. WANGER. Largely a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. There is the Panama Railway and then the Panama Transportation Company besides?

Mr. WANGER. The Panama Railway operates the steamship company.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Then there is no independent company, but the whole thing is operated by the railway company?

Mr. WANGER. Yes.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. And we own all the stock?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes; we control the Panama Railway Company.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Does the gentleman know whether they are American or foreign bottoms?

Mr. WANGER. American bottoms, built in Cramp's shipyard.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the third section of the bill reads "Detailed statement of the expenditures from this and subsequent appropriations for the construction of the Isthmian Canal shall be made annually to Congress at the beginning of each regular session." On page 40, second column, there is printed what purports to be a detailed statement of the amount composing the appropriation of $16,500,000. It seems to me that that statement does not go into details as fully as the similar statement printed in the previous column. I submit that if that is the kind of detailed statement that is to be presented under this bill it would be exceedingly unsatisfactory to this House.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would think so, too, and that is what the gentlemen preparing it think, for when they have given us a summary of the expenditures, they have given it to us in much greater detail than when they have given us a statement of the payments covered by the appropriations asked for. In that instance they simply state them generally, while in the other they go more into detail.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does not the gentleman from Iowa think it would improve that section if we were to insert after the word "detailed" the words "and classified," so that it would read "detailed and classified statement?" Then they would not include in that statement salaries, incidental expenses, and things of that kind, all running in under one item.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The gentleman means to segregate the classes.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman wants it more complete, let it be itemized.

Mr. TAWNEY. That might be too cumbersome.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then let it be itemized for sums above a given amount.

Mr. TAWNEY. I think that if it was a detailed and classified statement it would be better.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Insert the word "itemized."

Mr. LITTAUER. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the words of the act are the same as the ordinary provisions of law covering the Department, and no doubt the expenditures will be detailed to us in a manner similar to other expenditures of the War Department. They are submitted to us with their regular annual estimates; they are both classified and detailed, and you can go into every little item if you so desire. They give a general table of classifications.

Mr. TAWNEY. Inasmuch as this is under no Department I do not think it would do any harm to put in the words "detailed and classified."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the first section of this bill is merely intended, as I understand it, to change the character of the bonds issued so that we may have a bond which will float at par owing to the diminished rate of taxation upon it. To that clause of the bill I have no objection. I want to give the House notice now of certain amendments which will be offered to the bill. I want them in the RECORD so that Members of the House may be studying them and may be able to pass upon them when we finally get to the stage of amendment, when the bill is read under the five-minute rule. This is a nonpartisan question. We are engaged in the construction of a great waterway connection between the two great oceans of the world. No part of the United States will be any more benefited by the completion of that work than that section in which I dwell. It has been a dream of southerners for years and years. No party can claim credit for first advocating a transisthmian canal. No individual can claim any preeminent credit for it. It has been pushed upon legislators because it was one of the foremost things in the minds and hearts of the people. In this great undertaking two things should be kept in mind as nearly as possible; first, a speedy construction of the work, and secondly, an honest expenditure of the money.

The strip which the United States owns down about the Isthmus of Panama has made itself celebrated for two apparently antagonistic characteristics—suddenness and gradualness. The suddenness with which it was acquired, the suddenness with which the money already appropriated has been expended, the gradualness with which the actual dirt is being actually moved. [Laughter.] The American people, above all things, should not be rendered dissatisfied and disgusted with that work. They wish to see it succeed. Our hearts are in it, and we wish to see it succeed; but we wish that all legislation should be of the right character.

Therefore it has seemed to me that to meet a peculiar condition of a critical character this rather unusual procedure ought to be taken by the American House of Representatives. It has not seemed to me, Mr. Chairman, that all of the provisions of this bill should be enacted into law. To some of those I propose now to call attention, and likewise to the amendments which will be offered at the proper time.

Section 2 reads as follows:

> That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $16,500,000 to continue the construction of the isthmian canal, to be expended under the direction of the President in accordance with the said act, etc.

Mr. Chairman, when the proper time comes I am going to offer an amendment to strike out the word "sixteen," in line 3, on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof whatever sum I ascertain to be sufficient to carry on the work beyond the payments to be made upon the 1st day of January, because after that—certainly before the payments to be made for mid-January or the payments to be made for the last of January—the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have been appointed and will have had ample opportunity to act. What sum I shall propose I do not myself now know. It seems to me from reading over this statement that the sum of $5,000,000 would cover all that would be necessary by that time, including the payments to be made on January 1, and would leave a margin of something over; but whatever the amount may be I shall move to insert that amount in lieu of the sixteen millions herein provided for.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. In the estimate which the gentleman wishes to make of the amount that may be needed at once under his proposition, does he expect to include the amounts for material

and supplies purchased or simply the amount for salaries and labor?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amount for salaries and labor and the amounts for materials and supplies already purchased which will fall due on January 1 or before that date—everything that is absolutely necessary.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me a word, it is very difficult to tell exactly when a bill shall be paid. Most of the supplies are purchased in the United States. I only state this for the gentleman's benefit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, and they ought to be paid for in cash with a discount.

Mr. MANN. Most of the supplies, as I say, are purchased in the United States. They are not paid for until shipped to the Isthmus.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly not.

Mr. MANN. And an acknowledgment made here when they arrive at the Isthmus. Of course it is desirable to pay them here as soon as the receipt is acknowledged in proper form.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that—as soon as the goods are delivered. Then that is a cash payment, and the purchaser is entitled under ordinary business methods to a discount from the bills.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me further, as to the sum estimated which is submitted, up to December 1, for materials and supplies purchased and in transit there are $4,000,000 of liabilities. Of course probably all of that should be paid by the 1st of January, because it will become due as soon as an acknowledgment is received here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have thought that, and for that reason included that amount.

Mr. MANN. Now, there will be probably several million dollars more on that basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There ought not to be after the Commission are informed by Congress of the fact that before any other appropriation is made, it must be considered by a committee. I presume that they have bought the bulk of their machinery now for future delivery. A great deal of it will be delivered by the 1st of December, and some of it by the 1st of January; but I presume that January would not carry over its proportionate share of that particular item.

Mr. MANN. Of course, they have purchased a very large amount of their machinery and implements, etc., and are urging speedy delivery. There is no question about their authority to make the purchase.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course not.

Mr. MANN. Of course, all they absolutely need, as far as that part of it is concerned, is enough to pay their salaries, their wages, and their bills as they become due.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is all.

Mr. MANN. That, of course, we want to get at.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And in getting at that, I expect to find the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who has a much better faculty of getting at financial details than I have—I am not much of a business man—of very material assistance, and I shall invite his cooperation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I find in section 2, beginning on line 10, the following language:

Provided, That all expenditures from the appropriation herein made shall be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds authorized in section 8 of the said act approved June 28, 1902.

When we reach that in due course of legislation I shall move to strike out the proviso, and for this reason: There are now lying in the national banks of the United States on deposit and virtually on loan without being required to pay a dollar's interest to the United States Treasury something like forty-odd million dollars. I do not know precisely what it is, but it was fifty-odd millions not long ago and not much decreased now. I do not see why the people of the United States should be taxed to float a bond at 2 per cent when there are lying in the Treasury nominally but really in the national banks on loan three times that amount, more than three times that amount, probably, of the people's money which is not paying to the people one dollar of interest. It is always foolish to borrow money when one has money in bank. At the last Congress this House took the position that the deposits in the national banks ought to pay interest to the Federal Governmen, and tacked upon a bill then pending an amendment with that intent. The bill went to the Senate, or wherever it went. At any rate it has never been heard of any more. It seems that the interests which were desirous of procuring these further deposits from the United States Government were not anxious enough for further deposits to be willing to pay interest upon those deposits or upon those which they already had. If the proposed amendment to strike out that proviso shall be voted down by the House, then I shall offer another amendment, to which I wish to call your attention, and in order that you may understand it I will read the language of the amendment proposed and I will compare the language of that proviso with the language of the original act to which this act is supplemental. The proviso reads:

Provided, That all expenditures from the appropriation herein made *shall* be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds authorized, etc.

I shall move, if the motion to strike out the entire proviso is voted down, to strike out the word "shall" and substitute in its stead the language, "may in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury," so that it shall read:

Provided, That all expenditures from the appropriation herein made may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds authorized, etc.

Mr. MANN. Of course I know the gentleman has no intention of misleading the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, indeed.

Mr. MANN. But the House may think that language in regard to reimbursement was in the original act.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; I am just now going to call attention to the language of the original act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in reenforcement of the wisdom and the expediency of passing these two amendments, especially the one striking out the entire proviso, I will read the language of the original act. It may not impress you at first blush, but this act makes mandatory what the original act makes discretionary.

Section 8 of the original act read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to borrow on the credit of the United States from time to time, as the proceeds may be required, moneys to defray the expenditures, etc.

It says "to borrow on the credit of the United States from time to time, *as the proceeds may be required.*" It was not made mandatory that he should do it. He was left at liberty to do it, and then to borrow it only from time to time, "as the proceeds might be required." Now, Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the fact that the yellow streak in a gentleman is always the fear of being called or considered a demagogue, and I am aware of the fact that very frequently people will not push forward good legislation because they are afraid of that sort of charge. I have nothing in the world against national banks or against any corporation doing business lawfully under the laws of the United States. Even when I do not consider the laws themselves wise, I have nothing against those who avail themselves of the status of the laws to do business in an honest manner; but I do think that when every State in the American Union, as far as I know, makes it a point that for its moneys on deposit in banks it shall be paid interest—some of them the interest offered by the highest bidder who gives absolutely good security; some of them in depositories selected otherwise, but paying the rate of interest fixed by law—it is an abuse to lend fifty millions of the people's money (at one time very much more than that, but somewhat less another year) to people who are not necessitous people, not poor people, but to people who do not need it, without the payment of one dollar of interest. Some time ago we were all up in arms at the socialistic scheme of depositing in warehouses cotton, tobacco, corn, and wheat and giving a loan of 80 per cent of their value to the producers at 2 per cent interest. And now, every year, with the evil uncured and seemingly incurable, we lend money to the bankers of the country, and not only to the bankers of the country, but to a special class of bankers of the country—no State bank being allowed to come into this favored pool—whatever money we have, and when we need money to be expended for the very best possible purposes—to increase the commercial facilities of the Union, as this canal will, or to accomplish any other great purpose—everybody says at once, especially those who are afraid of being considered demagogues or of being considered as in an attitude of "making an attack upon vested interests" or something of that sort, that we must let the national banks and the money in the national banks alone, as if that money is not our money. I say that it is our money. We have a right to draw it out on our checks, just as I draw out my money on my check upon the Riggs Bank for the small amount I have on deposit there.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit me to make an inquiry of him? A number of gentlemen desire to know about how long this debate will last. I would like to know of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] about what time he thinks will be necessary?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I frankly confess to the gentleman from

Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] that I myself have no idea in regard to that. The matter has been sprung suddenly. Nobody upon my side of this House has thus far asked me for any time. I suggest that the debate go on with the agreement that the previous question will not be called to-day, at any rate, and then to-morrow maybe we can arrive at some understanding.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have no objection to that. All I wanted to know was whether probably to-day would be consumed by general debate. Does the gentleman think it will?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; it will take all of to-day, I think.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having dwelt upon that matter sufficiently for the purposes which I now have in view, I want to call attention to another thing.

Section 3 of this bill reads:

That a detailed statement of the expenditures from this and subsequent appropriations for the construction of the isthmian canal shall be made annually to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has suggested to me an amendment which I think is a good one, and which I think ought to be added to the bill. You will notice that all that is provided for here is for a detailed statement of money already spent. There is not to be a detailed statement of estimates submitted to the Congress of the United States beforehand, to be passed upon, just as there are detailed estimates for the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, detailed estimates for the Army, detailed estimates for the Navy, and all other work of the Government.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. In the last Congress the House passed a bill in reference to the Panama Canal covering a number of questions of the same sort which the gentleman has now suggested. That bill failed. The House and Senate conferees could not agree with reference to the abolition of the Isthmian Canal Commission. I say to the gentleman frankly, there is no question that not only should the Isthmian Canal Commission or the proper department make an estimate for expenditures, but there are a number of other details of that sort which ought to be provided for by law, and that matter will be brought out and called to the attention of the House undoubtedly at this session of Congress, and, I think, will become a law. All of those questions can not be very well covered in this emergency bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I differ in that regard——

Mr. MANN. I will say that I simply wished to explain to the gentleman. I think the gentleman himself will say that on a matter pushed into the House in this way, because of an emergency as to money, there ought to be fuller latitude given with reference to the necessary legislation, and there is necessity for legislation along several lines in that direction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the weight of the objection the gentleman makes, and I would not attempt to make this bill a long, cumbersome, detailed bill, correcting *all* the evils in connection with the operation of the Commissioners' work; but when I find a clause of the character which I have just read, providing for detailed statements of expenditures already made, it will require very little time from this House to adopt, and it will require no degree of previous committee training to prepare a needful and wise amendment. These are the words of the amendment which I wish to add to the bill: "And at the same time there shall be submitted to Congress a detailed statement and classified estimate of all moneys required for the next ensuing fiscal year." That is only one sentence. It is in strict analogy with all the work of Congress, and it is necessary in order that Congressmen may understand what they are doing when they make appropriations. It is time honored in our manner of carrying on the government. There is no reason why there should be any exception made in this particular case. On the contrary, this is entirely a matter of engineering and of exact mathematics, and they can more nearly make accurate estimates than can be made, for instance, by the Agricultural Department or the Department of Commerce and Labor. I wanted merely to say that. Now, in conclusion——

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. On this point that the gentleman now refers to, the gentleman will pardon me. The proposition which the gentleman makes may not cover all the case. It is quite a difficult thing to get this into a detailed statement of this sort. We now own the Panama Railroad and are operating it both in connection with the canal and as a commercial enterprise. Now the question would arise, as affecting the railroad company, as to whether they shall be required to make their amount of detailed statement which they can not exceed in this commercial business and if an appropriation is made, or whether they shall be permitted under certain restrictions to use their income, because it is a commercial purpose to carry on this road; and it is not a simple thing to answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not want to mix up this; I take it for granted that the Panama Railroad is making a profit; if it is not, it is very lately that they have got on the other side of the ledger.

Mr. MANN. It is difficult to tell whether it is making a profit or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has been one of the most paying properties in the world.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly the commercial property is profitable, but being used in connection with the work of the Commission it would not be easy to segregate the items.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This amendment will not ask anything about that. I do not desire to mix this with the railroad business, and if the gentleman thinks that makes it apply to that, why he can offer any amendment which will cure that and it would be acceptable. The amendment is much easier to consider, and it requires much less labor to consider a simple amendment of this sort to this bill than to consider the bill itself. While I do not want to complicate matters, these various amendments I have suggested are proposed to be offered by me, and one of them by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] at the proper time, and I have taken the floor simply for the purpose of giving notice of them.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the House upon the fact that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] agrees with me, and agrees with all right-thinking men, that if there be an appropriation of $10,000 a year for the purpose of paying the salary of a press agent it is a "misappropriation of public funds," to use the language of the gentleman from Iowa.

I am glad, also, to learn if it shall be determined that there is a misappropriation of public funds of that description he will stand with us in refusing to pay the amount. Whether there be or whether there be not I do not myself know. In fact, I never heard of the matter in connection with the Canal Commission until this morning, and I wish here to say that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], having confessed that a payment of that sort, if there be one—an allowance of that sort, if there be one—is "a misappropriation of public funds," he can not in the same breath charge the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] with acting "as a partisan" when he inquires about the fact. Certainly Republicans are just as much in favor of stopping misappropriations of public funds as the Democrats are; certainly Republicans are just as much in favor of the honest expenditure, the lawful expenditure, of public money and as much opposed to its unlawful expenditure as Democrats are, and certainly a Democrat is not to be arraigned for partisanship when he calls attention to a question of that sort. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. There are two employees of the canal who receive each a salary of $10,000 a year. One is Mr. Ross, the purchasing agent in the United States. I do not think that he has anything to do with press agencies. One is Mr. Bishop, the secretary of the Commission. Whether, in addition to his other duties as secretary, he is press agent for the Commission I am not informed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Neither am I, frankly.

Mr. MANN. Certainly that is not his duty, but those are the only two employees receiving salaries of $10,000, and the Commission has no press agent employed at any salary whatever.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the course of this debate we wish to hear from the Commission upon that question, and I have no doubt they will communicate with us without being further urged thereto. They ought to.

Mr. MANN. We have a list of salaries here, and those are the only two employees receiving that salary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand there is what is known as a publicity department. The name is a little sweeter, but the duties, I think, of the gentleman in charge of it would correspond to the designation which I gave it. Whatever that gentleman's nominal duties may be, his chief duties have been to distribute information about the work of this Commission to the representatives of the press in this city.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that I have no doubt the secretary of the Commission does distribute information.

The only objection which I might make is that he does not distribute enough. He certainly has not distributed enough to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question before he yields the floor. Some months ago there was considerable talk in the press about open competition between the United States and foreign countries in supplying the machinery, supplies, etc., used in the construction of this canal. Can the gentleman inform the House to what extent machinery and supplies have been bought in open competition, and to what extent they have not, and what the line of procedure now is in that respect?

Mr. MANN. My impression is that there is open competition. As a matter of fact, nearly all of the modern machinery for the class of work which is done on the Isthmus is made in the United States. For instance, in the purchase from the French company we purchased a large number of French excavators. Our engineers have determined after experience that it is considerably cheaper for us to purchase new American excavators than it is to use the French excavators, because the reduction in the cost of excavation will much more than pay for the cost of the new machinery.

The CHAIRMAN. If no other gentleman desires to further debate the bill the Chair will direct that it be read by section under the five-minute rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I find that nobody on this side of the Chamber desires to participate in general debate at this moment. I suppose we shall have to go into the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule. I understand that was the gentleman's proposition. I was in the cloakroom at the time.

Mr. HEPBURN. No; it was not my proposition. I asked the gentleman from Mississippi whether he thought that the debate would occupy to-day, and I understood him to say that that was his opinion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was.

Mr. HEPBURN. I made that inquiry because there were a number of gentlemen here who said they wanted to be present when the bill was being read by sections, but did not care to remain during the general debate. A large number of them have left the hall.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not know, for no one spoke to me about it, but I thought there would be enough Members who wanted to talk upon the bill to occupy the day. I find no one on this side who cares to take part in the general debate, and I suggest now to the gentleman from Iowa that instead of going into a reading of the bill under the five-minute rule this evening, that we let the bill stand aside for the present and take it up in the morning when the Members are here who want to be present when the bill is read under the five-minute rule. I think it would not be right to take it up now after these people are gone.

Mr. HEPBURN. There are gentlemen on this side who desire to address the committee.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have no special word to the House on this subject, and I hardly think it is necessary at all, after the very exhaustive discussion of the subject by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] for me to even say a word. But I have had occasion, as well as I could for the last week or so, to look into the various items which go to make up the expenditures of the past and the estimates for the current fiscal year. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has given us notice that he would offer an amendment to reduce the amount of the appropriation. It is undoubtedly true that we might appropriate $1,000,000 and probably get along in a way until a deficiency bill could be reported and passed. It is true that we might appropriate $5,000,000 or $10,000,000, but there is no doubt that there will be required before the end of the fiscal year the amount proposed in this bill. It will not surprise me if the amount shall be increased before the end of the fiscal year. We are in this position, that the more money the Commission asks for which it can appropriately expend at this time the better pleased we are, because the faster the work progresses the sooner we will realize upon our total expenses.

We are purchasing large quantities of the implements for carrying on the work. There were $4,000,000 due on the 1st day of December for materials purchased. There will probably be three or four million dollars more due by the 1st day of January for materials purchased. These materials are to carry on the work. We buy new excavators, in addition to building the houses for the care of the laborers and the sanitary work. We not only have to buy new excavators, but to lay new railroad tracks; we reequip entirely the work in the canal in the way of new rails, new cars, new engines.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. CLAYTON. I want to ask the gentleman, as a matter of information, whether or not the work of the construction of the canal—that is, the excavation of the earth—has been begun?

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that the work of the excavation of the canal has never been discontinued. The new French company were carrying on the excavation of the canal when we purchased it. Their forces, instead of being disintegrated upon our taking control of the canal, were kept at work, and while the amount of expenditure for excavation has not been large in the total amount of expenditure, there has been expended for excavation work itself in the neighborhood of a million dollars or more to date.

Mr. CLAYTON. Will the gentleman tell me, if he knows, how much of the proposed appropriation mentioned in the pending bill will be used in the actual work toward the construction of the canal—not for the purchase of material, but in the actual work?

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman mean, by "actual work," digging?

Mr. CLAYTON. Digging—excavation of earth; yes.

Mr. MANN. That would probably be carried in the item in reference to the isthmian pay roll. The estimated isthmian pay roll—that is, the pay roll on the Isthmus from December 1 to June 30 next—is $4,875,000.

Mr. CLAYTON. And the balance of it will be expended for preliminaries to the work?

Mr. MANN. The balance of it is expended mainly in getting the plant together for the work.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Has the gentleman any more information as to what moneys are needed and what they are going to be expended for than is contained in that statement?

Mr. MANN. Well, I will say to the gentleman, of course I have not other data in reference to what is needed.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman has no other information from the Commission than what is contained in the statement there as to expenditures?

Mr. MANN. Oh, I have discussed the matter with officials of the Commission and with the Secretary of War, and I have been over the matter of this with the auditor of the Commission, who has charge of these bills and knows in reference to the amounts of the bills which are to be paid.

Mr. SHERLEY. The reason I ask the gentleman the question is because the Commission has not seen fit, though they knew in advance that there was going to be need of this money, to give us any real information at all, and if the gentleman has gotten privately from them the information I shall stay here to hear from him, as I should like to hear it, and I believe the House would.

Mr. MANN. I would say to the gentleman that I have not received from the Commission an itemized estimate as to what these items are, and if I had the gentleman would not remain here to hear me, because I would be required, probably, to talk for a week. The gentleman understands very well that there are thousands of items in reference to these supplies.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman also understands that I did not expect that sort of a detailed statement, but I did expect something more explicit than what is given, which he himself nor no other Member has been able to explain.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I am afraid the gentleman has not read the estimate carefully. The estimate is not in terms which can not be readily understood and appreciated. The first item is an estimate of $4,000,000, estimated liabilities to December 1, 1905, covering the material ordered and in transit. I presume the gentleman read that item and said, "Why, there is nothing there to indicate what it is," and then dropped his eyes to the next numbered item; but the item does show what this $4,000,000 does show. "Fuel, $185,000." Now, they are accumulating and have to accumulate on the Isthmus—they have it on the way—a large quantity of coal to operate both their locomotive engines on the railway and their stationary engines in connection with their excavators. I do not know how they could be any more explicit without stating from whom they had purchased and to whom they had paid the money. "Explosives, $45,920." Now, it is true that they might have differentiated that item and said so much for nitroglycerin and so much for dynamite; but the gentleman himself, being nitroglycerin and dynamite, ought not to object to their consolidation in this item. "Household

and office furnishings, $165,773." The item of course covers an immense quantity of articles, for furnishing not only the offices, which is a small item, but for furnishing the buildings both for the white labor and to a certain extent for the colored labor on the Isthmus, which we have to provide. "Lumber and lumber products, $957,061." That item might have been divided. It covers not only lumber for the building of the new buildings and for the repair of the old buildings, but principally, probably, or very largely at least, ties for putting in the new railroad tracks when they are put in, replacing the old railroad tracks, and for double tracking the Panama Railway.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Illinois to answer a while ago, in reply to a question from me, that whatever part of this proposed appropriation of $16,000,000 would be used toward the actual work of excavation of the canal would be embraced in the item numbered 7, $4,875,000, being the total amount of that item, the item reading: "Estimated Isthmus pay rolls, from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, based on estimated pay rolls for November, with increase of 25 per cent from January 1, 1906, on gold rolls and 50 per cent on silver rolls."

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that if I made that statement I was mistaken about that. A portion of that is on other work on the Isthmus, but the bulk of it will probably be on the work of excavation now. It is proposed, I will say to the gentleman, to increase the amount of the common labor 50 per cent after the 1st of January; that is to say, they have what is known as a "silver" pay roll and a "gold" pay roll. The ordinary labor is done principally by negroes from the island of Jamaica. They receive their pay in silver and the white labor receives its pay in gold. The Commission estimate here that from the 1st of January on the railroad they will increase the silver pay roll 50 per cent between January 1 and June 30 and the gold pay roll 25 per cent. Most of that, of course, is in reference to excavation.

Mr. CLAYTON. For labor employed in excavating?

Mr. MANN. For labor employed in excavating.

Mr. CLAYTON. Now, will the gentleman answer me one other question? How much of this item of $4,875,000 is used toward the payment of salaries of officials and the clerical force and help there?

Mr. MANN. Well, I say to the gentleman, not a very large amount.

Mr. CLAYTON. The answer of the gentleman, as I understand it, is that most of that item will go toward the pay of labor used in excavating the canal.

Mr. MANN. For labor used in excavating the canal and in preparation. I say to the gentleman a fair proportion of it will still be used in putting down railroad tracks which they are building there, in sanitation, and in other ways.

Mr. CLAYTON. Now, will the gentleman tell me why there are these two rolls—the gold pay roll and the silver pay roll—and whether or not the pay under one is as much as under the other, and why the difference?

Mr. MANN. The silver pay roll has been the pay roll on the Isthmus always for the ordinary laborers. At the time we went down there silver was the money basis.

Mr. CLAYTON. What is the pay—if I may interrupt the gentleman—of a laborer under the silver pay roll who is engaged in excavating?

Mr. MANN. I am not able to tell the gentleman accurately what the pay is now, but a year ago the silver pay down there was from 15 to 18 cents per hour for ten hours of labor, the 15 cents of silver being worth about 7 cents in gold. I am told by the Commission, or by members in connection with the Commission, that since the eight-hour law went into effect——

Mr. CLAYTON. Of what coinage is that silver?

Mr. MANN. It is Panama money.

Mr. CLAYTON. Now, then, about the gold?

Mr. MANN. The gold pay roll is made up of the higher class of labor, not only the salaries of the officials of the administration, but of the higher class of labor. Practically the silver pays the cheap day labor.

Mr. CLAYTON. In other words, then, the American white people who go down there as officers and the like get their pay in gold, but the Santo Domingo negroes, or whatever negroes who are engaged in this work there as common laborers, get their pay in Panama silver. Do I understand that to be the fact?

Mr. MANN. All of the ordinary cheap labor, the work of real day labor, is paid in silver; the others are paid in gold. The gentleman understands very well some of those paid in gold are paid very well. An engineer in charge of an excavator receives over $2,000 a year in gold.

Mr. CLAYTON. Does the Government of the United States buy Panama silver coined by the Panama Government from Panama and pay it to her laborers?

Mr. MANN. They arrange in some way about exchange there.

Mr. CLAYTON. The gentleman is unable to tell me how that is arranged?

Mr. MANN. Well, I can not tell him how it is arranged now; I believe they were buying it a year ago down there.

Mr. CLAYTON. You do not know what we give the Panama people for their silver, but you do know how much we pay to the laborers?

Mr. MANN. I can not tell you how much we give, because that varies from month to month. We buy it at the market price.

Mr. CLAYTON. We put upon the common laborers there the cheap Panama money, as I understand it?

Mr. MANN. We get our labor there of all classes just as cheaply as we can as a business proposition. If the gentleman desires to pay the cheaper laborers in gold and double their wages, he is permitted to make that proposition.

Mr. CLAYTON. I was making no proposition of the kind; I was simply trying to get information.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman made an observation or I would not have made mine.

Mr. CLAYTON. I simply want information as to how the business of the Government is done there, and I want to understand how these expenditures occur. As the gentleman well knows, this bill has had no hearing before the Committee of the House——

Mr. MANN. Do not let the gentleman think I complain because he wishes information. If I can give him information, it is a pleasure.

Mr. CLAYTON. The gentleman is always kind, and I have heretofore found frequent occasion to refer to the gentleman to be informed on matters that come from his committee, and this does come from his committee.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Illinois is always pleased to help the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CLAYTON. It should come from his committee, but it is a matter, unfortunately for the House, that has not gone to the gentleman's committee, and perhaps all of these questions would have been elucidated had it gone there. I am not complaining of the gentleman, but I am complaining of the action of the House in bringing in this measure and considering it here when it should have been better considered in the committee and all this information then brought out.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will say on that point that I appreciate the fact that there ought to have been an estimate for an appropriation in the sundry civil bill last year. When I was attending to a matter from the committee last winter in reference to the Panama Canal, I ascertained that there was no estimate for an appropriation. I called the attention of a gentleman connected with the Committee on Appropriations to that fact, and was shown a letter from the former Isthmian Canal Commission stating that they did not need an appropriation because they had $130,000,000 of bonds to draw upon. I remarked at that time that it was almost funny that a commission which was appointed had never read the act organizing it, and that under the act creating the Commission they could not expend a dollar until it was appropriated. I also called the attention of the Commission to the fact that it ought to send in an estimate of appropriation last winter, so that the House would have plenty of time in which to consider it in the proper way and in the proper appropriation bill. But the Commission stated that they would not need the money.

Now that Commission has been removed. Since it has been removed and a new Commission appointed, the activity in reference to the canal has very greatly increased and the amount of expenditure has increased, so that while it is true that the gentlemen on the floor of the House have the right to criticise the bringing in of a bill at this time and in this way, still, having that right to criticise, and to feel that it is a subject for criticism, yet they will say as a gentleman very celebrated in the party of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] once said, "This is a condition; not a theory." The gentlemen now connected with the canal have no criticism upon them, and we all want the work to progress.

Now, if I can give any further information to the gentleman it will be a pleasure for me to do so.

Mr. CLAYTON. The gentleman from Illinois has been very kind to answer my questions. The information sought by me has not been obtained very fully, but the gentleman has endeav-

ored as best he could to answer, and I am satisfied. Had his committee had a hearing, he would have been able to answer more fully and more to my satisfaction.

But I desire with the gentleman's permission to ask one more question. I believe that so far we have expended the following amount in this work of building an isthmian canal, namely, $40,000,000 for the purchase of this right from the French Company—that is, for whatever rights it had—and then $10,000,000 to the Panama Government; and then $10,000,000 was appropriated for immediate use for the work on the canal in the last Congress, and now it is proposed to appropriate $16,500,000, if my mathematics be right, making $76,500,000. And I would like to know how much of the work of the canal has been done, and, if the gentleman can tell me, how much, probably, this canal is going to cost us. The gentleman is on that committee and he has had these hearings and he has studied the question, and I would like for my own information some light on the subject of what the eventual expenditure will be, having already spent $76,000,000 in a preliminary way.

Mr. MANN. I would be very glad indeed if I had time to go through with the gentleman some of the troubles which the Commission has met in reference to the type of construction. In my judgment, if the Commission shall proceed with the construction of a canal at a lock level of 85 feet, as proposed by the original preliminary commission, we will build the canal for less than the amount they estimated it would cost, which was $145,000,000, besides the amount we paid to the French Company and Panama. In my judgment, the level of the canal will be changed from an 85-foot level to either a lower lock level or possibly a tide-level canal. I do not think it can be changed to a tide-level canal without the authority of Congress, and there is no authority to indorse or to adopt any project which contemplates an expenditure of more than $145,000,000 from the beginning, exclusive of the amount paid to Panama and the French Company.

They have discovered, up to date, that by the use of new machinery the cost of excavation per unit is considerably less than the amount which was estimated for in the original estimate upon which we entered upon the project. In other words, they have discovered, for instance, that by the aid of compressed-air drills they can accomplish much more work. Gentlemen, understand that this excavated material has to be drilled and exploded. The French company, and we when we commenced, had ordinary hand drills which were used by the Jamaica negroes. They have introduced compressed-air drills, and a portion of the money which we are asking here to appropriate is for the purchase of 14 air compressors, in order to carry on the work of these compressed-air drills, which do the work of drilling at far less expense than can be done by hand. When the material has been exploded it has to be loaded into cars. The French company used a class of excavators much more expensive per unit than the excavators now being used. So that we can load the material into cars at considerably less than the original estimate. Then we are purchasing cars which will carry 40 to 50 tons, while the French company left us little dinkey cars and little dinkey locomotives. We are purchasing locomotives as large as are used in the United States, so that we can carry heavy train loads of the excavated material. The material all has to be carried by rail out of the canal cut and carried off to a distance and unloaded, and the carrying out of the material will be done at less cost per unit than we expected. And unless by lowering the level of the canal, which may be desirable, there be an increase in the amount of excavation, there will be paid for excavation, in my judgment, less than the amount we originally expected.

Now, the gentleman very naturally refers to the fact that after this appropriation shall have been made, if it be made, that $76,000,000 will have been spent or appropriated by the Government and no work done yet, or very little, in the way of excavation. It is much like any other business. If a man proposes to go into the manufacturing business or into the contracting business anywhere the first thing he does is to provide his plant. Very often the plant may cost from 25 to 50 per cent of the total cost of the entire work. Here the cost of the plant will not equal that; but in order to do this work properly and cheaply it is necessary to rebuild all of the railroad track down there. It is necessary to double track the Panama Railroad. It is necessary to put in new engines and new cars and excavators and air compressors. It is necessary to furnish quarters for those people who work there; to provide the plant in order to be prepared to do the work. Now, this is the situation: We have to-day 13,000 names of people on the rolls of the Isthmian Canal Commission down there, and in addition to that 4,000 on the rolls of the railroad company—practically 17,000 men. They estimate probably that 75 to 80 per cent of these men may be at work every day. They are like some other people whom the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] is well acquainted with. They do not report for work every day, and because of the great necessity to have labor on the Isthmus, the labor which is on the Isthmus is very independent. Each man knows that if he does not turn up to-day they will be just as anxious for his services next week, no matter what they tell him about turning up to-morrow; and to a certain extent we have been obliged to put up with that condition. Now, these 17,000 men, just as rapidly as the preliminary work is done, will be transferred to the excavation work—the real work which is to be done—and as that increases we will have before the middle of next year at work on the canal at least 25,000 men.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. MANN. Certainly. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. HINSHAW. Speaking of the character of the labor employed down there, is it a fact or not that the cheap labor of Santo Domingo or Jamaica is practically the only kind of manual labor that can be economically employed?

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska that the Jamaica negro labor, which might include some from Santo Domingo, is practically the only cheap labor which up to date has been worth the pay down there or which has survived the work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. A few minutes ago the gentleman stated that there were two men in this city employed by the Commission at a salary of $10,000 a year—one the purchasing agent and the other the secretary. The purchasing agent is responsible for the purchase of equipments and materials. I understand that that is his work.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman state what are the duties of the secretary?

Mr. MANN. Why, all the duties of the practical administrative officer here in charge of the offices. The chairman of the Commission receives a salary of $30,000 a year. Of course, Mr. Shonts is not practically in local charge of the administrative offices here, although theoretically so. He is engaged upon administrative work for the canal.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What I wish to ascertain is what sort of duties are performed by the secretary of this Commission that have resulted in his compensation being fixed at a larger sum than the salaries of the Cabinet officials who preside over the great Departments of the Government.

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman's position. I believe in meeting a matter of that sort with perfect frankness. The gentleman understands me about that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am asking the gentleman because he has had a great deal to do with this Commission on account of his connection with the committee that has had charge of this legislation pertaining to it; and I assumed that, from the gentleman's necessary visits to the office of this Commission and his investigations, perhaps he knew of some duties or some reason why a salary of this size, which I do not say now is improper, but which I think is very large, is paid to this man.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not able to say whether the gentleman who holds that position is worthy of a salary of $10,000 a year, or of 10,000 cents, or of 10 cents. The man who is secretary of the Commission is practically, by reason of that fact, in control, to a large extent, of the expenditure of money——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I thought there was an auditor.

Mr. MANN. To a certain extent he controls the work of the Commission here. If he does his work properly, as the secretary of a commission like this should do, if he is a man of the proper type, I do not say that this salary is too large. I know of no reason why Mr. Bishop should not be considered the proper man. It seems to me that he might well be worth $10,000. I do not see that we will ever be able to determine in this House, or elsewhere, in a legislative body, with reference to the construction of this canal, with exact nicety, whether one man is receiving a dollar too much or a dollar too little. We never will construct a canal costing us $150,000,000 on that basis. I have no criticism at all of the gentleman——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I agree with the gentleman that it would be impossible for us to determine whether a man is receiving a dollar too much or a dollar too little; but I think we can pretty nearly determine whether an office official, located here in Washington, is receiving thousands of dollars too much or thousands of dollars too little. Now, if this secretary has supervision of all the work of this canal from this city, perhaps he deserves the salary he is getting; but I should like to have

some comprehensive statement from somebody as to just what he does to justify this salary. I am not attempting to embarrass the gentleman from Illinois. I would not do it, because it would be very difficult to do it; but knowing the gentleman's superior information upon matters connected with the canal and the Commission, I thought perhaps he could enlighten the House upon that subject.

Mr. MANN. I think possibly the reason of the salary may be that it was considered necessary that some great man should be selected for this position, and hence they went to the city the gentleman represents, I believe, to secure this secretary. Of course it is not easy to get the best things out of New York, except in Congress, for a less salary than $10,000 a year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will permit me, I was under the impression that the gentleman to whom he refers was located here in Washington when he was selected for this position.

Mr. MANN. I have been informed that he was a New York newspaper correspondent.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Located in Washington.

Mr. MANN. Well, he might be located in Washington, but——

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will permit me, the personality of the individual who occupies the place, in my judgment, has nothing to do with it. The question here is, Are the duties of the office such as to justify a compensation of this size?

Mr. MANN. I say personally, in my judgment, the duties of the office of secretary of the Commission are such that in order to get the best qualified man for the place there ought to be a salary of at least $10,000 for a——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to have the gentleman tell me what he thinks a member of the Cabinet ought to have.

Mr. MANN. I think he ought to get more than $8,000 a year. Does not the gentleman from New York think so?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman one more question.

Mr. MANN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. If it should be eventually determined by Congress or otherwise that this should be a sea-level canal, will the work now being done and the materials purchased have been as economically and judiciously expended as if it had been known in advance just the character of a canal we were to have?

Mr. MANN. The material purchased will be the same in any event, whether it is a sea-level or a lock-level canal. So far as the work which is likely to be done for the next year or two is concerned, and perhaps longer than that, it will make little or no difference in the unit cost of the work whether it is finally a sea-level canal or a lock-level canal, for the reason that the work which is longest to be done, the work which is now being done, is excavating through what they call the Culebra cut, and that material comes out at whatever level the canal may be constructed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the inquiries of my distinguished friend from New York in reference to the secretary are along the line of some items which have appeared in some of the newspapers at times, giving the impression that the men employed by the Commission were receiving exorbitant salaries. I frankly confess to the House that I had the impression myself that probably there had been a tendency to create a great many places at rather high salaries. But upon investigation I do not find that to be the fact, so far as my judgment is concerned. The chairman of the Commission receives a salary of $30,000 a year. That is the largest salary. The engineer in charge receives a salary of $25,000 a year. Governor Magoon, who is one of the Commission, and who is governor of the Canal Zone, and also our diplomatic representative at Panama, receives a salary of $17,500 a year. The other Commissioners receive each a salary of $7,500 a year, but as to three of those a large portion of the salary is cut out on account of their being naval and army officers, and, of course, the salaries are not duplicated. The secretary of the Commission here receives a salary of $10,000. The general auditor receives a salary of $10,000. I said a while ago that there were only two who received salaries of $10,000—there are three. The purchasing agent receives a salary of $10,000. The deputy purchasing agent receives a salary of $6,480, but he is a United States naval officer, and the largest share of his salary comes from the Navy Department as a naval officer.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is, we do not pay out that sum, but his salary is deducted from that sum?

Mr. MANN. He gets a total of $6,480. I can not say whether the Commission pays the total salary or whether he receives from the Commission excess over his naval salary, but he does not receive both; it does not cost the Government any more. Now, take the purchasing agent at San Francisco. He receives $5,076, but $4,076 comes from the Army, and he only receives the additional thousand dollars salary. The man who receives all the supplies on the Isthmus, who has charge of them and the responsibility whether they are received in proper order, and who keeps track of them, stores them in the warehouses, hands them out, gives directions, and takes control of them, received a salary of $6,000. But they had to put in a new man, and they could not get a competent one for less than $9,000. He is undoubtedly worth the amount. The chief sanitary officer on the Isthmus, Colonel Gorgas, gets a salary of $10,000. The chief justice and associate justices get salaries of $6,500 and $6,000, and the superintendent of the hospital gets a salary of $7,000.

The chief quarantine officer receives a salary of $7,000. One of the division engineers receives a salary of $6,000. The assistant chief engineer receives a salary of $15,000. The manager of labor and quarters receives a salary of $7,200. Another division engineer in construction receives a salary of $9,000, and another $7,500. There are a few more salaries, two or three, over $5,000, but of the salaries over $5,000 there are only twenty-six places under the Commission.

Now, that, in my judgment, is not an exorbitant sum or a large list of salaries for this class of work. I doubt whether there is a large corporation in the United States having transactions of such financial magnitude which does not have a salary list of this kind more than twice or three times as large as this.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Illinois in making his statement reads from apparently quite an extended detailed list of officers and salaries. I would suggest the propriety, perhaps, of inserting that in the RECORD for the information of the House, if it relates to details in the bill. Will the gentleman do that?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad, in response to the gentleman, to insert in the RECORD the paper I read from, which purports to give a list of salaries of all of the members and employees of the Commission receiving more than $2,000 per annum, with this addition, namely, a statement from the auditor to the effect that the records have not been kept with the idea of determining salaries above the grade mentioned by myself in my request, and that therefore this report could not be immediately abstracted, but has been especially written for the purpose of replying to that inquiry, and that for that reason it is thought wise to carefully review the list and that that will be done at once when I shall be advised if there have been any errors or omissions made therein.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is, we are to understand that this is a tentative statement and not final.

Mr. MANN. With that explanation I would be glad to insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. A further inquiry. Can we have a detailed statement of the expenditures of the Commission up to December 1, 1905, or not later than June 1, 1905, and if we can not, will the gentleman be kind enough to explain why?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, of course the Isthmian Canal Commission, like all other Departments of the Government, keep their books upon the basis of the fiscal year. It would be a very great expense to prepare a detailed statement of the expenditures from July 1 down to date, or at least a very considerable expense, and it would take considerable time. I asked the Commission to give me that data down to as late a period as they possibly could. Of course they could not give the data down to December 1, because the bulk of the money is paid out on the Isthmus. There is a disbursing officer here and there is a disbursing officer on the Isthmus. There is an auditor here and there is an auditor on the Isthmus. I have what is called "a detailed statement of expenditures" in considerably greater detail than the one which has been printed, down to June 30, covering twelve or fifteen pages, or possibly more, of large legal cap, which, if the gentleman desires, I would be glad to insert in the RECORD, although it only covers a detailed expenditure of $4,000,000.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I would be glad, indeed, to have the gentleman insert it, and I think the House would also. Is the gentleman advised by the Commission whether or not they can give him a similar detailed statement coming down later than June 30, 1905, and, if so, about how far down and about when could we reasonably expect that, so that we can have it published for our general information?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is possible to obtain a detailed statement such as the gentleman wants. It would be possible to obtain any of these items probably separately, but it would not be possible, in my judgment, to obtain a detailed statement by the time that this bill will probably be acted upon in the House.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Well, that may be, of course, to-day or to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. But at any time within the next few weeks is it contemplated by the Commission to give the House a thoroughly detailed statement of the expenditures, as near as may be, up to date—that is, since June 30, 1905?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me in that connection, the Commission, of course, has made an estimate for the next fiscal year. They have to have an appropriation for the ensuing fiscal year. That will come before the House, and I have no doubt that on account of there being plenty of time for that to be acted upon by the Committee on Appropriations the Commission will not only be willing, but will be anxious to furnish to the Committee on Appropriations and to the House a very full and complete detailed, and possibly itemized, statement of expenditures not only up to the present time, but up to the first of the year.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Of course the gentleman is not able to state now how soon we may expect that?

Mr. MANN. I am not able to state that.

Mr. Chairman, the necessity of this appropriation at this time is this: I understood the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to say—and I suppose he had his information—that it was necessary to have this appropriation to meet the pay roll of December 15.

I do not so understand it. The silver pay roll is paid twice a month, and the gold pay roll is paid once a month. There is money enough on hand, as I understand it, to pay the silver pay roll on the 15th of this month, but there is not money sufficient to pay either pay roll on the 1st of January, and the auditor and Commission inform us that it is necessary, in ordinary dispatch of business, to have this appropriation before the 15th in order to place in the disbursing officer's hands at Panama the necessary money by the 1st of January.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. I yield.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. It was stated here a while ago by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that he contemplated introducing an amendment to this bill confining the appropriation to actual necessities that might prove to exist on the 1st of January. Would that be a wise amendment; and if not, why not? I ask purely for information.

Mr. MANN. I was explaining to the committee a while ago when my very distinguished friend from Alabama interrupted me (and I would yield anything for the purpose of carrying on a conversation with him) what this estimate was. The $4,000,000 of the first item is shown in the record to consist of items which are quite fairly itemized. Four million dollars, December 1, for materials which are in transit. The second item of that estimate is $3,350,000, and it shows exactly what it is for. Eleven hundred steel flat cars, a hundred and twenty locomotives, forty-three steam shovels, eighteen unloading plow machines, and other implements of that kind. That machinery is all contracted for——

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. I do not think the gentleman catches my question——

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes, I do.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. How would it embarrass the Commission or retard in any way the progress of the work if the appropriation should be confined to the actual necessities up to that time?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will pardon me. I think I understood him. This $3,350,000 is for material which is ordered and which we need. The Government is pushing the men to furnish it just as speedily as possible. As soon as these flat cars, engines, and other machines are on the ground the sooner the canal will be built. We are delayed now because we can not pay our bills. There has been bitter complaint made to the Commission, and, I think, with justice, that men who sold supplies to this Commission expecting to be paid when their goods were received in Panama and O. K.'d here, have not been able to receive their money. Now, these people are not anxious to furnish the material so promptly to us which we are pushing them for unless we are prepared to pay the money. The Commission can not tell just when this material will be furnished. They are egging the men on to furnish it as rapidly as possible, and probably if we do not pay our bills promptly it may affect, and will affect, the price of future orders.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. It is not proposed not to pay the bills, but it is proposed to confine the appropriation to such sums as may be necessary to pay the bills; but as I understand all of the appropriation now sought in excess of about $5,000,000 is speculative in character.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not all; a large share is now needed, but that in the future is speculative to the extent that we do not know whether it will be furnished at once or whether it will be several months from now. They have contracted to deliver within a certain time, and we know we will have to pay them, and we want to be able to pay as soon as possible. Now, it seems to me that there is no objection to making a sufficient appropriation so that the credit of the Government is maintained beyond question. I grant to all of the gentlemen here that if this were the only occasion for consideration of appropriations to the Commission it would be wise to segregate the amount of the appropriation and only appropriate a portion now, so that the House would have a further opportunity of discussion upon the other appropriations, but there will be another appropriation bill before the House carrying another item for the Commission for the next fiscal year, and all of the questions which the gentlemen might wish to inquire about now will come up at that time properly, so that the House will still retain control over the subject of appropriations for the Commission.

All I wish to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, is that although my first judgment was the judgment which the gentleman from Mississippi has expressed—that there ought to be appropriated now only a sufficient amount to carry the Commission until some time in January and then let them rely upon a deficiency appropriation bill coming in the regular form—that after an investigation of this matter as well as I could make one during the time I have been in Washington, for some two weeks, I have reached the conclusion in my own mind that it is better, if we want the work to progress without hindrance and without discredit to the Government, to give the sum asked for now, retaining control, as we will, of the general subject on the appropriations for the next fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the following statement, which the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] asked to have printed.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to print certain statements. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The papers referred to are as follows:

List of salaries of members and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission receiving more than $2,000 per annum.

THE COMMISSIONERS.

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Army or navy pay deducted from salary paid by Commission.
T. P. Shonts	Chairman of Commission	$30,000	
C. E. Magoon	Commissioner and governor of Zone.	17,500	
M. T. Endicott, U. S. N.	Commissioner	7,500	$5,220
O. H. Ernst, U. S. A.	do	7,500	5,220
P. C. Hains, U. S. A.	do	7,500	4,125
B. M. Harrod	do	7,500	

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES AT WASHINGTON.

J. B. Bishop	Secretary to Commission	$10,000	
W. L. Pepperman	Assistant chief	3,000	
E. S. Benson	General auditor	10,000	
H. C. Lewis	Chief deputy general auditor	2,800	
D. W. Ross	General purchasing officer	10,000	
H. J. Gallagher, U. S. N	Deputy general purchasing officer.	6,480	$3,500
J. G. Jester	Disbursing officer	3,100	
A. Anderson	Assistant purchasing agent, New York.	2,400	
C. A. Devol, U. S. A.	Assistant purchasing agent, San Francisco.	5,076	4,076
W. P. Armstrong	Law clerk	2,400	
H. L. Stuntz	Auditing clerk	2,100	
E. B. Harden	Chief draftsman	2,400	
L. B. Cornish	Draftsman	2,700	
E. F. Maurer	do	3,000	
W. M. Smith	do	2,880	
J. T. Weighell	do	2,400	

List of salaries of members and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission receiving more than $2,000 per annum—Continued.

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION ON ISTHMUS.

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Army or navy pay deducted from salary paid by Commission.
W. B. Starke	Local auditor	$4,500	
C. S. Todd	Chief clerk	2,400	
E. J. Williams[a]	Disbursing officer	5,000	
G. C. Schafer, U. S. N.[a]	do	5,000	$2,400
W. M. Wood	Chief clerk	3,000	
J. P. Waldrop	Cashier	3,000	
C. T. Schwegler	Assistant chief clerk	2,400	
J. A. Embry	Pay clerk	2,400	
C. C. Metcalf	do	2,400	
E. Lepiez	Clerk	2,160	
J. E. Kidwell	Pay clerk	2,100	
E. C. Tobey, U. S. N.[b]	Chief, division material and supplies.	6,000	2,400
W. G. Tubby[b]	do	9,000	
V. S. Jackson, U. S. N.	Assistant chief, division material and supplies.	4,500	2,400
E. Hanes	do	3,000	
J. Burk	do	2,700	
J. H. Cotter	do	2,500	
E. T. Paterson	Traveling inspector	3,000	
J. J. Jackson	Bookkeeper	2,500	
A. J. Hollenbec	Division storekeeper	2,500	
C. S. Prentiss	do	2,500	
L. R. Godwin	Assistant storekeeper	2,500	
M. H. Carpenter	Lumber inspector	2,500	
G. V. Crowell	Member board of appraisal	2,400	
H. Leonard	Chief clerk	2,100	

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND SANITATION.

C. E. Magoon	Governor	(c)	
H. D. Reed	Executive secretary	$3,600	
R. A. Lane	Assistant secretary	3,000	
I. Galindo	Legal adviser	4,000	
J. J. Reidy	Plumbing inspector	2,400	
J. K. Baxter	Civil-service secretary	2,100	
J. M. Keedy	Prosecuting attorney	5,000	
J. M. Durand	Chief justice	6,500	
A. J. Gudger	Associate justice	6,000	
L. C. Collins	do	6,000	
W. C. Gorgas, U. S. A.	Chief sanitary officer	10,000	$4,950
E. C. Smith	Chief of division	2,100	
A. I. Kendall	Bacteriologist	3,000	
H. R. Carter, U. S. M. H. S.	Director of hospitals	8,000	3,500
B. W. Caldwell	Physician	2,400	
R. T. Burr	do	2,400	
R. T. Bartlett	do	2,400	
W. F. Smith	do	3,000	
H. T. Summersgill	do	3,000	
J. P. Randall	do	3,000	
A. L. Haines	do	2,400	
J. L. Phillips, U. S. A.	Superintendent hospital	7,000	3,850
T. C. Lyster, U. S. A.	Surgeon and specialist	4,500	3,696
A. B. Herrick	Pathologist	4,000	
S. T. Darling	do	2,400	
J. P. Bates	Physician	3,000	
W. Brem, jr.	do	2,400	
S. Coolidge	do	2,400	
J. P. Lacroisade	do	2,400	
H. C. Curl, U. S. A.	Superintendent hospital	5,000	2,640
E. P. Beverly	Chemist	3,000	
L. Noland	Pathologist	3,000	
N. E. Williamson	do	2,400	
P. de Obarrio	Superintendent hospital	3,600	
J. H. Purnell	Health officer	3,600	
E. H. Wheeler	do	3,000	
J. A. Le Prince	Chief sanitary inspector	3,600	
J. F. Hoskinson	Assistant sanitary inspector	2,100	
J. C. Perry, U. S. M. H. S.	Chief quarantine officer	7,000	3,250
M. E. Connor	Assistant quarantine officer	2,400	
J. Tomaselli	Physician	2,400	
G. R. Shanton	Chief of police	3,000	
T. M. Cook	Collector of revenues	5,000	
A. M. Miller	Surveyor	2,100	
C. E. Davis	Division engineer	6,000	
W. I. Baucus	Assistant engineer	2,700	
H. W. Durham	Resident engineer	3,600	
E. W. Clarke	do	3,600	
H. P. Linnell	do	3,600	
C. E. Marshall	Assistant engineer	2,700	
E. C. McFarland	Chief clerk	2,100	
R. G. Castel	Chief of division	2,100	
S. E. Braswell	Supervisor	2,100	
G. A. Heath	do	2,100	
J. E. Wood	do	2,100	
G. V. Barril	Instrument man	2,100	

[a] Paymaster Schafer was succeeded as disbursing officer on the Isthmus of Panama by Mr. Williams in the latter part of November. The outgoing officer will be carried on the rolls while engaged in the closing of his accounts, when his services with the Commission will terminate.

Mr. Williams is required to give bond in the sum of $200,000 and to pay the annual premium thereon, amounting to $360.

[b] Paymaster Tobey was succeeded by Mr. Tubby, also in the latter part of November. This outgoing officer will be carried on the rolls only until he closes his accounts.

[c] See commissioners' salaries.

List of salaries of members and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission receiving more than $2,000 per annum—Continued.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING.

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Army or navy pay deducted from salary paid by Commission.
J. F. Stevens	Chief engineer	$30,000	
J. G. Sullivan	Assistant chief engineer	15,000	
E. P. Shannon	Private secretary	3,000	
H. F. Tenny	Assistant secretary	2,400	
C. F. Burtoncini	Chief of division	3,000	
J. Smith	Manager, labor and quarters	7,200	
H. Burnett	Assistant manager, labor and quarters.	3,600	
R. E. Wood, U. S. A.	Superintendent	3,000	$1,935
W. Bodette	Hotel manager	2,280	
J. M. Maguire	Superintendent	2,400	
C. L. Parker	Chief clerk	2,100	
R. W. Glaw	Chief of division	2,100	
S. W. Settoon	Labor agent	2,400	
J. A. Tabor	do	3,000	
H. A. Smith	Assistant engineer	a 3,000	
L. Park	do	a 3,000	
J. J. Loftus	do	a 2,400	
W. E. Dauchy	Division engineer	9,000	
J. G. Holcombe	do	7,500	
G. D. Brooke	Superintendent motive power and machinery.	6,000	
C. A. Strom	do	5,000	
F. B. Maltby	Division engineer	6,000	
W. Gerig	do	5,000	
R. M. Arango	do	3,600	
H. F. Dose	Resident engineer	4,800	
E. Zook	do	3,600	
A. B. Nichols	do	3,300	
W. G. Comber	do	3,300	
W. B. Ruggles	do	3,300	
A. C. Harper	do	3,300	
R. W. Hebard	do	3,000	
J. L. Little	do	3,000	
F. B. Bartles	Assistant civil engineer	3,000	
G. T. Kenley	do	3,000	
O. F. Lackey	do	3,000	
C. M. Du Bois	do	3,000	
C. L. Carpenter	do	3,000	
M. W. Tenny	do	3,000	
J. Hayes	do	2,700	
R. H. Anderson	do	2,400	
G. M. Wells	do	2,400	
A. Raggi	do	2,400	
F. O. Mattin	do	2,400	
J. A. Card	do	2,400	
E. C. Smith	do	2,400	
W. F. R. Griffith	do	2,400	
C. F. Auger	Steam-shovel engineer	2,280	
W. H. Bedell	do	2,280	
J. A. Baker	do	2,280	
P. M. Bates	do	2,280	
W. M. Bodette	do	2,280	
W. H. Bates	do	2,280	
T. Custy	do	2,280	
H. H. V. Fleming	do	2,280	
W. Holcomb	do	2,280	
F. Loulan	do	2,280	
B. F. Moore	do	2,280	
E. Elmoore	do	2,280	
J. J. Meehan	do	2,280	
L. Ward	do	2,280	
T. C. S. Froeman	do	2,280	
A. N. Arnold	do	2,100	
J. H. Averill	do	2,100	
E. C. Cummings	Master mechanic	3,600	
A. L. Robinson	do	3,000	
U. Lorentz	do	2,700	
W. J. Thomas	do	2,700	
E. C. Harrington	do	2,700	
E. J. Banta	do	2,400	
W. F. Carey	Superintendent	3,000	
J. Monahan	do	3,000	
T. W. Osterheld	do	3,000	
J. MacFarlane	do	3,000	
C. M. Boswell	do	3,600	
E. S. Claybourn	do	2,400	
L. L. Lepper	do	2,400	
T. Jove	Supervisor	2,400	
L. B. Murray	do	2,400	
C. L. Thorne	do	2,100	
E. E. Rigney	do	2,100	
M. J. Gallaghan	do	2,100	
W. B. Waltman	do	2,100	
J. Gradison	do	2,100	
J. A. Purdum	do	2,100	
M. Regis	Boss mechanic	2,100	
G. W. Steiner	General foreman	2,220	
J. D. Stevens	Shop foreman	2,100	
W. D. Holland	Foreman	2,100	
H. F. Younge	do	2,100	
W. W. Lindsey	do	2,100	
J. E. Morrissey	do	2,100	
F. F. Corbin	do	2,100	
H. B. Mattimore	do	2,100	
J. E. Fogertty	do	2,100	
J. A. Fornander	do	2,100	
J. J. Eason	do	2,100	
O. J. Griffith	do	2,100	

[a] Messrs. Smith, Park, and Loftus are temporarily engaged as labor agents, securing at points in the United States employees for the engineering department on the Isthmus.

List of salaries of members and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission receiving more than $2,000 per annum—Continued.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING—continued.

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Army or navy pay deducted from salary paid by Commission.
H. F. Cody	Foreman	$2,100	
H. C. Halleck	do	2,100	
A. K. Stone	Train master	2,400	
A. Sessions	do	2,400	
W. L. Thompson	Instrument man	2,100	
T. F. Boltz	do	2,100	
G. S. Walsh	do	2,100	
H. R. Clark	do	2,100	
R. B. Mauter	do	2,100	
S. Tatum	do	2,100	
A. Irvin	Chief clerk	2,400	
F. W. Doty	do	2,100	
S. J. Kennedy	do	2,100	
E. H. Morrice	Timekeeper	2,100	
W. M. Belding	Master builder	6,000	
A. M. Burtt	Assistant master builder	3,600	
P. O. Wright	Architect	3,000	
J. H. Barbour	Chief clerk	2,100	
G. H. Ruggles	Assistant engineer	2,700	
W. Bugg	Master carpenter	3,000	
G. A. Caldwell	Draftsman	2,100	
W. H. Farrington	do	2,400	
P. Perkins	do	2,100	
C. L. Stockelberg	Superintendent	2,400	
H. E. Daly	do	2,400	
A. G. Evans	do	2,400	
C. A. Luck	do	2,400	
P. J. Downey	do	2,100	
L. M. Lipsett	do	2,100	
J. P. Kyte	do	2,100	
F. B. Thomas	do	2,100	
J. D. Wood	Expert machinist	2,400	
S. M. Hitt	Instrument man	2,100	
W. G. Uffendell	do	2,100	

E. S. BENSON, *General Auditor.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 6, 1905.*

Statement of cost of construction and repairs of buildings to September 30, 1905.

	To June 30, 1905.	July 1 to September 30, 1905.	Total.
CONSTRUCTION.			
Quarters "gold" employees	$15,205.39	$6,565.85	$21,771.24
Quarters "silver" employees	3,886.54	1,799.25	5,685.79
Hospitals	9,641.55	27,953.73	37,595.28
Hotels	78,328.41	33,818.98	112,147.39
Storehouses		3,378.17	3,378.17
Division buildings	1,689.40	1,335.47	3,024.87
Docks	15,176.65		15,176.65
Jails	8,249.80	9,199.59	17,449.39
Total	132,177.74	84,051.04	216,228.78
REPAIRS.			
Total cost of repairs:			
Labor	254,341.38	244,581.71	498,923.09
Material (estimated)	165,321.90	158,978.11	324,300.01
Total	419,663.28	403,559.82	823,223.10
Total cost of construction and repairs of buildings	551,841.02	487,610.86	1,039,451.88

NOTE.—The expenditures made for construction of buildings show an aggregate of $216,228.78 was incurred. During the period to April 1, $52,638.90; from April 3 to June 30, $79,538.84, and from July 1 to September 30, 1905, $84,051.04.

The expenditures for repairs of buildings are divided as between the periods, prior to April 1, $233,848.48; from April 3 to June 30, $183,814.80, and from July 1 to September 30, 1905, $403,559.82.

E. S. BENSON, *General Auditor.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 5, 1905.*

Summary of expenditures in all departments.

	To April 1.	April 3 to June 30.	Total.
General expenses of the Commission	$126,571.74	$31,255.52	$157,827.26
Department of administration	86,291.43	38,629.08	124,920.51
Department of government and sanitation	43,264.29	24,041.36	67,305.65
Department of construction and engineering	159,374.78	66,233.32	255,608.10
Sanitation	119,987.28	88,653.77	208,641.05
Hospitals and asylums	122,820.92	47,031.94	169,852.86
Construction of waterworks, sewers, and roads	112,457.75	83,580.63	196,038.38
Police and prisons	48,576.39	19,017.73	67,594.12
Canal construction	407,439.31	286,853.02	694,292.33
Machine shop expenses[a]	$18,730.65	$149,110.79	$167,841.44
Repairs to equipment[a]	75,417.82	116.67	75,534.49
Materials and supplies purchased	897,061.49	151,512.72	1,048,574.21
Cost of purchase, handling, and transportation of material and supplies	145,561.09	105,325.95	250,887.04
Purchase of furniture, equipment, and instruments	36,754.89	2,397.54	39,152.43
Purchase of La Boca shops	8,425.79		6,425.79
Purchase of land and buildings	41,790.00	4,500.00	46,290.00
Construction and repair of buildings	159,874.80	145,225.81	305,100.61
Purchase of Panama Railroad stock	155,657.49		155,657.49
Total	2,766,057.91	1,243,485.85	4,009,543.76

[a] Prior to April 1 work done by machine shops was charged directly to the division of work receiving the benefit.

Statement of general and department of administration expenditures.

	To April 1.	April 3 to June 30.	Total.
GENERAL.			
The Isthmian Canal Commission:			
Salaries of Commissioners	$75,520.28	$8,400.01	$83,920.29
Per diem and traveling expenses	16,725.93	109.65	16,835.58
Transportation employees to and from Isthmus	11,120.17	12,832.83	23,953.00
Contingent expenses	7,129.74	5,875.96	13,005.70
Office of committee on engineering:			
Salaries and wages	3,597.65	2,050.18	5,647.83
Contingent expenses	135.84		135.84
Special commissioners:			
Salaries and wages of commissioners	310.00		310.00
Per diem and traveling expenses	8,043.07	1,986.29	10,029.36
Contingent expenses	4.06	.60	4.66
Expenses under section 291, Revised Statutes, in connection with treaty	3,985.00		3,985.00
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.			
The chairman:			
Salaries and wages		5,500.00	5,500.00
Office of administration:			
Salaries and wages	29,083.33	11,094.32	40,177.65
Per diem and traveling expenses	1,494.14	82.60	1,576.74
Contingent expenses	17,480.36	3,226.97	20,707.33
The general auditor, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages	11,572.51	7,353.33	18,925.84
Per diem and traveling expenses	225.23	11.25	236.48
Contingent expenses	241.84	2.05	243.89
The general auditor, Isthmus office:			
Salaries and wages	1,689.86	3,594.68	5,284.54
Per diem and traveling expenses	3.25	28.65	31.90
Contingent expenses	2.19	12.70	14.89
Disbursing officers, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages	6,313.91	2,210.42	8,524.33
Per diem and traveling expenses	64.10		64.10
Contingent expenses	125.85		125.85
Disbursing officers, Isthmus office:			
Salaries and wages	11,840.66	4,595.08	16,435.74
Per diem and traveling expenses	394.85	97.03	491.88
Contingent expenses	658.75	820.00	1,478.75
The land department:			
Salaries and wages	5,089.73		5,089.73
Contingent expenses	10.87		10.87
MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES.			
Purchased in United States	716,525.43	118,191.32	834,716.75
Purchased on Isthmus	169,359.49	33,321.40	202,680.89
Manufactured on Isthmus	11,176.57		11,176.57
COST OF PURCHASE, HANDLING, AND TRANSPORTATION OF MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES.			
The general purchasing officer, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages	1,863.24	8,853.21	10,716.45
Per diem and traveling expenses	121.05	183.05	304.10
Services of inspectors	1,864.70	1,033.82	2,898.52
Per diem and traveling expenses of inspectors	29.50		29.50
Contingent expenses	1,766.26	1,756.02	3,522.28
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, New York office:			
Salaries and wages	2,030.03	1,884.51	3,914.54
Per diem and traveling expenses	276.00	8.50	284.50
Contingent expenses	650.18	82.26	732.44
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, New Orleans office:			
Salaries and wages		650.00	650.00
Contingent expenses	28.40	16.95	45.35
Material and supplies division on Isthmus:			
Salaries and wages	116,642.07	88,728.52	205,370.49
Per diem and traveling expenses	512.35	29.15	541.50
Contingent expenses	810.99	27.73	838.72
Freight, advertising, etc	18,966.32	2,072.33	21,038.65

Statement of general and department of administration expenditures—Continued.

	To April 1.	April 3 to June 30.	Total.
PURCHASE OF FURNITURE, EQUIPMENT, AND INSTRUMENTS.			
Isthmian Canal Commission	$21.36	$300.59	$321.95
Office of administration	4,354.57	831.07	5,185.64
General auditor, Washington office	279.51	132.39	411.90
General auditor, Isthmus office		7.00	7.00
Disbursing officers, Washington office	225.00	48.96	303.96
Committee on engineering	111.61		111.61
The general purchasing officer	861.55	547.44	1,408.99
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents:			
New York office	199.91	266.69	466.60
New Orleans office	55.00	202.30	257.30
Miscellaneous	2,172.29		2,162.29
PURCHASE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS.			
J. Vasquez and Santa Rosa estates	41,790.00		41,790.00
One-half of Tivoli estate		4,500.00	4,500.00
Purchase of Panama Railroad stock	155,657.49		155,657.49
Construction and repair of buildings	51,812.68	10,282.75	62,095.43
SUMMARY.			
General:			
The Isthmian Canal Commission	110,496.12	27,218.45	137,714.57
Office of committee on engineering	3,733.49	2,050.18	5,783.67
Special commissioners	12,342.13	1,986.89	14,329.02
Department of administration:			
Office of administration	48,057.83	19,903.89	67,961.72
The general auditor, Washington office	12,039.58	7,366.63	19,406.21
The general auditor, Isthmus office	1,695.30	3,636.03	5,331.33
Disbursing officers, Washington office	6,503.86	2,210.42	8,714.28
Disbursing officer, Isthmus office	12,894.26	5,512.11	18,406.37
The land department	5,100.60		5,100.60
Material and supplies purchased	897,061.49	151,512.72	1,048,574.21
Cost of purchase, handling, and transportation of material and supplies	145,561.09	105,325.95	250,887.04
Purchase of furniture, equipment, and instruments	8,300.80	2,336.44	10,637.24
Purchase of land and buildings	41,790.00	4,500.00	46,290.00
Purchase of Panama Railroad stock	155,657.49		155,657.49
Construction and repair of buildings	51,812.68	10,282.75	62,095.43
Total disbursements, first department	1,513,046.72	343,842.46	1,856,889.18

Statement of department of government and sanitation expenditures.

	To April 1.	April 3 to June 30.	Total.
The executive office:			
Salaries and wages	$15,927.13	$10,701.59	$26,628.72
Per diem and traveling expenses	234.10	45.87	279.97
Contingent expenses	2,037.97	276.39	2,314.36
The Zone treasurer:			
Salaries and wages	377.50	287.50	665.00
The administration of justice:			
Salaries and wages	8,594.97	4,705.01	13,299.98
Per diem and traveling expenses	139.53		139.53
Contingent expenses	61.79		61.79
Division of internal revenue:			
Salaries and wages	6,686.82	5,767.52	12,454.34
Per diem and traveling expenses	148.57	147.98	296.55
Contingent expenses	384.37		384.37
Postal service:			
Salaries and wages	4,419.55	1,390.00	5,809.55
Per diem and traveling expenses	222.05	22.25	244.30
Mail transportation	81.50	97.25	178.75
Contingent expenses	3,948.44	600.00	4,548.44
Police and prisons:			
Salaries and wages	46,075.49	18,440.26	64,515.75
Per diem and traveling expenses	623.10	176.25	799.35
Contingent expenses	1,877.80	401.22	2,279.02
Sanitation, hospitals and asylums, office of chief sanitary officer:			
Salaries and wages	33,744.56	40,882.41	74,626.97
Per diem and traveling expenses	3,167.95	249.69	3,417.64
Contingent expenses	967.80		967.80
Director of hospitals:			
Salaries and wages	891.84	1,997.00	2,888.84
Per diem and traveling expenses		15.15	15.15
Ancon Hospital:			
Salaries and wages	76,866.99	28,191.69	105,058.68
Per diem and traveling expenses	2,370.37	3.90	2,374.27
Contingent expenses	616.13	39.75	655.88
Bohio Hospital:			
Salaries and wages	1,266.18	145.00	1,411.18
Per diem and traveling expenses	125.00		125.00
Contingent expenses	25.00	21.67	46.67
Colon Hospital:			
Salaries and wages	13,569.56	8,107.54	21,677.10
Per diem and traveling expenses	115.67	43.05	158.72
Contingent expenses	147.13	160.00	307.13
Cristobal and line as far as Bohio:			
Salaries and wages	1,148.14	126.00	1,274.14
Culebra Hospital:			
Salaries and wages	$1,882.85	$636.33	$2,519.18
Contingent expenses	99.41		99.41
Gamboa and Bas Obispo:			
Salaries and wages	25.84		25.84
Gorgona Hospital:			
Salaries and wages	2,494.24	1,219.88	3,714.12
Per diem and traveling expenses	86.92		86.92
Miraflores Hospital:			
Salaries and wages	1,687.06	1,855.92	3,542.98
Per diem and traveling expenses	10.99		10.99
Contingent expenses	3.05		3.05
Panama, Corozal, and La Boca dispensary:			
Salaries and wages	150.00	532.50	682.50
Convalescent station at Taboga Island:			
Salaries and wages	1,595.48	79.62	1,675.10
Contingent expenses	1.65		1.65
Hospital service, general:			
Salaries and wages	9,528.59	40.00	9,568.59
Per diem and traveling expenses	134.58		134.58
Contingent expenses	505.23		505.23
Quarantine station, Panama:			
Salaries and wages	2,958.08	1,415.72	4,373.80
Per diem and traveling expenses	121.09	35.80	156.89
Contingent expenses	81.82		81.82
Quarantine station, Colon:			
Salaries and wages	2,785.21	1,421.67	4,206.86
Maritime quarantine:			
Salaries and wages	323.49	416.67	740.16
Per diem and traveling expenses	1.25		1.25
Detention barracks, Panama:			
Salaries and wages	338.77	420.83	759.60
Per diem and traveling expenses		6.25	6.25
Detention barracks, Colon:			
Salaries and wages	863.31	100.00	963.31
Health officer, Panama and Colon:			
Office of health officer—			
Salaries and wages	126.20	26,788.51	26,914.71
Per diem and traveling expenses	16.35	168.75	185.10
Contingent expenses	44.50		44.50
Street cleaning, Panama:			
Salaries and wages	5,841.22	7,190.96	13,032.18
Per diem and traveling expenses	6.50		6.50
Contingent expenses	2,595.00	4,190.50	6,785.50
Mosquito, contagious diseases, and disinfecting service, Panama:			
Salaries and wages	827.60	2,087.78	2,915.38
Per diem and traveling expenses	35.31		35.31
Contingent expenses	95.30	76.00	171.30
Street cleaning, Colon:			
Salaries and wages	1,328.43	432.63	1,761.06
Contingent expenses		1,412.50	1,412.50
Mosquito, contagious diseases, and disinfecting service, Colon:			
Salaries and wages	215.25	5,174.04	5,389.29
Contingent expenses	215.00		215.00
Street cleaning, general:			
Salaries and wages	69,256.68		69,256.68
Per diem and traveling expenses	449.13		449.13
Contingent expenses	1,054.50		1,054.50
Improvement of Zone highways, construction division:			
Salaries and wages	9,249.67		9,249.67
Contingent expenses	27.83		27.83
Street paving, Panama:			
Salaries and wages	68.33	538.39	606.72
Construction of waterworks and sewers, Panama, Ancon, and Rio Grande:			
Salaries and wages	78,002.79	50,463.99	128,466.78
Per diem and traveling expenses	150.71	8.00	158.71
Construction waterworks and sewers, Colon:			
Salaries and wages	12,094.45	5,781.67	17,876.12
Intermediate water supply:			
Salaries and wages	12,714.72	26,686.83	39,401.55
Per diem and traveling expenses	149.25	101.75	251.00
CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF BUILDINGS.			
For government and sanitation purposes	42,912.69	34,564.11	77,476.80
PURCHASE OF FURNITURE, EQUIPMENT, AND INSTRUMENTS.			
Hospital at Colon	7.47	61.10	68.57
Sanitary department, general	930.02		930.02
Sanitary department, general, disinfecting apparatus	6,180.00		6,180.00
SUMMARY.			
Department of government and sanitation:			
The executive office	18,199.20	11,023.85	29,223.05
The Zone treasurer	377.50	287.50	665.00
The administration of justice	8,796.29	4,705.01	13,501.30
The collector of revenue	15,891.30	8,025.00	23,916.30
Police and prisons	48,576.39	19,017.73	67,594.12
Sanitation	119,987.28	88,653.77	208,641.05
Hospitals and asylums	122,820.92	47,031.94	169,852.86

Statement of department of government and sanitation expenditures—Continued.

	To April 1.	April 3 to June 30.	Total.
SUMMARY—continued.			
Department of government and sanitation:			
Improvement of Zone highways	$9,277.50		$9,277.50
Street improvement, Panama	68.33	$538.39	606.72
Construction of waterworks and sewers	103,111.92	83,042.24	186,154.16
Construction and repair of buildings	42,912.69	34,564.11	77,476.80
Purchase of furniture and equipment	7,117.49	61.10	7,178.59
Total disbursements, second department	497,136.81	296,950.64	794,087.45

Statement of department of construction and engineering expenditures.

	To April 1.	April 3 to June 30.	Total.
Office of chief engineer:			
Salaries and wages	$113,741.77	$13,439.17	$127,180.94
Per diem and traveling expenses	27,554.45	555.85	28,110.30
Contingent expenses	6,086.50	128.08	6,214.58
Principal assistant engineer in charge of records and office:			
Salaries and wages		9,467.03	9,467.03
Per diem and traveling expenses		10.85	10.85
Mechanical engineer:			
Salaries and wages	1,592.42	7,467.00	9,059.42
Per diem and traveling expenses	12.11	66.95	79.06
Office of general manager, labor and quarters:			
Salaries and wages	13.34	14,180.76	14,194.10
Per diem and traveling expenses	.40	164.18	164.58
Bureau of water works, sewers, and roads:			
Salaries and wages	1,714.66	8,339.00	10,053.66
Per diem and traveling expenses	68.61	76.70	145.31
Bureau of architecture and buildings:			
Salaries and wages	243.33	6,333.16	6,576.49
Per diem and traveling expenses	11.10	133.55	144.65
Contingent expenses		15.00	15.00
Bureau of telegraph, telephone, and electric lights:			
Salaries and wages	868.19	1,440.01	2,308.20
Per diem and traveling expenses	18.10	21.98	40.08
Bureau of meteorology and river hydraulics:			
Salaries and wages		342.33	342.33
Bureau of map making, lithography, and printing:			
Salaries and wages	7,449.80	4,051.72	11,501.52
Canal construction, Colon division, office of division engineer:			
Salaries and wages	25,594.07	19,800.23	45,394.30
Per diem and traveling expenses	530.15	14.10	544.25
Contingent expenses	15.80	30.00	45.80
Excavation:			
Salaries and wages	7,624.23	2,323.44	9,947.67
Tracks:			
Salaries and wages	1,250.87	4,223.87	5,474.74
Docks, foundations:			
Salaries and wages	1,080.41	884.85	1,965.26
Bohio dam:			
Salaries and wages	26,756.66		26,756.66
Per diem and traveling expenses	738.73		738.73
Contingent expenses	24.67		24.67
Surveys, Colon division:			
Salaries and wages	6,227.11		6,227.11
Per diem and traveling expenses	27.41		27.41
Chagres division, office of division engineer:			
Salaries and wages	2,733.53	12,801.29	15,534.82
Per diem and traveling expenses	70.56	4.00	74.56
Contingent expenses		1.00	1.00
Excavation:			
Salaries and wages	106.75		106.75
Gamboa division, office of division engineer:			
Salaries and wages		804.79	804.79
Gamboa dam:			
Salaries and wages	32,282.83		32,282.83
Per diem and traveling expenses	2,367.86		2,367.86
Contingent expenses	23.75		23.75
Gatun dam:			
Salaries and wages	17,826.62		17,826.62
Per diem and traveling expenses	873.22		873.22
Contingent expenses	84.32		84.32
Culebra division, office of division engineer:			
Salaries and wages	55,342.31	66,701.57	122,043.88
Per diem and traveling expenses	13.11	122.74	135.85
Office of resident engineer in charge of surveys:			
Salaries and wages	32,383.71	2,753.31	35,137.02
Per diem and traveling expenses	190.90	27.92	218.82
Cuts—excavations:			
Salaries and wages	51,684.09	66,436.48	118,120.57
Tolls and implements	2,012.79		2,012.79
Repairs to equipment	11,242.31		11,242.31
Contingent expenses	19,393.00		19,393.00
Cuts—dumps:			
Salaries and wages	21,064.29	15,445.76	36,510.05

Statement of department of construction and engineering expenditures—Continued.

	To April 1.	April 3 to June 30.	Total.
Cuts—mining:			
Salaries and wages	$16,019.79	$8,945.57	$24,965.36
Cuts—tracks:			
Salaries and wages	70,176.77	66,064.36	136,241.13
Per diem and traveling expenses	29.50		29.50
La Boca division, office of division engineer:			
Salaries and wages	1,450.63	17,193.49	18,644.12
Per diem and traveling expenses	6.54	47.70	54.44
Contingent expenses	4.50		4.50
Excavation:			
Salaries and wages		1,057.50	1,057.50
Harbors and dredging:			
Salaries and wages	185.52	1,169.05	1,354.57
Bas Matachin machine shops: [a]			
Salaries and wages	7,655.95	59,374.08	57,030.03
Per diem and traveling expenses	38.25	27.10	65.35
Small tools	712.29	233.86	946.15
Contingent expenses		2.40	2.40
Cristobal machine shops:			
Salaries and wages	3,670.07	27,549.17	31,219.24
Small tools	394.05	181.96	576.01
Culebra machine shop:			
Salaries and wages		21,997.84	21,987.84
Empire machine shop:			
Salaries and wages	3,197.45	29,327.67	32,525.12
Per diem and traveling expenses	22.80	4.75	27.55
Small tools	85.50	83.39	168.89
La Boca machine shop:			
Salaries and wages	2,954.29	10,328.57	13,282.86
Purchase of La Boca shops	8,425.79		8,425.79
PURCHASE OF FURNITURE, EQUIPMENT, AND INSTRUMENTS.			
Office of chief engineer	286.60		286.60
Canal construction:			
Excavating and dredging machines	21,050.00		21,050.00
Construction and repair of buildings	65,149.43	100,378.95	165,528.38
EXCAVATING AND DREDGING MACHINES.			
Repairs	8,319.12		8,319.12
Superintendence	119.33		119.33
RAILROAD CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT.			
Repairs of rolling stock	26,204.70		26,204.70
Repairs of machine and hand tools	15,164.59		15,164.59
Superintendence	1,359.44		1,359.44
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT.			
Repairs of floating equipment not dredges	14,408.14	116.67	14,524.81
Repairs of furniture, etc	247.60		247.60
Repairs of machine and hand tools	9,594.90		9,594.90
SUMMARY.			
Chief engineer	159,374.78	66,233.32	225,608.10
Colon division	69,870.11	27,276.49	97,146.60
Chagres division	2,910.84	12,806.29	15,717.13
Gamboa division	53,458.60	804.79	54,263.39
Culebra division	279,552.57	226,497.71	506,050.28
La Boca division	1,647.19	19,467.74	21,114.93
Machine shop expenses	18,730.65	149,110.79	167,841.44
Purchase of La Boca shops	8,425.79		8,425.79
Purchase of furniture, equipment, and instruments	21,336.60		21,336.60
Construction and repair of buildings	65,149.43	100,378.95	165,528.38
Repairs of excavating and dredging machines	8,438.45		8,438.45
Railroad construction and repair of railroad equipment	42,728.73		42,728.73
Repairs of miscellaneous equipment	24,250.64	116.67	24,367.31
Total disbursements, third department	755,874.38	602,692.75	1,358,567.13

[a] Prior to April 1 expenses of machine shops were distributed to the division of the work receiving the benefit of the work done by machine shops.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I should hesitate very much to offer an amendment to a bill of this kind if I did not know that I was doing it with the consent of the gentleman in charge of the bill. In order that my remarks may perhaps be more clearly understood, I will send the amendment to the Clerk's desk, to be read for information, as the text of the amendment which I propose to offer, or am considering the wisdom of offering to-morrow, or whenever the bill shall come up for action.

The CHAIRMAN. As the time for amendment has not arrived, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] will be read for information only.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out section 1, and insert in place thereof the following:

"That every national banking association having United States bonds on deposit to secure its circulating notes shall pay to the Treasurer of the United States, in the months of January and July, a tax of

one-fourth of 1 per cent each half year upon the average amount of its notes in circulation, and such taxes shall be in lieu of all existing taxes on circulating notes of national banking associations: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to circulating notes secured by bonds issued under the following titles, or any reissue of such bonds bearing the same rates of interest: Loan of 1908 to 1918, authorized under act approved June 13, 1898, and bearing interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum; funded loan of 1907, authorized under acts approved July 14, 1870, and January 20, 1871, and bearing interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum; loan of 1925, authorized under act approved January 14, 1875, and bearing interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum."

Three years ago, when the original Panama bill was passed, I called the attention of certain members of the Senate, the day after it was passed there, to the fact that bonds were authorized as 2 per cent bonds, but required to be sold at not less than par, and it would be impossible to sell them at par as a basis for circulation with a 1 per cent tax, and from that time to this the effort has been made to have that mistake corrected.

I hold in my hand the advance copy of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, issued to-day, and which the Members will find in their mail this evening, I suppose. I will read one clause from it, as follows:

By act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, an issue of bonds was authorized in aid of the isthmian canal now in process of construction. The act provides that the bonds shall bear interest at 2 per cent, and shall not be sold below par. In former reports I have called attention to the fact that these bonds, if now issued, would not be available as security for national-bank circulation at a less rate of taxation than 1 per cent per annum, and, therefore, would not be worth par. I believe a general statute should be enacted making all future issues of the Government bonds available for national-bank circulation subject to a tax of but one-half of 1 per cent, as in the case of the consols authorized by act of March 14, 1900.

Now, the amendment which, as I stated, is offered by the consent, at least, of the gentleman in charge of the bill, will do precisely, and nothing more, than that which is asked for by the Secretary of the Treasury in his report to-day. It distinctly exempts the threes and fours outstanding, and covers 2 per cent bonds hereafter issued. It covers also the privilege of reissue, and that is the particular reason why I offer it. Within eighteen months we shall have the termination of the first period of the $115,000,000 of 4 per cent bonds now outstanding. The Government would save a large amount in interest if this tax which it is now proposed to apply to the Panama bonds shall apply to these also in their extension. It will also cover thirty-five millions of 3 per cent Spanish war bonds, which will expire in thirty months. In both of these instances the Treasury Department has the right of option of extending them—the 4 per cent indefinitely, the 3 per cent for ten years.

Now, it is apparent to the business sense of every Member of this House that if the Secretary of the Treasury did not wish to pay the $115,000,000 4 per cent bonds, but did have it in his power to say to the holders of these bonds, "We will extend them, at discretion, at 2 per cent interest, with the additional feature of having it possible to use them as a basis of circulation at a tax of one-half per cent," he would have the power in his own hands to protect the interests of the Treasury so far as these two issues of bonds are concerned.

Now, I want to be perfectly frank with the House and to state that there is another issue of bonds which would be made available for bank circulation besides these two, a bond which has been authorized, but which has never been issued. And I think that every Member of the House, on both sides, will concur with me and with the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury as well, that this change be made so far as those are concerned. I refer to the authorized bond for the maintenance of the credit of the Government which bears 3 per cent interest and a one year's term. No such bond has ever been issued, but no human being can tell how soon or how far in the future the issue of that bond may be required. And I submit it to you that it will be impossible to sell a 3 per cent bond at par under the circumstances in which such sale would necessarily be made, unless it could be used as a basis for circulation by the banks, at the reduced rate of tax.

The amendment excludes the present issue of 3 and 4 per cents, but includes the reissuance of those bonds at lower rates, which would enable the Secretary of the Treasury to reissue, under the option he has, at 2 per cent instead of 3 and 4, and also includes the Panama bonds as well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not understand the gentleman as to the last class of bonds he refers to—when they were issued.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. They were authorized to maintain the gold reserve and the credit of the country, but never have been issued, and I hope that the necessity for such issue will never arise.

Mr. BOUTELL. And they were limited to $100,000,000.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. And limited to only one hundred millions. I think it is perfectly apparent to every gentleman that they can not be sold at par, and the law forbids their being sold at anything less. There is no question about that. I dislike very much to bring in a proposition about banking into this House in view of my past experience.

Mr. MANN. Permit me to say to the gentleman that he need not interject it upon this bill.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not want to interject it; but some gentlemen may not be aware of the fact that the great bulk of the bank circulation is based on the 2 per cent bonds, and these will continue to be used as the basis of circulation. Now, as a matter of fact, the supply of 2 per cent bonds is about exhausted; practically all of them are held for bank circulation. Possibly there may be from thirty to fifty millions in the market, but I am perfectly satisfied, gentlemen, that the 2 per cent bonds are being controlled and manipulated because of the shortage of supply. I am satisfied of it, and I think the very wisest possible course that Congress can take in regard to this matter is to make this a general statute, which the Secretary of the Treasury asks for, in order that at least that thing may be controlled and prevented. I will be glad to answer any question any gentlemen may desire to ask.

Mr. PRINCE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question or two?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. PRINCE. Are not we as Members of the House seeing the effect of taking up and disposing of a measure without having it properly go to a committee; that we are first legislating on matters pertaining to the Appropriations Committee, and next to the Ways and Means Committee, then to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and now finally landing in the Banking and Currency Committee, seeking to make a general statute recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury in his report to us a part of emergency legislation? Does not the gentleman from Connecticut think that it would be wiser in this House at this time to pass an emergency appropriation for a limited amount to meet the urgent necessities of the case?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would state in reply to the gentleman's question that the Committee on Banking and Currency would have nothing to do with the proposition referred to in this bill or the amendment I am offering. The amendment is purely a question with which the Committee on Ways and Means would have to deal, relating solely to taxation and the bonded debt, and it has been referred to the Ways and Means Committee. The reasons why the amendment is offered are, because the Secretary of the Treasury distinctly and specifically recommends it, and it is only a change of form and not of principle from that recommended in the pending proposition. If the bill was not here relating to the Panama bonds the amendment would not be offered with reference to the others. I think the gentleman's question is fully answered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ought we in this Panama bill to deal with any other bonds except the Panama bonds?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Instead of doing it for this specific issue, it might be made general law, in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury as set forth in a bill which I introduced day before yesterday, but I submit it to Members here for their consideration whether it would not be wise to make general that which it is now proposed to make specific. By doing so it would create a saving of several million dollars in interest in the next few years. I think when the Government option of extension matures that the interest on the 3 and 4 per cent bonds can be reduced to 2 per cent by making this a general statute. That is the whole proposition.

Mr. PRINCE. Do I understand the gentleman from Connecticut, then, that he now seeks to withdraw this question?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Oh, no; not at all. I leave it open for consideration to-morrow.

Mr. PRINCE. The gentleman insists upon it?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. It is the substitution of one form for another.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say that the Secretary of the Treasury was in favor of the action which he speaks of.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I read the statement in which he said he advised it.

Mr. MANN. But he has not made any request that it be acted upon in this bill.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. He is out of the city and could not make any such recommendation.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. This same proposition that is in this bill was submitted in person to the Secretary of the Treasury himself, and he made no suggestion in reference to the matter which the gentleman offers.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I went to the Treasury Department to-day, and the Assistant Secretary told me that the Secre-

tary was out of the city, but that he would be glad to have this proposition enacted. I will add, furthermore, that when this proposition was pending last year the Secretary of the Treasury distinctly recommended it. I have his letter in my pocket recommending it, and I will state that the verbatim language in the amendment was submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury and approved by him.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt of that, but I want the House to understand, which it might not understand from the gentleman's statement, that the Secretary of the Treasury does not ask that it be done on this emergency appropriation bill. He has not asked that a change of the current law with reference to bonds be made in that way.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Oh, I do not know anything about that. I submitted the amendment to the gentleman in charge of the bill before I offered it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I know of no other gentleman who desires to participate in the general debate, and I ask that the bill be read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that a good many of the Members on both sides have been under the impression that the bill would not be read for amendment until to-morrow morning, and for that reason it would be better to have unanimous consent—I will not intrude by asking it myself if the gentleman will ask it—to let the bill go over without detriment, to be read under the five-minute rule to-morrow morning, the first thing after the approval of the Journal, and continued in due course until finished.

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest to the gentleman, why not have the first section read for amendment, which will, of course, end the general debate, and then commence to-morrow morning on that section?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We can get unanimous consent, no doubt, to have it go over.

Mr. HEPBURN. I ask that the first section of the bill be read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, are we going to continue the reading?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know whether there has been any understanding that the bill shall go over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; there has been none, but I am trying to get an understanding. There was an understanding on the part of a great many Members of the House that the bill could not possibly reach consideration under the five-minute rule to-day. I was partially responsible for that understanding, which turns out to be a misunderstanding, and the gentleman from Iowa in charge of the bill will see that some Members, in consequence of what we expected, thought they could go home, and they will be taken rather by surprise if the bill is read for amendment this evening when they are not here.

Mr. HEPBURN. I am only asking that the first section be read, and then I will move to rise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But if the first section is read, all amendments to that section will be cut off.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, no; we will not proceed to the next section. It will be open for amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, amendments to the first section will be in order to-morrow morning?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. OLMSTED. Quite a number of Members have made arrangements to go away to-morrow morning, with the understanding that the bill would be finished to-day. I merely make that suggestion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The difference is that there was no reason for their having that understanding—none under the sun. They arrived at it unaided and unassisted. These other gentlemen have arrived at their understanding by being misled.

Mr. OLMSTED. It seems that the gentlemen I refer to were right in their understanding that it could be finished to-day if it were proceeded with under the regular order.

Mr. PAYNE. This illustrates the folly of leaving the House when a bill is pending. If gentlemen will all understand here at the opening of the session that a vote is liable to be taken at any time in Committee of the Whole, or that a bill is liable to be voted upon at any time, and will regulate their business in accordance with the business of the House, it will be a great deal better for all concerned. I have no objection to the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa that we read the first section and then stop there, leaving it open for amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we have as full an attendance here now as we will have to-morrow. There are a great many Members in the Capitol who are not on the floor, and there is no reason for postponing a vote on the matter until to-morrow on account of the absence of Members.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know of several Members myself who have gone home.

Mr. TAWNEY. There will be a great many more who will not be here to-morrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They will have full notice to be here to-morrow.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not make any request with regard to the postponement of the subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without detriment and that it be taken up the first thing to-morrow morning after the reading of the Journal under the five-minute rule, to be read for amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HEPBURN. I raise the point of order that the Committee of the Whole can not give unanimous consent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request; it escaped me for the moment that we were in Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that the first section can be read and then a motion made for the committee to rise. If no Member wishes to debate the bill, the Clerk will read.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, as I may not be able to be here to-morrow, I would like five minutes to-night.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to debate the bill?

Mr. OLMSTED. I wish to debate the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennslyvania is recognized.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I am as fully aware as any Member of this House of the great importance to the country of the construction of this isthmian canal. I am fully aware of the urgent importance of action upon this measure at this time, but I desire also to record my protest against this House being so often called upon from time to time to vote upon this great and important matter without being more fully advised, in appropriating large sums of money, as to the details of expenditures of moneys which have already been made.

Now, we are told that there have been expended the sum of $8,950,092.15 of a former appropriation, but I defy any Member, from the statement which has been submitted here, presumably coming from the Commission itself, to tell in what way or for what purpose, except in the most general manner, that money has been expended. For instance, the very first item is this: "Isthmian Canal Commission, $185,256.98." Whether that was for salaries or traveling or other expenses of the Commission, how much for either or both, or what it was expended for, no Member on the floor of this House knows. The next item is "Special commissioners, $18,265.90." Some one may know the full meaning of that term; I do not. Then we find the item "Office of administration, $102,012.76." I defy anybody to tell me what that means.

Mr. MANN. That is very easy. It means the payment of the administration of the office here.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman tell me the distinction between that and the first item, "Isthmian Canal Commission, $185,000?"

Mr. MANN. That pays the salaries of the Isthmian Canal Commission and this pays the administration force of the Commission here.

Mr. OLMSTED. "The administration force." Then the disbursing officer, I take it, is a part of the administration force, and yet he gets a separate $32,826.28 for something we are not told what.

Mr. MANN. The administration force of the Commission is like the salary for secretary's office over here, which we constantly appropriate for, and then we appropriate money for auditor and disbursing officer, which is part of the administrative force.

Mr. OLMSTED. Then I find the item, "Executive office, $52,371.89." Whether that is for salaries or expenses, or for what purpose it was expended, we do not know. Then we have the item, "Administration of justice, $22,886.35." What that is for we have not the slightest idea.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman knows that that is for the administration of justice—the payment of the salaries of judges, etc., in the Canal Zone. The gentleman knows that, I think.

Mr. OLMSTED. Then I find this item, "Department of construction and engineering"—and this foots up—"Office of the chief engineer, $209,000." Whether that is for salaries or what it covers we are not told. The only item which we can definitely understand is the purchase of the Panama Railroad stock, $155,657.49. That is specific, except we are not told how much they purchased nor what price they paid for it. I had one more specific item which I had lost for the moment. Here it is: "Canal construction, $1,010,014.62." Now, I supposed

that that whole appropriation—the whole eight millions—was, in a sense, for canal construction. There is the item of expenditure, but we do not know how much of that went for salary or wages or material or what any of it was paid for. Then we have "Material and supplies purchased, $2,091,258.72." Isn't that a part of canal construction? Next we have "General purchasing officer in Washington, $39,890.57." Now, was that for things that he purchased or was it for salaries of men in his office? Next there are assistant purchasing agents at other places. Then we have "Division of material and supplies, Isthmus, $342,381.07." Is that for salaries? Is it for wages? Is it for materials, or what on earth is it for? The mere explanation that it was expended for the "division" is not clear. Next we have this singular item, "Freight, advertising, etc., $144,085.23." Who ever heard or saw in an account of expenditures the grouping together of two such incongruous items as freight and advertising? How much was for freight and how much was for advertising? Why are we not informed?

Mr. Chairman, we are in these days insisting upon great publicity in the affairs of corporations, and very properly so. Recent events have shown the importance of demanding such publicity; but I say that there is no corporation in the country whose stockholders would be content with an accounting of the expenditure of $8,000,000 which was no more full, no more detailed, and no more specific than this account of expenditures which has been rendered to us by this Commission. I find that the salaries and wages estimated for October and November amount to the sum of $60,000—$30,000 a month—here in Washington. Certainly, with such a force as that, there is ample ability and force of men to prepare a statement which could be laid before this House showing in detail what has been done with our money. I do not mean to reflect upon any officer of the Government or any member of the Commission. I am going to take it for granted this time that this money has all been properly expended. I believe it has been, but I do think that in a matter of this importance, an enterprise that is going to cost such a vast sum of money, do the best we may, we ought to have a most careful accounting for every dollar that we appropriate. I have thought of offering an amendment to that effect. If I am not here when that section is decided I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] will offer such an amendment, and I sincerely hope that when it is offered to the third section of this bill it will be adopted by the House, so that as to the appropriations we are about to make we will hereafter receive a full, detailed, and classified statement of expenditures.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, just a word. I desire to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] that I think he will find in connection with the report of the Secretary of War which is now in the hands of the President, and which will be transmitted to us at a very early date, all of that information that his soul craves.

Mr. OLMSTED. I hope that is so, Mr. Chairman, but it certainly is not in the statement of expenditures which has been given to the House as the basis of our action upon this bill. There is no requirement of law that it shall be in the report of the Secretary of War, and in any event it will come too late to be of service so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, at the outset permit me to say that I concur in all the criticism indulged in by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED]. He criticises these items of expenditures already made up to September 30, 1905. He is correct in saying that no corporation or business firm in the country would be content with that sort of a statement rendered by its fiscal officer or agent as to the manner in which he had used the funds of that corporation or business concern. It shows to my mind, Mr. Chairman, a want of business methods in the conduct of the building of this canal. It shows to my mind that the money of the people may be used to some extent for unnecessary purposes, for experimenting, for exploiting some particular man, some newspaper man, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has suggested—a press agent. Now, we want to know and the country is entitled to know, not in a general way how the revenues have been expended, but in a specific and definite way how the party in power is expending the moneys of the public. Now, this case illustrates the folly, I might say, of this House undertaking to legislate on a matter as important as this without having the measure first considered by a committee. What Member of this House can know about this? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was asked questions, and he confessed again and again that he could not explain matters pertinent to this important discussion. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] is correct in his criticism. It may be that all of these items were properly expended. I do not know. I do not know for what these items grouped together under general terms were expended. Now, what he has said relates to what has already been expended, and his criticism is well taken. I desire to direct further criticism to the expenditure of the $16,500,000 which it is now sought to have us appropriate.

Now, for what purposes are we going to appropriate $16,500,000? In a general way we are told for preliminary expenses, for hospitals, and for houses and the like of that. If this matter had gone to a committee and there had been an investigation we would have found out how much hospital money was necessary, how many houses were necessary, and what other items were necessary. I do not know what the general statements mean. Under subdivision 3 in the second column, page 40 of the RECORD, "Estimated miscellaneous material purchases in United States from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, $2,300,000." Does any man on this floor have any idea of what these materials are, for what that money is to go?

Mr. MANN. The items are right there.

Mr. CLAYTON. It is simply in general terms.

Mr. MANN. It is specified what it is.

Mr. CLAYTON. "Estimated miscellaneous material purchases in the United States, December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906." What sort of miscellaneous material? For what purpose? You have specified a whole lot of materials and now you bring in a sort of omnibus clause under the head of miscellaneous expenses. I want to know what these miscellaneous matters consist of which calls for this money. Then you take the next one, item 4, "Estimated miscellaneous material purchases on the Isthmus and miscellaneous expenditures from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, consisting of hotel and hospital and other supplies, transportation of laborers from West Indies, etc., $800,000."

I would like to know more particularly about that. And then you come now to item 7, for I can not now undertake to criticise each one of these omnibus clauses in this so-called estimate of expenses, but take item 7. "Estimated Isthmus pay roll from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, based on estimated pay rolls for November, with increase of 25 per cent from January 1, 1906, on gold rolls and 50 per cent on silver rolls." And yet, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the long statement made by the gentleman from Illinois, I am still in the dark as to how much of this money is going to be spent on the actual work of constructing the canal. The gentleman says that it was estimated that it would cost a hundred and forty million dollars to complete this canal; that without further legislation of Congress no more than that could be spent for that purpose. Well, we have already appropriated, if this bill passes through, including $10,000,000 heretofore appropriated, $26,000,000 out of the hundred and forty million dollars for the work of construction, to say nothing of the forty millions paid to the company from which the canal was purchased and ten millions to the Panama Government. I want to know, Mr. Chairman, what is the purpose of all this money? To what use it is going to be devoted? I know I am heartily in favor of building an Isthmian Canal, but we want to go about it in a businesslike way. We want to know what we are doing and how the people's money is being expended and how it is proposed to expend it.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES. Under section 3, estimated miscellaneous material purchases in United States from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, does that mean they have to purchase in the United States notwithstanding they might pay more than they could get it for elsewhere?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not know. The gentleman from Kentucky will have to ask the whispering winds, because the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] on the committee could not answer that. We do not know; we are in the dark.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time, I believe, during my limited service here in this House that we have been called upon to vote upon so important a matter, to vote so much of the peoples' money without accurate and definite information as to what has been done with some of that money, and as to what will be done with the money for which we are asked to vote, except in one case, and that was in the great emergency that confronted the country at the beginning of the Spanish war, when that great heart lived in the White House and every patriot here voted to put into his hands $50,000,000 as an emergency war fund. We could not in time of war wait for itemized statements, we are

willing to trust our President, but here in time of peace, in purely a business matter, involving business questions, no emergency, with nothing of extraordinary nature confronting us, why this matter should be rushed through without explanation I demand to know.

I demand to know, to have more information about these items. What will this money be used for? Here are $26,500,000, that we appropriated and to be appropriated, of the proposed $140,000,000. How much work has been accomplished and how much will be accomplished by this? It may come to pass, Mr. Chairman, if we go on from time to time without due investigation, without any inquiry into this, we will find ourselves confronted with this condition, namely, that we will have spent $140,000,000, and most of it will have been expended upon items headed "Miscellaneous expenditures," and that then the canal will hardly have begun to be constructed. It illustrates the unwisdom of putting such a measure as this through at this time without due investigation.

There is a matter as important in the estimation of the country and more urgent in the minds of the people than this, and yet that is not brought forward by the party in power. That is waiting for the regular course; that must wait until after recess; that can wait at least until after the committees are appointed. I refer to the demand of the country for the regulation of the great transportation companies, to prevent the inequalities, the injustices, and the discrimination practiced by them against the producers, consumers, and shippers as well as the traveling public. That I consider a question just as important and as urgent as this, and the party in power will take time to deliberate upon it. But when it comes to this matter of expending sixteen millions of the money of the people, you bring in a measure here without reference to the committee and largely under the head of "Estimated miscellaneous expenses." I am complaining of the attitude of this House in asking us to vote for a measure without having the explanation. We ought to have it, and I register this protest and criticism. It is unbusinesslike, it is unfair to the country, and it is unfair to the membership of this House. This matter ought to be investigated, elucidated, and explained, so that all might know exactly for what they are voting. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HEPBURN. I would be glad if there could be a more detailed statement before the House at this time. I have no doubt but that a detailed statement is in the report of the Secretary of War. But I submit to the gentleman that there is no great innovation in this particular matter of estimates, only the sum is a larger one than usual. Take, for instance, the Book of Estimates with regard to appropriation for river and harbor improvements, as follows:

Improving the Black Warrior and Tombigbee rivers: For continuing improvements by the construction of locks and dams Nos. 1 and 2 in the Tombigbee River and the completion of Lock and Dam No. 1 in the Tombigbee River, near Demopolis, and Nos. 2 and 3 in the Black Warrior River, next above, and for the construction of bridges and lock houses as authorized.

Mr. CLAYTON. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. The information is that the committee had those items under investigation. They had the report——

Mr. HEPBURN. Here is the Book of Estimates as it is furnished by the War Department.

Mr. CLAYTON. And the committee gave a hearing on those items.

Mr. HEPBURN. They might have done so and they might not. I am speaking of the estimate and the form in which the estimates are made. Has the gentleman from Georgia information as to the cost of Dam No. 1 and Lock No. 2, and how much concrete there must have been, and how much of timber, and how much of labor, and how much of engineering? Those matters are never included in the estimates. The bulk sum is given, and that is done here. I think they might have adopted a different plan, and there might be connected with every estimate a detailed statement of every expenditure if a letter should have been addressed to a contractor with the necessary postage stamps. Then it might properly be included in the estimates that might be considered; but it has never been done. It is not the custom. When estimates are made they are made in this form. Here are 100 items of various amounts estimated for by the Secretary, and substantially the same language is used. There is nothing of a definite nature. It is not expected of them that the Congress will be informed in regard to every matter of this kind. Something is left to the engineer in charge; something of credibility rests on his statement.

Mr. CLAYTON. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. HEPBURN. Surely.

Mr. CLAYTON. Does the gentleman find in there any item as uncertain as this: "To equipment purchased or contracted for delivery not later than June 30, 1906?"

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know. I have not investigated.

Mr. CLAYTON. Does the gentleman find anything in there as indefinite as this: "Estimated miscellaneous material purchases in the United States from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906?"

Mr. HEPBURN. Here, for instance, is an item I pick up at random: "Construction of keepers' dwellings, Sunken Island Station, St. Lawrence River, New York, $5,000." How indefinite that is. Now, probably, the gentleman would like to know something of the style of architecture, whether it is Gothic or something more modern than that, or whether the Queen Anne style would be preferred. It might be wise and proper to gratify curiosity in that way; but in this department, in making estimates for these expenditures, that kind of minute detail is never indulged in. It is supposed that when the proper officer was authorized to construct this keeper's dwelling, that there was a limit upon him to keep within the expenditure of $5,000, and that as an honest officer he would do with the money what was best for the interest of his Government. Something has to be assumed as to the integrity of the individual instrumentality by which these works must be carried on.

Now, these gentlemen know what they want to expend during the year—what is necessary to carry on the work. Suppose there was a detailed estimate made. So many thousand dollars for cement, so many thousand dollars for sand, so many thousand dollars for the other materials necessary to make concrete, so many thousand dollars for labor in the preparation of this material at one point, so much at another point. What would this House know as to whether or not these estimates were rightful? Will the gentleman insist that if they were made he, as a Member of the House or as a member of the committee, would take them up item by item, figure out the amount, learn somewhere else the unit of probable cost, and base his judgment upon that? No one would pay any attention to these details if they were given. We have got to rely upon these officers. If they are honest men, then a mistake has been made. If that is true, neither the guardianship nor the watchful care or scrutiny of the gentleman from Alabama or myself can prevent dishonesty. It lies inherent in the personality of the man who has the discretion, and who in the nature of things must have discretion.

These estimates are made by men that have been selected for the purpose of this great work. The responsibility is upon them. They are scrutinized by the officers of the War Department. They have the confidence of those officers. In turn, the President of the United States, charged with the responsibility, upon whose shoulders rests all the responsibility of the selection of men to select the right instrumentalities—the man who above all others will suffer if there is dereliction of duties and failure to perform on the part of those selected by him—he, in turn, has given that scrutiny that it was possible under the circumstances for him to give; and so they come down to us in that way. I confess that it might have been better if infinitely more of detail had been indulged in. It might have been better if I and the gentleman from Alabama had information about these particular items of conjectural expenditure; but we would have known no more had we had them. What does he or I know about the cost of construction there? What does he or I know of the state of the market of materials here in the United States or in the markets where these particular things must be bought? It might have been better for us; but, after all, I think it would serve no useful purpose, for probably neither he nor I would have looked on them except in the cursory manner in which men examine details of that kind.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. Then, in view of the profound ignorance which, I take it, the gentleman's admission attributes to the membership of this House, we can not know anything about anything, and we must simply take the estimates furnished by the Departments. What is the use, then, of having committees to investigate any of these things? Why not take the estimates of the Departments on everything and put them through without the intermediary of a committee?

Mr. HEPBURN. As a rule, that is what is done. The estimates of the Departments, as a rule, govern, and it is only in exceptional cases, where unusual information is within the reach of gentlemen, that there is investigation other than that which produces any practical result.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman allow me?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRAN. I ask the gentleman's attention to this language:

I earnestly recommend to the Congress the need of economy, and to this end, of a rigid scrutiny of appropriations.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. COCKRAN. Would the gentleman regard that, then, as superfluous?

Mr. HEPBURN. No; I think this is rigid scrutiny. I think this is as complete scrutiny as would be given under any circumstances. I think there is no man in this House who would set his judgment against the judgment of this board of engineers with regard to the necessities of an appropriation for a given work. We would accept what they are bound, under the law of the land and under the law of honor, to give to us here truthfully.

Mr. COCKRAN. I just merely wanted to ascertain what the gentleman conceives to be the duty of the House. By scrutiny of appropriations does the gentleman mean a scrutiny of what these officers say or a scrutiny for themselves of the necessities of government?

Mr. HEPBURN. I understand it to be that scrutiny that business men would make of a given expenditure in which they were about to engage, and I undertake to say that if a railway corporation or any other great corporation appoints its engineers to conduct a certain improvement, when those engineers have carefully considered that matter and have made their report, as business men the board of directors would act upon that report of the man whose duty it was to make it, and to make it honestly—the man who had been selected because of his integrity and his wisdom to make it—and it would be insolence, I think, on the part of nonprofessionals who happen to sit upon that board to say without something to attract their suspicions that their judgment was better than that of the expert whom the wisdom of all had called to engage in the enterprise.

Mr. COCKRAN. The gentleman will, of course, understand that I merely seek to have his views on this subject for the benefit of the House. I would like to know what the gentleman desires us to understand is the business of Congress. Is it to accept the figures contained in the estimates and, using his own expression, that it would be impertinent to verify those figures by independent inquiries by a regularly appointed committee?

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, I have no desire to inform the gentleman upon any subject of that kind.

Mr. COCKRAN. Well, I ask the gentleman's attention then to this: Take the case he presents, where a board selects its own agents to make inquiries of a technical character, and acts upon that report. Does he consider that analogous to the action of a department of the Government, called upon to exercise its judgment on the actions, not of its own agents, but of appointees of another department?

Mr. HEPBURN. In a sense these men are our appointees. We have invested the President with the power to make these selections. The President has made the selections. I believe that he has been wise in the selections. These men whom he has selected have been engaged in the performance of this duty. They are learned upon this subject and familiar with it. I at least for one am not. I would regard it as insolent for me to put my judgment upon a great subject of engineering of which I have no knowledge at all against that of a man recognized throughout the world as great and eminent in his profession.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in this debate; but it seems to me that the question is now put upon a plane where every Member of this House must ask himself and his colleagues a very important question. If the enactment of this measure in this very unusual manner is justified by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] upon the ground that the House of Representatives, in exercising the power of appropriation, can not scrutinize the estimates of an executive office without exposing itself to an imputation of insolence? And insolence in a legislative body closely approaches treason to its duty.

I can not understand what function is left to us if we are to be considered impertinent when we ask any officer for an explanation of the reasons why millions of dollars should be taken from the Treasury. If putting and pressing that very inquiry be not our function, why, we have no function. It would be idle to call such a meaningless performance as the gentleman from Iowa describes a duty or a power. Nothing could be more ridiculous than to require this body to solemnly enact a law in order to justify the expenditure of money if the extent of our duty and our power is simply to express our approval of whatever the engineers of the War Deparmtent or any other officer may certify.

Mr. Chairman, just conceive the position in which we are placed. We are asked to appropriate $16,000,000, an amount larger than the entire revenue of a great many States, and it is asked to do it upon a piece of paper that not one man in the House can undertake to explain. If there be impertinence anywhere, let me submit to the gentleman from Iowa that it does not lie in scrutiny of estimates by Members of this House, but it lies with those who deny the right of this House, charged with the public purse, to satisfy itself in advance of any appropriation as to the necessity of every expenditure, the direction in which it will go, and the grounds on which it is asked. [Applause.]

What is the precise status of the measure before this body now? The gentleman from Iowa, among the most distinguished Members of the House, one of its brightest ornaments, stood on the floor this morning and vindicated the right of his committee to take charge of this bill. On what is the right of a committee based to take charge of a bill before this House? Upon the assumption that the committee can prosecute more efficiently than the whole House inquiries into the reasons offered for its enactment, and that the result of those inquiries will be spread before all the Members, either in a report or in answer on the floor, when a question is asked. It is only upon that assumption that the gentleman could be justified in standing here and claiming the right to take charge of this measure—a right we all conceded, because back of the claim he advanced lies a long record of effective service in that direction.

Now, he undertakes to tell us that the very efficiency on which he had a right to pride himself, which we consider a glorious feature of this House, was really an impertinence which any member of the Executive Department, if he had chosen, might have rebuked. If that be the extent of our power over appropriations, it had better be wiped from our constitutional system and the people of this country no longer left to believe that when the House of Representatives appropriates money the estimate of the officer recommending the expenditure had passed the scrutiny of a competent body. Let us acknowledge the truth, and proclaim it that executive officers can open the door of the Treasury and help themselves to its contents whenever they choose to assert that an expenditure of money is necessary for the public service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that at some time or other somebody in the course of this debate would explain to us the necessity for each of these expenditures; would tell us how this Commission came to expend moneys beyond the amount appropriated; would tell us, when they asked for the enormous sum of eight or nine million dollars in addition, just when and how and where it would be expended; but so far not a member of the committee has been able to answer a single question on this head, but the debate has reached its culmination of vagueness with the declaration of the gentleman from Iowa that such questions would be impertinent. Sir, if that be true, I do not want to sit on the floor of this House. If a question asked in the discharge of my duty as a custodian of the public treasure is to be considered impertinent, then the requirement of the Constitution that money can be taken from the Treasury only after an appropriation by the House of Representatives is a hollow mockery.

I hope that the Administration responsible for this enterprise, responsible for this demand made upon the House, will take an attitude more favorable to our Constitution, more respectful to our system of government than that which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] has thought proper to take here upon its behalf to-night. I hope that the House will be informed of the necessity for each of these expenditures; that we will be given some more definite information than this, for instance:

Estimated miscellaneous material purchases in United States from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, $2,300,000."

I hope we will be vouchsafed some more information about this material than the statement that it is "miscellaneous" before we appropriate such a stupendous sum for the purchase of it. And so through every item the right of the House to scrutinize estimates will, I hope, be asserted and recognized before one dollar is appropriated. And here, sir, I ask the attention of the House again to this language, which we listened to with respect yesterday when read by the Clerk:

I earnestly recommend to the Congress the need of economy, and to this end of a rigid scrutiny of appropriations.

If in the past that duty has been neglected, it is time now that it should be discharged. I ask this House to decide now that requests for information on subjects as important as this are not an impertinence, but an obedience to the oath of office which all of us took no later than yesterday when, with uplifted hands we swore to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States—one of whose chief features provides that

the Treasury of the Union shall be guarded by us, not in a perfunctory manner, but with vigilance, with unswerving determination to guard the safety of every dollar in its vaults until it is withdrawn by us to be expended in promoting the welfare of our whole citizenship. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] shall place me in the position that he reiteratedly has tried to do. I made no such declaration as he has declared. I have not denied the right of scrutiny to any Member of this House with regard to appropriations. What I said was this, and I was talking of a practical matter. I said that when an estimate was made by a man learned in his profession, with regard to that which he understood and with regard to a duty that he was charged to perform, I would regard it as insolence on my part, not a professional, to attempt to criticise his estimate. That is what I said, and when I carried it further to the board of directors, and it was something in the line of duty of an engineer who made his estimates to them on a subject about which they had no professional knowledge, I said that it would be regarded as insolence for them to criticise the knowledge of the man who had been selected by them as the expert. And out of that, for the purpose of the gentleman, in order that he may deliver one of his general diatribes upon public virtue and upon the Constitution of the United States, he attempts to distort the purpose of my language into a denial of scrutiny on the part of the membership here of the business that comes before us. I said that had there been the utmost of detail with regard to these engineering matters they would have amounted to nothing to us, for the simple reason that we have no knowledge upon that subject, and that we would accept what was said notwithstanding the fact that we did not technically and professionally know whether or not those estimates were right. What would we know, I again say, as to the units of cost? We may have some knowledge here—possibly some professionals would—but we would have no knowledge of the correct unit in other places, where labor conditions were so different, where climatic influences were so remarkably changed from ours. Practically, it would have amounted to nothing if we had them; and therefore I said what I said, and not what the gentleman so glibly and repeatedly tried to put in my mouth. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield.

Mr. COCKRAN. Oh, I thought the gentleman was through.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized in his own right.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I merely wished to say that no one would be slower to do injustice to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] than myself. I value too highly as a national possession the very brilliant record which the gentleman has made in this House even to stand idly by if the slightest reflection were cast improperly upon his fame, but I think after the gentleman finished his statement that not a Member of the House here could find the slightest difference between his description of what he had said and mine. I repeat my statement of it now, and if the gentleman will show me where it is wrong in the slightest degree I shall correct it on the spot, with ample apologies to him and with great personal joy at finding I misapprehended him. I understand the gentleman to say now that if experts employed by the War Department certify to an expense, make an estimate of what some public work will cost, and send it to Congress, it would be superfluous and insolent on the part of this House to scrutinize this estimate on the ground——

Mr. HEPBURN. No, sir.

Mr. COCKRAN. Pardon me——

Mr. HEPBURN. Wait a moment. The gentleman should make the distinction.

Mr. COCKRAN. Then let us have the distinction from the gentleman himself.

Mr. HEPBURN. I said that where an expert, a scientist, a man who had knowledge, is called upon under the solemnities of a great duty to perform an obligation, for me to set my information against his would be insolent, and I say that still and I believe it.

Mr. COCKRAN. Well, I will accept that. I will accept the gentleman's own statement of his statement. I shall not undertake to describe it myself again, because it would suffer in my imperfect rendering of it. [Laughter.]

I accept the statement exactly as the gentleman from Iowa has made it. It seems that the eminence of the expert is the test by which the insolence of the House is to be determined if it undertakes to examine the estimate he has made. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, I do not believe there is any degree of eminence that any expert ever reached in the history of mankind that would make it impertinent or insolent for the House of Representatives to scrutinize estimates prepared by him, or to scrutinize any act, condition, or case whatever upon which an appropriation of money, under our oaths, must be made.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have said what I would regard as insolence on my part; I have not stated it would be insolence for the House, if it concluded, to engage in any kind of investigation it wanted.

Mr. COCKRAN. In view of the explanation, Mr. Chairman, for which I am very grateful, I must say I should regard it as most calamitous, indeed, if the House had to separate itself from the gentleman from Iowa under any circumstance. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But, now, for the purpose of showing the gentleman from Iowa that, even where experts prepare estimates, there are abundant matters upon which Members of the House can exercise intelligent judgment before making appropriations, I ask his attention to paragraph No. 2 of the estimate or figures before us, and he will see there that 1,100 steel flat cars are certified to have cost $1,071,000. Now, it is a very fair and proper subject upon which any business man in this House can exercise his own judgment as to whether this is an extravagant price or not. And so with the item of 120 locomotives which appear to have been purchased.

Almost any person can tell about what the cost of a locomotive should be, given its weight, dimensions, and power. Here an expenditure of some three million dollars was made, and the items are given. We can all scrutinize them, and every Member of the House can see that the figures are about correct and fair. Why could not that same amount of information be given to us upon the other items? All this is information to which we are entitled. We, as the lawmaking body charged with the care of the Treasury, should exercise our own judgment as to whether any expenditure of money is a proper or an improper use of the public treasure, and I ask the gentleman from Iowa to remember that even though we may refuse appropriations or correct estimates it does not follow that we are impeaching the integrity of the expert who has made the estimates or of the Department recommending the appropriation. We can not put the judgment of the expert in place of our own. We can only use his information or figures to enlighten ourselves. Under our Constitution the Treasury door can not be opened by anybody except by this House, and by this House acting on its own conscience and judgment, that conscience and judgment enlightened, perhaps, by experts, but never controlled by them. But surely, Mr. Chairman, it is not extravagance to say that nobody on this floor has contributed more powerfully and more signally to establishing the ability of this House to discharge all of its functions than the gentleman from Iowa, and it is therefore in defense of the fame which he has won and of the record which he has made that I stand when I insist on the right of the House of Representatives to be governed by its own conscience and judgment in every appropriation of public funds and deny its right to accept the judgment of anybody, expert or other, in discharging a duty which the Constitution places on us and which it does not allow us to delegate to anyone, be he the wisest or best or most expert in all the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the debate has tended to what seems to me to be dangerous ground. This morning it was stated that this was an emergency measure. This House is always ready to act upon emergencies if it is necessary, but I am sorry from my standpoint of view to feel that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in his zeal for the passage of this measure leads us logically onto very dangerous ground. He holds up the Book of Estimates and says, "Here is our authority; let us follow the Book of Estimates."

Mr. HEPBURN. I beg your pardon, I did not say authority. I said that was the usual method in which estimates were made.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations for several years, I will say that estimates are nearly always made by experts—that is, by those who are believed to be peculiarly well qualified to estimate the necessities of the case under consideration. They are made by the friends of the enterprise sought to be promoted. Now, I want to say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if this House is to follow the Book of Estimates, it will mean to bankrupt the Treasury of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When the House assumes to abrogate its prerogative as guardian of the Treasury of the nation, and there is allowed to a coterie of men, experts

though they may be, in any and every department, and back of any and every enterprise, the spending of the money of the United States, it means that we will go many millions of dollars into debt. We ought to save the people from that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion right there, to the effect that if this principle were once declared and acted upon consistently the Agrostologist, the Entomologist, and the Biologist of the Agricultural Department alone would take all of the money out of the Treasury each year. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. I beg to ask the gentleman whether, with his experience on the Appropriations Committee, it has not been the usual and invariable rule of the committee, where contracts have been authorized by Congress, to appropriate the amount to carry on the work under contract which the engineering department or other department finally said was necessary for expenditure during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. But there is a difficulty in this case, and it shows the predicament in which the House finds itself in having no committee to investigate this particular subject. As a general proposition, the gentleman's query would be answered in the affirmative, but it does not necessarily follow from that that the expenses may not be extravagant and therefore ought to be scrutinized.

I believe, gentlemen, we have entered upon an enterprise here that will bring scandal upon the whole country, not upon the Republican party or the Democratic party, but upon the United States, unless we put our hands upon the financial throttle and say to those responsible for the work as carried on "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther." [Applause on the Democratic side.] Between us and the people who pay the money there is no other authority, no other power, to say you shall not put your hands into the Treasury and take this or that. I repeat again, study the Book of Estimates and you will find that every man magnifies his office. Every man seeks to build up his department, not at the expense of others, but at the expense of the General Government. I will here say publicly what I have often said privately, that if the country knew the millions and millions of dollars that are saved to the people by the faithful guardianship of the Members of this House over the public Treasury they would have a greater appreciation of our services than many do at the present time.

I hope, sir, that this bill will pass as an emergency measure, but not as a precedent for future action, and that every step in the progress of this colossal enterprise may be made open and public, in order that the people may not only know what it cost to construct and complete it, but that the vast sums necessarily used have been wisely and economically expended.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, for fear that we might forget the laws which we have already provided in reference to the canal and the powers under which the Commission and the President are now acting, I beg leave to call the attention of the House to the act of Congress which we enacted providing for this canal and by which we directed the President to construct the Panama Canal and under which we authorized him—the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] to the contrary notwithstanding—to enter into contracts, and obligated ourselves to appropriate for the payment of those contracts from time to time the money necessary to build the canal, to the extent, at least, of $135,000,000 in addition to the $10,000,000 carried by the act.

Here we have a case where we have required the President to enter upon a work; where we have authorized him to incur the expenditures. The distinguished gentleman from New York was mistaken, in my opinion, when he stated that the Executive had incurred expenditures without authority of law. We passed the law; we gave the authority; we imposed the duty; they only obeyed our behest; and the only judgment which we can properly use in reference to the future expenditures is as to whether the amount that is asked for is necessary at this time.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRAN. I would like the gentleman to point out where "the gentleman from New York," if he referred to me, stated that these contracts had been made without authority of law.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York stated, or at least I understood him to state, that they had incurred large expenditures without authority of law. If the gentleman did not so state, I am certainly sorry to have misquoted him.

Mr. COCKRAN. I certainly did not so state, and could not so state, for I did not know anything about it.

Mr. MANN. When the gentleman revises the proof of his speech, I think he will find that he did. He may have done it by inadvertence.

Mr. COCKRAN. The question was entirely unconnected with the basis of my discussion. But I would like to ask the gentleman this: Do "estimated miscellaneous material purchases" refer to contracts already made?

Mr. MANN. Very likely.

Mr. COCKRAN. But do they? I want the gentleman to say whether they do or not.

Mr. MANN. A portion of them I know do, but whether they do or not we have authorized the President to enter into contracts, and whether he has already entered into contracts through the Commission or whether he has advertised for bids or whether he only proposes to advertise for bids makes no difference. We have conferred the authority and imposed the duty upon the Executive in regard to these expenditures. It is true we have the right—and it is not only a right, but it is a duty on our part—when these expenditures are incurred to inquire into them and see whether they have been honestly and economically incurred. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COCKRAN. The gentleman's last admission puts us in a position of perfect harmony.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that the House ought to be most careful about the expenditures upon this canal work. I do not believe that we can frame any law which will be too strict, because I realize the fact, the Executive realizes the fact, the head of the Department which has this work under control realizes the fact that with the utmost endeavor upon the part of those in authority it will sometimes be difficult to prevent extravagance and corrupt expenditure of money when the work is carried on 2,000 miles away from here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My recollection is the last Congress enacted a proviso rendering it unlawful for an executive officer to anticipate appropriations. Did that proviso become law or not—does the gentleman remember?

Mr. MANN. That proviso became law; but I will say it has no application in this case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If that proviso became law, then is not any anticipation of actual appropriation unlawful, even in the case of a promised appropriation?

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman distinctly not. If it were so you could not carry on any public building in the United States satisfactorily, and could do no river and harbor work. We authorize the Secretary of War to enter into contracts for river and harbor improvements. These contracts are entered into because in this way the work is done more economically than by making contracts from year to year. They have made them for expenditures beyond the amounts which have already been appropriated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the gentleman thinks that $135,000,000 have been appropriated?

Mr. MANN. I do not think that $135,000,000 have been appropriated. Ten million dollars have been appropriated, and only $10,000,000 have been expended; but contracts have been entered into for more, as we authorized the President. Does the gentleman from Mississippi say that we ought not to go ahead with any of this work on the canal, that we should stop everything now until——

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; "the gentleman" does not say that. On the contrary, the gentleman is perfectly willing to give whatever amount is absolutely necessary to prevent the work from stopping, up to the time that the committees can properly act.

Mr. MANN. That is what I understood.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I was talking about whether they had not violated the law in putting us in this predicament.

Mr. MANN. They clearly have not violated the law. That proviso which we enacted does not at all relate to this authority which we grant. It has no reference to contracts authorized by statute. Now, we have conferred this authority upon the President. We have imposed this duty upon him. If we were in the position where we wanted to make just as small an appropriation as possible, we ought carefully to scrutinize the items for the future; but we are in the position where we want as much money expended as can possibly be expended properly and with economy. We want the work to progress. I do not see that there is any occasion for charging that these people have not presented a proper estimate for this work.

Mr. PRINCE. I want to ask my colleague a question.

Mr. MANN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. PRINCE. I do not desire to appear in the attitude of objecting to any reasonable amount that is required by the Commission to prosecute this work speedily and properly. In view of this statement will my colleague inform me, and through me the House, whether we can make a less appropriation than

$16,500,000 and not in the slightest degree interfere with the progress of this work, leaving the difference between what we ought to appropriate now as an emergency and $16,500,000 for the committee to consider later and report later to this House?

Mr. MANN. I say to my colleague that I have no doubt it would be possible in some way to segregate the amounts and to differentiate between the amount necessary immediately and the amount necessary between now and the 30th of June. On the other hand, I wish to say to my colleague further that in the effort to make this differentiation, in the effort to segregate these amounts, between the amount absolutely needed at present and the amount which might be needed at any time I changed the conviction which I started out with, that an appropriation of three or four million dollars would be sufficient, and expressed my judgment at least in favor of appropriating the entire amount, believing, as I do, that we will probably have a deficiency appropriation to make anyway. The people on the canal work are forming their organization in such a way that they are progressing more rapidly than anybody expected, and I believe it would be a serious detriment unless the money is appropriated as needed; and in my judgment they will need it before another bill is likely to be passed through both Houses of Congress.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to detain the House very long, but I desire to call attention to the fact that this is the first opportunity the House has had for taking a part of the good advice given to it by the President in his recent message. Some people have criticised his message because, it is said, he sermonized to some extent, that he indulged in a lecture as to public duty, and that he referred frequently to doing things decently.

Now, here we have an opportunity to do the very thing that he preaches in his message which was read yesterday, an opportunity to scrutinize a coordinate department of this Government in the expenditure of the people's money, not only the expenditure that has already happened, but the proposed expenditure.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] begs the question when he tries to make this case analogous to the report of a chief of engineers for cement and for stone used in building locks on the Warrior or the Tombigbee River. That was a matter that had expert investigation. That was a matter that underwent the scrutiny of a committee of this House and underwent the scrutiny of this House, and it was well understood.

Now, there we have right here the difficulty—a want of information that perhaps precipitated this discussion. In the beginning of this discussion to-day the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asked a pertinent question—if it be true that $10,000 a year of the people's money appropriated to build a canal across the Isthmus of Panama was used for the purpose of paying a press agent, and, if it was so used, what was the necessity for employing a press agent. This question was not answered. It has not been answered yet. If this had been a specific statement, a detailed statement, that information would now, perhaps, be in the possession of the gentleman from New York. Isn't it a matter fairly for comment and for criticism that $10,000 of the people's money appropriated for digging the canal should be used in paying a press agent? What do we want with a press agent, if there is one? Can he tell this House anything about Panama more than it already knows? He is a resident here in Washington. What are his duties? Where does value received come from such extraordinary services as that of a press agent?

Now, I want to call the attention of the House to another peculiarity of this statement. You will find at the top of column 2 on page 40 of the record, "Estimated expenditures for October and November, 1905." Estimated expenses! October and November are buried in the past. Now, that time has passed and yet this matter is brought here and defended under the head of "Estimated expenses."

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, the distinction in the two items is between the auditor's office—one here and one on the Isthmus. The auditor in Washington has accounts all the way from California to New York. These accounts have not all been returned, and it is impossible to tell exactly the amount of these expenses, either in Washington or at the Isthmus.

Mr. CLAYTON. Not even for October? Salaries and wages for October already spent, and you don't know what it is? It is high time then, Mr. Chairman, that the people should know how their money is being expended.

Mr. MANN. It is impossible to tell, either for October or November, exactly the amount expended in the United States for any of these items running all the way from California to New York. Now, in order to prevent any claim that there was an error in them, it is made as an estimate. It is supposed to be the exact amount of the expenses, I will say to the gentleman, but this statement was made to me by the auditor in submitting the estimates.

Mr. CLAYTON. You will find another peculiarity in this item. It says, "Salaries and wages at Washington for October, $30,000; for November, $30,000," making in all $60,000. Now, farther down in the same column you will find an item in subdivision 8 which says: "Salaries, incidental expenses, etc., in the United States, from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, covering Washington office, including commissioners' offices, of assisting purchasing agents at New York, New Orleans, and Tacoma, cable and telegraph service estimated at $25,000 per month," $5,000 less than what seems to be embraced in the item of expenditure for October and November mentioned above.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that if this very item of $10,000—and it is not a small item for a press agent. It is asked what services he rendered. "Oh, miscellaneous, miscellaneous." Everything is hid away under the word "miscellaneous" and "estimated." Follow these items through and you will find the word miscellaneous is used very often. Now, I want to know what is embraced in "miscellaneous?" I suppose the House has a right to know something about it; it is our duty to know about it when we come to appropriate the people's money. Let us carry out the injunction of the President and begin now and exercise some scrutiny over the expenditures of the public money. That is our business, and let us do it, and now is a good time to carry into practice the sermon which the President preached to us yesterday.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Chairman, I have always believed that we should have the most thorough exposition of every item of expense in connection with the building of the isthmian canal, and I beg to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the act authorizing the acquisition of the Panama Canal Company's assets, approved June 28, 1902, to which the pending bill is an amendment, provides that "the Commission shall in all matters be subject to the direction and control of the President, and shall make to the President annually and at such other periods as may be required, either by law or by order of the President, full and complete reports of all their actings and doings, and of all moneys received and expended in the construction of said work, and in the performance of their duties in connection therewith, which said report shall, by the President, be transmitted to Congress."

I understand, as stated by my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], that those reports have been transmitted to Congress, and that as soon as they are received from the Public Printer the House will have all the information with reference to past expenditures which has been desired; and if it has not been furnished, I am ready to join in the earliest effort to call for it, because there is no doubt of the fact that the accounts have been fully kept in every detail, and that it is a mere matter of copying and printing to give them to the House and the country. And in connection with the importance of this matter, specially called to our notice by the impressive warning of my friend from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER], I submit to the consideration of Members of this body whether it would not be well, whatever the cost, to have each month printed for general distribution every item of expenditure, no matter how insignificant. It is possibly the only way to avoid at some time in the future that terrible calamity of dishonor and disgrace which would come from a diversion of the moneys appropriated for this great work to private advantage and profit. I know not why the general auditor submitted such an estimate of possible expenditures for the future. I am very sure, from the character of the present chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission, that had he been on his feet in his office there would have been a much more extended and explicit estimate of expenditures for the ensuing months. Consider his situation. Called to this position but a few months since, with other great duties to discharge and which he could scarcely leave, and which required some attention from him part of the time since his employment, he went immediately to the Isthmus, and found that while thousands of workmen had been gathered together there no adequate provision for their housing, their feeding, for the care of the sick—and an epidemic of yellow fever and other diseases was then raging on the Isthmus—had been made.

It was a crisis which required the rushing in of material, the construction of piers, equipment, and double tracking of the railroad, which required large expenditures of money; first, for housing and for treatment in hospital, and, second, for getting and distributing machinery with which to employ the thousands of workmen that were then there; for had he simply looked to housing and feeding and made no provision for a speedy unloading of ships and the handling of materials and machinery

upon the Itshmus with speed and economy and of beginning the great work of excavating the canal, this force of workmen would have disappeared or at least have become disorganized and disorderly, and there would have been serious obstacles in the way of resuming the work. Therefore, I thank God that Theodore P. Shonts pushed this work onward and did endeavor to expend the largest possible amount of public money in facilitating the progress of the work. I believe he did it honorably, wisely, and purely. I believe that full accounts have been kept of every item. If errors have been made, they have been errors of judgment, which can be criticised and corrected hereafter. At this time it seems to me the only duty upon the membership of the House in this connection is to endeavor to maintain the credit of this Commission, and the most effective condition of the forces upon the Isthmus, and to maintain the credit of the Commission in the markets of the world, so that they can secure the best materials for the cheapest prices hereafter, and thus encourage and expedite the herculean work of constructing the canal, a duty we can best perform by passing the bill introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], now under consideration.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman desires to encourage the purchasing of materials in the open markets of the world, I would ask him what he has to say in respect to estimate 3, which says:

Estimated miscellaneous material purchases in the United States from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, $2,300,000.

Why limit it if we desire to go to the open markets of the world?

Mr. WANGER. I understand that that language relates to purchases by purchasing agents in the United States.

Mr. JAMES. But it does not say that.

Mr. WANGER. They can receive bids from anybody anywhere around the globe.

Mr. JAMES. It does not say that and does not use that language as to other articles, but limits this expenditure of $2,300,000 to the United States.

Mr. WANGER. They have purchasing offices in two places only—one upon the Isthmus and the other in the United States—and with the advertising for proposals by the Commission all manufacturers of machinery and materials that are required by them in the work become acquainted with their wants, and if foreign manufacturers can meet the prices of the producers in this country there is no obstacle to their successful competition. The invitations for proposals——

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. WANGER. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Can you tell me to what extent, if at all, we have bought any of these goods in competition with foreign markets?

Mr. WANGER. I have no information upon that subject. They advertised for proposals very generally.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Where?

Mr. WANGER. Wherever they supposed there were persons to offer them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Did they advertise in foreign countries?

Mr. WANGER. I have no information upon that subject, but I beg to suggest that the manufacturers abroad have agents in the United States ready to inform their principals whenever a market opens for their products.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would like to finish that line of inquiry, as I desire to get all the information I can, as we are all interested in it. My information is for a while Governor Taft, the Secretary of War, bought a great deal of machinery and many supplies in the open markets of the world. A great howl was raised about it in some quarters, and possibly he abandoned it. I do not know whether he did——

Mr. WANGER. I do not know at all, but I know the question of whether or not the supplies, especially for the Panama Railroad Company, were properly advertised for was a special subject of investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the last Congress, pursuant to which arrangements were made to secure more free competition in the purchase of supplies and give the fullest opportunity for competition by all producers and persons having the required articles for sale.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. WANGER. Yes, sir; with pleasure.

Mr. JAMES. You see, section 3 relates to purchases in the United States. I ask you whether or not the eleven hundred steel flat cars were to be purchased or were purchased only in the United States.

Mr. WANGER. I understand they were.

Mr. JAMES. Why did they not use the language "purchased in the United States" there?

Mr. WANGER. I think they discriminate between the mainland of the United States and the Isthmus.

Mr. JAMES. I know, but the point is that the purchase of this material to the extent of $2,300,000 is to be made in the United States. Now, here are purchases of steel flat cars, locomotives, steam shovels, water tanks and towers, and things of that character, and I desire to know why they did not use the same language in regard to that which they use in regard to this other item?

Mr. WANGER. I direct my friend's attention to the fact I had nothing at all to do with the preparation of these estimates.

Mr. JAMES. I know you did not, but I want to find out why it was done. It is not part of the bill, but if you pass the bill relying upon that estimate, then it will be assumed as a direction for the expenditure of the $2,300,000 in the limited market of the United States and not the open market of the world.

Mr. MANN. It is simply a differentiation in the——

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman from Kentucky had investigated more closely the language he would have found in one place reference is had to past transactions, purchases already made, and in the other instance to estimates of purchases yet to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further debate the Clerk will report the bill by sections for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall be subject to the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled "An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900, the same as though said bonds were issued under the provisions of said act of March 14, 1900.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to, and accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VREELAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration of the bill H. R. 480, and had directed him to report that the committee had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State covering statements showing the receipts and disbursements of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Company for the months of November and December, 1904, and the months of January, February, March, and April, 1905, furnished by the Louisiana Purchase Exposition Commission in pursuance of section 11 of the "Act to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory," etc., approved March 3, 1901.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1905.*

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs:

The Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Fifth Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico, covering the period from July 1, 1904, to June 30, 1905.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1905.*

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee, for ten days, on account of important business.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, December 7, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the findings as to the claim of the Indiana State board of agriculture—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, with a recommendation, a draft of a bill for the continuation of a naphtha launch at Norfolk, Va.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting a list of judgments rendered against the United States in Indian depredation claims—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the year ended June 30, 1905—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting explanations in connection with his estimates for foreign intercourse—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed, except documents already printed.

A letter from the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, transmitting an inventory of property in his charge—to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Merchant Marine Commission, transmitting a supplementary report—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the report of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the commissioner of the interior for Porto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the commissioner of education for Porto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the superintendent of the Government Hospital for the Insane—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 4424) to provide for the protection against storms and floods of the property adjacent to Fort Crockett Reservation, on Galveston Island, Texas, lying between Thirty-ninth and Forty-fifth streets, in the city of Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 4425) to amend and supplement an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4426) to extend the privilege of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise to various subports in the customs collection district of Puget Sound, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4427) to extend the privilege of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise to various subports in the customs collection district of Puget Sound, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4428) to secure the use of United States rural mail equipment and to place the rural service on a paying basis—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4429) for the consolidation of third and fourth class mail matter under the title of "merchandise," and for the insurance of all mail matter against loss or damage, and for the establishment of a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4430) providing for the hearing of cases upon appeal in the circuit court of appeals for the ninth district in the State of Washington—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 4431) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Wyoming—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4432) to provide for medical care and surgical treatment of honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4433) granting to the State of Wyoming 50,000 acres of land to aid in the continuation, enlargement, and maintenance of the Wyoming State Soldiers and Sailors' Home—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4434) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sheridan, in the State of Wyoming—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4435) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Rawlins, in the State of Wyoming—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4436) to provide for the entry of agricultural lands within forest reserves—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 4437) for the erection of a public building at Jeffersonville, Clark County, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 4438) limiting the hours of labor for railroad employees—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 4439) to provide for the extension and enlargement of the public building at Lancaster, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 4440) to regulate postage on newspapers deposited for delivery in letter-carrier offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 4441) to establish an agricultural experiment station in the Sixth Congressional district of the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4442) making an appropriation for dredging a channel from Ship Island Harbor to Gulfport, Miss.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4443) to amend chapter 182, volume 28, of the Statutes at Large of the United States, so as to relieve homestead entrymen on naval reserve lands in Mississippi and Alabama from the payment of greater prices for said lands than in other cases—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 4444) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Macon, in the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4445) to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of injunctions and restraining orders in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4446) to authorize the organization of cities of the first class in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4447) to prevent monopoly and trusts and to secure free competition in trade among the States and Territories of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4448) donating to the State of Arkansas 100,000 acres of public land for the purpose of establishing, equipping, and maintaining a textile school in said State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4449) defining a legal day's work, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4450) to refund the cotton tax—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4451) to revive the right of action under the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4452) prescribing certain duties of internal-revenue collectors, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4453) to remove the restrictions upon the alienation of lands in Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4454) to provide for levees and improvement of the Red River from the Louisiana line to Fulton, Ark.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMYSER: A bill (H. R. 4455) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a pubilc building thereon at Newark, in the State of Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4456) providing for the purchase of a site

and the erection of a public building thereon at Wooster, in the State of Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 4457) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Olean, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 4458) authorizing a public building at Highpoint, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 4459) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations respecting the rights and privileges of the fish wharf—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4460) requiring the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare a report upon the improvement of the Anacostia River flats—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4461) to provide for the abatement of nuisances in the District of Columbia by the Commissioners of said District, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4462) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4463) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4464) to classify the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4465) to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4466) to preserve Sixteenth street NW. as a residence street, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4467) to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4468) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1895—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4469) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations respecting the public hay scales—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4470) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1895—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 4471) to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph and telephone line in the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4472) for an additional appropriation for a public building at Warren, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4473) for a public building at Ashtabula, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 4474) granting carriers in the rural free-delivery service an annual leave of absence with pay—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TYNDALL: A bill (H. R. 4475) providing for the erection of a public building at Cape Girardeau, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 4476) to repeal chapter 541, acts of Fifty-fifth Congress, approved July 1, 1898, and as amended February 5, 1903—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4477) to add 10,000 acres of land, by purchase or condemnation, to the Chattanooga and Chickamauga National Military Park, and appropriating $200,000 for that purpose—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 4478) to amend section 64 of the bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 4479) to make use of the money due the estates of deceased colored soldiers of the late civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 4480) to prevent the adulteration of blue-grass, orchard-grass, and clover seed—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 4481) making an appropriation for a public building at Houston, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4482) to provide for the improvement and completion of the grounds of and approaches to the United States post-office and court-house building at Abilene, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4483) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Angelo, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 4484) to protect our national food supply by the extermination of dogfish or dogfish sharks of the Atlantic coast of the United States of America included between Cape Hatteras and Eastport, Me.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4485) to provide for the erection of a public building at Marlboro, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 4486) for the erection of a post-office building at Pontiac, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4487) for the erection of a post-office building at Lincoln, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 4488) to make oleomargarine and other imitation dairy products subject to the laws of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia into which they are transported, and to change the tax on oleomargarine, and to impose a tax, provide for the inspection and regulate the manufacture and sale of certain dairy products, and to amend an act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4489) providing for a tax on wood alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4490) to amend the internal-revenue laws—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 4491) for the erection of a public building at Tuscaloosa, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4492) to prevent the issue of internal-revenue special-tax receipts to retail liquor dealers in communities where the sale of liquors is prohibited by State laws—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: A bill (H. R. 4493) to amend sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions for widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENBY: A bill (H. R. 4494) for the erection of an additional public building at Detroit, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 4495) to amend, modify, and simplify the pension laws of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 4496) to provide for an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the southern district of New York—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN WINKLE: A bill (H. R. 4497) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Jersey City, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 4498) authorizing certain extensions to be made in the lines of the City and Suburban Railway, of Washington, the Washington Railway and Electric Company, and the Anacostia and Potomac River Railroad Company, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 4499) to provide for the erection of a monument to the heroes of the war of the American Revolution—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4500) to establish a national military park at Fort Frederick, Md.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4501) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the free-delivery system of the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes," approved January 3, 1887—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4502) in reference to the civil service and appointments thereunder—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 4503) to amend section 551 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 4504) to grant carriers and substitute carriers in the rural free-delivery service fifteen days' leave of absence in each year—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4505) to provide pensions for those who are blind or so nearly blind as to require the services of an attendant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 4506) to regulate the trial of contempts of courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4507) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended by act approved February 5, 1903, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4508) to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, so as to amend the national banking act, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4509) to provide for the recutting of the Great Seal of the United States from the original model—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4510) to increase the pensions of widows of soldiers of the Mexican war to $12 per month—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4511) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Griffin, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4512) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Milledgeville, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 4513) to restrict the unlimited transfer of merchandise in bonded warehouses—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 4514) to purchase a site and provide for the erection of a public building at Plattsmouth, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 4515) for the erection of a post-office building at Kewanee, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4516) to refund the cotton tax—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4517) to prescribe the jurisdiction of suits, both in law and in equity, brought by or against receivers or managers of property appointed by Federal courts or judges thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 4518) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 4519) providing that the question of loyalty be not considered in certain cases before the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 4520) to amend section 45 of an act entitled "An act to reduce revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes," approved October 1, 1890—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 4521) for the erection of a public building at Calais, Me.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 4522) regulating the duties and fixing the compensation of the customs inspectors at the port of Boston—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4523) to authorize the purchase of the statue "America," by Cyrus Cobb—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4524) requiring corporations operating street railways within the District of Columbia to equip open cars with guard rails, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 4525) relating to widows' pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4526) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to increase the pension of pensioners on attaining the age of 64 years—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 4527) for preventing the adulteration or misbranding of foods or drugs, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 4528) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4530) for the erection of a public building in Westerly, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4530) for the erection of a public building in Westerly, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4531) making appropriation for site and pedestal of a statue of the late Maj. Gen. Ambrose E. Burnside in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4532) to provide United States district attorneys with the Supreme Court Reports—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4533) to amend the internal-revenue laws so as to provide for publicity of its records—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 4534) to amend the immigration laws of the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4535) to provide for the erection of a public building at Pittsburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4536) to provide relief for such employees in United States navy-yards as may be disabled by accident while in the performance of duty, and, in the event of fatal casualties, for the relief of surviving dependents—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 4537) to establish a life-saving station at the Isles of Shoals on Six Town Point, Lake Ontario—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4538) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the compulsory attendance of witnesses before registers and receivers of the land offices"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4539) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to gather statistics relating to the number of live stock in the United States, and raising revenue to defray the expense thereof—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 4540) providing for subsistence for rural free-delivery carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4541) to provide for a macademized roadway from the town of Sharpsburg, Md., to the Connecticut monument on the battlefield of Antietam—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4542) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the State of Maryland—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TYNDALL: A bill (H. R. 4543) granting pensions to Missouri Home Guards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 4544) for the relief of ship keepers at the Mare Island Navy-Yard, Cal.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4545) creating the Royal Gorge National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4546) ceding to the city of Canon City, Colo., certain lands for park purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 4547) providing for procurement of site and erection of a public building at Independence, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 4548) to amend the immigration laws of the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4549) for the consolidation of third and fourth class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 4550) to authorize the governor of the State of Mississippi to select certain lands in part satisfaction of its grant for university purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) for the relief of Daniel B. Watts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE: A resolution (H. Res. 39) asking information concerning the underground transportation between the Government Printing Office and the Capitol—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A resolution (H. Res. 40) authorizing the appointment of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Pensions—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A resolution (H. Res. 41) to pay to the widow of the late Fred M. Campbell certain sum of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Maine, asking the repeal by Congress of section 20 of Title XXXIII of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A resolution (H. Res. 34) providing for the printing of 1,000 copies of the History of the United States Navy-Yard at Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A resolution (H. Res. 35) requesting information of the Secretary of the Interior concerning the San Francisco Mountain Forest Reserve in Arizona—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DRAPER: A resolution (H. Res. 36) directing the Doorkeeper of the House to employ Hugh Williams as an additional page in the press gallery—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BOWIE: A resolution (H. Res. 37) asking the Secretary of Agriculture for a reprint of the Special Report on the Swine Plague—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: A resolution (H. Res. 38) expressing the sentiments of the American people respecting the recent massacres in Russia and extending sympathy to the sufferers, etc.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of the legislature of Connecticut, favoring the consolidation of third and fourth class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the legislature of Connecticut, concerning pure foods, drugs, and medicines—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the legislature of the State of Connecticut, favoring a uniform law of marriage and divorce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 4551) granting an increase of pension to William P. Diehl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4552) granting an increase of pension to Edward Treasure—to the Committete on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4553) granting an increase of pension to William R. Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4554) to remove the charge of absence without leave and reported desertion from the military record of J. F. Wisnewski—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 4555) for the relief of the personal representatives of James Rhodes, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4556) for the relief of John W. White, of Tuscaloosa County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4557) for the relief of Mrs. Ann E. Sanders—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4558) for the relief of the estate of Daniel H. Avery—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4559) for the relief of the estate of Martha J. Bailey, deceased; Martha J. Ozment, Alabama Bell, Eugene A. Bailey, and estate of Amanda Jones, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 4560) granting a pension to James M. Browning—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4561) granting a pension to Julia A. Fletcher—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4562) granting a pension to Stewart Hardee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4563) granting an increase of pension to William T. Wright—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4564) granting an increase of pension to E. F. McCormick—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4565) granting a pension to Nelson Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4566) for the relief of Pinkney Persons—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4567) for the relief of Aaron B. Stripling—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4568) for the relief of Thomas G. Verdine—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4569) for the relief of the estate of Archibald W. Tanner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4570) for the relief of Mrs. G. W. Ross, Mrs. H. C. Cary, Mrs. Annie Brooks, L. C. Wilcoxon, and Willie Wilcoxon, heirs at law and representatives of Wiley Franks, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4571) for the relief of Mrs. Izabella R. Napier—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4572) for the relief of the estate of Daniel Brewer, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4573) for the relief of the estate of Samuel M. Farrar, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4574) for the relief of G. W. Clark & Son, a firm composed of G. W. Clark and J. H. Clark, of Spalding County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4575) for the relief of the heirs at law of Emily R. Hathorn, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4576) for the relief of the legal representatives of J. P. Lamar, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4577) for the relief of Sabini Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4578) for the relief of the McCaw Manufacturing Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4579) for the relief of W. T. Morgan—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4580) for the relief of Blank & Parks, of Waxahachie, Tex.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4581) for the relief of the heirs of Robert McCoy, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4582) for the relief of the heirs of Bethel A. Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4583) for the relief of the estate of John Ivey, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4584) for the relief of the estate of John G. Snell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4585) for the relief of the estate of William H. Hugley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4586) for the relief of Mrs. R. E. Miller—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4587) for the relief of J. B. Barry—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4588) for the relief of John J. Mullins—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4589) for the relief of James G. Clay—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4590) granting a pension to Alberta Noulen—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4591) granting a pension to Joseph F. Hathaway—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4592) granting a pension to W. C. Short—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4593) granting a pension to William C. Short—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4594) granting an increase of pension to Joshua S. Ditto—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4595) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Tallant—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4596) granting an increase of pension to John J. Hughes—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4597) granting an increase of pension to Martin Ellison—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4598) granting an increase of pension to James B. Barry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4599) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Wakeland Heryford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEDE (by request): A bill (H. R. 4600) for the relief of George B. Hughes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 4601) granting a pension to Mary J. Prator—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4602) granting an increase of pension to Lucretia A. Keith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4603) for the relief of G. A. Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4604) for the relief of Jeptha B. Harrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4605) for the relief of George W. Hansard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4606) for the relief of Gilbert E. L. Falls—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 4607) to restore to the pension roll the name of Annie Gaebel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 4608) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Mitch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4609) granting an increase of pension to William J. Millett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4610) granting an increase of pension to William H. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4611) granting a pension to Ellen Messenger Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4612) granting an increase of pension to J. Henry Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4613) granting an increase of pension to John R. Martin—to the Committtee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4614) granting an increase of pension to Robert Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4615) granting an increase of pension to Armstrong Walton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4616) granting an increase of pension to William W. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 4617) to refund R. D. Bounds the sum of $435.42, stolen from the post-office at Seminary, Miss., by burglars, without fault or connivance of said Bounds—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4618) granting a pension to Lucinda Matkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4619) for the relief of June Poitevent, administrator of the estate of William J. Poitevent, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4620) for the relief of Emily Donnelly—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4621) to correct the military record of Charles H. Kellen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4622) granting a pension to J. C. Terry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4623) granting a pension to Edward Dunscomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4624) granting a pension to William Fernsworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4625) granting a pension to Anderson J. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4626) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4627) granting an increase of pension to James H. Morse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4628) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hatch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4629) for the relief of William H. Gowdy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4630) for the relief of S. H. Caldwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4631) for the relief of Alfred James Saynor—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4632) for the relief of Frank S. Donahue and Howard J. Donahue—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4633) granting an increase of pension to Fannie E. Morrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 4634) for the relief of the widow and children of Daniel McDonough, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4635) granting a pension to M. Elizabeth Kent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4636) granting an honorable discharge to Samson Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4637) granting an honorable discharge to Isaac P. Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4638) granting a pension to Henry Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4639) for the relief of Cumberland University, of Lebanon, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4640) for the relief of Howard Female College, Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4641) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Granville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4642) providing for payment to Putnam County, in the State of Tennessee, for the burning and destruction of its court-house during the late war between the States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 4643) granting an increase of pension to Orlena F. Seaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4644) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Dickens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4645) granting an increase of pension to David A. Mowry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4646) granting an increase of pension to John S. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4647) granting an increase of pension to David C. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4648) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Dedrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4649) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Owen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4650) granting a pension to George F. Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4651) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Jane Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4652) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Whitaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4653) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Cassidy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) granting an increase of pension to Edward Larkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4655) granting an increase of pension to James H. Rickard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4656) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Snell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4657) granting an increase of pension to George B. Albro—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4658) granting an increase of pension to Waller Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4659) granting an increase of pension to John F. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4660) granting an increase of pension to John Flood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4661) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Blanchard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4662) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus F. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4663) granting an increase of pension to Horace B. Tanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4664) granting an increase of pension to Terence McDuff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4665) granting an increase of pension to Minerva K. Perrin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4666) granting an increase of pension to David A. Carpenter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4667) granting an increase of pension to Kate Duffie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4668) granting a pension to William A. Luther—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4669) granting a pension to Joseph E. Green—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4670) granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Tanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASTOR: A bill (H. R. 4671) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4672) for the relief of James Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 4673) granting a pension to Samuel Rowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4674) granting a pension to James Faubion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4675) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Fell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 4676) granting an increase of pension to David Gibney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4677) granting an increase of pension to Granville E. Stout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4678) granting an increase of pension to John F. Casper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4679) granting an increase of pension to Franklin D. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4680) granting an increase of pension to C. M. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4681) granting an increase of pension to John Hensly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4682) granting an increase of pension to James Whiteman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4683) granting an increase of pension to David Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4684) granting an increase of pension to Louis Frick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4685) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Rich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4686) granting an increase of pension to William M. Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4687) granting a pension to Margaret J. Nipper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 4688) granting a pension to Torkild A. Rossing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 4689) granting an increase of pension to James Reeder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4690) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Slinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4691) granting an increase of pension to George L. Janney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4692) granting an increase of pension to Levi Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4693) granting an increase of pension to Harvey B. Utley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4694) granting an increase of pension to James S. Maxwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4695) to correct the military record of William A. W. Daly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4696) to amend the military record of Charles Cannon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 4697) granting an increase of pension to Walter I. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4698) granting an increase of pension to Timothy E. Furnald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4699) granting an increase of pension to Irene A. Cochrane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4700) granting a pension to Sallie S. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 4701) granting a pension to Elijah T. Hurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENBY: A bill (H. R. 4702) to reimburse $337.52 to Col. Phillip Kirschner—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4703) granting a pension to William J. Allmand—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4704) granting a pension to Alice Rourk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4705) granting a pension to Harriet E. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4706) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4707) granting an increase of pension to John H. Pitman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4708) granting a pension to William T. Wiley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4709) granting a pension to Mary N. A. Seeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4710) granting an increase of pension to James K. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4711) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Vallard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4712) for the relief of Francis E. Rosier—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4713) granting a pension to Mary Manning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4714) granting a pension to John Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4715) granting an increase of pension to John H. Whiting—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4716) granting an increase of pension to Helen Harriett Hulbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4717) granting a pension to Marshall U. Gage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4718) granting a pension to Cornelia S. Swaine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4719) granting a pension to Mary J. Trumbull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4720) granting an increase of pension to Louis B. Moon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4721) granting a pension to Pierre L. Carmouche—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4722) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus B. Houston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4723) granting an increase of pension to William Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4724) granting an increase of pension to George M. Vincil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4725) granting an increase of pension to Charles Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4726) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Wachtel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4727) granting a pension to Emma M. Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4728) granting an increase of pension to Lewis N. Tohill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4729) granting an increase of pension to James W. Walters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4730) granting an increase of pension to Meshach L. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4731) granting an increase of pension to Robert McMullen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4732) granting an increase of pension to James Scrogum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4733) granting an increase of pension to John L. Files—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4734) to restore Lieut. James Hampton to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 4735) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Adair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4736) for the relief of the county of Custer, State of Montana—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4737) granting an increase of pension to Odilia Logan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLERBE: A bill (H. R. 4738) granting an increase of pension to Henry Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4739) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence B. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4740) granting an increase of pension to Ransom L. Logan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 4741) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Dickerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4742) granting an increase of pension to Edward Coy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4743) granting an increase of pension to Hiram N. Goodell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4744) granting an increase of pension to Thomas O'Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4745) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Stiehl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4746) granting an increase of pension to William B. Hemphill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 4747) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4748) granting an increase of pension to Robert Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4749) granting an increase of pension to Oliver C. Loomis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 4750) granting an increase of pension to William L. Shipps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4751) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Sparling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4752) granting a pension to Mary E. Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4753) granting a pension to Josephine Colbath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4754) for the relief of the estate of Dorothy A. Rickard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4755) for the relief of the estate of James S. Stearns, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4756) to correct the military record of Joseph A. Blanchard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4757) granting an increase of pension to Edward Willis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4758) granting a pension to Abraham M. Cory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 4759) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Bullard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4760) granting a pension to George Rodgers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4761) granting a pension to Isaac Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4762) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Lively—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4763) granting an increase of pension to John C. Matheny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 4764) granting an increase of pension to Abijah Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4765) granting an increase of pension to George W. Shepherd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4766) granting an increase of pension to John Deardourff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4767) granting an increase of pension to William Van Tilburgh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4768) for the relief of the heirs of Frederick Dieker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 4769) for the relief of the Methodist Protestant Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLETT of California: A bill (H. R. 4770) granting an increase of pension to Robert Gawthorp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4771) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Dennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4772) granting a pension to Mrs. Stapelton Hayes—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 4773) to pay to Leopold Luchs moneys laid out and expended by him in the improvement of a tract of ground in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 4774) for the relief of Cooper Walker—to the Committee on Claims .

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 4775) granting a pension to Salina E. West—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4776) for the relief of the estate of Joseph W. Green, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4777) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Jackson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4778) granting a pension to Samuel F. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4779) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Nowell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4780) granting an increase of pension to James C. Clampett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 4781) for the relief of the personal representatives of Mitchell J. Childress, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4782) granting a pension to J. T. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4783) granting a pension to William H. Shillings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4784) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Keeble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4785) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4786) granting a pension to John V. Mays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4787) granting an increase of pension to Robert Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4788) granting an increase of pension to Robert Orr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4789) granting a pension to Frank Medlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4790) granting a pension to Daniel Burkett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4791) granting an increase of pension to George W. Qualls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4792) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin R. Ricketts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4793) granting an increase of pension to William G. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4794) granting an increase of pension to George C. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4795) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Gravitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4796) granting an increase of pension to Henry Blevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4797) granting an increase of pension to J. R. Doty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4798) for the relief of the estate of John Chesney, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4799) granting a pension to Sarah Williams, widow of William Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4800) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Shields—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4801) granting an increase of pension to George R. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4802) granting a pension to John McGhee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4803) granting an increase of pension to George W. Aldridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4804) for the relief of William Spears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 4805) granting a pension to Ida R. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4806) granting a pension to Melita Latta—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4807) granting an increase of pension to David A. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4808) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4809) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hatfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 4810) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Goodsell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4811) granting an increase of pension to John Fryer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4812) granting an increase of pension to Alvin S. Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4813) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Fortney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4814) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4815) granting an increase of pension to Thaddeus Ely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4816) granting an increase of pension to John A. Sherwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4817) granting a pension to Amos O. Rowley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4818) granting an increase of pension to Orvin P. Waterbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4819) granting an increase of pension to William H. Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4820) for the relief of Henry Crangle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 4821) for the relief of John Thomas Power—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 4822) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4823) granting an increase of pension to John G. McFarlane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4824) granting an increase of pension to Franklyn Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4825) granting compensation to Joseph Dawson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4826) granting a pension to Leola V. Franks—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 4827) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Morrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4828) granting a pension to Leonard S. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4829) for the relief of W. F. Lockhart—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4830) for the relief of W. F. Lockhart—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4831) for the relief of the estate of Solomon Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 4832) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Yates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 4833) granting an increase of pension to S. F. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4834) granting an increase of pension to Silas V. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4835) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Bynum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 4836) granting a pension to Columbus A. Bailiff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4837) granting a pension to Nora Stokes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4838) for the relief of Joseph H. Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4839) for the relief of the estate of David Wise—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 4840) for the relief of the Ditmar Powder and Chemical Company, of New York City—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4841) for the relief of Henry A. Tolbert—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4842) for the relief of James Willett—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 4843) granting an increase of pension to James H. Marcum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4844) granting an increase of pension to George W. Childers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 4845)

granting a pension to Josephine Toliver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4846) for the relief of estate of P. M. M. Alexander—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4847) for the relief of the heirs of B. T. Terry, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4848) for the relief of A. T. Mitchell and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4849) for the relief of the heirs of Louis Cato—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4850) for the relief of the heirs of William Hunt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4851) for the relief of the estate of A. W. McAllister, deceased, late of Washington County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4852) for the relief of the heirs of A. M. Harton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4853) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Kuykendall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4854) for the relief of the heirs of U. H. Buck, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4855) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas J. Babb, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. C. M. J. Williamson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4857) for the relief of the heirs of J. B. Clark, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4858) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Whitehead, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4859) for the relief of James K. Hamblen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4860) for the relief of the estate of Nancy Barrow, deceased, late of Bolivar County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4861) for the relief of Mrs. Mercy C. Harvey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4862) for the relief of Mrs. Emily Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4863) for the relief of Jane P. Moore, of Bolivar County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4864) for the relief of the heirs of R. H. Montgomery, of Holmes County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4865) for the relief of the estate of William F. Strather, deceased, Holmes County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4866) for the relief of the heirs of J. H. Peebles, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 4867) granting a pension to Louisa Gregg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4868) for the relief of Joseph T. Chance and the heirs of John R. Burton, deceased, late of Accomac County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4869) for the relief of David R. Mister—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4870) for the relief of John Henry Edwards—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4871) for the relief of William J. Lewis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4872) for the relief of Thomas Johnson or his legal representatives—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4873) for the relief of John T. Spence, or his legal representatives—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4874) for the relief of the heirs of Lemmis J. Spence, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4875) for the relief of William H. Howard and Oliver D. Lewis—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4876) granting a pension to William L. Beeks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 4877) to resubmit claim of James Q. Shirley and the estate of Francis De Long, deceased, to the Court of Claims, with instruction to enter judgment on the findings and return same to Congress—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 4878) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Witherwax—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 4879) granting an increase of pension to John W. Roache—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4880) granting a pension to Clarissa Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 4881) to correct the military record of Charles M. Mayberry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4882) for the relief of the heirs of John G. Winter, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 4883) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Michael—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4884) granting an increase of pension to John Bokart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4885) granting an increase of pension to James Hennon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4886) granting an increase of pension to Marcus D. Burket—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4887) granting an increase of pension to John F. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4888) granting an increase of pension to William Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4889) granting an increase of pension to Bennett S. Shaug—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4890) granting a pension to Effie Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 4891) granting an increase of pension to George W. Swadley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 4892) granting an increase of pension to Francis J. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LE FEVRE: A bill (H. R. 4893) for the relief of James E. Fuller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 4894) to reimburse the State of Georgia money advanced in removal of the Creek and Cherokee Indians—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4895) for the relief of James A. Kennedy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4896) for the relief of the estate of James A. Gregory—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4897) for the relief of the legal representatives of James Doyle—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4898) for the relief of Big Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church, of Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4899) for relief of estate of Willis Ramsey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4900) for the relief of the estate of C. E. Rosser, deceased, late of Clayton County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4901) for the relief of Andrew J. Wells—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4902) for the relief of J. W. McConnell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4903) for the relief of Joseph H. Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4904) for the relief of the estate of James A. Stewart—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4905) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander L. Williams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4906) for relief of W. R. Harris—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4907) for the relief of George P. Howard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4908) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas W. McArthor, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4909) for the relief of Charles L. Bradwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4910) for the relief of Mrs. Emily Evans—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4911) for the relief of John J. Hart—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4912) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah E. Youngblood—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4913) for the relief of William Ellis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4914) for the relief of the Atlanta (Ga.) Female Institute—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4915) for the relief of estate of Margaret Barge, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4916) for the relief of Ambrose Chewning—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4917) for the relief of Elsas, May & Co.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4918) for the relief of Edman Green—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4919) for the relief of Samuel I. Gustin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4920) for the relief of Mark Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4921) for the relief of Miss Honora Ryan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4922) for the relief of George T. Reeves—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4923) for the relief of the estate of John M. Nace, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4924) for the relief of the estate of Henry Banks, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4925) for the relief of the heirs of William Markham, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4926) for the relief of the St. Luke's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 4927) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Marietta—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 4928) for the relief of John B. Luttrell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4929) for the relief of Johnathan Y. Bridges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4930) for the relief of Chester Bethel—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4931) granting an increase of pension to Clark Tritt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4932) for the relief of Wilburne R. Lee, of Logan County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4933) for the relief of Lucinda E. Howard, of Pike County, Ark.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4934) to authorize the Secretary of War to revoke and vacate sentence of court-martial against Daniel Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4935) for the relief of Mrs. Sallie Brown, of Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4936) for the relief of John A. Welch, of Kirby, Ark.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4937) correcting the military record of Jesse L. Meeks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4938) correcting military record of James M. Wright—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4939) for the relief of George T. Epperson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4940) for the relief of H. C. Hayman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4941) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles Phillips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4942) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Shoddon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 4943) for the relief of Catherine Grace—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 4944) granting a pension to Jennie A. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4945) granting an increase of pension to Elias H. Funk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4946) granting an increase of pension to William H. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4947) granting an increase of pension to Christian H. Goebel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4948) to reimburse James M. McKee for expenses incurred in the burial of Mary J. De Lange, a deceased pensioner—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4949) to place Pendleton G. Watmough upon the retired list of the United States Navy as lieutenant-commander—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4950) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca M. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4951) granting an increase of pension to Lucien B. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4952) granting a pension to Marion L. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4953) for the relief of Edward De Vanney—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4954) granting a pension to Ellwood I. Beatty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 4955) granting a pension to William McElroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 4956) granting an increase of pension to James C. Bryant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4957) granting an increase of pension to Elijah J. Snodgrass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 4958) granting an increase of pension to George Wineland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 4959) granting a pension to Mary A. Barrand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 4960) to validate certain certificates of soldiers' additional homestead right—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4961) granting a pension to Esther H. Stilwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4962) granting an increase of pension to William J. Sturgis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4963) granting an increase of pension to Abbie C. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4964) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Stillwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4965) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4966) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Dewey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4967) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Holcomb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4968) granting an increase of pension to George W. Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4969) for relief of William Postell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4970) for the relief of the heirs of Margaret Sivley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4971) for the relief of Lovenia Hodges (née Grant)—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4972) for the relief of the estate of Washington Pryor, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4973) for the relief of Jesse A. Wallace—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4974) for the relief of William Roberts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4975) for the relief of Edward D. Pickett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4976) for the relief of the estate of John A. Pickett, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4977) for the relief of the estate of Joshua Easterly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4978) for the relief of M. V. Easterly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4979) for the relief of Jasper Hackworth—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4980) for the relief of the estate of Austin Hackworth, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4981) for the relief of the estate of Martin Hartman, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 4982) granting a pension to James M. McGoodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 4983) granting an increase of pension to Loulie A. Sterick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4984) for the relief of Dr. Thomas P. Robinson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4985) to reimburse and indemnify the town of Frederick, in the State of Maryland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4986) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Frederick County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4987) for the relief of La Grange Lodge, No. 36, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Boonsboro, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4988) granting an increase of pension to David Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4989) granting an increase of pension to Dominick Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4990) granting a pension to James W. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4991) granting an increase of pension to William R. Glisan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4992) granting an increase of pension to Albert G. Lovell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4993) for the relief of Mrs. Inez Shorb White—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4994) for the relief of the heirs of Abel Welton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4995) for the relief of Margaret M. Groves—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4996) for the relief of Daniel Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4997) for the relief of Adam Ault—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4998) for the relief of the heirs of Henry N. Harris, deceased, late of Montgomery County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4999) for the relief of Sampson Kinnea—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5000) for the relief of Francis C. Renner and W. A. Renner, executors of Isaac Renner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5001) for the relief of James H. Forsythe, executor of the estate of William Forsythe—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5002) for the relief of Elizabeth Cramer, administratrix of J. Henry Cramer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5003) for the relief of Johnson Benson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5004) for the relief of Joseph White—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5005) for the relief of Isaiah J. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5006) for the relief of Nathan Shaw—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5007) for the relief of the estate of Susanna Fleming—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5008) granting a pension to Maggie E. Bamford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5009) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Keplinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5010) granting an increase of pension to William A. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5011) granting a pension to Amelia Gertrude Henshaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5012) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Samuel A. Motter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5013) to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of William Viers Bouic, administrator of the estate of Elijah Thompson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5014) for the relief of Everett Wroe—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 5015) granting an increase of pension to Edwin R. Goodell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5016) granting an increase of pension to Francis Carey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 5017) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint certain persons in the Regular Army and place them on the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5018) to give a true military status to the Nebraska Territorial Militia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 5019) granting an increase of pension to Melinda H. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 5020) granting a pension to Julia A. F. Bassett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5021) granting a pension to Amanda C. Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5022) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5023) granting an increase of pension to August Westfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5024) granting an increase of pension to John W. Coons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5025) granting an increase of pension to Herbert C. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5026) granting an increase of pension to Asa Tout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5027) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5028) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Carll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5029) granting an increase of pension to Beverly W. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 5030) to correct the military record of Lieut. John W. Geiger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5031) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Neidinger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R.5032) granting a pension to Annetta Vale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5033) granting a pension to Silas W. Rank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5034) granting a pension to Francis S. Griest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5035) granting a pension to George W. Ennery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5036) granting a pension to John D. Deihl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5037) granting a pension to John Culp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5038) granting an increase of pension to Stephen W. Pomeroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5039) granting an increase of pension to John Person—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5040) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5041) granting an increase of pension to I. Frank Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5042) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Meily—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5043) granting a pension to Henry S. Matter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5044) granting an increase of pension to Hiram G. Hoke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5045) granting an increase of pension to Lee P. Garrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5046) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Garland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5047) granting an increase of pension to Joanna R. Forster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5048) granting an increase of pension to William A. Failer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5049) granting an increase of pension to Jared Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5050) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim M. Boltz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5051) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Benner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5052) granting an increase of pension to Harry Beitzel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5053) granting an increase of pension to Adam Baum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5054) granting an increase of pension to James Appleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5055) granting an increase of pension to John A. Walter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5056) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 5057) granting an increase of pension to John McCann—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5058) granting a pension to Bernard Sutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5059) granting a pension to John Taylor Winbery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5060) granting a pension to John Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5061) granting a pension to Rhoda C. O'Neil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5062) granting a pension to Eli Tippett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5063) to increase the pension of William G. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5064) for the relief of Benjamin S. Harper—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5065) to authorize the Secretary of War to correct the record of Calhoun Malone—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5066) for the relief of B. F. Ludwig, former postmaster at Huntsville, Ala.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5067) for the relief of the executor or administrator of the estate of C. C. Spiller, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5068) for the relief of Elizabeth A. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5069) for the relief of the estate of James H. Ware, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5070) for the relief of the estate of Mary McCaa, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5071) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah Schrimsher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5072) for the relief of La Grange College—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5073) for the relief of the trustees of Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Huntsville, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5074) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Robert Herstein, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5075) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Huntsville, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5076) for the relief of Amanda M. Warren, of Lawrence County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5077) for the relief of James M. Gullatt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of the heirs of the estate of John Hogan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5079) for the relief of the estate of Bradford Hambrick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of the estate of Alfred Hambrick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5081) for the relief of W. P. Hooper—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5082) for the relief of J. W. Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5083) for the relief of James G. Porter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5084) for the relief of William Moseley, administrator—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5085) for the relief of James Hilliard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5086) for the relief of M. H. Carr—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5087) for the relief of Thomas W. White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5088) for the relief of Henry C. Martin and Robert D. Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5089) for the relief of the estate of A. L. Logan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5090) for the relief of the estate of F. L. Hammond, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5091) for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Raney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5092) for the relief of the estate of Peter S. Baker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5093) for the relief of the estate of Willam P. Tanner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5094) for the relief of Parks S. Townsend—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5095) for the relief of B. F. Hembree—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5096) for the relief of the legal heirs of James I. Donegan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5097) for the relief of the estate of Henry Ingram, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5098) for the relief of W. C. Tipton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5099) for the relief of the estate of W. W. McCrary—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5100) for the relief of James R. Nance—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5101) for the relief of the trustees of the Missionary Baptist Church, at Waterloo, in Lauderdale County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5102) for the relief of Fabius Varin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5103) for the relief of H. C. Armistead—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5104) for the relief of successor of William R. Rison, deceased, trustee of Harriett M. Barnard and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5105) for the relief of Mary B. Dancy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5106) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Hughes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5107) for the relief of the trustees of First Baptist Church, Decatur, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5108) for the relief of Houston L. Bell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5109) for the relief of Alfred O. Williamson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5110) for the relief of John T. Lehman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5111) for the relief of Nancy J. Howard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5112) for the relief of Boling King—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5113) for the relief of Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Pleasant Springs, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5114) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Foster, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5115) for the relief of Jason Howard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5116) for the relief of the heirs of John Pettipool—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5117) for the relief of Eli Schrimsher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5118) for the relief of John Till—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5119) for the relief of Mary Haney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5120) for the relief of Jacob A. Paulk, of Lauderdale County, Ala., administrator of Johnson A. Paulk—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5121) for the relief of William Cunningham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5122) for the relief of the estate of Joseph A. Martin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5123) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Thompson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5124) for the relief of Bettie Linder, administratrix of B. Franks, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5125) for the relief of John Graves Turner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5126) for the relief of the estate of James Williams, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5127) for the relief of the estate of Marius B. Cawthon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5128) for the relief of Stephen Fanning—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5129) for the relief of James H. Young, Benjamin F. Young, and F. A. Young, of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5130) for the relief of George Stovall—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5131) for the relief of Green Henry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5132) for the relief of Thomas H. Streeter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5133) for the relief of John T. Lehman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5134) for the relief of William J. Wilcoxson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5135) for the relief of the heirs of Eliah Matheny—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5136) for the relief of the estate of W. R. Hanserd, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5137) for the relief of Patrick Daily—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5138) for the relief of Mattie H. Ligon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5139) for the relief of the heirs of Robert Bynum—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5140) for the relief of the estate of John Black, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 5141) granting an increase of pension to Orrin J. Wells—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5142) to refer the claim of Nancy Taylor against the United States to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5143) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the claim of the trustees North Alabama College, of Huntsville, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5144) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of the claim of the Presbyterian Church of Huntsville, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: A bill (H. R. 5145) for the relief of Isaac Sutton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5146) for the relief of James Heiney, late of Company G, Two hundred and fourteenth Regiment Pennsyl-

vania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5147) for the relief of George E. Hoffman—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5148) for the relief of John Conway, Company E, Twenty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5149) granting a pension to David Everett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5150) granting a pension to Mary N. Haintz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5151) granting a pension to Howard S. Gardner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5152) granting a pension to Leonard Andre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5153) granting a pension to John J. Gangwere—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5154) granting a pension to Elmer E. Frederick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5155) granting a pension to Michael Kresge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5156) granting an increase of pension to Morris H. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5157) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Nell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5158) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam N. R. Ahl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5159) to correct the military record of Patrick O'Conner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 5160) granting an increase of pension to Elbert M. Saxton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 5161) granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Mesick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5162) granting an increase of pension to James F. Travis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 5163) granting a pension to William U. Mallorie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5164) granting an increase of pension to Lestina M. Gifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 5165) for the relief of Samuel B. Bootes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5166) for the relief of George W. Guyer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5167) for the relief of William H. Stiner & Sons—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5168) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5169) for the relief of W. B. Sutter—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5170) granting an increase of pension to David R. Pringle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5171) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kinsel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5172) granting an increase of pension to Milton Strattan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5173) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Henninger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5174) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Turney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5175) granting an increase of pension to William W. Nesbit—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5176) granting an increase of pension to George Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5177) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5178) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Pantall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5179) granting an increase of pension to Mary Tracy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5180) granting an increase of pension to Archibald George—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5181) granting an increase of pension to William C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5182) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5183) granting an increase of pension to George W. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5184) granting an increase of pension to John Kilpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5185) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5186) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Fulton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5187) granting an increase of pension to Robert John—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5188) granting an increase of pension to Jane Barr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5189) granting a pension to Catherine W. Stoops—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5190) granting a pension to Jonas J. Boal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5191) granting a pension to Kate D. Marlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5192) granting a pension to Peter Washington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 5193) to correct the military record of Edward S. Knappen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5194) to authorize payment to the Henry Philipps Seed and Implement Company for seed furnished to and accepted by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1902—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5195) for the relief of the Milburn Wagon Company, of Toledo, Ohio—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5196) to refund to A. L. Flack & Co., of Tiffin, Ohio, money paid for internal-revenue stamps lost in the mails—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5197) granting an increase of pension to Ignatious Saunders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5198) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Thornburgh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5199) granting an increase of pension to William Geyser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5200) granting an increase of pension to John F. McBride—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5201) granting a pension to Ruel Sherman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5202) granting a pension to Jennie R. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5203) granting a pension to Mary Kirk—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5204) granting an increase of pension to James H. Waddell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5205) granting a pension to William D. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 5206) for the relief of E. D. Cook—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5207) for the relief of Z. T. Taylor—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 5208) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Rounds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5209) granting an increase of pension to Edward R. Dunbar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5210) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. R. L. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5211) granting a pension to Louisa D. Foote—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5212) granting an increase of pension to Giles Q. Slocum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5213) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Brisbine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5214) granting an increase of pension to Truman S. Walden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5215) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Little—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5216) granting a pension to Mary J. Kincaid—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 5217) for the relief of Agnes W. Hills and Sarah J. Hills—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5218) granting a pension to Clara A. Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TYNDALL: A bill (H. R. 5219) granting an honorable discharge to George H. Smythe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5220) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 5221) for the relief of Edward King, of Niagara Falls, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 5222) granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Stegman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5223) to reimburse Quong Hong Yick for one case of opium erroneously condemned and sold by the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 5224) granting an increase of pension to Nowen Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5225) granting an increase of pension to John A. Markley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5226) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus T. Swain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5227) granting an increase of pension to Joseph O'Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5228) granting a pension to Sarah Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5229) granting an increase of pension to A. E. Bonsall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5230) granting a pension to Louisa McConnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5231) granting an increase of pension to Louisa H. Colyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5232) granting an increase of pension to James M. Barnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5233) granting an increase of pension to Ethan S. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5234) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Spears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5235) granting an increase of pension to E. S. Van Cleve—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 5236) granting an increase of pension to Mary Greene—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5237) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Garland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5238) granting an increase of pension to Lockey Stewart—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEBBER: A bill (H. R. 5239) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. McCollins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5240) granting an increase of pension to William H. Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5241) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Schroeder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5242) granting an increase of pension to James B. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5243) granting an increase of pension to Edgar J. Hueston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5244) granting an increase of pension to Hiram W. Cope—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 5245) to correct the military record of Noah Rickard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5246) for the relief of the estate of Samuel H. Patterson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5247) to correct the military record of William F. Songer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5248) for the relief of Hugh J. Needham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5249) granting an increase of pension to William Churchill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5250) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McLain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5251) granting an increase of pension to James M. Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5252) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5253) granting an increase of pension to Greenberry Suddarth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5254) granting an increase of pension to Travis W. Tichenor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5255) granting an increase of pension to Albert T. Weathers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5256) granting a pension to David Melton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5257) granting a pension to Spencer Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5258) granting a pension to George A. Cox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5259) granting a pension to William M. Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5260) granting a pension to Sarah L. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5261) granting a pension to George Washington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5262) granting a pension to George Heishman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5263) granting a pension to Joseph R. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5264) granting a pension to William R. Knibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5265) granting a pension to Bridget A. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5266) granting a pension to Hardin Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5267) granting a pension to John McIntyre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5268) granting a pension to James Faulkenborough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5269) granting a pension to Hiram G. McLemore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5270) granting a pension to Henry Graybrook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5271) granting a pension to John Hammond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5272) granting a pension to Joseph Vernia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5273) granting a pension to John H. Lagle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5274) granting an increase of pension to William T. Brannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 5275) for the relief of Faxon, Horton & Gallagher, and other parties—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, protesting against modification or repeal of the act for the exclusion of the Chinese—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Rockford (Ill.) Manufacturers and Shippers' Association, relative to regulation of freight rates of railways engaged in interstate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the American Medical Association, recommending aid to the United States Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the American Medical Association, praying for legislation regulating the practice of medicine in Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of American citizens resident on the Isle of Pines, praying for the protection of life and property on that island—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: Paper to accompany bill for retirement of Army officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of A. B. Means and others, of Washington, Pa.; Friendship Council, No. 201, and Star of the Valley Council, No. 136, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and Charles M. Foulk and others, of Newcastle, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Crouch, James W. Milligan, and C. C. Wolfe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the United Labor League of Western Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CAPRON: Resolutions of Eagle Council, No. 8, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Providence, R. I., and Washington Council, No. 2, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for the restriction of immigration and naturalization—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CROMER: Petitions of Dunkirk Council, No. 14, and Boundary Council, No. 59, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Morris & Writer, of Portland, Ind., for placing hides on free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Holmes Brothers, of Portland, Ind., and the Brannaham Company, of Indiana, for two classes of mail only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of W. F. Ferris and others, for general arbitration between nations—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of citizens of Leavenworth, Kans., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens, asking for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of United Labor League of Western Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ESCH: Affidavits to be filed with bill to pension Hiram N. Goodell, Company A, Third Michigan Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to be filed with bill for relief of Edmund Coy, Company C, Second New York Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, affidavits to accompany bill to increase the pension of Stephen Dickerson, Company C, Seventh Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of postal convention, relative to permitting postmasters more discretion and liberty in expenditures for small expenses—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry D. Stiehl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Wisconsin Consumers' League, asking for Congressional investigation of conditions among women employed as laborers in various occupations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Trades League of Philadelphia, relative to Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Wisconsin Retail Grocers and General Merchants' Association, against parcels-post legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of American members of the Educational Association of China, to protect Chinese students from insult at ports of entry—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLACK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph C. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petition of the Town Improvement Association, Agnes White Holt, secretary, for the preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of citizens of Elizabeth, N. J., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jane E. Bullard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: Letter from Department of Commerce and Labor, regarding a bill for the relief of Cooper Walker—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petitions of the United Labor League of Western Pennsylvania and Vine Cliff Council, No. 107, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring negotiation of new treaty with China relative to immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petitions of the Basset Jewelry Company, the T. W. Rounds Company, Ford & Carpenter, Press & Court, the George W. Dover Company, the Fletcher Manufacturing Company, the Barstow Stove Company, George B. Brooks, A. J. Magoon & Son, H. J. Astle, the American and British Manufacturing Company, John R. White & Sons, the Rhode Island Malleable Iron Works, the National Ring Traveler Company, the Crucible Steel Company of America, and H. W. Marcy, favoring passage of a postal law for two classes of mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island Horticultural Society, of Providence, R. I., favoring increased appropriation for agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island Horticultural Society, of Providence, R. I., for placing of basic slag meal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of Coal Union No. 2737, of Sugar Creek, Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GUDGER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel F. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Solena West—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Jonathan Nowell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of 108 citizens of Virginia, for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of James Borden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of citizens of Virginia, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Mount Crawford, Va., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Gabriel Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Papers for a pension to Benjamin Hamell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of residents of Virginia, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of John Sindbead and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Joseph T. Chance and the heirs of John Burton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers in support of the claim of William H. Howard and Oliver D. Lewis—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KNAPP: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Clarissa Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to John W. Roache—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Petition of the Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, against attempt to modify Chinese exclusion law—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Bennett S. Shaug—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Nome Chamber of Commerce, recommending establishment of a land office at Nome, Alaska—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Papers in support of bill H. R. 1962, granting an increase of pension to George C. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of bill H. R. 1957, granting a pension to Joseph Glassick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in support of bill H. R. 1960, granting an increase of pension to Conrad Lankenman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of R. W. Smith Post, No. 270, of Wrightsville, Pa., urging the granting of a pension to Ida L. and Clara H. Winters, to accompany bill H. R. 1958—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Petition of Painters and Decorators' Local Union No. 32, of Amsterdam, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of citizens of Hannibal, Mo., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Morris Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Jacob Marietta—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Eliza Snodgrass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James C. Bryant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Resolution on the reorganization of the Army Medical Department as adopted by the Cumberland Valley Medical Association, of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of William Portell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of George W. Holland, of Whitwell, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Beverly W. Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to John Young, of Jackson County, Ala.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Seymour, Edward Keating, Hudson J. Van Scoter, and Capt. George H. Hodges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Valley Grange, No. 52, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring amendment to oleomargarine law striking out "knowingly"—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of Local Union No. 15, United Union Workers of America, of Lincoln, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Giles I. Slocum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Louisa D. Burnet, now Foote—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Edward R. Dunbar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of citizens of Charlotte, N. C., in regard to the massacres and persecutions of Jews in Russia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Virgin Spring Council, No. 69, of Cornelius, N. C., and Belwood Council, No. 84, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Belwood, N. C., in favor of restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Rebecca Garlands, Lockey Stewart, and Mary Greenes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 7, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

THE JOURNAL.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, while at this early stage of the session I do not think it is desirable to dispense with the reading of the Journal, it is so very long to-day and the whole proceeding yesterday was so formal, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading be dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with. Is there objection? There is none, and the reading will be dispensed with.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905; which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON EDUCATION IN PORTO RICO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the commissioner of education for Porto Rico for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed.

MARITIME CANAL COMPANY OF NICARAGUA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERIOR FOR PORTO RICO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the commissioner of the interior for Porto Rico for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a letter from Dr. William A. White, superintendent of the Government Hospital for the Insane, together with a report showing in detail the receipts and expenditures thereof; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

LAWS OF HAWAII.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the acting governor of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the senate journal, regular and extra sessions, of the third legislative assembly of the Territory of Hawaii; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Territories.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifteenth annual report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905; which, with the accompanying paper, were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the forty-third annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the fiscal year ended October 31, 1905; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

KINGSTON HARBOR (MASSACHUSETTS) SURVEY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with a report from Col. W. S. Stanton, relative to a preliminary examination of Kingston Harbor, Massachusetts; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

IRRIGATION WORKS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey relative to examinations and surveys for the location and construction of irrigation works for the storage, diversion, and development of waters, including artesian wells, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on the Geological Survey, and ordered to be printed.

REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed Mr. LODGE and Mr. BACON Regents on the part of the Senate of the Smithsonian Institution, under the provisions of the Revised Statutes relative to that institution, to fill the vacancies occasioned by the death of Orville H. Platt and by the expiration of the term of Francis M. Cockrell.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the legislature of Georgia, praying for the repeal of the present Chinese-exclusion law; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A resolution urging the repeal or modification of the Chinese-exclusion act.

Whereas the Chinese-exclusion act is now bearing its evil fruits in the boycott of American goods, and is likely to effect seriously our southern products, as well as the Christian mission work in China, unless repealed or modified: Therefore,

Resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Georgia (the senate concurring), That the President of the United States and the Congress thereof are respectfully urged to repeal or so modify what is known as "the Chinese-exclusion act" as will not only restore friendly relations, but extend our commerce with that country.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President, Vice-President, and Speaker of the National House of Representatives.

JOHN M. SLATON,
Speaker of House.
JNO. T. BOIFEUILLET,
Clerk of House.
W. S. WEST,
President of Senate.
C. S. NORTHEN,
Secretary of Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, praying for the enactment of legislation imposing a duty on all coffee imported from foreign countries into the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives and the senate of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

Whereas the coffee industry of this Territory is now in a depressed condition and many of the plantations are threatened to be abandoned on account of the continued low price of the product and the large quantities of coffee imported into the United States from Mexico and Central America free of duty; and

Whereas there are within this Territory large areas of land suitable to the cultivation of coffee and there are large areas of coffee lands in the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico, new possessions of the United States; and

Whereas large amounts of American capital are now invested in this industry in the Territory of Hawaii and in the new possessions of the United States, providing employment to many citizens unable to compete with the peon labor of South and Central America; and

Whereas it is meet and proper that this industry and the citizens engaged in it should be encouraged and protected for the benefit of the Territory of Hawaii and the whole of the United States and its possessions; and

Whereas a distinguished commission of the honorable Senate of the United States, which lately visited the Territory of Hawaii and reported the same to the Senate of the United States, recommended that a bounty of 4 cents per pound be paid the producers of coffee within this Territory for each pound of coffee produced: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to impose a duty on all coffee imported from foreign countries into the United States, or in lieu thereof to provide a suitable bounty

to be paid to the producers of coffee within the United States, to the end that a great internal agricultural industry may be created and the nation further become self-supporting.

Resolved, That the governor of the Territory is hereby requested to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Delegate of the Territory of Hawaii, with the request that the resolution be properly placed before the Congress of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 10, 1905.

We hereby certify the foregoing to be a true, full, and correct copy of a concurrent resolution this day adopted in the house of representatives of the Territory of Hawaii.

ERIC A. KNUDSEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
D. KALANOKALANI, Jr.,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THE SENATE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 9, 1905.

We hereby certify the foregoing to be a true, full, and correct copy of a concurrent resolution this day adopted in the senate of the Territory of Hawaii.

D. PAUL R. ISENBERG,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM SAVIDGE,
Clerk of the Senate.

I, G. R. Carter, governor of the Territory of Hawaii, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a concurrent resolution passed by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, and that the signatures thereto attached are those of the duly authorized officers of the said legislature.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Territory of Hawaii to be affixed this 29th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.]

G. R. CARTER,
Governor of Hawaii.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, praying for the enactment of legislation excepting religious, benevolent, charitable, and scientific corporations from the restriction contained in section 55 of the act approved April 30, 1900, providing a government for the Territory of Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

Whereas for more than seventy-five years past the sisters and priests of the Roman Catholic Church have maintained and directed a mission in the Hawaiian Islands under the name of the Catholic Mission of the Hawaiian Islands; and

Whereas this mission represents several thousands of communicants and owns real estate in different parts of the Territory which is used for church and school purposes, and where not so used is held for such use when the population of the Territory shall warrant the same; and

Whereas the said Catholic mission is not an incorporated body, but is managed by said bishop and priests under the rules, regulations, and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church; and

Whereas said bishop and priests desire to become incorporated, but as the said mission owns throughout the entire group of islands over 1,000 acres of land an act of Congress is necessary to protect them in their vested rights if they should form a corporation; and

Whereas religious, benevolent, charitable, or scientific corporations should not be restricted like business corporations in their real-estate holdings to 1,000 acres of land: Therefore,

Resolved by the senate of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, memorialized to pass an act excepting religious, benevolent, charitable, and scientific corporations from the restriction contained in section 55 of "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, limiting the real-estate holdings of corporations to 1,000 acres of land, and allowing religious, benevolent, charitable, and scientific corporations to hold any number of acres of land, providing such land is used strictly and exclusively for religious, benevolent, charitable, or scientific purposes, as the case may be.

That the secretary of the senate and the clerk of the house of representatives be, and they are hereby, directed to jointly certify and send a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate, a copy to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and a copy to Hon. J. K. Kalanianaole, Delegate to Congress, for submission to that honorable body.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii on the 26th day of April, A. D. 1905.

WILLIAM SAVIDGE,
Clerk of the Senate.
D. KALAUOKALANI, Jr.,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, of Eureka, Cal., remonstrating against any modification of the present Chinese-exclusion law; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Santa Fe, N. Mex., praying for the enactment of legislation admitting New Mexico and Arizona into the Union as one State; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Rockford Manufacturers and Shippers' Association, of Rockford, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the National German-American Alliance of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reestablishment of the Army canteen; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Southeastern Millers' Association, of Nashville, Tenn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation admitting to this country Chinese visitors and travelers not of the cooly class; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of the American Bar Association; the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., and of the Commercial Club of Des Moines, Iowa, remonstrating against the repeal of the present bankruptcy law; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Grand Lodge, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PLATT presented the petition of Alcia M. Wentworth and sundry other citizens of Oneonta, N. Y., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. Robert Harris, of New York City, praying that an investigation be made into the conditions existing in the Kongo Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KEAN presented a memorial of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation extending the twenty-eight-hour limit during which live stock may be carried in cars; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HEYBURN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Boise, Idaho, and of the Boise City Typographical Union, of Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 98) granting an increase of pension to Doris Florence Clegg; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 99) granting an increase of pension to Eugene P. Kingsley; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of Lincoln Hall Council, No. 4, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Windsor, Vt., and a petition of Local Council No. 41, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Newport Center, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of St. Albans Division, No. 24, Order of Railway Conductors, of St. Albans; of Local Division No. 106, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Bellows Falls; of C. W. Clement Division, No. 296, Order of Railway Conductors, of Rutland; of Otter Creek Division, No. 347, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Rutland; of Green Mountain Lodge, No. 535, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of St. Albans, and of Local Division No. 45, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, of Woodsville, all in the State of Vermont, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Esch-Townsend railroad rate bill; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a petition of sundry citizens of South Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation amending the patent laws relating to patents affecting medicinal substances; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of South Dakota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMOOT presented petitions of Local Council No. 111, Journeymen Tailors' Union of America, of Ogden, Utah, and of Local Division No. 382, of Salt Lake City, Utah, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of Local Union No. 1601, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Elkins, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. ANKENY presented a petition of the ministers of the Bellingham District of the Puget Sound Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Stanwood, Wash., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT,

a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash., praying for the negotiation of a new treaty with China; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 131, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Seattle; of the Ballard-Seattle Weavers' Union No. 12, American Federation of Labor, of Ballard; of the Whatcom Central Labor Council, American Federation of Labor, of Bellingham; of Local Lodge No. 162, International Union of Steam Engineers, of Everett; of Local Council No. 2, Junior Order of United American Mechanics of Seattle, and of Local Council No. 3, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Bellingham, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NIXON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nevada, praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the mineral lands lying within the limits of the railroad grants; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PERKINS presented memorials of the Chamber of Commerce of Red Bluff; of the Board of Trade of Winters; of Orange Grove Lodge, No. 97, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Los Angeles; of the Grocers' Protective Association of Stockton; of Local Division No. 161, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of San Francisco; of Golden Gate Lodge, No. 91, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of San Francisco; of the Transportation Club of San Francisco; of Local Division No. 11, Order of Railway Conductors, of Los Angeles; of the Produce Exchange of Los Angeles; of Southern Pacific Division, No. 364, Order of Railway Conductors; of the Chamber of Commerce of Woodland; of El Capitan Division, No. 115, Order of Railway Conductors, of San Francisco, all in the State of California, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the Commercial Clubs of Santa Barbara; of the California Fruit Growers' Association, of Los Angeles; of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco; of the Fresno County Chamber of Commerce, of Fresno; of the Upland Citrous Association, of Upland; of the Fruit Exchange of Pomona, and of the Highland Growers' Association, of Highland, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Eureka, Cal., remonstrating against any change being made in the present Chinese-exclusion law; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners' Association of Fresno; of the Coopers' International Union of Santa Cruz; of Abraham Lincoln Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of San Francisco; of the Carmen's Union of Oakland; of the Trades and Labor Council of Vallejo; of Fearless Lodge, No. 15, International Association of Machinists, of San Bernardino; of George Washington Council, No. 49, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Fresno; of the Associated Charities of San Joaquin County, Stockton, and of sundry citizens of Oakland, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Sacramento, Cal., praying that commercial treaties be entered into with France, Russia, Switzerland, and Austria-Hungary; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Japanese and Korean Exclusion League, of San Francisco, Cal., and a petition of the Sacramento Federated Trades Council, of Sacramento, Cal., praying that the terms of the Chinese-exclusion law be extended so as to exclude from the United States all classes of Chinese and Koreans other than those exempted by the terms of the present law; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Venice assembly, of Venice, Cal., praying that an investigation be made into the conditions existing in the Kongo Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented a resolution of the legislature of Minnesota, indorsing the action of the President in waging war against unlawful combinations in restraint of trade; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolutions.

Resolved by the senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring), That we do hereby extend to the struggling people of Kansas our earnest sympathy and support in the contest inaugurated with the Standard Oil Company for economic freedom in the markets of their State and to secure an open field in which to exploit and develop the bounteous riches lavished upon them by the hand of nature; and we recommend to all our sister States cordial cooperation with the heroic people of Kansas in their efforts to destroy every form of monopolistic and corporate tyranny, to the end that trade and commerce production and consumption may again shed their beneficence over all the people unhampered and untrammeled by unlawful conspiracies, conceived and born only to gratify greed, to depress the prices of the producer, while enhancing the cost of everything to the consumer.

Resolved, That we expect and rightfully demand that our Senators, and Representatives in the Congress of the United States do all in their power to advance and carry to a triumphant issue the plans and policies of our President, Theodore Roosevelt, in the warfare he now is waging against unlawful combinations and conspiracies, whose sole purpose is to stifle competition, restrain trade, and plunder alike producer and consumer. The people have come to recognize that our capitalistic monopolies are laying the whole country under tribute, and that the only road to salvation, safety, and prosperity lies in the direction of laws wisely framed for the destruction of these monster evils and in the determined, inflexible enforcement of such laws.

Resolved, That in his manly, courageous, and prescient attempt to regulate trusts, corporations, monopolies, and all unlawful combinations and to punish all violators of the law pertaining to such evils, regardless of persons, the President of the United States is deserving of, and will receive, the support of both branches of the legislature of this State and the commendation and unanimous and unswerving support of all the people of this Commonwealth regardless of partisanship or party.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the legislature of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation opening certain lands to settlement on the Indian reservations in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas by an act of Congress, introduced by our Senator NELSON, entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians," a treaty was made with said Indians whereby they were to select lands for homes, and the remainder of their reservations were to be opened for actual settlers, at $1.25 per acre and five years' residence, the timber being first sold, which has been done; and

Whereas by subsequent legislation 225,000 acres of said cut-over lands were reserved for experiment in forestry, without compensation to the Indians; and

Whereas such lands surround the allotments taken by the Indians and render them valueless, thus defeating the purposes of the Nelson Act, which was to help them, educate them, and make them self-supporting. Land without roads, schools, churches, and towns, and no way to get them, is worthless; and

Whereas the State owns about 145,000 acres of land located within said tract, which is depreciated in value for the same reasons; and

Whereas the reservation of so much land fit for settlement is an injury not only to that part of the State, but to the commercial interests of the whole State, the land reserved being already crossed by two railroads: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is requested to enact a law to open said lands to settlement by actual settlers, conformably to the Nelson Act.

Resolved further, That our Senators and Representatives are requested to urge this matter upon Congress.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state is instructed to send copies of these resolutions to our Senators and Representatives and to the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior.

Which was adopted.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
Department of State:

I, P. E. Hanson, secretary of state in and for the State of Minnesota, hereby certify that the hereto attached copy of a resolution is a true and correct copy of a joint resolution adopted by the senate and house of representatives of the State of Minnesota on the 4th day of April, A. D. 1905.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed at the capitol, in St. Paul, this 6th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1905.

[SEAL.] P. E. HANSON, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry homestead settlers of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation extending the time in which to make payments for lands purchased and occupied by them as homesteads; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Medical Society of Ramsey County, Minn., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of Iron Molders' Union No. 226, American Federation of Labor, of Brainerd, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Mankato, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the conclusion of reciprocal treaties with foreign countries to encourage commerce; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DUBOIS presented a petition of the legislature of Idaho,

praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
Office of the Secretary of State:

I, Will H. Gibson, secretary of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 1 (by Aulbach) passed the house of representatives February 21, 1905; passed the senate February 27, 1905; filed in the office of the secretary of state March 2, 1905.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 4th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] WILL H. GIBSON,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial No. 1 (by Aulbach), memoralizing the Congress of the United States.

Your memorialist, the legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that, having heretofore enacted laws for the protection of the people against adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines, realizing the necessity for adequate legislation by Congress to protect the State against interstate commerce in such prohibited articles, does hereby memorialize the Senate of the United States to speedily enact efficient legislation prohibiting interstate commerce in adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines to the end that the laws of our State relative thereto may be more effective.

Mr. DUBOIS presented a petition of the legislature of Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,
Office of the Secretary of State.

I, Will H. Gibson, secretary of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house concurrent resolution No. 4 (by Thomas). Passed the house of representatives January 20, 1905; passed the senate March 3, 1905; filed in the office of the secretary of state March 5, 1905.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 4th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] WILL H. GIBSON,
Secretary of State.

House concurrent resolution No. 4 (by Thomas).

Whereas steps have been taken by the National Congress now assembled in Washington toward enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the ideas of President Roosevelt: Therefore be it

Resolved, That our representatives in Congress from Idaho be requested to uphold the hands of our President in this movement.

And be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This house concurrent resolution passed the house of representatives on the 20th day of January, 1905.

JAMES F. HUNT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house concurrent resolution passed the senate on the 3d day of March, 1905.

B. N. STEEVES,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within house concurrent resolution No. 4 originated in the house of representatives of the legislature of the State of Idaho during the eighth session.

WILL H. SHERIER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DUBOIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boise, Idaho, and a petition of the Typographical Union of Boise, Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. STONE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation granting relief to the Jews in Russia; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Monett, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of Iron Molders' Union No. 226, American Federation of Labor, of Brainerd, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry business firms of Hastings, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit unjust discriminations in railroad freight rates; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a petition of the American Society of Equity, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit speculation by boards of trade on farm products; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Clubs of the Indian Territory, praying for the establishment of county boundaries in the new State of Oklahoma to be formed according to the lines of recording districts; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the International Stewards' Association of the North Middle States, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the adulteration and misbranding of foods; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of the Electrotypers' Union No. 30, of Indianapolis; of Central Labor Union of Vincennes; of Newcastle Council, No. 16, of Newcastle; of Iron Molders' Union No. 51, of Evansville; of Typographical Union No. 395, of Vincennes; of Boundary Council, No. 59, of Boundary; of Dunkirk Council, No. 14, of Dunkirk, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

LAWS OF TEXAS RESPECTING RAILROADS.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, during the sitting of the Committee on Interstate Commerce in April and May of this year, Mr. Victor Morawetz, a citizen of New York, volunteered an attack upon the laws of the State of Texas respecting railroads and the action of the railroad commission of that State. Subsequently the attention of Mr. Allison Mayfield, a member of the railroad commission of Texas, was called to this testimony, and he has written, in the form of a letter to me, an answer to this voluntary criticism.

In view of the fact that his letter reached me too late to be presented to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and included in the report of testimony and statements taken by that committee, I ask that this answer be printed in the RECORD and also as a Senate document, so that it may be convenient for all Senators to examine it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas presents a communication and asks that it may be printed in the RECORD and that it also be printed as a document. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest to the Senator from Texas that he omit printing the communication in the RECORD. Let it be printed as a document. It can be easily attached to the testimony. I fear that we shall get too much matter in the RECORD in that way.

Mr. CULBERSON. Very well; I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The communication will be printed as a Senate document and referred——

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest to the Senator from Texas also that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CULBERSON. Let it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 823) to rectify the boundary line of Rock Creek Park (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 824) to incorporate the Economic Heating and Refrigerating Company, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 825) to authorize street railway companies in the District of Columbia to convey small freight, express matter, and so forth;

A bill (S. 826) to amend "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the acts approved January 31 and June 30, 1902, relating to the improper issue, sale, gift, or use of transfer tickets of street railroads; and

A bill (S. 827) authorizing certain extensions to be made in the lines of the City and Suburban Railway, of Washington, the Washington Railway and Electric Company, and the Anacostia and Potomac River Railroad Company, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 828) for the relief of Albert V. Conway, trustee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 829) granting an increase of pension to James Gannon;

A bill (S. 830) granting an increase of pension to Owen D. Lovejoy; and

A bill (S. 831) granting an increase of pension to Isaac G. Clark.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 832) to correct the military record of Asa Niles; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally

read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 833) granting an increase of pension to Milon Wilson (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 834) granting an increase of pension to Lucien W. French (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 835) granting an increase of pension to John W. Scott;

A bill (S. 836) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Fay (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 837) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Dunton; and

A bill (S. 838) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel C. Sawyer.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 839) granting an increase of pension to Roswell F. George (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 840) granting an increase of pension to Dwight P. Lesure;

A bill (S. 841) granting an increase of pension to Willard P. Chaffee;

A bill (S. 842) granting an increase of pension to William A. Eggleston (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 843) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Cilley;

A bill (S. 844) granting an increase of pension to James W. Ryan (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 845) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Page.

Mr. KEAN introduced a bill (S. 846) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office at Elizabeth, N. J.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 847) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Plainfield, N. J.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 848) to appoint Warren C. Beach a captain in the Army and place him on the retired list; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CRANE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 849) granting an increase of pension to Horatio Carter;

A bill (S. 850) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Forrester Devereux;

A bill (S. 851) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Houser;

A bill (S. 852) granting an increase of pension to Albert V. French (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 853) granting an increase of pension to Charles Lander; and

A bill (S. 854) granting a pension to W. W. Gauthier.

Mr. CRANE introduced a bill (S. 855) to provide for the due correction of original appointment of Maj. John C. White, United States Army, retired, to a second lieutenancy, Tenth United States Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McENERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 856) for the relief of the estate of Marcus Walker, deceased;

A bill (S. 857) for the relief of Josephine Roberts; and

A bill (S. 858) for the relief of the trustees of the First Baptist Church of Mansfield, La.

Mr. BURKETT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 859) granting an increase of pension to Richard T. Fried (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 860) granting an increase of pension to Gilamous McCarty (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 861) granting an increase of pension to Thomas O'Connor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 862) granting an increase of pension to J. M. Eaman;

A bill (S. 863) granting an increase of pension to I. S. Prosser;

A bill (S. 864) granting an increase of pension to W. A. Whitaker;

A bill (S. 865) granting an increase of pension to J. R. Williamson;

A bill (S. 866) granting an increase of pension to Horace Perry;

A bill (S. 867) granting an increase of pension to John W. Penney;

A bill (S. 868) granting an increase of pension to John H. Shook;

A bill (S. 869) granting an increase of pension to Baltzar Mowan;

A bill (S. 870) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Opelt;

A bill (S. 871) granting an increase of pension to E. N. Melton;

A bill (S. 872) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Lorance;

A bill (S. 873) granting an increase of pension to J. A. McCormick;

A bill (S. 874) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Green;

A bill (S. 875) granting an increase of pension to N. A. Hamilton;

A bill (S. 876) granting an increase of pension to Walker Jones;

A bill (S. 877) granting an increase of pension to Robert P. Faris;

A bill (S. 878) granting an increase of pension to Amos E. Evans;

A bill (S. 879) granting an increase of pension to Owen Buchanan;

A bill (S. 880) granting an increase of pension to Michael Brannan;

A bill (S. 881) granting an increase of pension to George W. Beasley;

A bill (S. 882) granting an increase of pension to Daniel P. Babb;

A bill (S. 883) granting an increase of pension to T. A. Willson;

A bill (S. 884) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mann;

A bill (S. 885) granting an increase of pension to John Timmerman;

A bill (S. 886) granting an increase of pension to Doctor Swigart;

A bill (S. 887) granting an increase of pension to John C. Testman;

A bill (S. 888) granting an increase of pension to George T. B. Carr;

A bill (S. 889) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Ewing;

A bill (S. 890) granting an increase of pension to L. D. Bennett;

A bill (S. 891) granting an increase of pension to Amos H. Denman;

A bill (S. 892) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Dotson;

A bill (S. 893) granting an increase of pension to Moses Davis;

A bill (S. 894) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sewell;

A bill (S. 895) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Ritchey;

A bill (S. 896) granting an increase of pension to Lydia R. Hicks;

A bill (S. 897) granting an increase of pension to Julia Lawrence;

A bill (S. 898) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. Bradley;

A bill (S. 899) granting an increase of pension to Ella R. Cooper;

A bill (S. 900) granting an increase of pension to Maria Van Kleek;

A bill (S. 901) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Wilcox; and

A bill (S. 902) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Pearman.

Mr. PETTUS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 903) for the relief of Mrs. E. W. Williams;

A bill (S. 904) for the relief of the heirs of Laura E. Wilkinson, deceased;

A bill (S. 905) for the relief of the estate of William Johnson, deceased;

A bill (S. 906) for the relief of the heirs of Ella Parker, deceased;

A bill (S. 907) for the relief of William Moseley, trustee of the estate of William Moseley, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 908) for the relief of Mrs. Frances W. Robinson (with an accompanying paper);

Mr. BURNHAM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 909) granting an increase of pension to Harvey M. D. Hopkins;

A bill (S. 910) granting an increase of pension to John B. Colby;

A bill (S. 911) granting an increase of pension to Julius A. Davis;

A bill (S. 912) granting an increase of pension to Ada Eaton;

A bill (S. 913) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Foster;

A bill (S. 914) granting an increase of pension to Edwin R. Hardy;

A bill (S. 915) granting an increase of pension to Augusta A. Hawes;

A bill (S. 916) granting an increase of pension to Bradley B. Aldrich;

A bill (S. 917) granting an increase of pension to Lyman M. Aldrich;

A bill (S. 918) granting an increase of pension to Edwin N. Baker;

A bill (S. 919) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Atwood; and

A bill (S. 920) granting an increase of pension to Abraham S. Brown.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 921) to provide for the payment of the volunteers who rendered service to the Territory of Oregon in the Cayuse Indian war of 1847 and 1848; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 922) increasing the limit of cost for a public building at Spokane, Wash.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 923) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel L. Badger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PILES introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 924) to establish a light-house and fog-signal station at the entrance to Bellingham Bay, State of Washington;

A bill (S. 925) for the construction of a steam vessel for the Revenue-Cutter Service, for duty in the district of Puget Sound;

A bill (S. 926) to authorize the construction of two steam vessels for the Revenue-Cutter Service, for duty on Puget Sound, Washington;

A bill (S. 927) establishing a fog signal at Ediz Hook light station, State of Washington, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 928) providing for the establishment of a life-saving station in the vicinity of Cape Flattery, or Flattery Rocks, on the coast of Washington; and

A bill (S. 929) to establish a dwelling for keeper of fog signal at Robinson Point, State of Washington.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 930) to provide for the refunding of certain license moneys collected in the district of Alaska to the town of Chena, in said district; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 931) making an appropriation for the administration and improvement of the Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds;

A bill (S. 932) increasing the limit of cost for public building at Tacoma, Wash.;

A bill (S. 933) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Aberdeen, in the State of Washington; and

A bill (S. 934) providing for a public building at Olympia, State of Washington.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 935) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the salaries of the deputy collectors of customs at the subports of Tacoma and Seattle, in the State of Washington, and repealing all laws inconsistent therewith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 936) granting right of way for telegraph and telephone lines in the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 937) granting a pension to H. Heasley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NIXON introduced a bill (S. 938) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Watson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 939) for the relief of Lieut. Jerome E. Morse, United States Navy, retired; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 940) granting an increase of pension to Antoinette Stewart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 941) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Mattson;

A bill (S. 942) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Steffes;

A bill (S. 943) granting an increase of pension to Oscar R. Arnold;

A bill (S. 944) granting an increase of pension to R. F. Catterson;

A bill (S. 945) granting a pension to Bridget E. Chrystie;

A bill (S. 946) granting a pension to Gertrude Stanley;

A bill (S. 947) granting a pension to Annie Ellis;

A bill (S. 948) granting an increase of pension to John W. Paul;

A bill (S. 949) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Eppler; and

A bill (S. 950) granting a pension to Emma M. Rea.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 951) to grant to the State of Minnesota certain vacant lands in said State for forestry purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 952) to authorize a patent to be issued to Stephen Teichner for certain lands therein described; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 953) for the establishment of lights at the mouths of Warroad and Rainy rivers, Lake of the Woods, Minnesota;

A bill (S. 954) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service; and

A bill (S. 955) authorizing the city of Nome, a municipal corporation organized and existing under chapter 21, title 3, of an act of Congress approved June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," to construct a free bridge across the Snake River at Nome City, in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 956) providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced a bill (S. 957) to amend an act entitled "An act to define and punish crimes in the district of Alaska, and to provide a code of criminal procedure for said district," approved March 3, 1899; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced a bill (S. 958) to provide an additional district judge for the district of Alaska, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 959) to amend section 905 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 960) authorizing national banking associations to make loans on real estate security in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 961) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Alexandria, in the State of Minnesota; which was read twice by

its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 962) to modify the law pertaining to the acquisition and holding of lode claims in the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also introduced a bill (S. 963) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the free-delivery system of the Post-Office Department, and for other purposes," approved January 3, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 964) for the relief of Andrew A. Kelly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 965) for the relief of Mrs. P. J. Getty, administratrix; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 966) for the relief of A. M. Darling, administrator; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 967) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the protection of the salmon fisheries of Alaska,'" approved June 9, 1896; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

Mr. SUTHERLAND introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 968) granting an increase of pension to Edward Michaelis, alias Edward Michel;

A bill (S. 969) granting an increase of pension to Howard Ellis;

A bill (S. 970) granting an increase of pension to William Crome; and

A bill (S. 971) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Hackney.

Mr. BLACKBURN (by request) introduced a bill (S. 972) to amend section 2 of the act approved June 6, 1896, entitled "An act relating to the sale of gas in the District of Columbia;" which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 973) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay James L. Anderson the sum of $598.28; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 974) granting an increase of pension to David L. Wright; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 975) granting an increase of pension to James Shaffer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 976) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the war of the rebellion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 977) to amend an act entitld "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 978) for the relief of Henry Bradley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 979) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak.;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 980) to ratify an agreement with the Lower Brulé band of the Sioux tribe of Indians in South Dakota, and making appropriation to carry same into effect; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 981) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims in Congressional Case No. 22524, entitled "The Sisseton and Wahpeton bands of Sioux Indians against The United States," and authorizing said court to report certain facts therein to Congress, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 982) to establish mining experiment stations, to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also introduced a bill (S. 983) to validate certain certificates of soldiers' additional homestead right; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 984) granting an increase of pension to William W. Benedict;

A bill (S. 985) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Smith; and

A bill (S. 986) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Doan (with accompanying papers).

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 987) providing for the granting of additional lands to the State of Idaho for the purpose of aiding in the construction of the State capitol and the procuring of the grounds and accommodations necessary and incident thereto; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 988) granting a pension to Russell A. McKinley;

A bill (S. 989) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Robinson;

A bill (S. 990) granting an increase of pension to Relf Bledsoe;

A bill (S. 991) granting a pension to Jane McMahon;

A bill (S. 992) granting a pension to Albert E. Lyon;

A bill (S. 993) granting a pension to Samuel J. Langdon;

A bill (S. 994) granting a pension to Henry Weston;

A bill (S. 995) granting a pension to James T. Quarles;

A bill (S. 996) granting a pension to John Robinson;

A bill (S. 997) granting an increase of pension to David C. Nigh;

A bill (S. 998) granting a pension to Enoch A. White;

A bill (S. 999) granting an increase of pension to Cary P. Taplin; and

A bill (S. 1000) granting a pension to George W. Soule.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1001) for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz; and

A bill (S. 1002) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Schiffer.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 1003) giving jurisdiction to certain State and Territorial courts over the possessory rights in the public lands of the United States of the parties to divorce proceedings; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MONEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1004) for the relief of Abner P. Bush;

A bill (S. 1005) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Phoenix, Miss.; and

A bill (S. 1006) for the relief of the estate of George M. Coker, deceased.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1007) to repeal section 4136 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the admission to registry of repaired foreign wrecks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1008) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Samuel A. Crawford; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1009) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Carville;

A bill (S. 1010) granting an increase of pension to Joel M. Sawyer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1011) granting an increase of pension to John E. Woodsum (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1012) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Foster (with accompanying papers).

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1013) granting an increase of pension to William H. O'Dear (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1014) granting an increase of pension to John Masters (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1015) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McSwain (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1016) granting an increase of pension to Mollie Tarvin;
A bill (S. 1017) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ryan;
A bill (S. 1018) granting an increase of pension to John B. Lucas (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1019) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dobyns.

Mr. MALLORY introduced a bill (S. 1020) making an appropriation for completing the construction of the road to Barrancas military post by way of the national cemetery and the navy-yard on the naval reservation near Pensacola, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 1021) granting a pension to Rollin A. Pratt; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 1022) granting an increase of pension to Heart Echard;
A bill (S. 1023) granting an increase of pension to Peter Shippman; and
A bill (S. 1024) granting a pension to Julia Coolen.

Mr. CLAPP introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:
A bill (S. 1025) for the relief of John Weikart; and
A bill (S. 1026) for the relief of Gen. C. C. Andrews.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1027) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1028) to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1029) to amend section 2165 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to naturalization; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1030) for the relief of James Grace; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1031) granting to the State of California 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the cash sales of public lands in said State; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1032) to aid in the erection of a statue of Commodore John D. Sloat, United States Navy, at Monterey, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1033) granting permission to Rear-Admiral Bowman H. McCalla, United States Navy, to accept a decoration tendered to him by the Emperor of Germany, and a medal awarded by the King of Great Britain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1034) providing for the purchase of metal and the coinage of minor coins, and the distribution and redemption of said coins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 1035) granting an increase of pension to Andrew McClory;
A bill (S. 1036) granting an increase of pension to William C. Beachey;
A bill (S. 1037) granting an increase of pension to Adolphus L. Oxton;
A bill (S. 1038) granting an increase of pension to James Frazier;
A bill (S. 1039) granting a pension to Andrew Barr;
A bill (S. 1040) granting an increase of pension to James Sloan;
A bill (S. 1041) granting an increase of pension to Myron E. Billings; and
A bill (S. 1042) granting an increase of pension to Francis Piccard.

Mr. HEMENWAY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 1043) granting a pension to William F. Bunger;
A bill (S. 1044) to restore Lieut. James Hampton to the pension roll;
A bill (S. 1045) granting an increase of pension to D. L. Bellville;
A bill (S. 1046) granting an increase of pension to John D. McCullough; and
A bill (S. 1047) granting an increase of pension to Joshua F. Spurlin.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced a bill (S. 1048) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 1049) granting a pension to Julia L. Parrott;
A bill (S. 1050) granting a pension to Jennie Morrow;
A bill (S. 1051) granting a pension to Edward B. Webb;
A bill (S. 1052) granting a pension to A. Elizabeth Nichols;
A bill (S. 1053) granting a pension to Bartlett Minot;
A bill (S. 1054) granting a pension to W. H. H. Lewis;
A bill (S. 1055) granting a pension to Etta S. Jeffrey;
A bill (S. 1056) granting a pension to Job E. Brownell;
A bill (S. 1057) granting a pension to Henry F. Tower;
A bill (S. 1058) granting an increase of pension to John B. Hanna;
A bill (S. 1059) granting a pension to Elliott H. Benton;
A bill (S. 1060) granting a pension to Moses A. Lovelady;
A bill (S. 1061) granting a pension to Lewis W. Goddard;
A bill (S. 1062) granting a pension to Thomas B. Hanoum;
A bill (S. 1063) granting a pension to William J. Houghtaling;
A bill (S. 1064) granting a pension to James H. Hower;
A bill (S. 1065) granting a pension to Edgar L. Beckwith;
A bill (S. 1066) granting a pension to T. D. Britton;
A bill (S. 1067) granting a pension to John Burns;
A bill (S. 1068) granting a pension to Rafael Chacon;
A bill (S. 1069) granting a pension to Mary L. Daniels;
A bill (S. 1070) granting a pension to A. S. Elwood;
A bill (S. 1071) granting a pension to John F. Kline;
A bill (S. 1072) granting a pension to Andrew J. McWade;
A bill (S. 1073) granting a pension to Thomas Madden;
A bill (S. 1074) granting a pension to John G. B. Masters;
A bill (S. 1075) granting a pension to Maria L. Meserve;
A bill (S. 1076) granting a pension to Thomas M. Moore;
A bill (S. 1077) granting a pension to Archie Nunnelly;
A bill (S. 1078) granting a pension to Morgan O'Brien;
A bill (S. 1079) granting a pension to John E. Page;
A bill (S. 1080) granting a pension to Luther B. Paxon;
A bill (S. 1081) granting a pension to Robert N. Pollock;
A bill (S. 1082) granting a pension to Milton Reynolds;
A bill (S. 1083) granting a pension to Thomas B. Roark;
A bill (S. 1084) granting a pension to O. Gustave Roedel;
A bill (S. 1085) granting a pension to Mary P. Scovel;
A bill (S. 1086) granting a pension to Upton T. Smith;
A bill (S. 1087) granting a pension to Henry Stutsman;
A bill (S. 1088) granting a pension to John D. Thomas;
A bill (S. 1089) granting a pension to William C. Thoms;
A bill (S. 1090) granting a pension to Daniel L. Tracy;
A bill (S. 1091) granting a pension to Henry Wagner;
A bill (S. 1092) granting a pension to Jacob D. Walter;
A bill (S. 1093) granting a pension to George R. Warner;
A bill (S. 1094) granting a pension to Reuben B. Weiser;
A bill (S. 1095) granting a pension to George W. Williford;
A bill (S. 1096) granting a pension to Aaron Wood;
A bill (S. 1097) granting a pension to Henry A. F. Worth;
A bill (S. 1098) granting an increase of pension to William J. Grow;
A bill (S. 1099) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Morrell;
A bill (S. 1100) granting an increase of pension to Christian Trostel;
A bill (S. 1101) granting an increase of pension to Charles Christy;
A bill (S. 1102) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stannah;
A bill (S. 1103) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Morgan;
A bill (S. 1104) granting an increase of pension to Levi E. Allen;
A bill (S. 1105) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Williams;

A bill (S. 1106) granting an increase of pension to Hiram E. Turner;
A bill (S. 1107) granting an increase of pension to William Pore;
A bill (S. 1108) granting an increase of pension to Wilson E. Davis;
A bill (S. 1109) granting an increase of pension to John Whisler;
A bill (S. 1110) granting an increase of pension to James Wilkins, alias James Earlie;
A bill (S. 1111) granting an increase of pension to Edward L. Berthoud;
A bill (S. 1112) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Creed;
A bill (S. 1113) granting an increase of pension to Hannibal H. English;
A bill (S. 1114) granting an increase of pension to Baronet Gow;
A bill (S. 1115) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Brown;
A bill (S. 1116) granting an increase of pension to John H. Smith;
A bill (S. 1117) granting an increase of pension to William Q. Haworth;
A bill (S. 1118) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Thompson;
A bill (S. 1119) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Bennett;
A bill (S. 1120) granting an increase of pension to Alfred R. Babb;
A bill (S. 1121) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Armstrong;
A bill (S. 1122) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ambrose;
A bill (S. 1123) granting an increase of pension to Hampton C. Booth;
A bill (S. 1124) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus A. Bowers;
A bill (S. 1125) granting an increase of pension to Elvira C. Compton;
A bill (S. 1126) granting an increase of pension to George W. Blake;
A bill (S. 1127) granting an increase of pension to Eli Davis;
A bill (S. 1128) granting an increase of pension to Sebald V. Schlessinger;
A bill (S. 1129) granting an increase of pension to Jackson J. Lane;
A bill (S. 1130) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Mitchell;
A bill (S. 1131) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Allen;
A bill (S. 1132) granting an increase of pension to W. F. Nichols;
A bill (S. 1133) granting an increase of pension to W. A. Gunn;
A bill (S. 1134) granting an increase of pension to John Milburn;
A bill (S. 1135) granting an increase of pension to Stella B. Moore;
A bill (S. 1136) granting an increase of pension to Warren W. Whipple;
A bill (S. 1137) granting an increase of pension to William H. Nix;
A bill (S. 1138) granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Blake;
A bill (S. 1139) granting an increase of pension to Richard H. Tombaugh; and
A bill (S. 1140) granting an increase of pension to W. K. Eggleston.

Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and refered to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1141) for the relief of Wilbur F. McCue;
A bill (S. 1142) for the relief of Charles F. Leimer;
A bill (S. 1143) for the relief of the heirs of Elias Gilbert;
A bill (S. 1144) to correct the military record of the late Capt. Marcus Coon;
A bill (S. 1145) for the relief of George M. Brayton; and
A bill (S. 1146) for the relief of James Broiles.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1147) for the relief of William H. Gowdy and his sureties; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1148) for the relief of David K. Wall and the heirs of John A. Witter, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1149) for the relief of Mrs. Julia L. Hall;
A bill (S. 1150) for the relief of Mary B. Spencer, administratrix of Albert G. Boone, deceased;
A bill (S. 1151) for the relief of James Inman;
A bill (S. 1152) to pay Erastus S. Joslyn amount found due him by Court of Claims;
A bill (S. 1153) for the relief of George G. Wortman; and
A bill (S. 1154) for the relief of George Washington Turner.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1155) for the relief of Charles P. Allen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1156) for the relief of the attorney and representative of the Choctaw Nation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 1157) for the relief of the estate of John Fleming, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1158) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment providing that homestead settlers on ceded Indian reservations who purchase the lands occupied by them as homesteads may be granted an extension of one year's time in which to make the payments now provided by law, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. CLAPP submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a bill and presented a report from the late Merchant Marine Commission. Already numerous calls are reaching me for copies of the bill and report, and it is very evident the ordinary number which will be printed will not be sufficient to meet the demand. I ask unanimous consent that 2,000 additional copies of the bill and report be printed for the use of the Senate.

There being no objection, the order was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That 2,000 additional copies of the bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage, and report No. 1, thereon, be printed for the use of the Senate.

THE OLD FRIGATE CONSTITUTION.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs is hereby directed to make a careful inquiry as to the present condition of the old frigate *Constitution*, with a view to recommending an appropriation for preserving this historic vessel if it shall be deemed advisable to do so.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any bills which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

CLAIMS OF COPE WHITEHOUSE.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate the correspondence between the Department of State and the diplomatic representatives of the United States in Cairo relating to the claims of Cope Whitehouse to certain desert lands in Egypt, between January 1, 1901, and November 7, 1905, inclusive, with any documents explanatory thereof.

SEAL ISLANDS OF ALASKA.

Mr. NELSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish for the information and the use of the Senate copies of all of the reports of the chief special agent in charge of the seal islands of Alaska to the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor made by that agent of the Department during the years of 1904 and 1905, inclusive, in obedience to the directions of said Department dated May 1, 1904, and subsequently, as they have been issued.

INVESTIGATION OF BLACK SANDS OF PACIFIC SLOPE.

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Resolved by the Senate, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, directed to furnish to the Senate a report on the progress of the investigation of the black sands of the Pacific slope, authority for which was included in that section of the sundry civil act approved March 3, 1905, which provided for the preparation of the report on the mineral resources of the United States, and his opinion as to whether or not this investigation should be continued.

EXAMINATIONS OF NATIONAL BANKS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from yesterday which was submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the resolution be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. TILLMAN, as follows:

Resolved, That the Comptroller of the Currency be directed to inform the Senate (1) whether all the reports of the examinations of the national banks made by the bank examiners since March 4, 1893, have been preserved in his office; (2) how often the regular examinations have been made; (3) whether it is the duty of every bank examiner to examine the records and vouchers showing the expenditures for all purposes of each bank visited by him; (4) whether it is his duty, if he finds that moneys have been illegally or wastefully expended by the bank, to state the facts in his report; (5) whether the reports now on file made since said date show any payments by any bank to any political committee or to any chairman, treasurer, or other officer of a political committee; and (6) whether such reports show any payments of the moneys of a bank to any person upon any voucher, or without any voucher, where the circumstances of the payments suggest that the money paid was to be used to carry on a political campaign or for any political purpose; and if any reports now on file show any such payments to any political committee, or to a chairman, treasurer, or other officer of a political committee, or any payments suggesting a use of money for a political campaign or any political purpose, said Comptroller of the Currency is directed to report all the facts in all such cases to the Senate, and to inform the Senate what action, if any, has been taken as the result of the discovery of any such payments as aforesaid.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I desire to modify the resolution by substituting the words "Secretary of the Treasury" for "Comptroller of the Currency," wherever they occur.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be modified as requested by the Senator from South Carolina. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

Mr. TILLMAN. When I introduced the resolution yesterday, Mr. President, accompanied by one of similar import which calls for an investigation by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I had no purpose to discuss it; but as there seemed to be objection, and there may still be objection, I desire briefly to outline the motives and purposes which I had in view.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the Senator proceeds, if he will permit me, as he speaks of objection to the resolution, I desire to say that I simply asked that it should lie over and be printed——

Mr. TILLMAN. I had no objection in the world to that——

Mr. GALLINGER. For the reason that I wished to examine it. I have read it with great care this morning and am fully satisfied it is a very proper resolution to pass. I see no objection whatever to it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, I am glad the Senator approves of investigations of some sort.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have always been in favor of proper investigations.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will be zealous in his new rôle of reformer as we go along, as we seem to have so many things that need reform and investigation around here. Now, I desire briefly to give some reasons why I think this special branch of the Government, or rather these banks created by Federal charters and acting under Federal law, are proper subjects for ventilation.

I want to say, first, as an excuse or justification, if either be necessary, that I have the very highest authority for desiring the Senate to enter upon this subject and subjects of similar character. Our President a year ago in his annual message had this to say along this line:

The power of the Government to protect the integrity of the elections of its own officials is inherent and has been recognized and affirmed by repeated declarations of the Supreme Court. There is no enemy of free government more dangerous and none so insidious as the corruption of the electorate. No one defends or excuses corruption, and it would seem to follow that none would oppose vigorous measures to eradicate it. I recommend the enactment of a law directed against bribery and corruption in Federal elections. The details of such a law may be safely left to the wise discretion of the Congress, but it should go as far as under the Constitution it is possible to go, and should include severe penalties against him who gives or receives a bribe intended to influence his act or opinion as an elector; and provisions for the publication not only of the expenditures for nominations and elections of all candidates, but also of all contributions received and expenditures made by political committees.

In his annual message this year the President says:

It is entirely proper both to give and receive them—

That is, contributions—

unless there is an improper motive connected with either gift or reception. If they are extorted by any kind of pressure or promise, express or implied, direct or indirect, in the way of favor or immunity, then the giving or receiving becomes not only improper, but criminal.

Farther down I find this statement in this year's message:

All contributions by corporations to any political committee or for any political purpose should be forbidden by law; directors should not be permitted to use stockholders' money for such purposes; and, moreover, a prohibition of this kind would be, as far as it went, an effective method of stopping the evils aimed at in corrupt practices acts. Not only should both the National and the several State legislatures forbid any officer of a corporation from using the money of the corporation in or about any election, but they should also forbid such use of money in connection with any legislation save by the employment of counsel in public manner for distinctly legal services.

Now that our Chief Executive has taken a very pronounced and aggressive stand to secure purity in elections, every good American will say, "Well done," and will look for progress along that line.

In this connection I will quote other and very high Republican authority as indorsing and urging this policy. I am reading now from an article in the North American Review, by Mr. Perry Belmont, of New York, who has had some intimate association, through his kinsman, with Democratic campaigns, and who ought to know something about how these things are worked. You will see as I go along that I will be entirely impartial in endeavoring to cast light in dark places that may exist now or may have existed in the past, or, rather, I am trying to get the committee to turn the light on, which they alone can do. I will merely give the reasons why I think it imperative that something should be done and done at once. Mr. Belmont states that—

Close upon the heels of the Presidential campaign of 1892, in which it is known, millions were expended on both sides, Mr. Root, speaking in the New York constitutional convention of 1894 in reference to the proposed incorporation into the State constitution of an amendment relative to corrupt practices, said (Revised RECORD, Vol. III, p. 877)—

I will only quote a brief paragraph—

"* * * The use of money has come to such a pass at the hands of both of the great political parties in this country that we find enormous contributions necessary to maintain party machinery—to conduct party warfare—and the effect is that great moneyed interests, corporate and personal, are exerting yearly more and more undue influence in political affairs, * * * and political parties are every year contracting greater debts to the men who can furnish the money to perform the necessary functions of party warfare."

Later on, in this connection, Mr. Root said:

I think some qualification would have to be inserted, otherwise the general language would apply to such corporations as those which publish newspapers. * * * The idea is to prevent * * * the great railroad companies, the great insurance companies, the great telephone companies, the great aggregations of wealth, from using their corporate funds, directly or indirectly, to send members of the legislature to these halls in order to vote for their protection and the advancement of their interests as against those of the public. It strikes at a constantly growing evil, which has done more to shake the confidence of the plain people of small means of this country in our political institutions than any other practice which has ever obtained since the foundation of our Government. And I believe that the time has come when something ought to be done to put a check to the giving of $50,000 or $100,000 by a great corporation toward political purposes, upon the understanding that a debt is created from a political party to it.

I quote this from Mr. Root, the present Secretary of State, a man as to whose patriotism and ability I do not suppose there is any possibility of doubt among any class of his fellow-countrymen anywhere.

Now, Mr. President, this particular resolution seeks to get some light from the only source that is at present available. I do not know whether the report of the Secretary of the Treasury when it comes to us—supposing that this resolution shall be passed—will be only "darkness visible" or not; in other words, whether we shall have an illustration of "how not to do it." Possibly he has not got any facts, but I think I will show from the statutes that he ought to have some or that he can get some.

I have had an intimation that the Comptroller of the Currency is now investigating along this very line, with the possible purpose of instituting legal proceedings in case he finds that there has been disobedience to the law, or rather that the law has been trampled under foot.

I desire to read here section 5209 of the Revised Statutes. It is the national banking act of 1863 as incorporated into the Revised Statutes with amendments:

SEC. 5209. Every president, director, cashier, teller, clerk, or agent of any association—

That is, a national banking association—

who embezzles, abstracts—

Listen to these words—

or willfully misapplies any of the moneys, funds, or credits of the association; or who, without authority from the directors, issues or puts in circulation any of the notes of the association; or who, without such authority, issues or puts forth any certificate of deposit, draws any order or bill of exchange, makes any acceptance, assigns any note, bond, draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree; or who makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of the association, with intent, in either case, to injure or defraud the association or any other company, body politic or corporate, or any individual person, or to deceive any officer of the association, or any agent appointed to examine the affairs of any such association; and every person who with like intent aids or abets any officer, clerk, or agent in any violation of any of this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be imprisoned not less than five years nor more than ten.

That is a very broad and sweeping provision of law. It would seem to be a kind of dragnet to catch any scoundrel, I would say, though the term may be harsh, who might use the funds of a bank for purposes which are so vehemently denounced by the President and the present Secretary of State.

I recall in this connection that in one suit brought to punish the cashier of a bank who had used its funds for deposit and collateral with a broker for purposes of speculation, and who contended that he could produce evidence to show that he did it with the knowledge and consent of the bank president, and that the profits, if any, were for the benefit of the association, when he was indicted, in the court he was told that such testimony was not admissible. I did not track it up to see whether he was punished or not, but I presume he was, because the facts were undisputed. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court, who held that the testimony was not admissible, and therefore that that man should be punished according to law.

So we have here warrant of law for the idea that any use or misuse of the money of a national bank by any of its officers or directors, unless it be by vote of the board of directors, would be punishable by fine and imprisonment, and maybe even then.

The Comptroller of the Currency has the specific and direct control, through the bank examiners, of all the expenditures of these corporations; he has access to the books, and can call for a report whenever he pleases. So if a probe is pushed in, probably—I do not say certainly—we will discover some things that ought to be known, and I hope we shall take steps to guard against their recurrence. My reason for guessing or surmising that the national banks are not innocent in this particular, but have contributed of the funds of their stockholders for political purposes, rests upon the supposition of mine, or rather the supposition rests upon the fact, recently brought out in the insurance investigation in New York, that the insurance companies have not felt at all reluctant or unwilling to use the funds in their control for this specific purpose, and they have not felt unwilling, in fact have been for ten years or more annually contributing of such funds to the political campaigns of the Republican party in the State of New York with the direct assurance or confession in the testimony of a member of this body that these contributions were given with the implied understanding that such insurance companies were to be protected from adverse legislation or administration, or something of that sort, at Albany.

Now, if the insurance companies have been guilty of this practice, a crime in the eyes of the President, and certainly of the policy holders—and I myself have a little policy in the Mutual, and do not like for my dividends to be cut down by giving a salary of $150,000 to Mr. McCurdy, and about $175,000 of that money to his sons and other kinsfolk, and all the other members of the family.

I am a little inclined to hope that something can be done toward ventilating and giving publicity to the enormities and outrages that are being perpetrated by the political machines probably of both political parties toward the debauchery of the American electorate. That is what I am after. If the Democrats have been guilty of these things—and I have no doubt they have got all the money they could for campaign purposes, and have used it unscrupulously, perhaps—I have no objection in the world to ventilating that and having those who are guilty held up to public obloquy and disgrace, as they ought to be, if we can get the facts. The question is, Will the Senate go after the facts in an honest and determined manner, or will we practice such things as I have seen here since I have been a member of this body, of going about anything like that in a lame and half-hearted way, with every possible excuse not to search to the bottom and not probe the abscess, as I may term it. That is the whole sum and substance of it.

I note here in the act creating the Department of Commerce and Labor the following among other powers and duties of the Secretary of that Department.

The said Commissioner shall have power and authority to make, under the direction and control of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, diligent investigation into the organization, conduct, and management of the business of any corporation, joint stock company, or corporate combination engaged in commerce among the several States and with foreign nations excepting common carriers subject to "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and to gather such information and data as will enable the President of the United States to make recommendations to Congress for legislation for the regulation of such commerce, and to report such data to the President from time to time as he shall require; and the information so obtained, or as much thereof as the President may direct, shall be made public.

Now, here is a well-organized branch of the Government. The machinery is in full movement, I suppose, or it ought to be, through which these facts can be obtained, if they have not already been obtained, and if the President is sincere and honest and means business, to use a slang phrase, he already has at hand the instrumentalities by which the facts can be brought to light. To indulge in rhetorical platitudes and high-sounding phrases, fine words, and all that kind of thing, which "butter no parsnips," as I have heard, and to do nothing, to fail, so far as the instrumentalities of the law permit, to exercise his executive authority to investigate and to punish wherever practicable any malpractices of this sort will not, as I say, add very much to the stature of the Executive as a statesman and as a patriot.

I am waiting prayerfully and hopefully for something along the line that I have indicated; but, as I said, the main object of life with public men nowadays seems to be how not to do certain things, while being very easy, and, I might say, servile and subservient to do other things, and they always find a way to do those things they want to do, and always seem to find a way not to do things the corporations do not want done.

I call attention to the law under which the President has the lantern with which he himself can enter these dark recesses and counting rooms and railroad offices, and all that kind of thing, and give us light, if he will. A committee of Congress would have power to send for persons and papers; but even then, judging by past experience, it is doubtful, when we might imprison somebody for contempt, whether or not anything would come of it. So it seems that we have got to a point in an effort to solve this difficult problem where most men are doubtful or unwilling to go forward.

I note here, in addition to what I have already read from the act creating the Department of Commerce and Labor, the following:

It shall also be the province and duty of said Bureau, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, to gather, compile, publish, and supply useful information concerning corporations doing business within the limits of the United States as shall engage in interstate commerce or in commerce between the United States and any foreign country, including corporations engaged in insurance, and to attend to such other duties as may be hereafter provided by law.

I am no lawyer, as you all know, but I have doubts as to whether an insurance company that might be called on to permit investigation might not fall back on its undoubted rights under the Constitution as a State corporation and disclaim or prohibit——

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TILLMAN. Let me get through with my sentence first.

I was going to say that I doubted very seriously whether we had any right to include insurance companies in the category of corporations that are to be examined by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina now yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly; with pleasure.

Mr. HALE. I wish to say to the Senator, though that is not a matter of much importance, that I agree with him fully upon that. I think the clause the Senator has quoted, by which the fundamental act creating the Department of Commerce and Labor included in its investigations corporations doing insurance business, was not in the bill originally; that in a way which I have not yet ascertained it came in afterwards; and that nobody realized—I know I did not so realize—that he

was either voting for a bill or allowing a bill to pass without protest that gave to any Department of the Federal Government the authority to take in charge the business of insurance companies as a part of interstate commerce.

I do not feel that the Senate or any Senator is bound by the fact that in the hurry of legislation upon a subject not thoroughly investigated that clause crept in, giving authority to investigate insurance affairs.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is there all the same. It is a law passed by both branches of Congress and approved by the President, and is law until repealed.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly it is there, but fortunately the whole subject remains for Congress to deal with.

Mr. TILLMAN. Of course the courts can destroy it by decisions if the test is made, in which the issue would be that the Secretary of Commerce and Labor has no right, no legal, constitutional authority to investigate the affairs of an insurance company chartered by a State.

Mr. HALE. The courts, as the Senator knows, have already taken ground upon the general subject, and the Senate has already directed the Committee on the Judiciary, the law committee of this body, to investigate fundamentally that great question—the constitutionality. So the Senate is already committed to the investigation.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, this is a mere side issue with me. I am thankful to say that through a committee of the legislature of the State of New York we are getting light as to the corruption and the debauchery, I will say, that have seized upon the insurance companies and have made the insurance companies seize upon the politicians, and I trust that we will have some reform legislation in New York and in other States in regard to insurance companies which will give us more protection.

Mr. BAILEY rose.

Mr. TILLMAN. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from South Carolina stated a moment ago that he is a policy holder, and I know he has kept well informed as to the progress of the investigation. I therefore desire to ask him if he can inform the Senate whether the money contributed by the insurance companies to the Republican campaign committee has been returned?

Mr. TILLMAN. I understood that the President was going to urge Mr. Cortelyou to get the money and send it back; that it had come into his hands unlawfully or dishonestly somehow or other, and that he felt honor bound to see that it was restored. But I have not yet received my share of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAILEY. I did read in the prints that the President was exasperated when he learned——

Mr. SPOONER. May I ask the Senator from South Carolina whether his is a life policy?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPOONER. It is not time for him to get his share.

Mr. TILLMAN. Hold on. I had some dividends coming to me on my policy. I paid very high premiums in order to get the dividends, and they have been very small and pitiful—so small and pitiful that I have called them contemptible; and with Mr. McCurdy getting $150,000 a year for getting fat and doing nothing, I should like some one somewhere to come in and stop him. By the way, I see he has resigned, but his salary does not come back any more than do some of the great lawyers' fees which have been paid come back.

Mr. BAILEY. My opinion was that the President having expressed, so we are informed by the public prints, his determination to have this money restored to the trust funds from which it was improperly taken, had probably seen to its return before he delivered another message to the Congress of the United States upon the subject.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, all the Turveydrops and Pecksniffs are not dead, I am afraid, though of course I would not for a moment hint that the strenuous gentleman who presides over the destinies of this Republic should be mentioned in the same breath. But I am waiting prayerfully and watching for action and results rather than so many words.

In connection with this I think probably it is a good place to bring it out or to bring it in—the testimony of the Senator from New York [Mr. PLATT] before the investigating committee in New York some time in November. I have already alluded to the fact that one of the members of this body, being called upon to testify in this connection, made certain statements, and I have given an outline of those statements, but I wish to incorporate more fully or "embalm" this testimony in the RECORD, as the phrase is. You know we have got into such a habit of loading down the RECORD with dead speeches or dull, dry utterances, and an immense amount of nonsense and rot, I may almost say, that nobody, except people who have more time than sense, read it. Therefore, when we want to put anything where it will never be looked at any more—after a few years, anyhow—we put it in the RECORD and embalm it, and it stays there for the future bookworm or the worm that will eat the books up. I do not mean the two-legged worms, but those that really eat books. I do not mean the fellow who delves around in the library and gets out facts.

I quote from the New York Sun of November 22, 1905:

Mr. PLATT stated, in answer to the very first question, that he had received contributions from the life insurance companies for political purposes. He gave it as his opinion that the contributions covered a period of ten years or so. These contributions were solely for State campaign purposes; he had had nothing whatever to do with the national campaign funds.

The Equitable Life had contributed $10,000 yearly. Mr. PLATT denied, though, that he had ever received any money from the Equitable as a contribution for any local or municipal campaign. He denied also that any contributions had been made to the expenses of candidates for the legislature.

"Then the amounts that you have received for the purposes of State campaigns," said Mr. Hughes, "cover all the amounts you have received from the Equitable Life?"

"Yes," replied Mr. PLATT, "the contributions were general in their character. There was not any specific sum mentioned for any campaign—for what it was to be used for."

EQUITABLE'S $10,000 IN CASH.

Q. But you divided up, or some committee divided up, this money that was received in such a way as you thought expedient?—A. It was. They usually made the contributions to me, and I think they always did by a special messenger. He came to my office and delivered me a package of money, and I didn't know—I could only tell what it was, and I immediately turned it over to the State committee, either to the chairman or the secretary or the treasurer.

Mr. PLATT said that he didn't even keep the contributions over night when they came to him, but turned them over at once to the State committee. He could not remember ever having received one of these contributions directly from an officer of the Equitable.

Q. Did you make any request for these contributions?—A. I did not.

Q. They came voluntarily?—A. They came voluntarily.

Q. At the inception of the making of these contributions, or the practice of making them, did you make any request for them?—A. Well, I don't remember about that.

Mr. Hughes wanted to know whether $10,000 was a fixed sum to be paid by the Equitable yearly.

"Well," replied the Senator, "it was a fixed sum; that is, they did not exceed that amount, and they didn't reduce it either."

Senator PLATT said that his memory was somewhat hazy in regard to the contributions which he had received from the Mutual Life. They did not give any sum annually, like the Equitable, but contributed only on stated occasions.

M'CURDY ACTED FOR THE MUTUAL.

Q. With what officer of the Mutual Life did you deal in receiving these contributions?—A. I think it was Mr. McCurdy. I would not be sure.

Q. R. A. McCurdy?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you get the money from him directly?—A. No, sir; it was given to me just as I said.

Q. In the same way that it was given to you by the Equitable—sent by a messenger, in currency?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did it happen that the Mutual Life contributed the money? Was it in pursuance of an understanding between yourself and Mr. McCurdy?—A. I simply asked him at various times when necessities were very great for money, and he said he would be very glad to subscribe.

Q. This was for the State campaign?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And Mr. McCurdy understood it?—A. He understood it, and could not understand it any other way, because I was not representing the national campaign.

Mr. PLATT said that whenever he got anything from the Mutual it was usually about $10,000. In reply to a question as to whether he had ever received anything from the New York Life, the Senator replied: "I think very seldom."

Mr. PLATT said that he had talked with John A. McCall, of the New York Life, in regard to contributions; but when asked for a more definite statement in regard to the New York Life, he replied: "I am not positive. My memory is at fault with reference to that."

Mr. Hughes said that he had heard that Senator PLATT had something to do with the raising of funds for the Harrison campaign, but Mr. PLATT said he couldn't recall that.

"You are clear in your mind," asked Mr. Hughes, "that you never had any contributions made to you for the purposes of a national campaign?"

"Yes, sir," the Senator replied emphatically. "They never were given to me for a national campaign, although I sometimes, in talking with gentlemen about it, said that I thought it would be a good thing for them to subscribe because of the bearing of the national campaign on a State campaign."

Mr. PLATT did not think that he had talked with President McCurdy along this line, but he may have brought the subject up in this way before President McCall. Mr. PLATT said that he could not recall any of the details in regard to these campaign contributions, as he kept no record of them.

Q. Are you acquainted with any contributions that have been made to anyone for the purpose of favoring the candidacy of anyone for office outside of those contributions you have mentioned?—A. I never had any such thing broached to me at all.

Q. Or for the purpose of aiding a candidate for judicial office?—A. No; there never has been any suggestion in regard to any candidate.

Q. With reference to the matter of campaign expenses, in reference to judicial nominations?—A. I never heard of such a thing in my life.

HAS NO KNOWLEDGE OF THE MONEY'S USE.

Mr. Hughes wanted to know if Senator PLATT had any knowledge of what disposition had been made of the contributions by the insurance companies for State campaigns.

"I don't know anything about it, sir," replied the Senator vigorously. "I turned these contributions over to the State committee, and then my connection with them ceased."

Q. Do you know whether by virtue of such contributions any allotments of money were made for the purpose of helping the campaign of candidates for the legislature?—A. There was not, that I know of.

Senator PLATT denied that he had ever been asked on behalf of the insurance companies to intervene in any way in their favor by reason of such contributions.

Mr. Hughes said that he had been asked to inquire whether the Senator desired the committee to understand that his relation to contributions by insurance companies began only ten years ago.

"I would not say ten years ago," replied the Senator. "I could not specify the date, but I should think it was as much as ten years ago."

Q. Was it as long ago as twenty years?—A. I doubt it.

Q. About 1885 or 1886, did it begin?—A. I can't remember.

Q. It might be fifteen years or more?—A. Yes, sir.

The Senator added that the figures which he had given would, however, hold good for whatever time it was.

Mr. Hughes turned then to the subject of justification for these contributions.

"I should think," said Senator PLATT, "that they were justified in making contributions while the gold issue was at stake."

Q. Take the course of our State campaigns—of course you are familiar with them for many years. What has there been in them that would justify an insurance company contributing to the expense?—A. Well, I should not want to pass upon that.

Q. If you have an opinion, of course we should be glad to have it, but the point I want particularly to get at is this: What suggestion was there to the insurance companies of any quid pro quo? What were the insurance companies to get out of the fact that they had made the contribution?—A. There was not any suggestion of any sort.

Q. What advantage could they really get?—A. They got it through me as being connected with the State committee.

Q. How would they get it through you?—A. Well, they would suppose I would be very likely to defend them at times when it was necessary. I never had occasion to do so.

Mr. Hughes wanted to know what Senator PLATT meant by that.

"That they would expect me," said the Senator, "to support them, naturally, for anything that they thought was right and they were for."

Q. And have they ever requested your support in any manner?—A. They never have.

Q. In what matters could you properly give a company support in return for such contributions?—A. Well, I don't know.

Q. I understood you to say they would expect you would support them or defend them. Now, what class of possibilities had you in mind in saying that?—A. I didn't have any class of possibilities in mind at all, because where their interests were involved they might come to me for help.

Q. To see that the legislature did not enact legislation which they thought hostile to policy holders?—A. That is about what it would amount to.

Mr. Hughes wanted to know how Senator PLATT could control such a situation. The Senator replied that he could not control it, but that he might have some influence.

Q. Through the disposition of the moneys in the election of legislators?—A. Oh, I could not say that.

Q. Isn't that the way it really comes about, Senator, that the use of these contributions in the election of candidates for office puts the candidates more or less under a moral obligation not to attack the interests supporting them?—A. That is what naturally would be involved.

Q. Isn't that really what is involved?—A. I should think so.

Q. That is what you meant when you said they would expect you, through your relations with the State committee, to defend them?—A. Yes, sir.

Senator PLATT testified that he knew nothing about "Judge" Andrew Hamilton, the New York Life's legislative supervisor, and that although he had met Andrew C. Fields, the Mutual's legislative agent, once or twice, he knew nothing about his work at Albany. Mr. PLATT said that, so far as he knew, the insurance companies had no influence in the appointment of the superintendent of insurance. Mr. PLATT said that he knew nothing about the things which the insurance companies had done to shape legislation in their favor in this State.

When the Senator was excused he was thanked both by the chairman of the committee and Mr. Hughes, and, in turn, extended to them his thanks. After the Senator had left the room the suggestion was made to Mr. Hughes that Mr. PLATT would have been glad, if he had been questioned, to have told more in detail how the funds which he had turned over to the State committee had been used by Chairman Odell in furthering the election of men to the legislature who would be favorable to his rule.

The suggestion as it came to Mr. Hughes was not at all authoritative, but he started toward the door to call Senator PLATT back. The Senator, however, had disappeared, and Mr. Hughes, after conferring a few moments with Chairman Armstrong, decided that the ground had been thoroughly covered by him, and that Senator PLATT had had an opportunity to make any statements that he desired.

So the fact of such contributions is clearly brought out, acknowledged, without any dodging; for I must compliment the Senator from New York for the manliness and consciousness of rectitude with which he testified, and I have not the slightest doubt that not a dollar of this money ever stuck to his fingers. But I think practically all will agree that the legislature of New York has been controlled in the interest of insurance companies, and that the lame and impotent inspection, the miserable farce of an inspection for the protection of the policy holders which the investigation has disclosed, is the direct result of the debauchery of the administrative and legislative branches of the government of New York by these campaign contributions.

In this connection I have here an editorial from a leading Republican paper of the city of New York—the New York Press. It is very meaty; and it has some blood in it, too. It is dated October 12. I will ask that the Secretary read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE MOTIVE OF THE MUTUAL'S CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

President McCurdy and his fellow-grafters in the Mutual Life persist in saying, and in saying under the obligation of a solemn oath, that their motive for contributing to the campaign funds of 1896, 1900, and 1904 was to save the country from "the menace of free silver."

In 1896, when the menace of free silver was great, and when business men were warranted in supporting the Republican ticket with all their might, by putting up money for legitimate campaign expenses (but only their own money), the Mutual Life's contribution to the McKinley fund was $15,000.

In 1900, when Bryanism still was a danger, though not so great a danger as four years before, because the free-silver platform had narrowly escaped defeat in the Kansas City convention, the Mutual Life's contribution to the second McKinley fund was increased to $35,000—more than twice the amount subscribed in the year when the Democratic and Populist parties were almost unanimous in their enthusiasm for free silver.

In 1904, when there was no mention of free silver in the Democratic platform, and when the Democratic candidate for President pledged himself to the gold standard, the Mutual Life's contribution was increased to $42,500, or nearly three times the amount contributed by the company in the campaign when free silver really was a menace.

The fact that the "national honor" was in danger in 1896 and 1900 did not justify the misappropriation of other people's money then. But the plea that in the Roosevelt-Parker campaign free silver was a menace is so wildly absurd that it is only a waste of time to prove that the Mutual Life crooks did not believe there was any danger of free silver in case of Parker's election at the time they made the contribution to Messrs. Cortelyou and BABCOCK, and did not believe it when they said under oath that their motive in putting up the $42,500 in 1904 was to save the country from the "menace" of free silver.

Now, we do not contend that the Mutual grafters have committed perjury in their testimony about the motive of the Hanna-Cortelyou-BABCOCK subscriptions. Perjury is not easily proved. It may be possible to convict the younger Mr. McCurdy of perjury for swearing that he did not know the salary of his father, when his duties as an officer of the Equitable not only gave him every opportunity of knowing, but made it his duty to know. But men may take oath that they did a certain thing for a certain reason, when everybody recognizes that a totally different motive controlled their action, without laying themselves open to a charge of perjury.

We do contend, however, that the officers of the Mutual have lied about the motive of their contributions to politics.

The proof is overwhelming, and they furnish it themselves.

When the Mutual crooks say the $42,500 stolen from the policy holders last year was used to avert the menace of free silver, everybody knows they lie.

But the testimony of Mr. Robert Olyphant, a Mutual trustee who O. K.'d the political thefts, heaps a ton of corroboration on the invincible proof that the "national honor" was not the controlling motive of the crime. Mr. Olyphant testifies that the contributions to campaign committees came out of the fund called "For confidential legal services."

What was the nature of this fund? Out of it was paid, in 1904, over $300,000 in addition to the $42,500 to Mr. Cortelyou's committee. It was used to promote legislation in various States, aiding insurance graft. It was spent prodigally on the suffocation of laws meant to help the policy holders. As in the New York Life, it was dished out in $25,000 or $50,000 chunks by disbursing officers, on their own testimony, without a question of its purpose. When it was spent, the "Andy" Hamiltons of the Mutual made a confidential accounting to Mr. Granniss or Dr. Gillette or Mr. McCurdy. Mr. Hughes can not find one item in the records showing how this vast sum of more than $300,000 in a single year, of many millions in the life of the Mutual, was expended. The Mutual officers admit that the uses to which the money was put made it extremely unwise to require itemized accounts.

This fund was for blackmail and bribery.

It was out of this fund that the $42,500 "to save the country from the menace of free silver" was taken. Says Mr. Olyphant: "I have heard that there were contributions made to the national committee, and, if there were, I suppose they came out of that fund ['confidential legal services'], and it was looked upon as legal services."

Not, then, to save the country from the menace of free silver? It was "legal services." The true motive thus stands revealed in sharp relief against the falsely professed motive. It was meant to buy protection for life-insurance graft through Mr. Cortelyou's committee and through Mr. BABCOCK's committee, and the money stolen from the policy holders with this purpose came out of the confidential fund for bribery and blackmail in State legislatures.

On the eve of the last election President Roosevelt issued a statement vehemently denying that he had promised official favors or immunity from justice to the corporate contributors to the Republican campaign fund. The people believed him then, and they believe him now. Mr. Cortelyou issued a statement, too, but it did not deal with life-insurance contributions or mention any contributions specifically. In the light of the Armstrong committee disclosures Mr. Cortelyou owes the people an explanation, which he could best make by volunteering as a witness in the insurance investigation.

When Mr. Cortelyou does make his explanation we have no doubt he will deny with all the force at his command that there was any understanding with the McCalls and McCurdys and Hydes whereunder the power of the national committee was pledged to protect the Big Three from hostile or blackmailing legislation in the various States where the influence of the national committee could be exerted to that end.

If Mr. BABCOCK, of the Congress committee, should think it worth while to protest his political virtue he probably will deny that the $2,500 for which he "touched" the Mutual was used to save himself from the wrath of the people of his district, where he narrowly escaped defeat for his treachery to the Republican party.

Mr. Cortelyou, who owes the public an explanation, may be able to convince us that he did not give the Mutual grafters the slightest reason for supposing that they would get anything in return for their $40,000 but an honest administration and a square deal. Nevertheless, the fact will remain that the money was paid over to him with the hope and expectation on the part of the Mutual crooks, the New York Life crooks, and the Equitable crooks that whenever the influence of the national committee was needed tho help the Big Three's fights in politics the help would be forthcoming—if not from Mr. Cortelyou, then from a large number of other members of the old Hanna machine, who have sold themselves over and over again for less money than the Big Three was always willing to pay for blackmail and bribery.

Mr. Cortelyou is not the whole national committee. He was not the national committee when it kicked Governor La Follette out of the Chicago Convention. He was not the national committee when it refused to stop the perennial scandal of barter in Black Belt delegates. He was not the national committee when it recognized the foul

Addicks gang. He can not control the action of the Senators on that committee who have sold out the Republican party on railroad legislation, who have smothered pure-food bills, who have "vindicated" Dietrichs, who have swindled the Government in postal and land frauds. It was from these purchasable associates of Chairman Cortelyou, if not from that gentleman, that the Big Three grafters expected a return in kind for the boodle paid out of the special and confidential fund which is devoted to bribery and blackmail.

This is justification, we believe, for our statement that, while technically the Mutual crooks have not committed perjury in this particular instance, they have lied under oath on the witness stand.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from South Carolina permit me to inquire what is the newspaper from which that clipping was taken?

Mr. TILLMAN. The New York Press, one of the leading Republican papers in the city of New York. I am glad to be able to say there are some good men in the Republican party. There are lots of them in this Chamber. There are millions of honest Republicans in this country, as has been shown by the Philadelphia and the Pennsylvania and the Cincinnati elections. There is still hope for the country. I am not in despair, though I was getting to be very pessimistic.

Mr. President, I have here something more. I want to keep the record straight and to get it all in in one batch, so that it can be read all at one sitting, and a not very long one at that.

It will be recalled that in October of last year or November, about a week or two before the national election, the Democratic candidate for the high office of President brought down an avalanche of invective and adverse criticism, and I may say abuse. upon his head because of some of his utterances. I will read some of these to illustrate or illuminate the question of campaign contributions and debauchery. I read from the Washington Post of November 5, 1904.

In his initial platform speech of the campaign at Madison Square Garden last Monday night, Judge Parker said:

"Congress creates a new Department of Commerce and Labor. Of that Department the President of the United States appoints a Secretary. That Secretary was his private secretary. Within the Department provision is made for the collection from large corporations, including the so-called trusts, of information which, it is to be borne in mind, is to be submitted to the President for public or private use, as he may direct. By grace of the same Executive, this Secretary, through whose Department this information is collected, becomes the chairman of the Republican national committee. His chief duty it has been, and still is, to collect funds for the purpose of securing the election of the President. And it is now notorious that there has resulted from this organized importunity—whatever may be the precise way in which it is made effective—an overflowing treasury to the committee, of which boast is openly and continually made. Although this may be satisfactory to the conscience of Republican leaders, it must, I firmly believe, be condemned as nothing short of scandalous, not alone to myself or the Democratic party, but by the American people as well."

I will ask to have inserted in the RECORD, without reading, his remarks at the Cooper Union meeting.

There is a still uglier page to the general story. An example is before us of how the effort of the people to free themselves from a burden can be seized upon by the unscrupulous and itself made the agency whereby the burden is bound more firmly upon their backs. The clamor of the people against the trusts rose to the point where recognition was necessary. A new Department of the Government was created—the Department of Commerce. To that Department was intrusted inquisitorial power over the great corporations. Its head, the Secretary of Commerce, was made a Cabinet officer. But, lest honest business interests should suffer, lest unscrupulous competitors should take unfair advantage, it was provided that the results of the Department's investigations into the affairs of any corporation should be confidential. They were and are to be placed in the first instance at the disposition of the President, and in his discretion only are they to be made public and become the common knowledge of the people.

Extraordinary powers these, and marking an extraordinary faith of a people in its elected Chief Executive. And how has this Administration responded to this trust? It places at the head of this new Department, as the first Secretary of the Department of Commerce of the United States, the private secretary of the President. What the Department's researches were we know not. Of the results attained by such researches we are not informed.

When, however, the present campaign opened the Secretary of Commerce resigned his office, and at the request and as the personal representative of the President became the chairman of the Republican National Committee to bring about, if it might be so, the election of his patron to the Presidency. And, lest any should err, it was at the time of his resignation authoritatively announced that at the termination of the campaign he would be summoned again to the Cabinet to fill another Cabinet office. I leave it to you to say whether or not, in your estimation, the vicious circle is complete.

The article continues:

At Hartford, Conn., on Thursday night, Judge Parker made his accusation even more emphatic. He said:

"Born, as it [the Department of Commerce and Labor] was, of a union between the trusts and the Republican party, the parallel of this legislation in scandalous features does not exist upon our statute books to-day. It puts into the hands of the President and of the Republican party the means of continuing its hold on the reins of government"—

I think "on" would have been better than "upon." I am sometimes a little curious on English, and I did not read that right because it used the preposition—

"without limit as to time, through the possession of secrets of trusts which, under the terms of the legislation itself, he may or may not make public or private, as he directs.

"We know full well how the opportunity for the use of that legislation had been availed of in this campaign. No statute could have been better devised for the successful 'financing' of the present election of the candidate of the Republican party, or for its indefinite perpetuation in power.

"In the promotion of our business interests we need a Department of Commerce and Labor. The problems involved are many, and difficulties have to be overcome at every turn, so that all the ingenuity and honesty of our people will be required in order to attain the best results in the shortest time and with the least waste of effort.

"But we do not want a Department of Commerce and Labor whose Secretary shall go out from it every four years, after he had filled his brain and his notebooks with the secrets of all the great corporations and combinations which depend upon the Government for business or favors, in order not to serve the people, but to raise money to corrupt them. Nor do our people want a Department to send its statisticians at the expense of the Government, into the service of a great political committee, in order to put forth doctored statistics.

"We want a Department of Commerce and Labor which will furnish our merchants, farmers, manufacturers, and workmen with the fullest and latest information, intelligently and honestly obtained, and so fairly prepared that dependence may be placed upon it as a real guide. We want to know what other countries are doing in industries, and this is all the more important because we feel sure that in none of them has the head of such a Department retired from his work to go out into the business world in order to collect blood money.

"We do not not need and ought not to have a modern inquisitor who exploits corporations to collect money for corrupting the franchise, or electing pliant legislators, or capturing the electoral vote of pivotal States."

That is a very strong indictment of what the candidate of the Democratic party for President last year supposed to be a grievance, a wrong, and an abuse. He had no direct and positive proof. He had only the circumstantial evidence that it was practicable and he jumped at the conclusion that, therefore, it was possible and had been used. But, as I said, it brought down an avalanche of vehement denial and I might almost say brutal criticism, among others from the President himself, who in his letter dated at the White House November 4, 1904, used this red-hot language:

That contributions have been made to the Republican committee, as contributions have been made to the Democratic committee, is not the question at issue. Mr. Parker's assertion is in effect that such contributions have been made for improper motives, either in consequence of threats or in consequence of improper promises, direct or indirect, on the part of the recipients. Mr. Parker knows best whether this is true of the contributions to his campaign fund, which have come through his trusted friends and advisers who represent the great corporate interests that stand behind him. But there is not one particle of truth in the statement as regards anything that has gone on in the management of the Republican campaign.

Now, I want to say that election disclosed the fact that the Republican party did not need a solitary dollar to elect Theodore Roosevelt. It need not have put a speaker in the field. It need not have sent out a document. It need not have employed a brass band or done any of those things which are called "legitimate campaign expenses." He would have been elected anyhow, because of the prosperous business conditions in the country and the confidence of the American people in the honesty and patriotism of the man. That is my belief.

Yet, in the Washington Post, which is a pretty reliable paper—sometimes it stumbles, but in the main it wants to be clean and decent and give everybody a square deal—I find last Sunday an exposé or disquisition. I do not know what the foundations in fact are, but the man signs his name. and I understand he is a thoroughly reliable and reputable neswpaper man—and upon the whole the newspaper men are about as reliable as any other class. They will lie sometimes like we do, but as a general thing they want to deal fairly with great public questions where their papers will permit, and they will deal fairly with public men, but sometimes they get orders that such a man must be flyblown, and in order to hold their job they go at him and put on him the microbes of disability and of all kinds of adverse criticism, or ignore him and smother him and shut him up, bottle him up, or seal him up, and all that kind of thing.

But the Post, as I said, is a pretty clean paper, about as clean as we have got, and I would say for the benefit of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom the resolution I had the honor to offer yesterday was referred for the investigation of national banks, that if they begin to pull on the string with any kind of vigor as evidencing sincerity of purpose and honesty of intention, I may later on be able to furnish some clews and indicate certain lines to enable them to get light if they really mean to get it. But the Post had in its Sunday edition of December 3 the following:

TRUTH ABOUT ROOSEVELT'S CAMPAIGN FUND—NATIONAL COMMITTEE HAD LESS THAN $1,900,000—CLEVELAND'S WAS $4,000,000.

There were over 4,000 known contributors to Roosevelt's fund, and the largest single contribution was $75,000 or $100,000 from an unknown donor—

Gracious, wasn't he liberal! He did not want a foreign embassy or something like that, like honest Mr. Hyde. He was not like the other man, although I have forgotten his name. My old memory is getting ramshackle and the bell will not ring every

time, but I remember some one Mr. Cleveland nominated once, I believe, for a high diplomatic position.

Mr. MALLORY. Van Alen.

Mr. TILLMAN. Thank you. Your memory is better than mine, although I believe I am a younger man than you are. He had contributed largely to the Democratic campaign fund or had been instrumental in getting others to do so, and demanded as his compensation that he should represent this great Government abroad. I am glad to say he did not get it.

The Post goes on:

Bliss and Cortelyou ignorant of Hyde's diplomatic aspirations—Fund nearly a million less than in 1900.

WHAT IT HAS COST TO ELECT PRESIDENTS.

Fund of the Republican national committee in 1904	$1,900,000
Fund of the Republican national committee in 1900	2,800,000
Fund of the Republican national committee in 1896	3,800,000
Fund of the Democratic national committee in 1892	4,100,000

We poor Democrats, you know, are always tagged on at the tail as getting more money than anybody else and being more rotten than anybody else. I expect we are as rotten as we ought to be, and probably more so, but as far as that campaign fund is concerned, if we never had gotten a dollar and had never elected Grover Cleveland President the history of parties in this country would have been very different from what it has been since he tore us all to pieces and sunk our ship, so to speak. But I will not enter upon that discussion just now.

HOW THE REPUBLICAN FUND WAS DISTRIBUTED LAST YEAR.

I merely allude to these figures for the purpose of indicating that they have sufficient foundation in fact to warrant somebody, I hope a Senate committee, to call this man before them and find out where he got these facts, if they are facts, and then it may be they will get a clew to the real facts as to whether the national banks, and if so, which ones, and the railroad companies, and if so, which ones, have used their money to debauch the electorate and control State legislatures and Presidential elections and Congress.

I ask permission to insert this entire article from the Post of December 3.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From The Washington Post, Sunday, December 3, 1905.]

TRUTH ABOUT ROOSEVELT'S CAMPAIGN FUND—NATIONAL COMMITTEE HAD LESS THAN $1,900,000—CLEVELAND'S WAS $4,000,000—THERE WERE OVER 4,000 KNOWN CONTRIBUTORS TO ROOSEVELT'S FUND, AND THE LARGEST SINGLE CONTRIBUTION WAS $75,000 OR $100,000 FROM AN UNKNOWN DONOR—BLISS AND CORTELYOU IGNORANT OF HYDE'S DIPLOMATIC ASPIRATIONS—FUND NEARLY A MILLION LESS THAN IN 1900.

What it has cost to elect Presidents.

Fund of the Republican national committee in 1904	$1,900,000
Fund of the Republican national committee in 1900	2,800,000
Fund of the Republican national committee in 1896	3,800,000
Fund of the Democratic national committee in 1892	4,100,000

How the Republican fund was distributed last year.

Remittances to State committees	$700,000
For literature	550,000
Maintaining speakers' bureau	175,000
For lithographs, advertising, etc	150,000
Salaries and expenses at headquarters	150,000
Miscellaneous expenditures	50,000
Balance at close of campaign	100,000

[Special to the Washington Post.]

New York, December 2.—As the result of a careful, diligent research it is possible for the Post to allay a widespread curiosity concerning the receipts and expenditures of the Republican national committee during the Presidential campaign of 1904. This curiosity, always a natural one, was stirred to an unusual pitch when Judge Alton B. Parker, the Democratic nominee, made his charge near the close of the campaign that the Republican managers were "holding up" or "blackmailing" corporations for contributions to promote the candidacy of Mr. Roosevelt, and it has become intensified since witnesses before the legislative investigating committee have candidly admitted that big life insurance companies gave generous subscriptions. Many guesses have been made since last fall on the amount of money raised by Cornelius N. Bliss, the treasurer of the committee, but none of them has struck the mark. If at any time Mr. Bliss or Postmaster-General Cortelyou, the chairman of the committee, sees fit to make a public statement it will be found that the figures contained in this dispatch are fully confirmed.

NEARLY TWO MILLION LESS THAN 1896.

The fund with which the Republican national committee conducted Mr. Roosevelt's campaign last year was a little less than $1,900,000. Some credulous people—the result of the election indicated they were comparatively few—drew the inference from Judge Parker's ill-advised accusation that the sum ran up into many millions. Possibly others who have purely theoretical and impractical notions about the management of a political campaign may advance the argument that the fund actually raised was altogether too large for the purpose for which it was used. This may or may not be mere sophistry; but comparisons with former campaign funds shows that the Republican treasury last year was not filled to the bursting point. The total contributions in 1904 were nearly $1,000,000 less than the donations in 1900, when President McKinley was a candidate for reelection. The fund was between $1,800,000 and $2,000,000 less than that which was raised in 1896.

This is the first time these figures have gone out to the public. There are only a few men in the United States to whom the secret was ever intrusted, for Mr. Bliss and his confidants have never considered it essential to the happiness of the people to make a formal statement on the subject. Ever since 1896 there has been a pretty general impression throughout the country that the fund raised by the Republicans that year was the largest in the history of American politics, and partisan politicians have drawn upon it for inspiration in the heat of debate in Congress and on the stump. Men who had no definite information on the subject unblushingly exaggerated the amount, and did not hesitate to do so, because they felt confident their statements would not be contradicted by those who were in possession of the exact data. Representative BOURKE COCKRAN, of New York, while greatly agitated over the accusation of Representative DALZELL, of Pennsylvania, that he had received money for supporting McKinley in 1896, dramatically declared to a spellbound audience in the House of Representatives a year ago that "$16,000,000 was used to purchase a Republican victory in 1896."

CLEVELAND'S FUND $4,000,000.

But the 1896 fund was not the biggest ever raised in the interest of a Presidential candidate. The late Senator Hanna knew that when he was alive, but never publicly stated so. Mr. Bliss also knew it, but likewise was silent. There were other men who more properly could have taken the public into their confidence, but they apparently saw no reason for so doing. The largest amount of money ever collected to conduct a national campaign was in 1892, when Grover Cleveland was a candidate for reelection. The late William C. Whitney obtained the bulk of that fund, and it was a trifle over $4,000,000. I have this on unimpeachable authority, and the statement can not be successfully controverted any more than the other figures herein given can be proven incorrect. But Mr. Whitney's fund was not used to purchase the election of Mr. Cleveland thirteen years ago. It was expended in legitimately furthering the interests of the Democratic nominee, just as the money contributed in 1896 and 1900 was devoted to the intelligent promotion of the Republican cause. Every sensible, practical man who knows anything about the financial requirements of a national campaign knows that a Presidential election can not be purchased with any such sum, or, in fact, any sum at all.

It is possible for me to give not only the size of the fund raised by the Republicans last year, but also to present a recapitulation of the manner in which it was disbursed. Two items consumed nearly two-thirds of the entire fund, namely, literature and assistance to State committees. Very nearly one-third of the $1,900,000 at the disposal of the national committee was expended in the printing and distribution of political pamphlets, documents, etc. The postage and expressage alone amounted to thousands of dollars. It would be correct to state that about $550,000 was utilized in this way. Fully a third of the fund was sent to the Republican managers in a dozen or more States where the local committees had exhausted their own financial supplies. It is well within the limits of accuracy to say that at least between $650,000 and $700,000 was paid out in this manner. The chairmen of the State committees who were the recipients of such aid doubtless have records to show that the money was expended in stimulating interest in the campaign by the employment of bands and the customary popular attractions, and for literature on topics which were of special interest in certain localities.

Another big item consisted of the salaries to employees at the headquarters in New York and Chicago and the rent of the offices. At the two headquarters there were fully 250 men and women engaged in a score of different capacities. Throughout the campaign the weekly salary expense and rent roll aggregated about $15,000, and by the time the contest was ended and headquarters closed up $150,000 was paid out on this account. Next came the lithographing and advertising account. Millions of lithographs and campaign buttons were distributed throughout the country, and in the neighborhood of $150,000 was expended for this purpose and for advertising in magazines and periodicals. It will be recalled that Chairman Cortelyou introduced an innovation in 1904 by printing highly attractive advertisements in the leading magazines, and in this way reached something like 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 people. Those who are familiar with some of these details of campaign management will recall that the Democratic national committee here was much discomfited when it learned of this ingenious and sagacious method of advancing the Republican cause.

ORATORY WAS EXPENSIVE.

Even larger than the lithograph bill was the account of the speakers' bureau. President Roosevelt's managers made it a rule at the beginning of the campaign that every man who was speaking under the auspices of the committee should get his transportation at headquarters. In other words, the chairman placed a ban upon the use of free passes. Thus most of the large corps of stump speakers had their traveling expenses paid out of the committee's treasury. A large majority of them, moreover, received compensation for their services. Altogether it required between $175,000 and $200,000 to maintain the speakers' bureau. This item completes the recapitulation, with the exception of the balance which was left in the treasury at the close of the campaign. This was between $95,000 and $100,000.

Exaggerated reports concerning the size of the balance have appeared in the last two or three months. One story had it that it amounted to about $400,000, and this report gained extensive circulation. To any person who may think the actual balance was excessive or useless it is only necessary to state that the national committee maintains headquarters at Washington, and will continue to do so until the next campaign opens. To support the headquarters costs in the neighborhood of $10,000 a year, and this sum includes the salaries of the secretary and two clerks, office rent, stationery, etc. Thus $40,000 approximately will be expended before the Republican headquarters are opened in 1908. What is left of the fund at that time will be devoted to establishing the new headquarters and starting the tremendous machinery of the national committee before the treasurer again starts out to collect funds.

MONEY FOR STATE COMMITTEES.

Of the money which was distributed by the national committee among State committees that had exhausted their own funds, a large proportion went to New York, New Jersey, West Virginia, Indiana, Nevada, Illinois, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Wisconsin. It was these States which the Democrats regarded as the chief battle ground, and it was in them that the bulk of their funds was spent. There are other States in the Middle West and Northwest which received assistance from the Republican national committee, but in no instance was any money furnished near the close of the campaign. In other words, no State committee received a large lump sum a day or two before the election. The remittances came earlier, so that there could be no ground for the suspicion that the money was to be used improperly on election day. State committees that went "broke" on the eve of election stayed "broke"

over election day. Moreover, before Treasurer Bliss came to the relief of any of the State committees he knew for what purposes the money was to be expended, and in no case was money advanced except for purely legitimate objects. Mr. Roosevelt's plurality in these States aggregated 1,500,000; so that if the $650,000 or $700,000 was used corruptly the price of votes averaged 40 or 45 cents each. And certainly votes are worth more than that to people who are selling them.

The contributions to the Republican treasury last year came from an astonishingly large number of sources. There were over 4,000 known contributors—about 40 per cent of the whole number. This means there was no record of the identity of 60 per cent of the subscribers. Practically the same ratio obtained in the collection of the Republican national fund that was shown to exist in the subscriptions which were made to the campaign of District Attorney Jerome in New York this fall. I am satisfied that the estimate of 10,000 individual contributions to the Republican committee in 1904 is a conservative one, and therefore the average amount received was less than $190.

SOME ONE GAVE CLOSE TO $100,000.

The largest single contribution was either $75,000 or $100,000—I have been unable to learn which, but was authoritatively informed that it was one or the other. Strange to relate, this large sum came from an unknown donor. It was turned in to Treasurer Bliss by one of the men who were soliciting funds, and even he did not reveal the identity of the giver.

There was a great deal of speculation at Republican headquarters on the subject, but the mystery has not been revealed to this day. Some people may think Andrew Carnegie made this healthy donation, because he publicly declared before the campaign opened that he was willing to give any sum that was necessary to advance the political interests of Theodore Roosevelt. Still, it may have been any one of a score of other multimillionaires who had nothing to ask of the President, but wanted to give a little of his spare cash to the party whose principles he subscribed to and to aid a man whose personality he admired.

But the bulk of the contributions was collected by Mr. Bliss's corps of assistants and by committees in such cities as Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Pittsburg, St. Louis, and San Francisco. Mr. Bliss had subcommittees for various lines of trade, who confined their efforts to specified channels. These collectors carried subscription books, and every man who contributed either set down the amount opposite his name or inscribed the word "cash" only.

Some conception of the number of small contributions that were made may be gained when it is stated that in Chicago alone more than 200 of these books were placed in circulation by the subtreasurer of the committee in that city. Much of the money thus collected was turned into the treasury in New York in lump sums, and necessarily there could be no record of the individual amounts given.

Chairman Cortelyou and Treasurer Bliss both declined many large voluntary contributions because there were conditions attached to them. More than one man went to the headquarters in New York and offered to give a snug sum of money if the chairman or the treasurer would agree to use his influence in getting a Federal appointment or in securing him some other material reward after the election. Every such proposition was rejected peremptorily, and the proponent was given to understand that the national committee was not doing business on such a basis. There positively is no doubt whatever that Chairman Cortelyou made no pledges involving a reward of any sort to a single contributor to the Republican fund. He started out on that principle and adhered to it until election day, and the result has been that he since has suffered no embarrassment, nor has the President.

HYDE AND THE AMBASSADORSHIP.

Neither Mr. Cortelyou nor Mr. Bliss knew that James H. Hyde, late vice-president of the Equitable Life Assurance Company, had made a contribution with the idea of being rewarded with the American embassy at Paris. If they had personal knowledge that he gave money from his own pocket, they certainly knew nothing of his diplomatic aspirations. When, after the election, Hyde's name was presented to the President for consideration, it is said upon unquestionable authority that Mr. Roosevelt in the course of a conversation with Mr. Cortelyou referred to the application. And it is known that the national chairman emphatically dissented from the opinion of those who suggested Hyde for the Paris post. Chairman Cortelyou is on record officially as having made no promises of any character to contributors to the Republican fund. In a public statement, issued at the close of the campaign, he said:

"Every part of this fund has come from voluntary contributions made without demand, importunity, or pressure, and without any agreement, pledge, promise, assurance, or understanding, express or implied, regarding the policy or the action of the Administration, or looking to any benefit or advantage to any contributor, except the benefits which will come to all business and to all our people from the continuance of Republican policies and Republican administration."

Should the officers of the Republican national committee ever be called upon to show how the money was spent last year, they could produce one of the cleanest statements ever prepared. The business of the committee was conducted according to high-grade methods that would be the envy of many a successful mercantile establishment. Every important purchase made was on the basis of the lowest bid, and Republican contractors and printers were favored only if their proposals were the lowest and best. Mr. Cortelyou and Mr. Bliss had expert accountants employed to keep track of every expenditure, even to a single postage stamp. And it may be said in this connection that the contracts for literature, lithographs, and other campaign novelties demonstrated that there were astute business men in charge of the campaign.

THE MOVEMENT FOR PUBLICITY.

Republicans in this city who were identified with the management of the President's campaign are gratified to learn that Perry Belmont is active in a propaganda whose object is to secure the publicity of campaign contributions and disbursements. He has assurances of the moral support of a large number of prominent Democrats throughout the country, and it is believed this will tend to insure earnest consideration of Mr. Roosevelt's recommendation to Congress on this subject. In his message last December the President urged publicity of this character, and he intends to renew his recommendation next week. It has been the understanding in Administration circles in Washington that he will go further in urging Congressional action than he did a year ago. Those active in the publicity movement ought to be able to get some valuable information on this question from Postmaster-General Cortelyou. Some months ago the legislature of Connecticut passed a corrupt practices act, which is one of the best enactments of its kind on the statute books of any State.

The inspiration for the law came from Chairman Cortelyou in the summer of 1904, when he was in the midst of the Presidential campaign. Among other things the Connecticut law provides that only the treasurer of a committee may receive contributions and pay campaign expenses, that a full list must be published after election, and that no pledges must be made in consideration of subscriptions.

JUDGE PARKER'S FUND.

Very likely accurate data concerning the expenditures of the Democratic national committee last year will be obtained soon. It probably will astound most people, who may have formed the idea that the Democrats were hard pressed for funds, to learn how much money actually was collected and disbursed by Judge Parker's managers. They had a plethora of cash, as may be shown later.

FRED STAREK.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, Mr. President, I have only a few more words to say. It is very clear to my mind that the insurance companies are not the only rascals that have been engaged in this practice, if we consider the fact that several national banks—a good many of them—are great beneficiaries, particular pets of the Treasury Department, that at one time and another one bank and another have been selected by the Secretaries of the Treasury for deposits running up into the scores of millions, and that the use of this money in banking has been the instrumentality through which great fortunes have been piled up for the owners of the banks, directors, etc. But there was a mutuality of interest undoubtedly, aside from the "16-to-1" business, which would almost compel these national banking corporations to contribute to the campaign fund of a party which had created them, which had been their uniform and consistent friend and supporter, and, therefore, I think that the investigation, if honestly and zealously pressed, will give us light on a great many subjects about which we now have unpleasant suspicions.

It is a sad thought to me that the Senate is discredited by the people of the United States as being a body more or less corruptible or corrupted, and that we are the instrumentalities and agents of corporations in a great measure who dictate our conduct here or our course in legislation, and whose interests are sedulously watched over and guarded.

We have had some misfortunes to come our way in the recent past. We got one or two lame ducks among us. I saw a squib this morning in one of the papers—with mortification and shame I read it—that it was about time, at least it was apropos, for the Senate to unite in singing the chorus of the song—I never heard it—

Are we all here and none in jail?

[Laughter.]

I wish to say for one Senator that while I do not claim to be any better than my brethren, and admit that I am more than liable to temptation and to fall when tempted, I would be glad if we could begin without partisanship, without any array of Democrat against Republican or Republican against Democrat, or for any benefit of any party, to cleanse the Augean stable, if it is here. We have been called the "gray wolves of the Senate." I do not happen to belong to that category because I am not quite gray yet, but still there are many men here whom I respect and admire whose heads are white. Death comes along once in a while and strikes down one after another of us. I honestly believe that with the temper of the people as it is now, and the condition of the public mind which at present prevails, it is opportune and a good thing for this body to try to lift up Senate investigations above the suspicion of dodging, or collusion, or cowardice, and to lift the Senate as a whole in the estimation of our fellow-countrymen out of the bog of dishonor and disgrace which now envelops us.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the resolution of the Senator from South Carolina will go to the Calendar.

Mr. TILLMAN. I had supposed that there would not be any objection to its passage, and unless there is objection I should like to have the inquiry go to the Treasury Department. If it may be done by unanimous consent, I ask that the resolution be put on its passage.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the resolution which he offered be now acted upon. Is there objection? The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR ORVILLE H. PLATT.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. BULKELEY, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President of the Senate in

arranging for and attending the funeral of the late Senator from Connecticut, Hon. ORVILLE H. PLATT, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

LAWS OF PORTO RICO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith eleven ordinances enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico, which ordinances have been approved by the President of the United States.

Attention is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 7, 1905.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. FRYE. If there is no further legislative business, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 11, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 7, 1905.

DISTRICT JUDGES.

Luman F. Parker, jr., of Indian Territory, to be judge of the United States court of the northern district of Indian Territory, vice William R. Lawrence, resigned.

William H. H. Clayton, of Indian Territory, to be judge of the United States court of the central district of Indian Territory. A reappointment, his term expiring December 16, 1905.

Hosea Townsend, of Indian Territory, to be judge of the United States court of the southern district of Indian Territory. A reappointment, his term expiring January 9, 1906.

William R. Lawrence, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States court of the western district of Indian Territory, vice Charles W. Raymond, whose term will expire December 16, 1905.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Lewis I. O'Neal, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia. A reappointment (his term expiring December 31, 1905), in accordance with the provisions of the act approved June 30, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.'"

Samuel C. Mills, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia. A reappointment (his term expiring December 31, 1905), in accordance with the provisions of the act approved June 30, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.'"

Luke C. Strider, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia. A reappointment (his term expiring December 31, 1905) in accordance with the provisions of the act approved June 30, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.'"

Robert H. Terrell, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia. A reappointment (his term expiring December 31, 1905) in accordance with the provisions of the act approved June 30, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.'"

Thomas H. Callan, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia. A reappointment (his term expiring December 31, 1905) in accordance with the provisions of the act approved June 30, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.'"

Charles S. Bundy, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia. A reappointment (his term expiring December 31, 1905) in accordance with the provisions of the act approved June 30, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.'"

MEMBER CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION.

Capt. Charles H. McKinstry, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Débris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Col. Thomas H. Handbury, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, relieved.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Newton A. McCully to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 22d day of April, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander Washington I. Chambers, promoted.

Lieut. Marcus L. Miller to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Commander James P. Parker, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edison E. Scranton to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. William V. Pratt, promoted.

Ensigns Daniel P. Mannix, Harry K. Cage, and Benjamin G. Barthalow to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Daniel P. Mannix to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Thomas Washington, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Benjamin G. Barthalow to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Louis A. Kaiser, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harry K. Cage to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Marcus L. Miller, promoted.

Asst. Surg. Robert A. Bachmann to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 20th day of March, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service.

Asst. Surg. Howard F. Strine to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 8th day of May, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service.

Asst. Surg. Joseph P. Traynor to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 8th day of May, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service.

Asst. Surg. John L. Neilson to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 4th day of October, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service.

Francis M. Shook, a citizen of Minnesota, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 15th day of March, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 3d day of May, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Richard A. Warner, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

Paul R. Stalnaker, a citizen of Texas.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 24th day of May, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Ernest O. J. Eytinge, a citizen of New York.

George M. Olson, a citizen of Minnesota.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 7th day of July, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Curtis B. Munger, a citizen of California.

Edward R. Marshall, a citizen of Tennessee.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 14th day of July, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Fletcher H. Brooks, a citizen of Maryland.

John B. Mears, a citizen of Virginia.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 1st day of August, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date.

George S. Hathaway, a citizen of Rhode Island;

Frank E. Sellers, a citizen of Virginia.

The following-named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 21st day of September, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Edward H. H. Old, a citizen of Virginia;

George H. McConnon, a citizen of Virginia;

Edward C. White, a citizen of New Jersey;

Thurlow W. Reed, a citizen of New York;

Edward U. Reed, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Edward L. Woods, a citizen of Virginia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 14th day of October, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

Robert C. Ransdell, a citizen of the District of Columbia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 24th day of November, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 7, 1905.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Charles Joseph Bonaparte, of Maryland, to be Secretary of the Navy.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

Truman Handy Newberry, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

POSTMASTER.

MISSISSIPPI.

Anna D. Cook to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Jones and State of Mississippi.

EXTRADITION WITH DENMARK.

The injunction of secrecy was removed December 7, 1905, from a supplementary extradition treaty between the United States and Denmark, signed at Washington on November 6, 1905.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 7, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TOBACCO GROWERS.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of December I introduced a bill for the relief of tobacco growers, but in the great rush in introducing bills the Clerk was unable to note the fact that it was introduced on that day, but erroneously noted on the next day that it was introduced on the 5th. I desire this fact to go into the RECORD, so that the true history of the bill may appear in the RECORD.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriations for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes.

The motion of Mr. HEPBURN was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. VREELAND in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 480. Section No. 1 of the bill has been read for amendment. No amendment having been offered, the Clerk will read section No. 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $16,500,000 to continue the construction of the isthmian canal, to be expended under the direction of the President in accordance with the said act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, approved June 28, 1902, and for each and every purpose connected with the same, the said sum to continue available until expended: *Provided*, That all expenditures from the appropriation herein made shall be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds authorized in section 8 of the said act approved June 28, 1902.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 3, on page 2, the words "sixteen million five hundred thousand dollars" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "six million eight hundred and fifty-eight thousand three hundred and thirty-three dollars."

I announced yesterday, Mr. Chairman, that I would move to strike out the sum named in the bill and substitute for it a sum to be ascertained and which would, or ought to, fully cover all payments necessary to be made by the Commission during the month of December, including the payments on January 1.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman send the amendment to the desk for the information of the committee?

The Clerk read the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I came to the conclusion that that was the right sum by the investigation of the detailed statement, or summary statement, rather, of the Commission.

I find that the indebtedness of the Commission on all scores, by this statement, up to December 1 to be $4,500,000. I find that the December proportion of the remaining appropriation asked for—in a manner estimated for—would amount to $2,358,333. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] went over the figures for me and made an estimate, which he handed me yesterday, while I was too busy to do so myself.

By reference to page 40 of the RECORD, gentlemen will find $4,000,000 in one place and $500,000 in another, in the second column—this includes what is due the Panama Railroad Company—and will find the balance of the amount I propose by taking one-sixth of the amount estimated by the Canal Commission to be necessary for the seven months following as the December proportion thereof.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not further discuss the amendment except to say that while I would not for anything have the work upon the Isthmus stopped one day—none of us desire that it shall be stopped one day—I am of the opinion, which seems to be prevalent on both sides of this Chamber, that legislation of this unusual and extraordinary character ought not to be a precedent for future legislation and ought to be limited to what is absolutely necessary to meet an unavoidable emergency. I think the figures cover the unavoidable emergency and give a margin of nearly $800,000 in addition.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Your proposed amendment contemplates a proportionate amount of the entire amount which is recommended? One-sixth, you say, for the future expenses and $4,000,000 for the indebtedness up to December 1. One-sixth would not carry it beyond January.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Through the payment on the 1st of January until January 15.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the gentleman understand that under item No. 2, on page 40, right-hand column, $3,300,000 is for equipment purchased or contracted for delivery not later than June 30, 1906? So that if the Department has legally obligated the Government, the Government will be compelled to make that payment without reference to the future appropriation. Now, can you segregate one of the months from the liabilities on the part of the Government from others? Have we sufficient information to enable us to determine just what portion of the liability must be met in January for equipment now purchased or contracted for? What part will have to be met in December? It seems to me that it is impractical to segregate the amounts severally, for the reason that this is a liability already incurred.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentlemen is not asking me a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the time of the gentleman from Mississippi be extended for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In response to the question of the gentleman from Minnesota, not in response to his argument, the item of $2,740,000—i. e., item 2 in the statement—represents equipment "purchased or contracted for delivery not later than June 30, 1906." I take it, as an ordinary business man, and a very ordinary one I am frank to confess, that the supplies will not be delivered much prior to the time, if any prior to the time, fixed in the contract. That item, therefore, will not call for any payment in its major part, perhaps not in any of its parts, before June 30.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman must certainly admit that if the goods are contracted for the liability will have to be met by the 30th of June.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course. Payment will not, however, have to be made before that nor until delivery. It would be a very foolish thing on the part of the Government to make a contract for goods to be delivered at a certain time and pay for them before delivered.

Mr. TAWNEY. It shows that that much is contracted for and that must be met in accordance with the terms of the purchase, so that it makes very little difference whether we appropriate the money now or after delivery. If we postpone the appropriation we will not be able to appropriate less than is necessary and called for now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We may get a less or we may have to get a larger one; I do not know. But the end I am seeking to reach is this: That a committee of this House shall sit upon that precise question, shall investigate it, shall scrutinize the expenditures, shall scrutinize the estimates, shall scrutinize the contracts; and therefore I want an emergency bill like this

to make no appropriation for anything but an actual emergency—any matter which we will have plenty of time to do after having had it investigated and voted on by a committee.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say that he arrived at the amount named in his amendment by taking the items in the second column on page 40, item 1, $4,000,000; item 5, the amount due the Panama Railroad Company, $500,000, and then taking the balance of the $16,500,000 and dividing it by 6. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the estimates cover seven months and not six, to begin with, so that on the gentleman's own theory, to cover the month of December only, he should take one-seventh, but that if he runs, as he proposes to do, until the middle of January, it would take more than one-sixth. This estimate is for seven months. The gentleman's proposition would clearly only carry it until the 1st of January.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Carry it through the payments on the 1st of January.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. His estimate of one-sixth would only run to the 1st of January.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One-seventh.

Mr. MANN. One-seventh.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One-seventh has not been taken. One-sixth was taken to allow the very margin of which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. MANN. There is very little difference between the fractions—between one-seventh and one-sixth. It would only run until the 31st of December. Large payments are made on the 1st of January. At least the pay rolls are made out on the 1st of January, and the payments are made then. The gentleman would not cover those items that are necessary even for pay rolls on the 1st of January, much less the pay rolls due the middle of January or the 1st of February.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, in explanation of what the gentleman has stated, this amount, $6,858,000, includes the entire amount in item 1, which is $4,000,000. It includes the entire amount in item 5. It does not include a proportionate share of that amount, but includes the entire item.

Mr. MANN. I understood that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That makes $4,500,000. Then all the other items on that page added together—items 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8—are summed up, and one-sixth of them taken instead of one-seventh. Now, this will not only cover all that can be paid for the month of December—it is for the month of December that the payments on January 1 are made—but it takes a fractional part larger than necessary, not one-seventh, but one-sixth. There can be no doubt, in my mind, that the amount—$6,858,333—more than covers the emergency necessities of payment between this time and the 15th of January, because the Commission pay, as I understand it, at the beginning and middle of each month.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Mississippi be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman from Mississippi be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I wanted to call the gentleman's attention to the other item which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] called attention to. My information, which I am very frank to say is somewhat indefinite, is that both because they want the material at once and because it is necessary to get material as rapidly as they can—that is, the railroad material—in order to transport it (as we have to take it in our ships), the Commission are urging the delivery of material just as rapidly as possible—the big locomotive engines, the cars, and so forth. I am frank to say that in my judgment it would be a mistake to appropriate simply one-sixth of that amount. I do not believe it would be sufficient even to carry the Government through without distress until the middle of January.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, in response to that I have to say that if there is any mistake it is in including even one-sixth of that amount. Here in the House we take a sort of judicial cognizance of the ordinary methods of business. I will read item 2 to the House:

2. Equipment purchased or contracted for delivery not later than June 30, 1906	$3,350,000
1,100 steel flat cars	1,071,100
120 locomotives	1,367,000
43 steam shovels	493,600
18 unloading machines (plows, etc.)	151,794
3 water tanks and towers	36,050
3 earth spreaders	23,382
2 dipper dredges	205,000
Miscellaneous	2,074
Total	3,350,000

Now, let us take cognizance of the ordinary course of business. It is very improbable that a dollar of that will be delivered before June 30, for the very simple reason that the contract allows them to wait until June 30. They will make no money by delivering prior to June 30. The chances are that instead of one-sixth of it being delivered before June 30, one-sixth of it will not be delivered until after June 30, for that matter.

That is my experience in connection with these contracts for future deliveries. Nothing will be necessary to be paid until the goods have been delivered upon the Isthmus of Panama. So, if I have made any mistake at all, it was in taking one-sixth of the item—a mistake in taking any part at all.

Mr. WANGER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. WANGER. In the articles mentioned I understand the opinion of the Commission to be that these articles should be furnished at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But they have contracted for them all to be delivered "not later than June 30."

Mr. WANGER. The most of them are in the process of manufacture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And will remain in the process of manufacture until June 30.

Mr. WANGER. I submit that the process of manufacture will be expedited by the certainty that the contracts are going to be carried out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will bring to me any contract——

Mr. WANGER. Any implied veto on the part of the Government of the conditions of the contract will make contractors less anxious to finish the construction than what they would be if they had a certainty that the contracts would be carried out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no "implied veto" about this. If the gentleman will show me any reason to hope that these people will deliver these things any sooner without being paid a dollar more money—slighting or delaying other and concurrent contracts with no addition, and at a loss of other business—then I would include a greater proportion of this amount. The gentleman knows as a business man that business men are not going to hurry up unnecessarily in delivering their goods unless they have something to make by it. The Commission has already made the contract with them under which they can deliver the goods as late as June 30 and get every dollar fixed in the contract.

Mr. WANGER. My impression is that there has been a great deal of publicity about the purpose of the condition of securing these articles. Has my friend heard any criticism of the Commission or the Government in making these contracts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not here to criticise the Government or the Commission; that is not at all relevant or necessary to the consideration of the purpose of this amendment. I do not criticise an Executive Department of this Government by refusing to make an appropriation at its request when I do not believe the appropriation ought to be made at a particular time. I have said that I am willing to meet an emergency with an emergency appropriation; no more. The gentleman might as well say that I would be criticising the War Department if it should come in here to-day and want $50,000,000 appropriated and suggest that $500,000 of it was immediately necessary, because unless something was done at once a great public work would go to pieces, and I should take the position that we appropriate the $500,000 and let the balance of the fifty millions wait the ordinary course of legislative procedure.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by changing the sum named to $10,000,000.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth day of the session of the Fifty-ninth Congress. Within a short period of time the Speaker of the House will appoint the regular committees. When these regular committees are appointed, measures like the one under discussion will be referred to these committees. However, we are confronted in the early days of this session, which is a long one, and which may last until June or July, with an emergency bill calling for $16,500,000 of the people's money to be appropriated at this time. The estimates that are presented to this House, in my judgment as a Member of this House, do not warrant us at this time in favoring an appropriation of $16,500,000. We should, as Members, do everything in our power to advance speedily the construction of the isthmian canal. It is in view of this that I have offered the amendment appropriating $10,000,000. I have taken some little pains to ascertain as best I could how much there ought to be paid out now as an emergency proposition. The best information

I can obtain, without giving the source of it, is in the neighborhood of $8,000,000. That will more than cover the amount that we should appropriate to-day as an emergency proposition. To ask this House at this time, in the early days of the session, to appropriate $16,500,000, that will carry us until the 1st of July, 1906, is asking too much of this House that opens and closes the doors of the Treasury upon the question of appropriating money.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to the amendment with a view of trying to harmonize this question, because legislation is a compromise at best; it is the average judgment of 386 men sitting here, each one clothed with responsibility to his district; and I am frank to say that I would not like to go before my constituents in the coming election, as I hope I may, and say that without any knowledge whatever I voted to appropriate $16,500,000 on the fourth day of the session when it met in its regular long session. In addition to that, I wish to say that I am not in favor of issuing bonds at this time. From the first days of the party to which I belong, whose majorities have now grown so that the members of that party in the House have been compelled to come over to this side of the Chamber in order that they may obtain seats, it has never issued a bond, except in the case of the Spanish war. Let me read to the House the condition of the Treasury of the United States on the 6th day of December, 1905:

Available cash on hand	$136,596,542.29
In the banks to our credit	55,638,210.70

On yesterday we received $1,119,856.06 more than we paid out. For this month thus far we have received in excess of expenditures nearly $3,000,000. Is there an urgent necessity for the issuance of bonds? We have $55,000,000 of the people's money in the banks to-day. Now, let us resolve ourselves back to individuals. Fifty-five thousand dollars is in the bank to our credit individually. Suppose I want to enter into a project which will cost me an outlay of $16,000. What would you think of me if I had that $55,000 to my credit and did not draw my check on my own money in the bank, but instead went and borrowed the money either of that bank or of some other bank, engaging to pay interest on the $16,000, when I had $55,000 in the bank to my credit for which I am not receiving a dollar's interest? Yet that is the condition we are in to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate fully the feeling in the House that an emergency appropriation of this kind ought to carry only an appropriation sufficient to cover the actual emergency. It is undoubtedly true that we can make an appropriation of less than the amount carried by the bill and still conserve the interests of the canal work, provided we make a subsequent appropriation in an urgent deficiency bill. It is, in my judgment, equally true that the amount proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is not sufficient. He proposes to carry a sufficient fund to meet the bills which are now due, and, in addition, one-sixth of the balance. That would not carry an amount which would last beyond the 1st day of January, even if it should last that long; and for us to say that we will leave the Commission without any money at all after the 1st day of January is to say that we bring discredit upon the Government and paralyze the efforts of the Commission.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether certain of these articles for which estimates have been made and which are said to have been contracted for, such as 43 steam shovels, $493,000, would be required in case the work should be done by contract?

Mr. MANN. They would undoubtedly be required however the work may be done.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Do I understand the gentleman to say that so large an investment in steam shovels will be required if the work of excavation—the whole work—is let by contract?

Mr. MANN. I understand it to be the judgment of the Commission and of the engineers that whether the work shall finally be finished by the Government, or whether it shall be done by letting it out on contract, all of these supplies, including these excavators, under a form of contract which would be made, will not only be necessary but must be used, and that the Government can in no case suffer loss by obtaining them now.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Is it not true that their only certainty of using those shovels is based on the expectation that some contract would be made with the contractors who undertake the work, while those contractors might prefer another variety of steam shovels or another method of doing the work?

Mr. MANN. Oh, that is possible.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Is it not only possible, but probable?

Mr. MANN. It is true that if these articles are purchased, if contracts are let, the Government will require that in those contracts some provision shall be made with reference to their use.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Let me ask the gentleman a somewhat broader question. Is it not true that a considerable measure of these supplies have been purchased or contracted for upon the theory that the work will be done directly by the Government?

Mr. MANN. My understanding is, and I say to the gentleman, that the Commission and the engineers have not finally determined how the work shall be done. I say, frankly, as far as my own judgment is concerned, that it is impossible to divide the work of excavation of the Culebra Cut between different contractors, and that it must be done either by the Government directly or by turning it over to one contractor, and I feel confident that that never will be done.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. But the work is severable in a measure, is it not?

Mr. MANN. Practically not severable at all in this Culebra cut.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Then the gentleman is proceeding on the thought, is he not, that the work will be done directly by the Government, although that question has not yet been decided?

Mr. MANN. Well, I understand the Commission not to have decided the question and not to have engaged in any purchases which will be affected by the decision of the question. My own judgment, I said to the gentleman, is worth nothing. I am not an engineer and not an expert; it is a pure matter of guess.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think it necessary to appropriate the entire $16,500,000, or would he believe that a smaller sum sufficient to carry the Commission along for two or three months, until some committee of this House could consider the needs of the Commission in a proper way, would be all that should be appropriated at this time?

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt whatever that the Commission can get along without serious detriment to the work with less than $16,500,000, but in my judgment, which is purely a personal judgment, the Commission will in the end get better work and quicker results if they know that they have this entire sum at their disposal at this time, because most of this money is for the purchase of implements and machinery to carry on the work. We have contracts entered into providing for the delivery of these implements, not contracts, as stated by the gentleman from Mississippi, which require that these articles shall be furnished on the 1st day of July at all. The time covers the contracts on up to July 1, but many of the contracts expire entirely before July 1, and most of them require the furnishing of many of these supplies at monthly intervals. For instance, in the item of 120 locomotives, the heavy locomotive engines such as we use now in modern railroad work; these locomotives if delivered all on the 1st day of July would swamp our transportation department. We provide for the delivery of these locomotives at intervals, and we are urging the manufacturers of them that they (and they have to be specially manufactured, I may say) hurry the work along. You understand that in the railroad work there we meet this difficulty. All of our railroads in this country are either what are called "narrow-gauge" railroads or "standard-gauge" railroads. The Panama Railroad is neither. A car which can be run on our roads here can not be run on the Panama road, and the locomotive engine which can be used here can not be used there, as the gauge there is different.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. MANN. I yield to my colleague gladly.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think the emergency is so great as to require a blind vote on the part of this House for an appropriation of the amount sought by the Isthmian Commission, or does he believe that an amount equal to the requirements for the next three months would be wiser, and that then

this House, through its proper committee, would have ample opportunity to study into the needs of the Commission and to make such appropriations and recommendations as in its judgment it would be justified in making?

Mr. MANN. My colleague, who may become a member of the committee which will have charge of any deficiencies or any other estimates which may come from this Commission, asks me what I really think. I really think that this matter is receiving more consideration by the House now than it ever will receive in the future either from the Committee on Appropriations or the House. I have seen so many appropriations come in from that distinguished committee and so easily passed through the House which nobody knew much about that I feel confident we are giving as much attention to it now as it ordinarily would receive.

Mr. COCKRAN. May I interrupt the gentleman to ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, merely to illustrate the fullness of that explanation and information the House possesses, I would ask the distinguished gentleman from Illinois if he can tell us anything further about the identity of that press agent who is drawing $10,000 a year, according to the statement of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MANN. If the distinguished gentleman from New York, who often graces the floor of the House when he addresses it, had remained upon the floor yesterday he would have heard me state then that there was no such person and no such office.

Mr. COCKRAN. I was on the floor continuously the whole day, sir, and my recollection does not cover that statement.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman, unfortunately, at that time was absent.

Mr. COCKRAN. Do I understand the gentleman to state now that there is no such person, no such agent, no such expenditure, as mentioned by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]?

Mr. MANN. I state now that there is no such person, no such agent, and no such expenditure——

Mr. COCKRAN. I desire to express my acknowledgment to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN (continuing). As a salary of $10,000 for a press agent, or any other salary for a press agent. I stated that very fully to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] yesterday.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to leave to the House, on the explanation which has been made, the amount which they shall wish to appropriate. And I hope the House will not accept the amount offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] be extended——

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that the debate on this amendment is exhausted. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] asks for five minutes of time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that this matter comes in at this time. There is an urgent necessity for action upon it. No committee of the House has had an opportunity to examine it, because of the urgency that arises. If we do not appropriate sufficient money at this time it will hamper the Commission and delay them at the very outset in the construction of this canal. The Commission has reported to the House the total deficiency for this fiscal year ending on the 30th of June next. They have reported it in such a manner that we can not easily segregate the amounts sufficient to run the work until some committee of the House may examine into the items that are presented here. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] moved to cut it down, on the theory that $4,000,000 is all that is necessary now, except another sum of $500,000 which he thinks necessary now, and a sixth of the amount from now up to the 30th of June next. Obviously, this amendment is not sufficient to cover the amount necessary. There must be a stoppage in the work before this matter can be considered and a deficiency appropriation bill be brought in. That would take it beyond the 1st of January. Of course, the House will adjourn over the holidays. Then after that the committees must meet and have time to examine these items before they bring in a deficiency appropriation bill. I think we can figure enough out of this statement to show that the amount suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is grossly inadequate to supply the Commission without hampering them until the 1st of January next. He admits item No. 1, on page 40 of the RECORD, an amount of $4,000,000. The next is item 2, an amount of $3,350,000, for cars, locomotives, steam shovels, unloading machines, water tanks and powers, earth spreaders, dipper dredges, and a miscellaneous item of $2,074, making a total of $3,350,000; and he says that the contract calls for delivery not later than June 30, 1906. It has been stated here upon the floor that the contract is for the earliest possible delivery, and that all must be delivered before June 30, 1906.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, if this is a hurry order, if these articles are to be produced by the manufacturers at the earliest possible date, they will be delayed if we delay the appropriation. If we say, by passing a sufficient appropriation now, that the money is there in the Treasury, to be paid when these articles are delivered, then, of course, the manufacturers will hurry in order to get their pay; but if they can not get their pay until the 30th of June next, they are going to take other work, cash orders, and delay these. I have seen it stated somewhere, and I think it was in a speech of the Secretary of War made in a western city, that the object of the Commission was to assemble all of these articles——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for an extension of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] asks for an extension of five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. As I have said, I have seen it stated that the object of the Commission was to assemble all of these articles at the earliest practicable moment, in order that they may let their contracts and go on with the work. My understanding is, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that they propose either to lend out these tools to the contractors, receiving a consideration from them, or else, if they build the canal, to use them for themselves, their judgment being that such a large number of these articles can not be hastily assembled by any contractor or produced by the manufacturer, and that they are taking time by the forelock by purchasing them in advance.

Now, there are two other items of $500,000 upon this schedule, as Members will see, that look as though they ought to be appropriated for at once and the money paid before the 1st day of January. Then we ought to provide enough money to continue this work until February, and give the committee having the matter in charge an opportunity to examine the members of the Commission, or some one able to speak with authority, and bring the matter before the House in a businesslike way, so that we can all understand just what we are doing. I think we ought to appropriate ample money, sufficient for the purpose of taking it into February. Evidently the amount asked for in the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi will not do this. Evidently the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, $10,000,000, will cover these items, and I think the House ought to vote it into the bill and adopt it as a part of the bill; and then this other six millions and a half, and even more money if the Commissioners can show that they need it, can be put in the regular deficiency bill and acted upon in this House in a deliberate way, so that we can know what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, to hamper this Commission now by the inadequate appropriation covered by the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi would give a black eye to this Commission and to this canal in its very outset; and I do not believe a Member of this House wishes to do that. Then let us give them an ample sum; let us adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois and put it on the bill. All these things are audited——

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PAYNE. If I can have a minute to answer it, I will be glad to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I will ask that you may have a minute so that you may answer a question.

Mr. PAYNE. When I get through I will try to answer you. You are consuming my time, and I have almost forgotten where "I was at." I will vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. How do you arrive at the sum of $10,000,000? Is it by way of a compromise?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no; here is $10,000,000 of indebtedness nearly due.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Why not make it $11,000,000?

Mr. PAYNE. Let me answer your question. Do not get so excited over this. The Commission say that they have liabilities of $4,000,000 due by the 1st of December; then there is another payment of $3,750,000 for supplies to be delivered before the 30th of June next. The Commission want these goods as early as they can get them. As I said, the Secretary of War, in a recent speech, said the Commission were urging the delivery of these tools at once, and of course a portion of them will be manufactured in the gentleman's State, and by this provision the manufacturers can get their money upon delivery of their goods. Then there are two other items of half a million dollars. These must be cared for, and this one-sixth of the balance can be left for salaries and other expenditures for the purpose of carrying on this work up to the 1st of February, when it can be examined and be brought into the House for full consideration.

Now, gentlemen, all these accounts are audited, not alone by the auditors on the part of the Commission, but also by the Auditor of the War Department, so that every dollar of this expenditure will ultimately come under the Auditor of the War Department and get the same auditing as all the other items of expenditures of that Department, running up to a hundred millions of dollars. This will give an ample amount with which to carry on the work until the matter can be considered by regular committee and put on the deficiency appropriation. We know that this committee will do its duty, as they have done heretofore, and will call the officers in charge of this work before them, and give every dollar that is needed. If we were to give this $16,500,000, they do not need to spend it simply because we give it. I would not vote to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi, for that would simply stop the work of the Commission, hamper it, and give the whole project a black eye. I shall vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to have five minutes, not to make a speech, but to ask some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How did the gentleman from New York get ten minutes then?

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to have ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the committee for ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa three or four questions. I see in his statement in the RECORD there is provision for purchasing agents at Washington, New York, New Orleans, and Tacoma, and that nearly all the supplies are purchased in Washington or New York. Is that true or not?

Mr. HEPBURN. I am sorry to say that I can not inform the gentleman on that subject.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will ask you another question. How many ships has the Government in this trade down there to take this material to Panama?

Mr. HEPBURN. Five, I believe.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Nine, isn't it?

Mr. HEPBURN. Five.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And every one of them plies between New York and Panama?

Mr. HEPBURN. Between New York and Colon.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why do not some of them ply between Colon and New Orleans?

Mr. HEPBURN. I can not answer that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Who is there that can answer that?

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether he knows of any manufacturer of locomotives, cars, steam shovels, and things of that kind in the vicinity of New Orleans?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will tell you what I know. I know there are a good many things about this business that I do not know, and which nobody else seems to know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will suggest to the gentleman from New York that they manufacture locomotives in my district, within 300 miles of New Orleans. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is not simply New Orleans, it is every State drained by the Mississippi River and its tributaries, including a large part of Pennsylvania; beginning with Minnesota and Wisconsin all the way down the banks of the Mississippi, including the greatest iron-producing place on the face of the earth, represented by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I undertake to say that you can ship coal and steam engines and everything that is used in the construction of this canal more cheaply from Pittsburg by an all-water route to Colon than you can ship it across the continent to New York and then ship it by water to Colon.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. WANGER. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will address the Chair. To whom does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield first to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER].

Mr. WANGER. The statement was made to me that the United Fruit Company, which runs a line of steamers between New Orleans and Colon, would not give as advantageous a rate as the estimated expense in shipping by the Panama Railroad Steamship Company from New York, and that in purchasing supplies it was always endeavored to be ascertained in what manner supplies could be delivered at the lowest cost.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, let me ask you a question.

Mr. WANGER. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The United States Government has ships of its own carrying this stuff down there?

Mr. WANGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the reason it can not take material from New Orleans, ton for ton, a good deal more cheaply than it can take it from New York, not counting the railroad expense of getting it to New York?

Mr. WANGER. If there was a commerce for the regular employment of the steamers, it might be able to do that. I am not acquainted with the terms of delivery at the respective points.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I had just as lief catechise you as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. All the material that goes down there for the use of this Panama Canal is not machinery, is it?

Mr. WANGER. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, coal, and the stuff to feed that army of 25,000 people, and the cement that goes into the construction, and the whole business—what is the reason that it can not be shipped down the Mississippi River to New Orleans and from there to Colon more cheaply than you can ship it across the continent to New York and then reship it from New York?

Mr. WANGER. For the reason, so far as I know, that no shipping concern has offered to transport and deliver the material as economically by that route as it is being done by the ships of the Government from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I am trying to get at is, Why do not some of these Government ships that were bought for the purpose of shipping this stuff down there ply between New Orleans and Colon, instead of plying all of them between New York and Colon?

Mr. WANGER. Because it has not yet been discovered that they can ply as economically.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Don't you know that they can?

Mr. WANGER. I do not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You had better study up the subject of navigation, then.

Mr. WANGER. I understand that the port of New Orleans was closed for a considerable period during the present year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You are not the man I am after. I will ask the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that my sympathies are with him, as far as New Orleans is concerned.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly what I thought. I want to find out the reason why the Mississippi Valley does not have as fair a deal in this business as the eastern part of the United States. Now, right on the banks of the Mississippi River, just below Hannibal, in my district, there is a cement plant that makes 3,000 barrels of cement a day and it is doubling its capacity so that it can make 6,000, and every foot of the way to Colon, except about 400 yards, that material can be carried by water, and a vast economy effected for the Government.

Mr. WANGER. Will my friend permit one more suggestion? As I understand, the original programme of the Secretary of War was to have the Government abandon all connection with transportation in the delivery of persons and property and rely entirely upon private facilities; but the conditions which con-

fronted him were such that he was practically compelled to abandon that project.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the gentleman, Who controls this shipping business? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. MANN. What shipping business?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. These five ships we own for the purpose of shipping this stuff down there.

Mr. MANN. Five ships are controlled by the Panama Railroad Company, the directors of which are the Isthmian Canal Commission.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not that belong to the United States?

Mr. MANN. Certainly; the stock of the Panama Railroad Company belongs to the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois a leading question. How can the Representatives from Missouri, Illinois, Minnesota, and the other States in the Mississippi Valley stand here and indorse a performance that cuts our people out and gives all this business to this New York gang? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit an answer to the first question, briefly, the Panama Railroad Company has maintained a steamship line between Colon and New York for many years. There is no other regular steamship line plying between those ports. There is a regular steamship line plying between New Orleans and Colon—the United Fruit Company Steamship Line, which has more steamers than the Panama Railroad Company—so that we have a line of steamships for transportation between New Orleans and Colon. Now, we simply followed up the past of the Panama Railroad Company in connection with the steamship line between New York and Colon. I may say to the gentleman that there has been under consideration a proposition not only to maintain a line between Colon and New York, but also to establish a line between Colon and New Orleans, owned by the Government, and also a line between Panama and San Francisco, owned by the Government. That has not yet been done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. One more question. Who is going to feed the army of 25,000 people? Is that going to be done by the Government, or is it going to be done by private contract?

Mr. MANN. The Isthmian Canal Commission at one time entered into a contract, in my judgment ill advisedly, at least somebody concluded it was done ill-advisedly, and it was canceled. At present, as I understand, the Isthmian Canal Commission is endeavoring to get and furnish to the Isthmus a sufficient quantity of healthful food.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. One other question. I understood the gentleman from Illinois, in response to a question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], to say——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to ask it, but I want five minutes more to ask questions. I do not want to make a speech on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Illinois, in answer to a question by the gentleman from Ohio, to say that he did not know whether they were going to undertake to build a canal by the Government or to let it out to contractors.

Mr. MANN. I understand that to be the case.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If that is true, what is the good of spending this vast amount of money for machinery that the contractors, if they take this by contract, may not want to use at all?

Mr. MANN. Because whether the work is done by contract or by the Government all this machinery will be absolutely necessary. If it should be let by contract—the excavation of the Culebra cut—the interest of the Government will be conserved by taking all this machinery mentioned in the contract.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Can the gentleman tell me how long the Panama Railroad is?

Mr. MANN. About 47 miles long.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And what is the gauge?

Mr. MANN. The standard gauge is 4 feet and 8 inches. The gauge of the Panama Railroad is 5 feet.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, inasmuch as you can not use an engine constructed for that track anywhere else on the face of the earth than on that 40 miles of railroad, why not, instead of making a special contract for special engines and special cars, go to work some day and change the gauge of that railroad to the standard gauge? They can do it in one day.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken about the time required. In the first place, while the railroad is only 47 miles long the track laid there in connection with the canal and the road is several hundred miles, including that for the canal excavation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gauge of railways in the United States hundreds of miles long has been changed in a single day. It has been done repeatedly.

Mr. MANN. Well, I will say to the gentleman that it is costing us a very large amount of money now——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Would it not be more economical to change it in that way than to make these special engines and cars and have to wait for them?

Mr. MANN. I say to the gentleman that changing the gauge would involve the abandonment of all the railroad equipment down there. The old engineer, and I presume the present engineer, in calling for bids for the new equipment proposed, and I presume that is the case, to have it so provided that new cars might be adjusted upon a change of the gauge and still be used after the gauge should be made the standard gauge. Of course, down there, there being no connecting line, it makes no difference whatever whether the gauge is one thing or the other. The only difference it makes is as to the purchase of supplies, and the only question involved is whether the supplies purchased would cost as much less as the value of the present plant, which would be thrown away in making the change.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am not in control of the time. The time belongs to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate on this matter has expired.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the committee for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WANGER. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to ascertain what has become, or if any use has been made, of the 250 locomotives that we saw there a year ago.

Mr. WANGER. Some of them are in use, but the use of a very large percentage of the old locomotives has not been found economical. There is trouble with derailments and with inability to haul sufficient loads with these locomotives, making it more expensive in the end than to get new and large modern engines.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any feeling of censure—and I do not recall that any has been expressed—or any feeling of criticism entertained toward members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the last Congress for not being more thoroughly in touch with all of the details in connection with the work of the Isthmian Canal Commission, I would call the attention of the House to the fact that on March 2 last a resolution of that committee authorizing such of its members as had been reelected to sit during the recess was presented to this House and its passage refused. In fact, I think it was regarded more as a joke by the Members of the House than anything else. The distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin is recorded as making this comment about it:

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the whole House in this junket.

Now, I take it that it was very unjust in my friend to make that remark, and I trust that the zeal now manifested by this House to have a thorough study of expenditures by this Commission in this great work will continue, and that there will never be a period of months from March 4 to the next first Monday of December when there is not a committee to keep in touch with the conduct of the work, and especially with the manner and methods and details of expenditures. I suggest, in connection with the estimate of the amount necessary to enable the Commission to go on with its work, that there are many other things besides the machinery and materials contracted for which are absolutely essential to the credit of the Commission, to the credit of our Government upon the Isthmus, and to the encouragement of the faithful men who are laboring there. Why, in these estimates of expenditures necessary after the first of this month are included all of the medicines and all the minor supplies which are so essential to the efficiency of the working forces

of engineers and the other employees of the Commission; and besides that are the great items of expenditures necessary to be made by the Panama Railroad Company. For, as I understand the matter, the new locomotives and other materials detailed in the estimate submitted here as item 2 there is nothing included for the reequipment of the railroad for railroad purposes. The engines, cars, and other machinery are for the use of the Canal Commission in its particular work, as distinguished from the work of transporting merchandise across the Isthmus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WANGER. I want to ask one more favor from the House, and that is unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the speech of the Secretary of War made recently in St. Louis, in which there is probably the most comprehensive review of work done upon the Isthmus and of the conditions that surround the Commission that has been made. No doubt every Member received a copy in his mail yesterday or to-day, but that does not go to the country as it ought to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the speech of the Secretary of War relating to the isthmian canal be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The time for debate upon the amendment is exhausted.

The speech referred to is as follows:

Speech of William H. Taft, Secretary of War, at the St. Louis Commercial Club, St. Louis, Mo., Saturday evening, November 18, 1905.

GENTLEMEN OF THE COMMERCIAL CLUB OF ST. LOUIS: It is a great pleasure to meet you again. My association with your club was begun at the time of the visit of the Cincinnati Commercial Club to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, and was renewed at the time of the visit of this club to the silver wedding of the Cincinnati Club. On that occasion I remember having the honor of being adopted into your membership for the sole purpose of adding avoirdupois to a photograph.

Your president, Mr. Nagel, has suggested as a subject for my remarks to-night the Panama Canal, and I shall follow his advice. You can read much of the canal written by far more competent observers and critics, for I am neither an engineer nor a constructor of works. There is a phase of the subject, however, with which it has been my lot to have something to do. The canal is to be built by the Government of the United States. It must be built according to law. I shall attempt to review the history of the canal construction from the standpoint of an officer of the Government charged by the President with the duty of general supervision over those appointed to do the work and the methods pursued by them.

It is sufficient to begin my history with the discussion in our Congress as to the preferred route for a canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. Other things being equal, of course the best route is the shortest, and that is neither Nicaragua nor Panama. The shortest route, not more than 30 miles, is across the Isthmus of Darien, by way of the San Blas River, 30 miles from tide water to tide water. The difficulty with this route is that it requires the tunneling of a mountain 1,500 feet high in such a way as to permit the passage of modern steamships. The length of the tunnel is more than 5 miles and at least 150 feet in height above the water. Modern engineering has as yet accomplished no feat equal to the arching of such a tunnel, and the best evidence seems to show that the interior of the mountain is not granite or some hard rock that would hold itself in place after tunneling, but is probably a shaly or volcanic substance requiring the roof of the tunnel to be supported. The Nicaragua route, which had and still has sincere and strenuous advocates, is much longer, being about 137 miles in length, and involves the extensive dredging and use of a lake some 110 feet above sea level.

The Panama route was but 46 miles in length from shore line to shore line, had been partly constructed, and was paralleled by an existing railroad, an agency indespensable to constructing any canal. The routes were all thoroughly discused by the Walker Commission, and it finally recommended the Panama route. Congress by a majority vote deliberately reached the same conclusion, and confirmed it in the so-called Spooner Act passed early in 1902, by directing the President, if practicable, to buy the rights of the New French Panama Canal Company in the Panama Canal, as well as the right of way from the then sovereign of the canal territory, the United States of Colombia, and to build the canal with the proceeds of bonds authorized for the purpose. In the alternative, however, if the President found it impracticable to make satisfactory arrangement with either the canal company or Colombia, he was empowered to buy the necessary land and right of way and construct a canal by the Nicaragua route. The Panama Canal begins near Colon, on the north side of the Isthmus of Panama, at a small suburb called "Cristobal," and runs in a southeasterly direction to its other terminus, which is called "La Boca," the Spanish word for "mouth," a suburb of the city of Panama. The odd sensation is given the traveler when he rides on the railroad from Colon to Panama of going south and east instead of west, and when he rises the next day in Panama he will find that, because Panama is on a point of land jutting out into the ocean, the sun both rises and sets in the Pacific. In its projected course the canal is made to follow generally the valleys of the Mindi and the Chagres rivers on the north or Atlantic side and of the Rio Grande on the south or Pacific slope. It crosses the height of land at the famous cut in Culebra Hill between the two oceans, about 32 miles from the Atlantic and 14 miles from the Pacific. Culebra, the lowest hill on the divide, was about 340 feet above the sea. The French made a cut in the hill to a point 140 feet above sea level, leaving for excavation, should there be a sea-level canal, a ditch yet to be dug 10 miles long of 180 feet depth to the bed of the canal and 150 feet wide at the bottom, with sloping sides.

The decision of Congress in favor of this route for a canal was undoubtedly a wise one. Few engineers who have visited the canal have doubted the possibility of its construction, either as a lock or as a sea-level canal, and the Walker Commission, when it found that the Panama Canal could be bought, in changing its views, if it did change them, from a recommendation of the Nicaragua Canal to that of the Panama Canal, instead of subjecting that body to criticism entitled it to the gratitude of the nation. The theory advanced by opponents of the Panama route, and by opponents of any canal, that the route of the canal has not been finally decided upon, is utterly unfounded. Congress voted in favor of it, the President has made the selection in accordance with the power conferred by the act, and under its terms he would be entirely justified in constructing the canal at Panama without again consulting Congress, except for the purpose of obtaining the annual appropriations out of the funds to be realized from the sale of the bonds already authorized by legislative act.

While the Spooner Act gave a preference to the Panama Canal, it did not specifically direct what kind of canal should be constructed. It merely made it the duty of the President to proceed to build a canal, provided for the issue of $135,000,000 of bonds, and the expenditure, in addition thereto, of $40,000,000 for the French company's concession and property, $10,000,000 for the right of way, and $10,000,000 for the preliminary work in the construction. But the surrounding circumstances in the formulation of this legislation must be taken into consideration. The Walker Commission had reported in favor of the construction of the canal as a lock canal, with a sea-level section as far as Bohio, about 16 miles from Colon, where there was to be a flight of two locks 90 feet in height; thence on a 90-foot level from Bohio through the Culebra cut to Pedro Miguel on the Pacific side, a distance of 22 miles, to a flight of locks 60 feet in height; thence to Miraflores, some 2 miles, where still another lock was to be erected 5 miles from the Pacific, and thence from Miraflores to La Boca, the mouth of the canal. This additional lock was thought indispensable, because at Panama the tide rises and falls 20 feet, while at Colon the tide rises and falls but 2 feet.

The Walker Commission reported that the lock canal which it favored could be constructed for $145,000,000, and so Congress fixed in the Spooner Act that amount as its financial provision for building the canal. The power to build the canal by the President, however ample in its language, is so affected by the practical limitation of the bonds and money provided that should he deem it proper to construct a sea-level canal it would be wise in him to refer the matter to Congress and secure further express power in the premises. Under the Spooner Act the President bought the Panama Canal from the New French Panama Canal Company for $40,000,000. That which he bought consisted of a canal at sea level, constructed 16 miles from Panama to Bohio on the Atlantic side and 5 miles at the same level from La Boca to Miraflores on the Pacific side. These two stretches were dug in accordance with the specifications for the old canal, and have been filled with water for twenty years. They have been filled at places with silt and other material, so that they will need redredging. Furthermore, as they were only 28 feet deep as originally planned, and so not furnishing draft enough for the largest modern steamships, their depth must be increased to 35 or 40 feet. I ought to say in passing that, contrary to the expectations of the engineers, the prism of the canal at sea level in these two stretches, completely dug twenty years ago both on the Atlantic and Pacific sides, has been remarkably well preserved. The banks are as firm and have the same slope as given originally, and the amount of silt and other deposit from the Chagres and other rivers flowing into and through it has proven to be comparatively small. In addition to the sea-level part of the French canal, excavations for the higher lock level of the canal were made to a greater or less extent clear across the Isthmus. I have already described the most extensive of them, which is at Culebra.

In addition to the land and the ditch, the transfer from the canal company included an immense amount of material and equipment dumped on the ground along the line of the canal—engines, cars, dredges, steam launches, tools, and machines of all characters and sizes for excavation. Then there were also extensive machine shops at two places and many storehouses containing a great variety of stock. The French also erected upward of 2,175 houses of all sorts, the most numerous being tenements for laborers.

It is very doubtful how much of the machinery, material, and equipment can be used. Mr. Wallace, the former engineer, was of the opinion that he could use most of the locomotives and a great many of the flat cars, and spent a considerable sum and much time last year in repairing the best of them. I believe that the consensus of opinion in the Commission now is that while the locomotives which he repaired may be used the flat cars are so small that it will be greater economy to buy new ones. In addition to the canal prism the canal company owned docks and a harbor at Cristobal and a harbor at La Boca, on the Pacific side. With the purchase of the property of the French Panama Canal Company there was included all but 1,112 shares of the 7,000 shares constituting the Panama Railroad Company's capital stock, and the remainder of these, 1,112 in number, have since been purchased for $155,020. This gives the Government exclusive ownership and control of the Panama Railroad, an instrumentality indispensable in building the canal.

The Spooner Act was passed in the spring of 1902. The President was not able to make an effective purchase from the Panama Canal Company until May 4, 1904. I shall not stop to rehearse what is entirely familiar to you, the failure of negotiations with Colombia, the change of sovereignty over the Isthmus to the new Republic of Panama, and the recognition of that Republic by this Government, and the treaty by which we acquired the right to build the canal and assumed governmental control over a canal zone of 10 miles. These proceedings consumed a full period of two years.

In April, 1904, and after confirmation of the treaty, and in anticipation of the transfer by the French Company of the canal property, the President appointed the Commission of seven provided for in the act as his agency for building the canal, and made Admiral Walker its chairman. A majority of the Commission, as required by the act, consisted of engineers or army and naval officers who had had experience as such. The President is charged by law with the construction of the canal. Of course it was not expected that he would personally build the canal. The act empowered him to do it through the Commission and other agents selected by him. The President became convinced, as anyone must be who is familiar with the calls upon his time, that in order to maintain a close touch and to secure detailed knowledge of exactly what was being done in the expenditure of this immense amount of money to build the canal he should direct a member of his Cabinet to act for him in the supervision of this work. Accordingly he selected the Secretary of War as the head of the great department of construction of the Government, who might call to his aid at any time army engineers of large experience and of the highest character to assist him. Of course this work was to be merely supervisory. It was not expected that the Secretary of War would meddle or interfere with the sound discretion and generally free hand which must be vested in those specially appointed to build the canal if successful results are to be accomplished by them, but it was expected that the Secretary of War should have a general knowledge of the work, should be consulted on matters of general policy, and, when particular matters were called to his attention seeming to need further investigation, should make it and

report the matter to the President. He is, of course, with his less extensive duties, much better prepared to look into the policy and details of the construction than is the President, and can relieve the President of much burdensome work.

The Commission effected a local organization in Washington in June, 1904, and, after inquiry covering several months, selected Mr. John F. Wallace as its chief engineer resident on the Isthmus. Mr. Wallace had been the chief engineer of the Illinois Central Railroad, was an engineer of high character and standing and of long experience. Mr. Wallace accepted the position and reached Panama in June, 1904, and began the work of organization. Maj. Gen. George W. Davis, United States Army, a member of the Commission, also went to the Isthmus to assume the duties of governor of the Canal Zone. Reference has already been made to the fact that in the treaty of concession the Republic of Panama had granted governmental control to the United States over a zone from Colon to Panama 10 miles wide, 5 miles on each side of the canal.

This zone did not include the towns of Colon and Panama, but did include their suburban villages of Cristobal and La Boca, which are the immediate mouths or ends of the canal. The treaty also gave to the United States police control in Panama and Colon to suppress insurrection and to enforce needed health regulations. The importance of this concession I shall point out later on. General Davis served as governor of the Zone until May, 1905, when, his health failing, he was relieved and called home to become the chairman of the board of consulting engineers. During Governor Davis's incumbency the government of the Zone was organized on a satisfactory basis, and the necessary laws to make it a going government were passed by the Commission.

An ill-advised Executive order putting the Dingley tariff law in force in the Zone against all the world, including Panama, caused much ill feeling among the Panamans for a little while, but by its repeal and other concessions the good will of the Republic was quickly restored. Governor Davis secured from the Panama Government a geographical delimitation of the Zone boundaries, especially as between Cristobal and Colon at one end and Panama and Ancon, including La Boca, at the other. This was a matter of much delicacy, because it was left so indeterminate in the treaty itself as to create bitter discussion; but the arrangement as made proved to be just and fair. Governor Davis, as governor of the Zone, was put in direct charge of the sanitation department, which had as its head Colonel Gorgas, and work has been constantly going on under that sanitation expert down to date.

The Commission, with Admiral Walker at its head, organized an office in Washington, and visited the Isthmus several times during the year. Before Mr. Wallace's appointment the Commission had employed surveyors and engineers and had sent them in parties to the Isthmus to make borings, surveys, and secure the data necessary to fix the exact type of the canal. When Mr. Wallace took charge he did much work in trying to find out what the French company had left on the Isthmus worth using, in repairing locomotives and flat cars found there, and in laying sufficient side tracks from Culebra cut to make excavation and dump the material in a proper place. This was only experimental, and was for the purpose of finding the real cost of excavation per cubic yard. He also began the work of constructing houses for workmen. He designed and carried on the work of furnishing a water supply to the city of Panama, and he did considerable work on a sewer system.

He did some work on docks at Cristobal and La Boca, and he laid some heavy rails on the railroad. He complained much of the slowness with which his requisitions for material, supplies, and equipment were furnished him. Complaints were continually coming to this country from employees and workmen representing that no sufficient houses were provided for them and no food either supplied them or to be purchased at reasonable prices. The yellow fever, in spite of the efforts of the sanitation bureau, began to show in the increasing number of its cases greater danger to the Americans employed by the Commission. Salaries were said to be much too low because of the high cost of any kind of living and the risk to health and life. All these elements working together created something like a panic on the Isthmus among the employees of the Commission.

They witnessed the arrival of the first supplies and equipment in such great quantity as to produce congestion and confusion, and, like an army without confidence in its leaders, they felt that choas was at hand. I do not seek to place the blame for this on any one person, but rather on the method or system. I think there was error in not making more preparation for employees. It thus became apparent during the six months succeeding the appointment of the first Commission that the body of seven men as organized was not an effective force for doing the work required in the construction of the canal. The members of the Commission themselves agreed that as constituted and organized good results could not be expected from it. The President had submitted to Congress during the winter of 1904–5 a recommendation for amendment to the law by which he should be given a freer hand in the number of agents to be selected by him for the work which the act of Congress made it mandatory upon him to perform. He informed Congress that the method of construction by a commission of seven was clumsy and ineffective. The House of Representatives gave the requested power to the President in a bill which it sent to the Senate.

There the bill met determined opposition, and in the short session it was entirely possible for its enemies to defeat it. Thereupon the President felt that radical action was necessary. On April 1, 1905, he asked the resignation of the then existing Commission, and appointed a new Commission under certain regulations as to their procedure, by which he hoped to secure in practice greater centralization of power in the hands of a chairman and an executive committee less than the whole Commission, with its acts subject to confirmation by the Commission. Much care was taken in selecting a man for chairman. As the great constructive enterprises of this country have been chiefly railroads, and as the problem of chief difficulty in building the canal is one of transportation, the President looked to the railroad circles for a man capable of pushing this great enterprise to a conclusion. He selected as chairman Mr. T. P. Shonts, who had had large experience in railroad matters, and who had shown by his energy and high character that he was well fitted to take upon his shoulders this most responsible task. As another member, capable of acting on the executive committee of the Commission, he appointed Mr. Wallace, the chief engineer, and as a third member he selected Charles E. Magoon, for many years the law officer of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, and a man who, in the task of making new governments for our new possessions, had been Secretary Root's chief law adviser, and a pioneer in devising ways and means for the purpose. To Shonts, Wallace, and Magoon, as members of the Commission, were added four distinguished engineers, General Hains, U. S. Army engineer, who had devoted a great deal of time on a former commission to the investigation and report as to the construction of the canal; Colonel Ernst, also of the army engineers, who had been on a previous canal commission; Admiral Endicott, the leading civil engineer of the United States Navy and Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks; and Mr. Benjamin Harrod, a member of the former Commission and a member of the Mississippi River Commission. Under the regulations prescribed by the President the Commission organized and appointed an executive committee, consisting of Shonts, Wallace, and Magoon, and adopted regulations dividing the executive work between Mr. Shonts, who, as chairman, took charge of the Washington office, the making of contracts, and the purchase of material, and general executive control of the whole business of the Commission; Mr. Wallace, who was chief engineer, and had now become a member of the Commission and executive committeeman, who took immediate charge of the engineering and construction work upon the Isthmus; and Governor Magoon, who succeeded General Davis as governor of the Zone, and who assumed control of the whole sanitation of the Isthmus, with Colonel Gorgas as the immediate chief sanitary officer. This arrangement was put in force at once, and Governor Magoon and Mr. Wallace went to the Isthmus, while Mr. Shonts remained to reorganize the office of the Commission in Washington. As already said, one of the difficulties encountered by Mr. Wallace upon the Isthmus had been the delays attendant upon his requisitions for all sorts of supplies which it was the proper office of the home organization to furnish him. They showed the necessity for a reorganization of the Washington office.

Mr. Shonts drafted into service to assist him in the reorganization of this office Colonel Edwards, the Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, whose experience in organizing his most efficient Bureau was regarded as of especial value at this time. David W. Ross, a gentleman of wide and varied experience as purchasing agent for great railway systems, was employed at a salary of $10,000 a year, and E. S. Benson, a gentleman having similar railroad experience as an auditor of many different railway systems, was employed at the same salary as auditor. It was not thought wise to economize in the matter of salaries to be paid in the selection of men upon whose skill, honesty, and experience so much of the success of the canal work depends. Mr. Shonts himself received $30,000 a year, Mr. Wallace $25,000, and Governor Magoon $17,500. Subsequently Governor Magoon was appointed minister to Panama, and thus united in one person the executive of the Zone and the diplomatic representative of the United States to Panama.

This was in accord with the wish of the authorities of the Republic, and has been a source of very great comfort to those who have had to deal with the Republic, because it removes doubt as to whether the matter in hand is to be taken up and considered by the canal authorities or by the diplomatic representative of the United States with the Republic of Panama. Of course Governor Magoon can not draw two salaries, so that he draws no salary as minister. The other Commissioners, who were not expected to take active executive functions, but only advisory and supervisory, are paid $7,500 a year. By this arrangement the new Commission is not more of a charge to the canal funds in the matter of salaries than the Walker Commission, but by distribution of duties greater efficiency has been obtained.

I come now to the separation of Mr. Wallace from the service as chief engineer and commissioner. Mr. Wallace is a gentleman for whose engineering skill and whose high character as a man I had always much respect, and, except in one regard, my opinion has not changed. Mr. Wallace was certainly dissatisfied, as all of us were, with the workings of the first Commission, and had reason to be. He complained seriously of the delays incident to his work, due to the cumbersome machinery and the slowness with which decisions and action could be had by the old Commission. When the reorganization was determined upon Mr. Wallace was consulted by cablegram and advised of the new plan. This he fully and gratefully approved. He was directed to come to Washington for the purpose of fixing details. He did come and expressed himself as highly pleased with the result, and went back to the Isthmus full of the most superlative expressions that everything that he had hoped for in the reorganization was accomplished. He was not only chief engineer, but he was a member of the Commission and a member of the executive committee of the Commission in active charge of the construction and engineering work on the Isthmus, with Mr. Shonts, a railroad man and a classmate of his, to back him as chief executive.

He had not, however, been back in Panama more than six days when I received a cablegram advising me that he must come to New York to discuss questions relating to his continuance as chief engineer of the project. I was greatly taken aback, for I heard indirectly from reliable sources that he had received an offer of a much higher salary and that he was determined to accept the offer and give up this job. Mr. Wallace came north, and at an appointed interview stated to me that he had received an offer of $65,000 and had accepted it; that he was anxious to assist me and the members of the Commission, as far as possible, with his advice, and would be glad to continue as a member of the Commission, but that he could not and would not go back to the Isthmus at all. I gave Mr. Wallace a full opportunity to state all the reasons that actuated him in withdrawing, but this is the only one he mentioned. I told Mr. Wallace that his appointment had been solely as chief engineer resident on the Isthmus, that on account of the critical condition of affairs existing on the Isthmus his presence there was of the highest importance, and that for him to cut off his relation to the Commission for a mere money offer and to decline without further notice to stay on the Isthmus and conduct the affairs of the Commission there showed him to be so subject to pecuniary motives that I did not think his continuing his relation with the Commission would be of any service to us. Mr. Wallace feels that I have done him great injustice. He says that money was not the only consideration which led him to sever his relations; that there was too much red tape in the Government's methods of business, and that the health of his family and other controlling reasons led him to his conclusion, but that at our interview he was so embarrassed by my evident feeling on the subject that he did not do himself justice in stating fully the cause of his withdrawal. He says that he was not under any contract obligation to stay, and that he might sever his relation at any time. If Mr. Wallace was influenced either by considerations of the health of his family or by a feeling that governmental methods were so in conflict with successful business methods that he felt that the job was too difficult for him, or by any other good cause, and the charge that mere pecuniary motives influenced him did him injustice, I deeply regret it; but I submit that my inference was justified by his failure to mention any reason for his action except a higher salary. Mr. Wallace's course in declining without any notice to return to the Isthmus as chief engineer of the canal

for any time, however short, was most embarrassing to the Government, for while he had organized on paper only some six or eight divisions of work upon the Isthmus, at the head of each of which there was to be an engineer of great experience, to be paid from $10,000 to $15,000 a year, he had, in fact, selected for these positions but one man. At the time Mr. Wallace laid down his office, conditions on the Isthmus were most chaotic, and it seemed to the President and to me that proper loyalty to the enterprise required that Mr. Wallace should remain on the Isthmus for a reasonable period, say at least six months, in which to enable us to fill his place and to complete the mere skeleton organization which he was leaving and which would necessarily fall apart on his withdrawal. He gave us no option as to whether he would return to the Isthmus or not. That, he said, was settled.

The publication of the interview with Mr. Wallace was made after consultation with the President, and was made not for the purpose of punishing Mr. Wallace, but because the public were entitled to know the facts and because it was hoped it would discourage others engaged in responsible positions in the construction of the canal from withdrawing at critical stages of the work without sufficient notice. This is all there is of the Wallace incident, except that I have been very glad to assure the advisory board, or the board of consulting engineers, that I believed Mr. Wallace to be an able, experienced engineer and an honest man who had large opportunities for acquiring information which would be valuable to them. I advised them to call him. Mr. Wallace has fully and freely responded to the call and has answered all questions, and has declined any compensation whatever.

By great good luck, after Mr. Wallace's separation from the service, we found that we had then in the employ of the Government a man whose peculiar fitness to do the executive work of chief engineer on the Isthmus was fully shown, as investigation was made into his experience and reputation and his achievements as a constructing engineer. I refer to Mr. John F. Stevens. We had employed him in the Insular Bureau to go to the Philippines and supervise the construction of 1,000 miles of railway, the bids for the building of which were to be opened on the 15th of December next.

With a good deal of hesitation, Mr. Stevens, who was on the eve of his trip to the Philippines, accepted the new position proffered him, and went to the Isthmus in July of this year. The executive committee of the Commission now consisted only of Mr. Shonts and Governor Magoon, and the chief executive work in Washington and elsewhere falls upon Mr. Shonts as chairman, who is in general control, especially of the work of construction on the Isthmus, through Mr. Stevens. Governor Magoon still has charge of sanitation and of the government of the Zone. The whole Commission meets regularly every quarter and acts upon that which has been done by its agents.

I come now to discuss the actual progress which has been made. By the 1st of December we shall have spent $60,000,000 in the course of acquiring a transisthmian canal. The two questions which the American people have a right to ask are, first, Have we proceeded without unnecessary delay? Second, Have we received our money's worth?

First, the Spooner Act was passed in the spring of 1902. The delay incident to Colombia's conduct certainly could not be avoided. No one can deny that we closed as quickly as we could reasonably with Panama in December, 1903, and that there was no unnecessary deliberation in closing out the transfer of the French Panama Canal Company's property to the United States in May, 1904. The Walker Commission was appointed before the transfer. It lost no time in selecting a chief engineer. Mr. Wallace took hold in June, 1904. Considering all the obstacles, I think great progress has been made since then. That which was done in a year under Mr. Wallace and the old Commission seems less than what has been done under Mr. Shonts and Mr. Stevens and the new Commission in three months, but, in the nature of things, in the early days of a great organization like the human machinery for building this canal, progress toward smooth coordination and satisfactory results is slow. Many thoughtless persons cry out "Why does not the dirt begin to fly? The way to build the canal is to dig." Such remarks only show the ignorance of the authors and their complete failure to understand the real character of what has to be done. The canal is to be built by manual labor and machinery. The number of laborers required will perhaps be 25,000.

Panama is a sparsely settled country, with few laborers available. The great majority of those employed must be imported. For every laborer brought in at least one person more will come who will be dependent on him. We must therefore count on an alien population of 50,000 to be distributed along the line of the canal for 47 miles. To get the best work out of the laborers, they and their families must be housed; they must have healthful food; they must have pure, good water to drink, and the filth and noisome drainage caused by such a collection of human beings must be taken care of so as not to promote disease. Finally, Panama has a history of awful losses of life among workmen engaged in the construction of the railroad and the canal from yellow fever and malaria, and these two diseases must be stamped out. All these things ought to be done before the "dirt begins to fly."

When Mr. Wallace left, the pay roll contained the names of 8,000 persons. Since Mr. Stevens has taken hold, in three months, this has been increased from 8,000 to 13,000. Under Mr. Wallace it was thought wise by the old Commission, and by Mr. Wallace himself, to make experiments in the cost of excavating earth in the Culebra cut. He did this with some new excavating machinery, but principally with the old transportation machinery, and he reached some results, the value of which is in dispute. He feels confident that he has shown by his calculations that the cost per cubic yard of excavation in the Culebra cut may be reduced below half of that fixed by the Commission, and this is used as an argument in favor of changing the type of the canal from a lock canal to a sea-level canal. Upward of half a million dollars were spent by Mr. Wallace and the former Commission in these excavations. Mr. Shonts and Mr. Stevens have not deemed it wise to continue them because they think the conditions under which the experiments were carried on are not like those which will prevail in the actual excavation, for the reason that the disposition of the spoil must be made at a very much longer distance and with a very much greater expense. I do not stop to pass on this difference of judgment between engineers, except to say that the excavation has been made and has reduced the work to be done to that extent. The objection made to the excavation at this time was that it may have prevented the devotion of more time and energy to the preparation of houses and of food supplies for the laborers. I do not know whether this is true or not.

Recurring to the amount of preparatory work needed, it has already been noted that there were left standing along the canal some 2,175 structures erected by the French. With the rapid decay that follows neglect in the Tropics, most of these structures were in such tumble-down condition as to be uninhabitable. They had to be repaired, and they had to be repaired with material brought from the United States. The amount of timber actually ordered and needed for the repairing and construction of the houses is upward of 32,000,000 feet. The difficulty in promptly securing the shipping of this will suggest itself to those who know of the incidental delays in practical transportation, either from Oregon or the Atlantic coast to Panama. Until lately there has been much delay in persuading competent carpenters from the United States in sufficient numbers to come to the Isthmus.

The towns of Panama and Colon and the sixteen towns and villages lying between them along the line of the canal and the railroad all must be furnished with water. Panama as a settlement is one of the oldest towns in America, and yet for about three hundred years during the dry season there has been no means of furnishing water to the Panamans except from cisterns, puddles, and receptacles for water often covered with green scum and as productive of disease as is possible to imagine. The first thing that the first Commission did, and to them is the credit due, was to make arrangements for the construction of a water supply for Panama. Engineer Wallace and his assistants devised the plans, took a reservoir which had been partly constructed by the French some 11 miles from Panama, built the dam 20 feet higher and ran the water pipes to Panama, and then laid the mains into Panama, so that on the 4th of July, 1905, the water cocks in the city of Panama were opened, and the people were permitted to drink pure water. This reservoir furnishes water also to the towns between it and Panama on the Pacific side; but another reservoir for Culebra, another one for Empire, another one for Bas Obispo, and others for Colon are being constructed, together with water-pipe systems in all of them. Sewers are now being constructed in Panama, and about 50 per cent of them have been completed. In order to make Panama really healthful the Commission has decided it to be necessary to pave the streets, which for centuries have been dirty—muddy in rainy weather, dusty in dry weather, and full of disease in all weathers. The whole Isthmus strip from Panama to Colon when our Commission went there first was grown up with underbrush, with weeds, and with all that jungle that a tropical soil and weather unrestrained rejoice in. Now from point to point, as the population increases, as the work is elaborated, the jungle is being cut down, the hills are being shaved, and under the tremendous work of the sanitary department pools are being drained, swamps relieved of water, and in every way the stagnant water surfaces and the propagating ground for the deadly mosquito are being reduced. When one thinks of a strip 47 miles long and half a mile wide in the center of the Tropics, with marshy swamps and water accumulating everywhere, the task of reducing the stagnant water surface so as to prevent the generation of mosquitoes seems impossible; but it must be and can be done.

The mosquito is the worst enemy in the propagation of disease in the West Indies and American Tropics that man has. One variety in the Isthmus carries the germ of the deadly yellow fever, and another variety carries the germ of malaria, while a third infects its victims with the loathsome disease of elephantiasis. Petroleum prevents the generation of mosquitoes. A yellow-fever mosquito lives only about ninety days. The custom of the yellow-fever mosquito is not to depart far from the place of its birth. It is not ordinarily born in the open. Its fellow who carries the malaria germ is born in the stagnant pools that are found in the meadows and on the hills and in the valleys, but the yellow-fever mosquito is ordinarily to be found in the forgotten corners of the cellars and dark rooms of tropical houses, in neglected utensils, in cisterns, puddles of water within the back yards, or in the closets of the residents. While with petroleum and with drainage a large part of the surface which generates the malaria mosquito may be reduced, the yellow-fever mosquitoes must be attacked in houses by fumigation, either with sulphur or pyrethrum. At one time it was thought sufficient in the town of Panama when a victim of yellow fever was taken from a house to fumigate that house and the two houses next, because the habit of the mosquito indicated that it did not depart far from the place of its birth. It seems that the mosquito that acquires and communicates the yellow-fever virus is a female, and this only during her period of gestation. She dies at the end of ninety days, and it is not known that her descendants continue to carry the poison. These limitations are what prevent the spread of the disease.

When Judge Magoon arrived upon the Isthmus he found Doctor Gorgas battling manfully against the yellow fever, but the cases seemed to be increasing. Judge Magoon conceived the idea that the fumigation which had been confined to two or three houses might well be extended to all the houses in Panama, and at considerable expense, and after procuring a large amount of material, every house in Panama was fumigated once every two weeks. To secure increased vigilance and popular assistance he employed all the respectable Panaman physicians of Panama as inspectors of the districts of that city, at annual salaries of $1,200 a year. He also offered $50 reward for the discovery of any case of yellow fever not reported. By methods of this kind the native apathy, usually so great an obstacle to successful sanitation in Spanish countries, was neutralized.

The plan of fumigation is as follows: Strips of paper are placed across the windows, which ordinarily have no glass or any netting in them, and then either by the fumes of the sulphur or pyrethrum every nook and cranny of the house is visited. These gases are fatal or paralyzing to the mosquito. After sufficient time has passed the house is opened, and then a corps of health employees are set to work cleaning the house and sweeping out the dead mosquitoes, which are found in great numbers upon the floors. The mosquitoes are burned to avoid further mischief. By these methods, for which Doctor Gorgas and Governor Magoon are both to be credited with great praise, yellow fever has been reduced to a point where during the last month only three cases were reported, not one of these among canal employees, and all originating many miles from the canal line. The efforts to subdue the fever instead of being relaxed are being continued. Square miles of woven-wire netting with interstices so small as to prevent the entrance of mosquitoes are spread about the piazzas of the house of every American or foreigner who comes to live under the auspices of the Canal Commission in the Isthmus. The windows inside are also screened, and then mosquito bars on the beds are used as a third precaution.

Whenever a case of yellow fever is discovered, the patient is at once either removed to the hospital and put under a woven-wire screen or, if he prefers to remain at home, the woven-wire screen is put over him and an orderly placed in charge of him at his own residence. In this way he is prevented from furnishing a supply of the poison to the healthy mosquitoes who, in turn, by stinging, would bring it back to man. In other words, the plan is to kill all the mosquitoes, well or ill, keep them as much as possible from stinging man, and isolate every man with yellow fever, not from his fellows, but from mosquitoes. Of course there are in this district, especially in the old town of Panama and at some villages along the canal, old houses which must be burned completely to the ground because of the

infection which it is impossible to destroy in them. The old buildings in Panama are persistent sources of the yellow-fever mosquito.

The Canal Commission has its offices in one of these great stucco structures, with thick walls, bad ventilation, and damp nooks and crannies. It has often been fumigated and cleansed in every way; but once in a while a new case of fever in one of the American employees is to be charged to the old building. I am glad to say that the general offices are soon to be moved to new buildings at Culebra and Emperador on the line of the canal. Little by little, and facing discouragement after discouragement, the 2,000 employees of the sanitary department are winning in this fight against disease, upon which the whole success of the canal work depends. As Mr. Stevens said to me, when I crossed the Isthmus with him this month, "I take off my hat to the work which the sanitation department has done in this Canal Zone." In the month of August, out of a force of 13,000 men, the percentage of illness was less than 25 per thousand. In June the cases of yellow fever were 61 and 19 deaths, in July there were 36 cases and 13 deaths, in September there were 9 cases, and in October but 3. The percentage of deaths among all is about 33, and among Americans about 20.

The work of furnishing water, of installing sewers, and of building houses is not now in the sanitation department, but is under the engineering and construction department; but as soon as the work is completed it will be turned over to the sanitation department for maintenance. Good food is now furnished by a commissary at reasonable rates. The carrying of refrigerated fruits and foods and meats on refrigerator cars from Colon across the Isthmus has just been begun. There is an ice plant at La Boca, another one at Colon, and others along the way are to be constructed, so that ice—that most healthful form of liquid in the Tropics—will be at hand for all.

A hotel has been erected at Corozal, where the American employees of the Commission may live and run in to their business in Panama in a few minutes by railway. A hotel of 128 rooms is being constructed at Ancon, which is the Pacific terminus of the terminating township of the governmental isthmian strip. The French had an excellent hospital at Ancon. They had also rather a large hospital at Colon. It was necessary, however, in view of the decay and lack of repair in which these hospitals were found, to refit them entirely. And now we have a hospital at Ancon, one at Panama, a convalescent hospital at Taboga, an island some 10 miles off the coast in Panama Bay, where very healthful water, healthful bathing, and fine fruits can be had, so that in all the hospital accommodation has been increased from about 350 to upward of 1,000 beds.

American trained nurses may be had at any point on the Isthmus, and any employee or laborer and any member of his family will be taken care of at these hospitals. In addition to this, and to protect itself, the Commission has taken over the general hospital of Panama and has accepted $80,000 Mexican, a fund which had been voted by Panama for its improvement, and is now completely rebuilding it. It has also taken care of the insane and lepers of Panama, charging a certain rate per day. It exercises by right of law and by agreement complete quarantine jurisdiction over Panama, Colon, and the isthmian canal strip, and this quarantine is a division of the sanitation bureau under Governor Magoon and Colonel Gorgas.

Not only has it been found possible to accomplish much by the draining of swamps by surface drainage, or turning of stagnant pools into running water, the cutting of gutters, and the flushing from reservoirs, but the attention of the chief engineer has also been directed to filling up, with the spoil from excavation made in construction, swamps and lowlands which now generate disease. The evidences of successful war against malaria are not so easy to produce as those of the defeat of yellow fever. One reason is that malaria is so much harder to combat than is yellow fever.

To begin with, yellow fever finds its victims only among those who are not residents of the tropical coast towns, so at least the statistics seem to show. Europeans and Americans from the Temperate Zone, and Colombians coming from the hills and mountains, and other workmen from the interior, especially the highlands, are all subjects of yellow fever, but generally the blacks from Jamaica and Trinidad, from the islands of the Caribbean Sea, and the Panamans themselves are immune. The field for attack by yellow fever, therefore, is very much limited. Not so, however, with malaria. An examination for experimental purposes, and repeated at various times under the direction of Colonel Gorgas, shows that at least 70 per cent of people picked up at random in the Isthmus have the malarial microbe. I am glad to say that since our occupation the malaria has not generally taken on the malignant form of the days of the railroad and French canal construction, but is rather mild.

The great difficulty in preventing the transmission of malaria is that with 60 or 70 per cent of the persons infected with malaria it is impossible to prevent malaria mosquitos from happening upon the source of malaria supply in the blood of 60 per cent of the inhabitants of the Isthmus. The cases of yellow fever, on the other hand, are comparatively so few that isolating them is a real measure of protection to all. Nevertheless, by the reduction in the total number of mosquitos, which, though an enormous task, is still capable of accomplishment, the spread of malaria may be largely checked. This is a work of constant attention and which will last long after the construction of the canal, and will be constantly the task of all those responsible for the government of the strip. Of course, the less malaria, even of the mild character, the greater the efficiency of the laborer.

In recounting what is being done I will refer next to the work of engineering and construction. Preliminary to the work of construction proper much of the time of the engineer and his assistants has been taken up in doing that work of construction necessary for the sanitation of the Isthmus, to wit, the houses, sewering of water, the food supply, the hospitals and places of recreation, all necessary to keep a sound mind in a sound body of each workman, whether superintendent, clerk, or common laborer.

In regard to the pure work of construction. As already said, the New French Panama Canal Company had bought the Panama Railroad for its use in the construction of the canal. When the property of the French Canal Company was transferred, the railroad was, from the standpoint of modern railroads, most inadequately equipped. It had a single track from Colon to Panama, with some sidings, very insufficient yards at the termini, and a large number of thin, light rails, quite insufficient for the heavy traffic which was carried over it. The laying of the track with heavier rails had been projected by the company before the transfer, but only a few miles had been laid. The Commission, acquiring control of the railroad company, directed the purchase of rails so as to lay completely the whole line with the heavier rails, and now all but 9 miles of the road is so equipped. The roadbed is as fine as any roadbed in the United States, ballasted in gravel and rock, and seems to be completely free from any possibility of washouts, but with this exception every other feature of the road as to structure and equipment is subject to criticism, and must be changed before it can be an adequate instrument in the hands of the Commission for the purposes for which it was bought. The gauge of the railroad is 5 feet, while the standard gauge in the United States and elsewhere is 4 feet 8½ inches, a fact which reduces much the amount of equipment which could be bought ready-made and greatly increases the cost and time of buying that which is necessary. The telegraph system and the telephone system along the road are now being completely reconstructed. The yards and wharves at each end of the road for the purpose of receiving freight from steamers were utterly inadequate, and are now being very much enlarged at La Boca and at Cristobal, and must be repaired at Colon.

I should say that Cristobal is the Colon end of the canal, a made harbor, reached by the railroad and entirely protected from the north winds which, when they blow with violence, require all steamers at Colon wharves to go to sea. It is quite evident, and the Commission has so decided, that in order to transport the commercial freight which the railroad is under charter obligation to carry, and at the same time to transport to the spoil banks the excavated rock and dirt, it will be necessary to double track the road nearly all the way from Colon to Panama. The exceptions are through narrow cuts or at the top of the grade over which the spoil from the excavation will not need to be carried. The recent work of construction under Wallace and Stevens has been the work of putting this road into proper condition, of making preparation to double track, and of laying at various and suitable intervals long tracks leading from the Culebra cut at various elevations to the points of the Panama Railroad to which the spoil may be hauled downhill from the point of excavation and thence carried to Miraflores on one side or to Colon on the other, to be dumped into swamps or else to be dumped into barges and carried out to sea and there disposed of. The amount of this track laying will reach 250 or 300 miles when completed, and it is one of the chief consumers of labor in the construction department at present. The work of excavation is comparatively easy, for with compressed-air drills and blasting and the 29 modern steam shovels which are now on the ground, and the 60 more which are ordered, digging might go on rapidly. With a sea-level canal at least 270,000,000 cubic yards of material will have to be blasted, dug out, and carried from a few feet to 15 miles.

The great problem, however, is the problem of transporting that which is dug to the point where it is to be finally deposited with such speed and such return of the vehicles of transportation as to enable the shovels to be in constant use. It is a problem of transportation really and not of excavation. These figures suggest the amount of preparation in the way of increasing the capacity of the railroad, of track laying, and of other mechanical devices for disposing of the spoil which must be made before the "dirt begins to fly."

In addition to this work, machine shops of the French have to be repaired and in some cases rebuilt. Wharves are being put up now in order to furnish additional berths for steamers at Cristobal on the one side and at La Boca on the other. There are to-day engaged on the railroad proper about 4,000 employees; that is, there are 2,500 paid for six days' labor, but they are not perhaps the same 2,500. In addition to this there are 13,000 laborers on the pay roll of the Commission, and that means about 10,000 effective laborers per day. As the work of construction of houses goes on, as the capacity for housing and feeding and properly attending to laborers proceeds, we may look for an increase in the pay roll.

One of the great burdens of the present situation is the procurement of transportation and proper disposition of the immense amount of supplies and material and equipment which have to be ordered and pressed forward to the Isthmus. The Commission bought two large freight steamers costing $1,300,000, or $650,000 apiece. And even with these and three others owned by the Panama Railroad which came into the possession of the Commission, there is still such an immense amount of freight that there is much difficulty in getting the orders and the requisitions of the chief engineer supplied. The following is a list of the principal items of material purchased and delivered, or now under order, and will serve to give an idea of the vastness of the undertaking and why congestion in sea transportation and on the railroad, with all the commercial traffic besides, may be pardonable: Sixty-one steam shovels, 1,300 flat cars, 12 rapid unloaders, 22 unloading plows, 13 earth spreaders, 324 dump cars, 12 hoisting engines, 120 locomotives, 5,000 tons of steel rails, 125,000 cross-ties, 12,000 pieces of piling, 14 air-compressing machines, 3 cranes, 152 rock drills, 30,000,000 feet lumber (approximately), 2 dipper dredges, 646,000 pounds blasting powder, 617,500 pounds dynamite, 7,000,000 paving brick, 3,500,000 building brick, 500,000 square feet roofing tile, 36,000 barrels cement (approximately), 3 steel water tanks and towers, 12 standpipes, 2 ocean steamships.

The Panama Railroad on its own account has also purchased during the last six months 500 box cars (40-ton), 12 caboose cars, 10 refrigerator cars, 6 passenger coaches, 24 locomotives, 2 wrecking cranes, 1 locomotive crane, 1 pile driver, 3 track scales (100-ton), 1 modern coal-hoisting plant, 1 cantilever crane for coal-hoisting plant.

It should be borne in mind that all of the large equipment like locomotives, cars, steam shovels, dirt spreaders, and cranes have to be knocked down and boxed in order to have them carried by vessel to the Isthmus and there unboxed and reassembled before available for use. Still, as Mr. Stevens himself told me, everything grows better from month to month. The exasperations and frictions of early organization are passing away as matters move with more smoothness. A quarantine of Panama on the one side and of Colon on the other much delayed the delivery of material, and brought seventeen ships into La Boca at one time for unloading. These discouragements, so characteristic of the Tropics and of great works in the Tropics, at first seem insurmountable, but to an engineer having the patience needed for any enterprise in the Tropics they can be overcome, provided he applies himself to his task with constantly renewed effort. Another great work by the engineer department is the taking of borings and the finding of data upon which to proceed in the detailed construction of the canal. Parties of engineers go out and stay for months measuring capacity of natural basins, the flow of water in the tributaries of the Chagres and other rivers, and thus procure the facts upon which the chief engineer and the Commission must proceed in developing the detailed plans for the ultimate building of the canal.

I have drawn out this paper to such an unpardonable length as not to permit a proper discussion of the question of labor. Nearly all the labor upon the Isthmus is now negro labor from the West India Islands. It is very poor. The question remains to be decided whether we shall attempt to secure Chinese or Japanese labor. It has been held by the Attorney-General that the Federal eight-hour law applies to those employed by the Canal Commission. I was at first disposed

to think its effect would be good, because we could have three shifts every twenty-four hours. I am assured, however, by Mr. Stevens and Governor Magoon that its enforcement only interferes with good work.

Petitions are being filed by all foreigners and Americans asking that its operation in the Zone be amended. There is practically no limit to the negro labor we can obtain from the West Indian and Caribbean islands, but its efficiency is so low that we may have to call in Asiatics. Another year will show more facts upon which a labor policy may be based. The fact that no white labor can be found to stand work in the tropical sun ought to remove the question from the forum of ordinary trade-union labor discussion and lead to a solution free from considerations which might properly have great weight in a more temperate climate and in conditions less resembling a national emergency.

I visited the Isthmus a year ago and again this year. I am able to see a marked difference, even in outward appearances, and to say with much emphasis and certainty that real work has been done and is being done. The effect of better housing for the employees, the influence of the successful efforts of the sanitation department to stamp out yellow fever, the confidence of the American subordinate engineers, foremen, clerks, rodmen, and others that there is a competent and skillful head to the enterprise in Mr. Shonts, knowing what is being done in each department, and coordinating all departments, tends to give an atmosphere of conscious progress, individual interest, and patriotic pride in the great task of a great nation. The Panamans feel the change and are accordingly happy and contented with things as they are.

And now I shall speak of something which will not take me long, but it is a most important matter at this juncture. Fifty millions of dollars were taken out of the Treasury of the United States, $40,000,000 for the French Panama Canal Company and $10,000,000 for the Republic of Panama, to give us the canal as it is and the right of way and the Panama Railroad. Ten millions were voted to begin the preliminary work on the canal. That $10,000,000 is about exhausted. It has been expended as follows:

General expenses:	
General administration expenses at Washington and other points in the United States, including salaries and expenses of Commissioners, special commissioners, advisory board, and office of administration	$511,000
Department of administration expenses, Isthmus	67,000
Department of government and sanitation	143,000
Department of construction and engineering	348,000
Expended for hospitals, sanitation, construction of waterworks and sewers, police, and prisons	1,383,000
Purchase of Panama Railroad stock	155,000
Permanent plant	3,946,000
Purchase of supplies consumable in their use, including cost of inspection, handling, and transportation	1,870,000
Canal construction	1,360,000
Total	9,783,000

The pay roll at present amounts to something like $600,000 a month, and there is not enough money on hand after the payment of the bills to meet the December pay roll. There are bills unpaid for material and supplies which should be paid at once. The delay is quite oppressive and unjust to the creditors of the Government. It will be necessary, therefore, for Congress to make an emergency appropriation to carry on the work without calamitous interruption. Nothing could be more disastrous to have the pay rolls go unpaid for even a few weeks. This was the trouble with the New French Panama Canal Company, and with the old French Panama Canal Company. Certainly there is nothing in the credit of the United States justifying suspension of payments. I know there is a disposition in some quarters, and possibly among some Members of Congress, to reinvestigate everything connected with the canal. But while this desire to know all about the canal and its construction is most commendable, it will hardly be allowed to delay the current appropriations for the daily work by 13,000 laborers that is now being so successfully carried on. It may be asked why have the conditions been allowed to arise under which an emergency appropriation must be asked. The answer is that those responsible deemed it their chief duty to push the work, to buy needed plant and material as rapidly as possible, and to increase the pay roll as far as provision could be made for the housing and comfort of the additional laborers and employees. It was supposed that an extra session of Congress would be called in October, when ample time would have been given for deliberation in making all the necessary appropriation.

Now it will be necessary to make partial appropriations to pay current bills and meet the necessary pay rolls until the type of the new canal has been fixed and definite estimates for each fiscal year's work can be submitted to Congress, as in the case of all other general appropriations of Congress. Assuming that the type of canal is properly fixed, the faster the work is done the better everyone will like it. It is important only that the money shall not be wasted by haste and that the country shall receive the worth of its money. Subject to this limitation, the greater the amount we can spend in a year in building the canal, therefore, the better.

And now about the type of the canal. I do not propose to discuss that. It is being considered by a board consisting of many of the best engineers of this country—Mr. Alfred Noble, the engineer of the Pennsylvania Railroad; Mr. William Barclay Parsons, the engineer of the underground system in New York; Mr. Isham Randolph, of the Chicago Drainage Canal; Mr. William H. Burr, professor of engineering in Columbia College; Mr. F. P. Stearns, the hydraulic engineer, of Boston; Gen. H. L. Abbot, one of the greatest of Army engineers, who has made a study of the canal for years; Mr. Joseph Ripley, chief civil engineer of the "Soo" Canal; Mr. Henry W. Hunter, of the Manchester Ship Canal, appointed by the English Government at the request of the President; Mr. Adolph Guerard, one of the leading civil engineers in the employ of and appointed by the French Government; Mr. Eugen Tincauzer, chief engineer of the Kiel Canal, appointed by the German Government; Mr. E. Quellennec, the consulting engineer of the Suez Canal, and Mr. G. W. Welcker, appointed by the Netherlands Government. The board is presided over by Maj. Gen. George W. Davis, of the United States Army, a gentleman of long experience in engineering and works of construction. The great question before the board is, Shall the canal be a sea-level or a lock canal? If it is to be a lock canal, as recommended by the Walker Commission, I think the President may build the canal safely on the money appropriated without consulting Congress further as to the type. If it is to be a sea-level canal, the question, it seems to me, for reasons already stated, should be left to Congress.

There are various plans. Mr. Bunau-Varilla produces a plan by which he would construct a lock canal, the highest lock at 170 feet, and then would make provision for the ultimate reduction of this canal to a sea-level canal. Another—Mr. Bates—presents a plan for making, by dams, two great lakes at the termini of the canal and with a comparatively low lock canal between. I shall not stop to discuss these various plans, because I am neither competent nor have I time to do so. It will be sufficient to discuss them when the advisory board shall have returned its judgment, when the Commission shall have reported, and when the matter is before the President for decision.

One of the great obstacles to success in building the canal is the opposition of powerful persons and interests to its construction. Some of this opposition comes from those who are sincerely convinced that the Panama route is not a practicable route, and that there are other and easier routes to be preferred. It is not to be expected that owners and managers of great transcontinental lines should become enthusiastic over an enterprise which, if carried to completion, must certainly affect the rates of freight between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Even now there is some question as to whether low rates and equality of service to all on the Panama Railroad may not reduce transcontinental rates. Orders have been issued directing equality of service and rates to all and also a reduction of rates. But so congested is the railroad by transportation of material for the Canal Commission, and so interrupted is the traffic by quarantine and other causes, that it is impossible now to say what will be the effect of this policy under the conditions which we hope to make normal when all the commercial traffic and all the canal transportation can be promptly and easily cared for. But recurring to the obstacle found in the opposition of powerful interests to the building of the canal, it takes different forms. It is found in the misrepresentations of conditions on the Isthmus, in unfounded reports concerning friction between those having authority in the canal work, in intimations of irregularities and frauds and favoritism in contracts without any evidence whatever to justify suspicion, and generally in the constant suggestion of a presumption that the expenditure of millions in building the canal must involve what is called "graft." Doubtless Congressional investigations will be held from time to time.

Doubtless they ought to be held to assure the public; but if they are to be permitted to delay the work on the canal and to paralyze the energy of those upon whom the burden of pushing the work must fall, then they will be productive of evil and will become exactly what many private interests would be glad to have them become—the grave of all the high hopes for a trans-isthmian canal. The American people will not permit such a catastrophe.

As I have already said, I have just returned from a trip to the Isthmus. I was there a year ago, and so long as the work remains under my supervision I shall deem it my duty to visit the Isthmus once a year. I shall do this not only to keep informed of the work in actual progress, but because I believe it stimulates the subordinates in an enterprise like this to have it felt that their work is under the immediate observation of the supervisory power, and that what they are doing is a matter of interest and observation for everybody from the President down.

I recall that while at the meeting of the Cincinnati Commercial Club last year proposal was made that a steamer be chartered to visit Panama this winter, and I agreed to be one of the party, or at least to time my annual visit so that I should be on the Isthmus when you were. My impression is that it would be wiser to postpone your visit until about this time next year, when I understand you have perhaps a twenty years' anniversary. I do this because at that time there will be a hotel constructed at Ancon, on the Panama side, sufficiently large to take in all the members of the club likely to make the visit—a hotel fresh and new and clean, free from any contagion, where you can be comfortable and feel safe at the same time. I sincerely hope that the proposition to visit Panama will not be given up.

Those who go will feel richly rewarded for the definite information that the eye will give them of the task which this Government has undertaken and which, under the inspiration of energy breathed into the enterprise by the words and action of President Roosevelt, it will certainly perform. I thank you for your kind attention.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for three minutes' time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I confess the struggle within me between my ignorance and a desire to do what is right. When I asked the gentleman from New York, who is our leader by right of appointment, how he would, by compromise, arrive at the sum of $10,000,000, a sum for us, as followers, to vote for, he virtually told me to sit down and be quiet. Thus you see the value of instruction. This is the most unusual and extraordinary demand that has been made on Congress within ten years, and my experience as a wrestler with estimates made by the Department moves me to have some apprehension that what we are asked to do may not be done well or wisely. I have in my mind a time one year ago when the estimates made by the Navy Department for the different bureaus amounted, according to public report, to $160,000,000. The Secretary of the Navy was requested to argue with the bureau chiefs and see if they might not make a reduction of estimates. He succeeded in reducing them about $44,000,000, I am told. The Committee on Naval Affairs grasped the subject and succeeded in a further reduction of $16,000,000 more. We always felt that our work had been well done. Surely the Navy has lived and prospered. I do not intend to embarrass this Commission. I see no reason why we should vote for $10,000,000. I believe the gentlemen who have these subjects in charge understand them much better than we do. Although I have listened for four hours as intently as possible, I do not feel myself well informed. I will vote for the proposed amount of $16,500,000 because it is the estimate made by the Commission, and it is the one I believe to be indorsed by the

chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in whom I have great confidence, unless he is satisfied a smaller sum will be adequate for the purposes enumerated.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the sum proposed as an amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi is entirely inadequate. I do not know how he arrives at that particular sum. It is true that it is not essential that this entire sum should be appropriated at this time. A portion of the expenditure will not be made until in the month of June, so that whatever deficiencies there might be from time to time by emergency appropriation bills could be provided for. It is simply a question for the House to determine whether they will do this work by making this appropriation. I say to you gentlemen every dollar of this sum, in my belief, will be appropriated for expenditures during the present fiscal year. It is a question for each man to determine for himself whether it is better to do it at once or by piecemeal. I can see how gentlemen here upon the floor of the House may feel a desire for more of information. I do not believe that the great majority of the gentlemen will, under any circumstances that may result from delay, be more familiar with the subject at the end of many months than they are to-day. The truth is that the estimates will be made; they will go before the committee; the committee will investigate them; but there is no item, there is no expenditure, there is no sum estimated for in this estimate that, in my judgment, will be changed. The members of that particular committee will have more of information, but the great majority of this House will simply content themselves with the belief that their committee has investigated the matter and that their report is accurate; that will be the result. Now, in this particular instance we have the estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury, we have the estimate of the auditor of the Commission, we have also the statement of the Secretary of War, and we have the statement of the president of the Commission. Those gentlemen have all concurred in saying that this sum is essential for expenditures during this fiscal year.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if he thinks it is proper to make an appropriation for six months' further work on the basis of a lock canal when in less than two months we may decide to have a sea-level canal, and thereby render to a large extent useless the work that is being done now?

Mr. HEPBURN. I certainly do, for this reason, that all work that is now being done will be essential whether a sea-level canal shall be adopted or one with locks. All this is essential to either canal.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that every dollar that is expended on the basis of a lock canal will render more difficult and more costly a sea-level canal.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think the gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think not.

Mr. HEPBURN. The work that is being done is in the way of excavation in the Culebra cut. That great range of mountains must be penetrated, no matter what form of canal is adopted. Sums are being expended in sanitation. That sanitation will be essential without reference to the character of the canal. Expenditures are now being made for the housing of the laborers; that will be essential no matter what form of canal is adopted. And so it is with all of the expenditures that are being made now. They are common to either form of canal that in the future may be adopted. Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, if it is not the temper of the House to make this appropriation as it is, that there will be at least an appropriation made that will meet the expenditures necessary, say, up to the 1st day of next March. It is not probable that our committees will be appointed and will get to work until some time in January. And remember that these appropriations—the estimates that are made for March—must be in the hands of the Commission by the last day of February, because the pay rolls will then have to be met.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are liabilities already incurred, and sums due that amount to $5,000,000 to-day. I have no doubt that the monthly expenditures, the ordinary expenditures that must be incident to each current month, will be more than a million of dollars a month. There are equipments purchased, or contracted for delivery not later than June 30, 1906, but being currently delivered, amounting to $3,350,000—estimated miscellaneous material purchased in the United States from December 1, 1905, to January 30, 1906, that in all human probability will be delivered from month to month, a full proportion each month, that ought to be provided for by the 1st day of next March.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEPBURN. Now, the sums, as I figure them, that will be essentially necessary—this estimate is for the 1st day of April; I have been talking about March, however—up to the 1st day of April the expenditures that will be then due or will have matured, as I figure it, are $11,725,000, only assuming that the one-half portion of the two items—three and a fraction million and two and a fraction million dollars, that I refer to—should mature proportionately each month.

Now, that sum, at least something more than $10,000,000, will be absolutely needed by the 1st day of March next, and the gentleman's motion, I would think, would call for all that is absolutely necessary if he enlarged it a million dollars more, so as to cover all possible contingencies.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to substitute "eleven" for "ten" in the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. BONYNGE. I move as a substitute for the amendment that has been offered and for the pending motions that eleven millions be inserted in the bill in place of the $16,500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon perfecting the original amendment. The amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is that $6,858,333 be substituted for $16,500,000 appropriated in the bill. The amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] is that ten millions be substituted in the place of that. The question is first on the amendment to the amendment, namely, that $10,000,000 be substituted for the sum named in the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment to the amendment, and the Chairman stated that he was in doubt.

The committee divided.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is no longer in doubt; the amendment is carried. The question now recurs on the adoption of the substitute to the amendment, substituting $11,000,000 for $10,000,000.

The question was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in doubt.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 113, noes 114.

Mr. HEPBURN. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PRINCE, and the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BONYNGE, will take their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 136, noes 121.

So the substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The question was taken; and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 11, page 2, after the word "made," the following: "and all expenditures heretofore made for the construction of said canal."

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment will be to reimburse the Treasury from the proceeds of the sale of these bonds, not only for whatever appropriation may be carried by this bill, but such appropriations and expenditures as have already been made for the actual construction of the canal.

The act of June 28, 1902, authorized the sale of $130,000,000 of bonds, the proceeds of which can be used as the basis of appropriation for expenditures in the construction of the canal. That same act appropriated $40,000,000 for the original purchase of the rights and property of the Panama Company. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, it was eminently proper that the $40,000,000 should be paid from the cash in the Treasury, and that that portion should not be reimbursed from the sale of

bonds. That $40,000,000 was the basis, the anchorage of this great project. But, Mr. Chairman, whatever reason there may be for reimbursing the Treasury from the sale of bonds for the appropriations carried by this bill now under consideration, is an equally potent reason for the reimbursement of the Treasury of the amount actually expended for the purpose of the construction of the canal, which the gentleman from Iowa informed the committee yesterday was approximately $10,000,000. I think the time has passed when any doubt exists in any mind relative to the wisdom of this enterprise; but, Mr. Chairman, the burden of expenditure upon the Treasury should not fall so heavily upon the initiatory movement of the project, but should be so extended over a period of time that those in the future, who will reap far greater benefit from this great enterprise than we, will pay their part of this great expenditure. Now, the bonds authorized by the act of 1902 are to be sold and the proceeds used to reimburse the Treasury to the extent of the appropriation carried by this bill. This amendment only seeks to reimburse the Treasury further to the extent of that which has already been expended in actual construction. When this is done the beginning of the project, the anchorage of this great national enterprise, will have been paid for out of the cash in the Treasury to the extent of $50,000,000, then the actual expenditures for the actual construction of the canal will be made from the proceeds of the bonds, which will be paid as they mature, and fall equally upon those of the present day and also of the future to the extent of the limit of the bonds.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Would your amendment include the $10,000,000 paid to Panama?

Mr. MANN. Would your amendment cover the entire $60,000,000 already expended?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I think not, but I will say frankly to the gentleman from Illinois that if there is any construction to that effect I shall accept any proper amendment which would limit the reimbursement to the $10,000,000 of expenditures of actual construction with the appropriations carried in this bill.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think he ought to prepare the amendment limiting it in that way?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Whenever I am convinced that the language I propose is susceptible of that construction I might propose such an amendment, but I do not see it that way now.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's amendment reads identically so as to cover all appropriations heretofore made.

Mr. OVERSTREET. For the actual construction of the canal.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no, but for the entire amount of money expended for that purpose.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I differ from you.

Mr. MANN. On any other basis the money already expended can not be expended.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Does the gentleman mean to say that the $40,000,000 paid to the Panama Canal Company was for the construction of the canal?

Mr. MANN. Why certainly.

Mr. OVERSTREET. That is where we differ.

Mr. MANN. It is just as much a part of the construction as the building of a hospital.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I do not agree with the gentleman. Will the gentleman agree with me that the actual expenditure of this sum, approximately $10,000,000, which we as amateurs over here understand means for actual construction, ought to be returned to the Treasury from the sale of these bonds?

Mr. MANN. Well, I will agree that it ought not to be done out of the sale of $130,000,000 of bonds authorized, because that was to be a sum in addition to the $10,000,000 which was appropriated and which has been expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I ask unanimous consent for one minute further.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman may proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, it is not my understanding that the $10,000,000 which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] informed us yesterday had been expended for actual construction was expended prior to the act of June 28, 1902. I asked him on yesterday what was the amount of expenditure for actual construction of the canal, and he said about $10,000,000; but that was not all expended prior to the authority for the issue of the $130,000,000 of bonds.

Mr. MANN. No; not any of it was expended prior to that. The act which authorized $130,000,000 bonds made an appropriation of $10,000,000, and obligated Congress thereafter to appropriate $135,000,000, $130,000,000 of which was expected to be paid out of the bonds and $15,000,000 total in the end out of the Treasury on an estimated expense of canal construction of $145,000,000.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, just a word. The purpose of this amendment is to reimburse the Treasury from the proceeds of the sale of these bonds, for the appropriation carried by the bill now under consideration, and such amount as has been heretofore expended for actual construction, not taking into account either the $40,000,000 paid the French company or the $10,000,000 paid to Colombia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important proposition and the House ought to understand what it means. It means that we are not only to borrow the $11,000,000 appropriated by this bill, when we have $55,000,000 of the people's money lying in the national banks on deposit, according to the last report of the Treasurer, which I hold in my hand, but that we are to add to that, by the construction which the gentleman from Indiana places upon the amendment, $10,000,000, and by the construction of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] $50,000,000, already paid out of the Treasury, so that that may come back into the Treasury and then be deposited in the national banks, virtually lent to them without the payment of a dollar of interest.

It is worse than that, Mr. Chairman, because when we, instead of taking our own money out of our own deposits, borrow money unnecessarily, we accompany it with the issuance of a bond, whereby the very man who loans the money for which our bond is issued may deposit in the Treasury the bonds which are the evidence of the loan and get their full face value back in good national-bank money, and then lend that money out to the people at whatever per cent he can get.

It is time that there was a halt called upon the partnership between the national-bank depositories and the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No sensible business man in God's world, when he had money in his pocket, or in bank subject to his draft, would go into the market to borrow money. No honest man, acting as trustee for any person or corporation, would go into the market and borrow money for that person or corporation to pay necessary expenses that must be paid in the execution of the trust when an unengaged fund was lying idle somewhere in the hands of some friend, who was lending it out at interest and paying no interest himself to the beneficiary.

Take this step, if you dare! The Democracy challenges you to take it. There is a drop of water somewhere that will overflow the cup of public endurance and public patience. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This may possibly be that drop of water. It will be bad enough if you get the $11,000,000 appropriation in this bill by borrowing money rather than taking it out of your depositories.

What excuse are you going to give to the American people? Some of you answer me that before this debate closes. What excuse are you going to make to account, on a "square-deal" ground, for the fact that instead of using their money without cost to them, except of the principal—and the cost of that fully justified by the public necessity—you have borrowed money and paid to a certain favored class of bankers 2 per cent for that which you already had and needed not to borrow? Two per cent for what? That which you did not need to borrow. Two per cent for what purpose? Merely to favor your depositories.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] is right in this far, that there is not a reason in the world that will make it proper, wise, just, or honest to borrow the $11,000,000 appropriated by the bill instead of paying it out of our own money that will not also make it just and wise and honest to issue bonds for the $10,000,000 already expended, get the money into the Treasury, and deposit it also in the national depositories to feed speculation in margins and industrials. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. The House and Congress deliberately said they could pay this sum all out of the surplus in the Treasury. It has been paid. There is no reason why we should reverse that rule now, why we should amend that legislation and go back and issue bonds to put it back into the Treasury. The deficit in the Treasury up to the 30th of June last, for two years, amounted to $64,000,000; that is, the deficit arising from the expenditures exceeding the receipts amounted to about $64,000,000. That is $4,000,000 more than the money we have paid upon this canal purchase up to this time. That, perhaps, would not have been so large but for

the concessions in regard to revenue which we have made to our own insular possessions and to Cuba.

But we are running very close now in receipts and expenditures. Up to to-day I believe the deficit on that account is about $10,000,000. I do not care about the precise figures, but that is about the deficit up to to-day.

The gentleman from Illinois read a statement showing that the receipts for one day were three or four million dollars. That may be true. Sometimes they are less than a million dollars. But this deficit has arisen since the 30th day of June last. It looks now, if this abundant prosperity throughout the whole country continues until the 30th of June next, that we would be able to meet the ordinary expenses without much, if any, deficit at the end of the fiscal year. I think we will do that. I think we will accomplish that result. But because we may do that there is no reason, on the other hand, why we should follow the lead of the gentleman from Mississippi and now begin to work down the surplus in the Treasury, which we may need some time in the not very distant future. No man knows how long this wonderful prosperity of the country will run.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought it was to run forever.

Mr. PAYNE. We have had it since 1898, and there are no clouds in the horizon now; there is no Democratic peril even in the horizon to-day. [Laughter.] If that prosperity continues, we shall have abundant revenue to pay the expenses of the Government. But no man or set of men is wise enough to work out any revenue measure that will come out even every 30th day of June in running a big government like this. It never has been done and it never will be done. The nearest we ever approached to it was the period while the McKinley bill was in operation, and the period since 1898, when we had another Republican measure which has produced adequate money to pay our ordinary expenses.

We had a large surplus in the Treasury. It is not so large to-day by $74,000,000. What shall we do with that surplus? It is necessary to keep a surplus. We can not depend upon running into a deficiency that will make a draft upon the Treasury such as we had under the last Democratic Administration, which forced them to go into the markets of the country and buy gold with bonds, at a discount of $12,000,000 on their bonds. That is not the Republican idea. That is not our idea of the way in which the Treasury of the United States should be run. We want sufficient money to run it, and we want to provide against a rainy day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York may be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. It is necessary to have this surplus. The gentleman from Mississippi dares us to maintain it. Good heavens! Have we not been maintaining that surplus while we have been in power? Have not we boldly proclaimed that we propose to have sufficient money for the necessities of the Government, even if they were extraordinary, by reason of hard times overtaking us? This is no new thing. You have been barking at that hole God knows how long. [Laughter.] The American people have not listened to you a great deal upon that particular question. The minds of the people and their memories go back to the time of your Administration, when God knows we were not troubled with any surplus in the Treasury. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, having this money, what shall we do with it? Shall we lock it up in the vaults of the Treasury so it can not go into trade and perform the functions of money?

That has not been the policy of the Government for the last twenty-five years, whether the Administration was Republican or Democratic. They have sought to put that money where it can go into circulation and help to perform the business of the country, and it is right that they should do so. I am not going into the figures to show whether national banks make money out of this operation or not. They do not make much. It is a pretty small margin. The money is apt to be called for at any time. We have called for about $50,000,000 of it in the last two years. It went into the Treasury then and was paid out for Government expenses, and so went back into circulation, and there was no trouble about it then. But we have got to the point now where it is necessary to preserve our surplus in the Treasury of the United States. So the Congress thought when we passed this original bill and provided for the issue of bonds that another generation might pay for this canal, which possibly this generation may not see completed and running and bringing such benefits to the country as it will bring in the future. There is no necessity for it; there is no reason for it. We will not take a back step because you threaten that you are going to do something. Why, you dare us so that we almost tremble at the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], about taking this step, although we know it is right and proper to do so. We are not going to put ourselves in such a condition when the Presidential campaign comes around in 1908, because the Republican party is and is going to be interested in the campaign of 1908, that you will be crying from every platform that there is a deficit in the revenues or a deficiency in the Treasury of the United States. The people want money enough to carry on the expenses of the Government, and we propose they should have it. They want a sufficient surplus to provide for the running expenses of the Government, and we propose that they shall have it. They are willing to pay in the future for this great work, and we propose to give them the opportunity. Therefore I trust that this amendment of my friend from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], which I think ought not to be in the bill, will be voted down, and that we shall start from the point that we provided for in the original act; and I trust, on the other hand, that the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], when he shall offer it, to strike out this provision, will be voted down with equal unanimity, and that we will go on and complete this work under the programme which we have already inaugurated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York to give the House the amount of available cash in the Treasury now over and above the gold reserve.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I think there is about $131,000,000. I do not remember the precise figures.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman is very nearly right. The amount is $136,000,000.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, one hundred and thirty-six millions, and in that connection I want to state to the gentleman from Mississippi that the people who were responsible for running the Treasury of the United States show very good reasons for their argument and their opinion that there should be at least $75,000,000 for the ordinary current running expenses of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: If there be one hundred and thirty-six millions of cash available in the Treasury, over and above the gold reserve, and if even the Treasury officials calculate that seventy-five millions is a sufficient margin, then upon what ground can the gentleman resist the motion to take out of the remaining $61,000,000, over and above all margin and gold reserve, this $11,000,000?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, that is a fair question from the gentleman's standpoint, and I shall try to answer it. The Government revenue is limited. It is not only limited, but it is uncertain. I do not know, Mr. Chairman—none of us knows—but what an all-wise Providence may sometime in the future frighten the country with a threatened return of the Democratic party to power.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, if the gentleman from New York please, let us talk business a little while.

Mr. PAYNE. I am talking business now. I am talking history. The country may again be threatened with the Democratic party coming into power, and if that threat goes so far as that the people believe it, it will act as it has always acted—to palsy business enterprise, to destroy prosperity, to destroy credit and cut down the revenues of the Government, because unless the people are prosperous and buy and business is done in this country the revenues will not come into the Treasury of the United States.

It is just such conditions and contingencies that we are bound, Mr. Chairman, to have in our mind when we are considering these things. I will admit the possibility may be remote. Good heavens! I have wondered in the past how it could come about when it has that people should get frightened over these things,

but they do. They sometimes have reason to, and I do not know when it will——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. And now that the revenues run so closely to our expenditures I, for one, do not believe it is policy to cut down the surplus any further below the present amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Mississippi understands the gentleman from New York then, and I would ask him whether he understands him correctly or not, the answer of the gentleman from New York to his former question is that there ought to be kept in the Treasury $61,000,000 more than the Treasury officials advise for fear that the Democratic party may come into power. Is that it?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, now, I spoke of that as one thing, as one cloud that might come up in the future. The Democratic party is not the only cloud upon the prosperity of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, I thought it was the only cloud.

Mr. PAYNE. One of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the only one you have thus far mentioned. Now, will the gentleman from New York mention some other clouds that necessitate the carrying of this sixty-one millions, fifty-five of it as a loan to banks without interest?

Mr. PAYNE. I have heard the gentleman from Mississippi argue, and I will put the argument to himself, that these periods of depression come in cycles. I think it was three years ago he was talking, when he warned the Republican party that that cycle might happen about 1904, just before the Presidential election, and it would not do for us to predicate prosperity upon the tariff laws——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am talking now of a business proposition, not of cycles.

Mr. PAYNE. Upon the tariff laws which the Republican party had inaugurated. Now, it may be one of the gentleman's cycles may come upon the people of the United States and produce a period of depression, and we had better be prepared for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, I understand the gentleman's answer to be this, that the $61,000,000, $55,000,000 of it lying on deposit in the banks and not paying interest, ought to be kept over and above the margin suggested by the Treasury officials, over and above the gold reserve, in order to prevent a reoccurrence of Democratic rules or Mr. WILLIAMS'S cycles? Is that your answer? [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Now, I would like to have some sound business reason why this country should keep that $61,000,000, $55,000,000 of it in the banks, instead of spending $11,000,000, which they already have in this enterprise, and go out and borrow money at 2 per cent, the people lending it getting bonds, reissuing the same amount and lending it over to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, I want to have the amendment read, and then I desire to speak in opposition to it for a few moments.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Clerk will report the amendment for the information of the committee. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate upon this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the House for a few moments to the amount of the bonded indebtedness of the country and when that bonded indebtedness can be paid. The consols of 1930, amounting in round numbers to $538,000,000, can not be paid prior to April 1, 1930, unless we buy them by paying a premium in advance. The loan of 1907, amounting to a hundred and seventeen million dollars, can not be paid until after July 1, 1907. The loan of 1908, amounting to the neighborhood of $64,000,000, can not be paid until August 1, 1908.

The next loan, of $118,000,000, is not due until after February 1, 1925. In other words, we have a bonded indebtedness of about $900,000,000 which can not be paid without buying at a premium, until the first of them fall due July 1, 1907, and some that fall due later, August 1, 1908. Now, what condition are we in?

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PRINCE. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman state to the committee the rate of interest on 1907 bonds and also the rate on the 1908 bonds?

Mr. PRINCE. I will. The 1908 bonds are at 3 per cent; the 1907 bonds are at 4 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to ask my friend whether it would not be better, if we are going to pay this money on big work of this kind, to pay this money next July, or in 1907 pay this money on a 4 per cent bond and retire it when we can retire it without a premium?

Mr. PRINCE. I agree with the gentleman in that respect, and the purpose of my stating these figures is this, to call the attention of the House to the fact that we owe money that we can not pay, and to call the attention of the House to the further fact that we have one hundred and thirty-six millions now on hand and available for use, sixty-five millions of which are in the Treasury and fifty-five millions of which, properly, are in the national-bank depositories. It had better be there than locked up in the vaults of the Treasury, unused by the people. This matter deserves more careful consideration by this House than to take it up as an amendment to an emergency bill, and I fully concur with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that we have gone as far to-day in this House under the Committee of the Whole as we ought to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] has expired.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one or two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] asks unanimous consent for the extension of his time for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRINCE. The amendment as suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] may be a proper amendment later on for a committee to consider, when they bring in an appropriation for this Panama Canal. At this time, and under the present circumstances, in my judgment, it is unwise to go any further than we have gone, namely, to make an emergency appropriation of this $11,000,000.

I do not agree with my friend here upon the left, the leader of the minority [Mr. WILLIAMS], as to his views. I think there is a middle course that we can better take in order to preserve the dignity of the House, and to maintain the responsibility of committees, and that is to stop right where we are now and let this question, if it is a proper question, be left to the proper committee and let them report to this House later on. The purpose is here to add twenty-one to seventy-six million dollars more of a bonded indebtedness. That is the effect of it. And I want to say to my colleagues on this side, it has been my pride in speaking to the people to say to them that in a time of peace, barring the time of the Spanish war, we have had money enough to meet the expenses, money enough to pay for the canal, money enough to buy the strip, money enough to meet the emergency, and take it out of the available cash of the Treasury, and not put a bonded indebtedness upon the people who have trusted us with the affairs of Government since 1898.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] is exhausted.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I am not disturbed by the frenzy into which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] worked himself upon the question of deposits of national money in national banks, because that subject does not relate to this amendment. When that subject is properly before the House his criticisms may properly be answered to his own satisfaction, but this proposition does not deal with that topic at all. It is a plain proposition offered by me, with the simple view of emphasizing my position, at least relative to the expenditures for the Panama Canal in its actual construction. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the people will approve the proposition that the actual outlay of money for the construction of that enterprise should be paid, not from the available cash, but distributed over a series of years, as evidenced by the bonds which were offered for issue. I call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that if the bonds, which aggregate $130,000,000, authorized under the act of June 28, 1902, have been sold there is a large proportion of this $10,000,00 which I propose to be reimbursed would not have been paid out of the money in the Treasury. I propose to treat

that expenditure in the same way that Congress now proposes to treat the appropriation carried in this bill. I am obliged to my friend from New York for his argument in support of this amendment, notwithstanding his declaration that he will vote against it. Every syllable of his argument in support of the protection of the surplus is an argument in favor of this amendment. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if we propose to be consistent in our attitude toward this great enterprise we will put upon the same plane this appropriation which you are now about to make of $11,000,000 the $10,000,000 that has already been expended in the actual construction of this canal. That is the sole proposition. I do not intend to raise any nightmare of Democratic administration to disturb the placid nature of my friend from New York nor arouse the gentleman from Mississippi upon his favorite topic of deposit of Government funds in national banks, but call the attention of this House to what I at least believe to be the sentiment of the country—that the people of the future shall aid in the payment of the actual expenses of this construction, and that it shall not all come from the cash in the Treasury. The $50,000,000 already taken from the Treasury is ample evidence of the good faith of the people of this day. That has been paid and should not be reimbursed, but the actual outlay for the actual construction already made should be put upon the plane of the $11,000,000 which you propose here to appropriate. Simply that and nothing more. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon the amendment is exhausted, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the proviso beginning in the tenth line of page 2, with the word "*Provided*," and continuing to the end of line 14, page 2.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes out the proviso, which makes it mandatory upon the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse to the Treasury of the United States the $11,000,000 appropriated by the bill out of the money to be procured by floating bonds. I have nothing further to say upon the subject now except to reiterate that it is bad finance for an individual or for a country to borrow money at interest when the individual or the country has money lying idle which he or it could use.

But one word further; the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has attempted to frighten that side of the Chamber and the country by the fear there may not be sufficient surplus left in the Treasury to carry on the Government properly. He does not know what is going to threaten the surplus. He undertakes in no business way to tell us. Our receipts, from the last report, are larger than the expenditures. A deficit may come and may not; but I submit that when it does come, if it shall come, that will be the time to borrow money, and not now. What would you think of a man who was fool enough to go out and borrow money to pay his private debts when he had thousands of dollars, perhaps millions of dollars in bank, upon the ground that the time might come when he might not have millions of dollars in the bank? [Applause.] It may be necessary at some day in the future to borrow money to defray the expenses of the Government. That "prosperity under the Dingley bill," that great shield under which prosperity has been brought not only to the United States of America but to our northern neighbor, Canada, our southern neighbor, Mexico, and generally all the world, even including Japan, may some day change its character or it even may be repealed, as the gentleman "opines" under an imaginary "cycle" system that he attributes to me.

I do not remember ever to have said anything in debate on the floor about "cycles," but when it does come—this "cycle"—that will be the time to protect the Treasury against me or the Democratic party, either one of us, as it may be. My friends, I assure you that I have no real bad intentions upon the Treasury, and no "cycle" that can be attributed to me as its author, manufacturer, or originator, will ever threaten the present surplus, except to spend it to get results of greater benefit than the possession of the money.

I do not think that the gentleman was called upon to infuse partisan politics into a discussion which ought to be a business discussion for business men, as far as this particular proposition is concerned.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] says that the question of deposits in national banks has nothing to do with his amendment, and therefore nothing to do with the provision in this bill. It has everything to do with it, because that is where our money that we can use if we would is now lying idle, and neither he nor anybody else can get away from that fact. He can not fool the people about it subsequently to this date. A great many of them know now, and all the balance shall know, that your object in doing this is to prevent the necessity of making your national bank depositories give up part of what they hold and use without interest, to their own profit. No honest man will deny that the effect of his amendment will be to add to the amount of deposits in the banks; and the effect of this provision in the bill would be to prevent a decrease of the amount of deposits in the banks, virtually on loan without interest. That will be the effect of the bill unless the proviso is stricken out by my amendment. You can not get away from it and you shall not. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, a settled policy was adopted with regard to the manner in which funds should be raised for expenditures in this work at the time that the act of June 28, 1902, was passed. That was an act that I think the gentleman from Mississippi voted for. I think he was heartily in favor of all parts of it. At least I heard no dissent from him with reference to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When was that?

Mr. HEPBURN. The act of June 28, 1902, in which we adopted a settled policy with reference to this canal. In that act I find—

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to borrow, on the credit of the United States, from time to time, as the proceeds may be required to defray expenditures authorized by this act, such proceeds when received to be used only for the purpose of meeting such expenditures, the sum of $130,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, and to prepare and issue therefor coupon or registered bonds of the United States in such form as he may prescribe.

At that time there was nearly if not quite as much money of the Government in the hands of the depositories as there is to-day.

Mr. PAYNE. More.

A MEMBER. Twice as much.

Mr. HEPBURN. I wonder why the gentleman at that time did not make this objection? Now he discovers that there is a surplus in the Treasury, and that calls for a Democratic challenge. Ah! I recognize the fact that the Democracy has always been opposed to a surplus in the Treasury. I find here, in a table just furnished us, a statement giving the population, the net revenues, and the net expenditures of the Government of the United States from 1837 down to the present time.

I find that during that period there were twenty-four years of Democratic rule, and that in those twenty-four years, during fifteen of them, the net revenues of the Government were less than the expenses; so that it seems that in 62 per cent of the years during which the Democratic party was in power it was never able to furnish, or at least did not furnish, means ample for the purposes of this Government.

It is a Democratic habit to have a deficit rather than to have a surplus.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be interrupted now, as I have only five minutes.

I notice, Mr. Chairman, that during those years of Democratic deficit there was not prosperity in this country. Those were years of penury to the people. There was no claim then that the people of the United States everywhere were prosperous. When the nation in its aggregate was pauperized the people in their individual experiences were pauperized.

We prefer the other method—of having not only plenty in the homes, but enough in the Treasury.

Of course, there will be times when that surplus will be a little more or a little less, but under the wise provision of depositing that surplus in the depositories of the Government it is still open for all of the commercial uses for which money may be needed. It is not hoarded in the Treasury to bring distress to business. It is furnishing and performing and completing the office for which money is created, of carrying on the business interests of the country.

Whether or not it would be practicable to exact or to secure a rate of interest for that money, and at the same time have it at all times and under all emergencies within the control of the Government, is a question of monetary affairs with which I am not sufficiently conversant to say; but it is a policy that has long been adopted. It has worked well; it has resulted in no defalcation to the Treasury. The money is safe and when needed can be used, and the fact that it can be had at a moment's notice is a great factor in that prosperity that is universal throughout the whole country. [Applause.]

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say briefly to the House that it strikes me as a very appropriate time to offer some remarks

with reference to the effect of partisan bitterness upon a purely business proposition. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is a pure question of business administration, and certainly that party which boasts of having given the country a business administration ought to be willing in debate to consider a business proposition in a business way. This question can not be thrust aside; can not be answered to any reasonable man, no matter what his politics is, by historical pleas of past party condition. The condition confronts us now. It is not a theory that we have a surplus in the Treasury more than six times enough to cover the amount proposed by issuing bonds. Is there any business sense in that? Is there any impending trouble from the Democratic party, from cycles, Providence, or any other source, that requires a surplus as large as now exists to meet the present or the probable impending business needs of the Government? Why, then, should the people have these bonds issued and have the interest to pay? What good will it accomplish? What wise purpose can be subserved from a business point of view? What difference does it make on this question whether there was a surplus or not in 1860, in 1850, in 1840, or 1870? There is a surplus now, a big one, and the proposition is now to issue bonds in the face of a surplus. That is the question. It is not a question of cycles; it is not a question of Democratic impending trouble. As far as I am concerned, I am strongly inclined to the view that many a jest is spoken in earnest, and that the jest will prove true in the coming Congressional election this next year. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I believe that the people are tired of this control of the country and the House by a coterie and fixed arrangement about such matters as this. No man in this House believes any number of business men anywhere in this country would adopt such a method as this in the transaction of their great business interests. No; not for a moment. Grant that it may be wise to have a moderate and reasonable surplus to meet the needs of the Government; how much ought it to be? Is it necessary that it should be $136,000,000? Is it necessary to have this money scattered out over the banks of the country, to be used as a political pull, it may be, or as a system of political graft? What wise business purpose is involved in this? If you gentlemen vote for this, I predict that you will hear from it, and I know that you ought to hear from it. You will not be able to satisfy the honest minds among the plain people of this country that a thing is right because the Democratic party did so and so away back yonder before the war, perhaps, or because Cleveland or some one else did this. You are confronted with this proposition in a plain business way. No man was ever fairer in putting the question in reference to the proposition than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] was to the gentleman from New York, and his answer in the RECORD will make him, distinguished and able and honest as I believe him to be, appear ridiculous before the country; and then the gentleman from Iowa thrusts into the debate the fact that we were authorized to issue the bonds. It is not a question of authority; it is a question of exercising the authority against the interests of the American people and sound, wise, economical business principles. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment may be withdrawn.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I renew the pro forma amendment. From this debate it appears that we have had a deficit in the Treasury during the past two fiscal years, and since the 1st of July of the present year we have had a deficit of about $10,000,000. Those facts are uncontroverted. What the future may be we can only guess. Whether that deficit will be large or small will depend upon the prosperity of the country during the remaining part of the fiscal year, or up to the 1st of July, 1906. We have the opportunity now of borrowing money at 2 per cent to pay for a great national work to last for the ages. A business man under those circumstances, knowing that he had a large amount of obligations coming due in January, 1907, bearing a much larger rate of interest, would not hesitate to borrow the money now and wait until the time was tided over, seeing whether that yearly deficit for two years was turned into a surplus of receipts over expenditures, and if so, then there is ample time when those bonds become due in 1907 to apply all the surplus that can be safely used in the retirement of bonds bearing interest at 4 per cent. These 4 percents amount to $117,000,000. So that, from a business standpoint, it is the right thing to do to carry out the policy inaugurated in 1902 and pay this money out of the proceeds of the bonds provided for in the act of 1902.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 92, noes 136.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The Chair appointed Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. HEPBURN tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 107, noes 152.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the pending section, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 11, page 2, strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof the words "may in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of the proposed amendment only one sentence will be necessary. This bill makes it mandatory upon the Secretary of the Treasury to issue the bonds. The old law, of which this is a supplement, left it discretionary. The language of the old law reads:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to borrow, on the credit of the United States, from time to time as the proceeds may be required, money to defray expenditures, etc.

This proviso says that all expenditures from the appropriation herein made shall be reimbursed and leaves no discretion in the Secretary of the Treasury at all. I merely propose to strike out the word "shall" and insert the words "may in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury." I shall not argue the question any further, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 89, noes 131.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding after the word "provided," in line 10, page 2, the words:

"That the Secretary of War is directed to use so much of this sum and subsequent appropriations as may be necessary to fortify the canal at each terminal end."

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, in the Fifty-seventh Congress, when the canal bill was before the House, I endeavored to have that amendment passed requiring the fortification of the canal, but by reason of the fact, as I believe, that the committee, without partisan division, had agreed to the bill as it stood and had agreed to pass no amendment under the conditions then existing, the amendment was defeated. I believed then and I believe now that this amendment is wise and of vast importance and that it ought to be adopted.

It goes without saying that it is entirely nonpartisan. It ought not to matter that it is offered by a Texan on this side. If it has merit and appeals to your judgment it ought to be adopted. Now, what would this amendment mean? It means simply this, that we give notice to the world that this canal is an American institution, secured by American diplomacy, to be constructed by American brains and labor, and paid for by American cash, and that we propose that it shall be so fortified that no power on earth can ply through it except by American will. It does not mean that we will discriminate against the commerce of any nation on earth. Oh, no. I am in favor, personally, of being fair, of giving, as an eminent orator who has been speaking in the country says, all the nations of earth as well as the American people "a square deal," but I am in favor of being prepared so that we can make any other nation give us a square deal whenever it becomes necessary in our interest. This canal will be a great institution when completed. No other nation has one dollar of interest in it and we ought to have it so fortified as that if war or trade relations or any motives of national interest properly considered suggest the propriety of forbidding or fixing terms by which it can be used by any given nation we will be in a position to propose the terms and to enforce them when proposed. It will be too late in the event of war to talk then about fortifying the canal, and the immense military utility of the canal if fortified will double the power of our Navy in the Pacific or in the Atlantic by access forward and backward as against the nations of the world who would have to round South America. It would be too late then to secure that advantage, nor could we protect it against the ravages of a foreign enemy, but if it should be fortified we would not only be able to ship our battle ships forward and backward and avoid things like the experience of the *Oregon* in the Spanish war, but

we would be able to prevent a foreign nation from having equal facilities with us in that war. There is no doubt in my mind but what if this amendment could be passed on by the American people it would receive three times the majority that the President of your party received in the last election, and that was a good sized one at that. Now, what objection can the distinguished chairman of this committee have to this amendment? What objection can any gentleman on that side have to this amendment? Are you opposed to the fortifications of the canal? I serve notice on you now you will have to come over to it within five years after the completion of the canal. These international complications may be different from what they are now. Now we ride majestically on the seas, a nation at peace with the world, with a power never before possessed, not even threatened. Now we can go ahead and do this cheaply without trouble with Great Britain by reason of our treaty with her or any other power in the Orient or elsewhere. If we wait we will be, perhaps, in the condition of the man in Texas who had no roof above his house and when it rained he could not stop to put a cover on it, and when it did not rain of course he did not need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the position of the two sides of the House is quite well illustrated by that amendment. When we are endeavoring to obtain the money necessary to proceed with the work in hand the gentleman who offers the amendment votes against giving the money, and then having reduced the amount he wants to still further reduce it by using the money to fortify the canal. Let us build the canal at least before we fortify it. The gentleman opposes the money to build the canal and yet wants to use the money to fortify the canal. How foolish it seems——

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MANN. Why, certainly.

Mr. BURGESS. I do not wish to be placed, knowingly or unknowingly, by the gentleman from Illinois in a false position. He certainly does not understand I am opposed to voting the money for building the canal.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman voted against $11,000,000 twice.

Mr. BURGESS. I did, but I was ready to vote for any necessary amount, and I am ready to vote now or hereafter at all times for whatever is shown to be actually necessary to construct this canal; but I am not to be put in any such false position by the gentleman from Illinois, who would rather do that than meet the argument——

Mr. MANN. That is the voice of Jacob, but the hand is the hand of Esau.

Mr. BURGESS. Will the gentleman permit one more question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BURGESS. Are you opposed to the fortification of the canal, yes or no?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the law providing that the President shall construct the canal provides that he shall construct and defend the canal. I am in favor, first, of doing some work toward the construction of the canal. The gentleman, as is usual with his party, wants to do something first which can not be used, and he opposes a thing which can be used. They always favor the cart before the horse. [Laughter.] We put the horse first. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BURGESS. Just a moment. Does the gentleman contend that under the existing treaty with Great Britain, and the language of the canal act, the Secretary of War can fortify the terminals of the canal? I am not speaking of defense. Can the canal be fortified under existing law?

Mr. MANN. The act provides that the President shall make such provision for defense as may be necessary for the safety and protection of the canal and harbors.

Mr. BURGESS. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will permit me, I will suggest that we do not play about a great question like this.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will stop. That is what he is doing.

Mr. BURGESS. The question is this: Does the gentleman contend that under the existing treaty with Great Britain and the language to which the gentleman has referred, and with which I assure him I am perfectly familiar, that the Secretary of War can construct a fortification at the terminals of this canal to prevent egress and ingress if the nation sees fit? That is the question.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, that will be a question when the canal is finished. I trust that the gentleman may then be voting in reference to appropriations of this kind, but I hope that if he is, it will be at the other end of the Capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That a detailed statement of the expenditures from this and subsequent appropriations for the construction of the isthmian canal shall be made annually to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

Mr. TAWNEY and Mr. FITZGERALD rose.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute for section 3, which has just been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] offers a substitute for section 3, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of section 3 and insert:

"SEC. 3. That a detailed, classified, and itemized statement of all expenditures for which a voucher shall be furnished and audited, in amounts of $100 and over, from this and subsequent appropriations for the construction of the isthmian canal, shall be made annually to Congress at the beginning of each regular session, together with an additional statement of all orders for machinery, cars, and other appliances used in connection with and in the construction of said canal given by the Isthmian Canal Commission, including therein the amounts and prices covered by such orders."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I believe under the rules has precedence over the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

Mr. TAWNEY. I offered my amendment as a substitute to section 3; that is, striking out all of section 3 and insert.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The amendment which I offer is to perfect the provision of the bill as it stands at present, and under the rules of the House it is entitled to precedence over the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY]. I send the same to Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 18, page 2, strike out the period and insert a semicolon, and add the following: "and at the same time there shall be submitted to Congress a detailed, itemized, and classified estimate of all moneys required for the next ensuing fiscal year."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I believe I am entitled to the floor on the amendment, inasmuch as it takes precedence of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman from Minnesota did not yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], but will yield now if the gentleman from New York wishes to address the committee on his amendment. How much time does he desire?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I simply wish to discuss it for about five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent for five minutes of time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the bill is the amendment which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] gave notice yesterday would be offered by me at this time.

The bill in its present shape provides that there shall be submitted to Congress a detailed statement of the expenditures made from this and from subsequent appropriations. This amendment requires that there shall be submitted at the same time a detailed statement of the money required for the ensuing fiscal year. This bill itself is the best argument in favor of the adoption of such an amendment. A request was made that Congress should appropriate $16,500,000 without any proper estimate having been submitted and without any Member of this House having any adequate information regarding the money required and the uses to which it was to be put.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from New York permit a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAWNEY. You are aware that the expenditure of this money is under the jurisdiction and control of the War Department? Now, the general law provides that all Executive Departments of the Government must submit their estimates by October 1, and if not done by the 1st of October, then the Secretary of the Treasury is required to put in as much as he may estimate for them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] will permit me, I understand that under the language of the canal act the expenditures of this work come

under the direct supervision of the President, and that the law regulating the submission of estimates by the Department has no application to the moneys required here at all.

Mr. TAWNEY. I understood from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]—I may have misunderstood him—in the debate yesterday that these expenditures were all under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

Mr. MANN. We conferred authority upon the President; the President by order transfers the supervision to the Secretary of War. That would not require the Commission to make estimates as the Department estimates, undoubtedly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, to be imperative that somebody should submit estimates to this House before any appropriation be made for any purpose. In no other way can the House be informed of the purpose for which the money is required. This amendment was prepared in this form so as to have estimates submitted as nearly as possible in the form and manner now provided for the submission of estimates for the regular Departments. The only argument against requiring estimates was a suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois yesterday, that it would be impossible to tell in advance how much money would be required for the Panama Railroad; yet in the very statement submitted to the House in connection with the pending bill there are estimates of the sums required even for the railroad. I trust that this or some other amendment of a similar character to it will be adopted by the Committee. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a substitute for the amendments which are pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] has a substitute pending.

Mr. MANN. I beg the Chair's pardon. I understood the gentleman from Minnesota to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers a substitute for the section. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment perfecting the text of the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Then I shall offer what I do as an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the committee, and for the purpose of accommodating my friend from Illinois, I will withdraw my substitute in order that he may offer his first.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the substitute will be withdrawn. The Chair hears no objection. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. That the President shall annually, and at such other periods as may be provided, either by law or by his order, require full and complete reports to be made to him by the persons appointed or employed by him in charge of the government of said Canal Zone, the construction of said Panama Canal, and the operation of said Panama Railroad, including an itemized account of all moneys received and expended, which said reports shall be by the President transmitted to Congress. And any of the persons appointed or employed by the President in connection with the said government or the said work of construction or operation shall give to Congress or to either House of Congress such information as may at any time be required either by act of Congress or by the order of either House of Congress in relation to their respective actings and doings and the receipt and expenditure of money. The President shall annually cause to be made, by the persons appointed and employed by him in charge of the government of said Canal Zone and the construction of said canal, estimates of expenditures and appropriations, in detail as far as practicable, which estimates shall be submitted to Congress in the manner provided in section 5 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes.' And no money shall be expended for any of the purposes named in this act except in accordance with appropriations made by Congress, except that the moneys received, in the ordinary course of business, from the operation of the Panama Railroad and the property and rights appertaining thereto may be expended, so far as necessary, in defraying the expenses of such operation, including maintenance, without being covered into the Treasury of the United States, and such moneys are hereby appropriated for such purpose, and monthly reports of such receipts and expenditures shall be made to the President by the person or persons in charge."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], or some Member who has charge of this matter, why it is—if it is a fact, and I understand it is a fact—that there has been no statement in detail of what has been done with the appropriations heretofore made. It seems now we are about to pass, as we should, an amendment requiring hereafter such statements; but why has not a detailed statement been made by the parties in charge, whether the Commission, if it was its duty, of the Secretary of War, if it was his duty. I should like to have some explanation on this point from the gentleman, and I feel that he can give it.

Mr. MANN. Although the law does not require a report in detail, I had printed in the RECORD yesterday a fairly well detailed report of the official year last past, and I understand that there will be submitted to Congress a complete detailed report of the expenditures of the last fiscal year.

In the last Congress we passed a bill in the House in reference to the Panama Canal construction work and the government of the Canal Zone, and endeavored to perfect a section in reference to the making not only of detailed but itemized statements of expenditures; not only annually, but as often as might be required by the President or by either House of Congress.

We also required in that section detailed estimates of future expenditures, and provided in addition that there should be estimates of expenditures made even for the Panama Railroad, but that the money which came in from current receipts of the road could be used in the operation of the road, requiring, however, monthly statements of those receipts and expenditures.

That section of the bill failed with the rest of the bill, because of the disagreement of the House and the Senate in reference to the abolition of the Canal Commission.

It is that section of the former bill, perfected by the committee which had charge of it, and adopted by the House, which I have offered; and so far as I know, no one has suggested an amendment in any way which will add to it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman go just a step further now and answer my question completely as to why that statement has not been already prepared and submitted? Why did they not anticipate the notable occasion of the assembling of this Congress and its immediately taking up this important matter? Understand, I am not reflecting on the Secretary of War. I think he is as clean a man as we have, in or out of public life. I know him personally and officially, and esteem him almost in the extreme. He is a great, clean man; he won't do or permit, knowingly, a wrong; but I want to know why even that kind of an official, if it was his duty, or your great, clean, able Commission, as I take it to be—I know none of the members of it—why have they not anticipated this great occasion and this important request of Congress and filed an itemized statement?

Mr. MANN. I apprehend that it is more a lack of experience on the part of the gentlemen in charge of the Commission than anything else. In an examination of the law they did not find that they were required to submit a detailed statement at all. They thereupon proposed to submit a detailed statement for the past fiscal year, as ought to be done in the ordinary course of business, and probably if this work were under the control of the officials of a Department having experience in such matters we should have had more information; but the auditor of the Commission is now engaged, I may say to the gentleman, in making a detailed statement of the expenditures down to the 1st of October, which will be furnished to the House in the course of a few days.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by way of substitute by the gentleman from Illinois is, as I understand it, a provision of a bill upon which the members of his committee in the last House were in accord and which passed this House. It has been prepared with great care and goes into details which are considered of much importance, and I hope that that provision will be incorporated into the bill instead of the present section as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SHEPPARD. To submit an amendment at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 2 by adding to said section the following:

"*Provided*, That no further appropriations shall be made until it shall have been authoritatively determined whether the canal is to be a lock or a sea-level canal."

Mr. HEPBURN. I raise the point of order that that section has been passed.

The CHAIRMAN. This being an amendment to section 2, it is out of order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to submit it as an amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to return to section 2 of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 2.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, let the proposed amendment be again read. I understand it provides that no appropriation shall be made by the House until certain things are done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to refuse to enter into any unanimous consent until the substitute I have offered is disposed of. This has nothing to do with that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made; and the question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question was taken; and the substitute was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I renew my request.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the committee recur to section 2 of the bill for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. I object.

The motion of Mr. HEPBURN was then agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VREELAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 480, supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriations for Isthmian Canal construction, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question on the bill and amendments to its final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the vote will be taken in gross.

The amendments were considered in gross and agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HEPBURN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ORDINANCES OF PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

The Senate and House of Representatives:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith eleven ordinances enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico, which ordinances have been approved by the President of the United States.

Attention is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 7, 1905.*

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. LIVINGSTON was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Maggie D. Russ, Fifty-eighth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, December 11, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect of the Treasury submitting an estimate of appropriation for construction of a wharf, runway, etc., at quarantine station at Honolulu, Hawaii—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an appropriation for the post-office and court-house at Kansas City, Mo.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for clerks and expenses for the office of the surveyor-general in Nevada—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Director of the Mint submitting an estimate of appropriation for examination of mints, etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the chief of division of Revenue-Cutter Service submitting an estimate of appropriation for repairs and improvements of certain vessels—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Postmaster-General submitting changes in estimate of appropriation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for steam machinery—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Director of the Mint submitting an estimate of appropriation for freight on coin and bullion—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, recommending a deficiency appropriation for vaults, safes, locks, etc., for public buildings—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the superintendent of the Library building and grounds, resubmitting a report as to plans, etc., for a power-house for heating, etc., of public buildings in the vicinity of the Mall and White House—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, submitting his annual report—to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Kent Narrows, Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Everett Harbor, Washington—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Clayton Harbor, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Essex River, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of San Rafael Creek, California—to the Committeee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of effect of wave action at harbors at Ludington, Mich., and Manitowoc, Two Rivers, Racine, Kenosha, and Sheboygan, Wis.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Bay Ridge channel, New York Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Wappinger Creek, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the fifteenth

annual report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Morristown Harbor, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Ocmulgee River, Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, abstracts of proposals for materials and labor in connection with work under his department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the report of the annual inspection of the several branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the report of the Currency Bureau for the year ended October 31, 1905—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of all type and experimental manufacture of guns and other articles manufactured by the Government during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905—to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, presenting the annual report of the Board for the year ended June 30, 1905—to the Committees on Appropriations and Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office relating to survey of public lands within land grants—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey, a report of the examination and surveys for construction works for reclamation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, a draft of a bill for final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, a draft of a bill increasing the efficiency of the Ordnance Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 5276) relating to appointments to the Naval Academy, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5277) to amend an act providing when plaintiff may sue a poor person, and when counsel shall be assigned by the court, as passed July 20, 1892—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5278) authorizing the purchase of a site for a building for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5279) to authorize the judges of the circuit and district courts of the United States to appoint stenographic reporters, fix the duties and compensation thereof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5280) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Auburn, in the State of Maine—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5281) to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5282) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox at Thomaston, Me.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5283) concerning licensed officers of sail vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5284) to amend section 4136, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5285) for the protection of the President of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 5286) to provide for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 5287) creating a railway hospital service within the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 5288) to provide for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 5289) to provide for the selection of grand and petit jurors for the district courts in the Territory of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 5290) providing for the allotment and distribution of Indian tribal funds—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5291) to amend the law relating to the salmon fisheries of Alaska—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 5292) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in buildings and upon premises owned or controlled by the United States Government—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 5293) to provide for the building of a new light-house and range lights at Honolulu Harbor, Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5294) for the establishment of a light-house at Makapuu Point, on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5295) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5296) authorizing the extension of the post-office and United States court building at Columbus, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 5297) providing for the granting of service pensions in addition to pensions heretofore granted, or to be hereafter granted, to soldiers and sailors of the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5298) to amend section 64 of the bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 5299) for the erection of a public building at Hamilton, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 5300) to repeal section 4136 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the admission to registry of repaired foreign wrecks—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5301) setting aside a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands in the Philippine Islands for school purposes—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5302) to further provide for the redemption of mutilated United States paper currency and to maintain the cleanliness of the circulation—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 5303) to provide for the erection of a public building at Palestine, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5304) to retire enlisted men, either in the Army or Marine Corps, after twenty-five years' service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 5305) to give each soldier of the civil war a land warrant—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5306) to provide for the payment of medical expenses of sick officers and enlisted men of the Army while absent from duty with leave or on furlough—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5307) providing for the holding of Federal court at York, Nebr.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5308) for the erection of a public building at York, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 5309) to revive the right of action under the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5310) for the organization and maintenance of an expedition for the investigation of all phenomena connected with the sea, for the advancement of physical science—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 5311) to regulate the issuance of writs from the district and circuit courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5312) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Alabama—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5313) to reduce letter postage to 1 cent per ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 5314) authorizing an increase of pensions for total deafness—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5315) imposing a tax on certain transactions in grain, provisions, cotton, stocks, bonds, and other securities, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 5316) for the erection of a public building at Owensboro, Ky., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5317) to admit free of duty certain articles manufactured in the United States of America—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 5318) to amend the act approved March 15, 1878, entitled "An act for the relief of William A. Hammond, late Surgeon-General of the Army"—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 5319) to provide for the erection of a public building at Delrio, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5320) to provide for the erection of a public building at Eagle Pass, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 5321) to amend an act approved July 1, 1902, known as "Joint resolution construing the act approved June 27, 1890," and so forth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 5322) for the widening of the Bladensburg road, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5323) for the opening of R street NE. to Twenty-eighth street and of Twenty-eighth street NE. from R street to M street—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 5324) to provide for the erection of a public building at Mountairy, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5325) to provide for a public building at Salisbury, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 5326) making appropriations for the improvement of the Missouri River from its mouth to Sioux City, Iowa—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5327) construing the provisions of sections 2304 to 2309 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 5328) making appropriation for the removal of the quarantine station at San Diego, Cal., and to acquire a new site, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5329) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at San Diego, Cal.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 5330) to prohibit and punish the purchase and sale of indorsement or support for office by certain persons—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5331) to provide for the erection of a public building in the town of Sparta, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5332) to provide for the erection of a public building in the town of Thomson, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5333) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Sandersville, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 5334) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish the Department of Commerce and Labor," approved February 14, 1903—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 5335) providing for rank and pay for certain retired officers of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 5336) to refund the cotton tax to the States wherein collected—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5337) appropriating $50,000 to enlarge the public building at Jackson, Miss., so as to meet the necessities of the public business—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5338) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5339) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Yazoo City, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 5340) authorizing the purchase or acquirement of land adjoining the Fort Hamilton Reservation, New York City—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 5341) for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 5342) to authorize the purchase of a building for the United States legation to France—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5343) to authorize the purchase of a building for the United States legation to Great Britain—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 5344) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Stevens Point, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5345) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Manitowoc, in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5346) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the State of Wisconsin—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5347) to prevent the desecration of the American flag—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 5348) to empower the Secretary of War to authorize the construction or extension of wharves, piers, or other structures on lands underlying the harbor areas and streams in or surrounding Porto Rico and the islands adjacent thereto; and to extend to the island of Porto Rico the provisions of the acts of Congress relating to agricultural experiment stations, approved, respectively, July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 5349) to amend the laws of the United States relating to the registration of trade-marks—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 5350) to amend the laws regulating appeals and writs of error from the circuit court of appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 5351) to provide for the adjustment of certain sales of lands in the late reservation of the confederated Otoe and Missouria tribes of Indians in the States of Kansas and Nebraska—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 5352) to provide a site and erect a public building at Gadsden, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 5353) providing for the purchase of a site and the construction of a Government building in the town of Moscow, Idaho—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5354) providing for the purchase of a site and the construction of a Government building at the town of Pocatello, Idaho—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5355) providing for the purchase of a site and the construction of a Government building at the town of Lewiston, Idaho—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 5356) for the erection of a public building at Winchester, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5357) for the erection of a public building at Mount Sterling, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5358) to define who are and who are not fellow-servants of railroad and mining corporations, and defining the defense of said corporations on account thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 5359) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the compensation of inspectors of customs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 5360) to protect the rights of women citizens of the United States to register and vote for Members of the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5361) extending the provisions of the act allowing leaves of absence to homestead settlers—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5362) to provide for town sites in connection with projects under the reclamation act, and for the construction of municipal improvements, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5363) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Greenville, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5364) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon for a post-office in Denison, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 5365) for the establishment of a national park and forest reserve in the Appalachian Mountains, and to provide for the conservation of the water that flows down the Potomac watershed, and to provide laws for its sanitary policing, and so forth; to include all parts of the States of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia that contribute to form the complete watershed of the Potomac River from its head to and including the District of Columbia; and for the primary purposes of providing a sufficient and pure water supply for the District of Columbia; to prevent overflows and denudation of soil; for the establishment of reservoirs, canals, lakes, ponds, and ditches, and for all other useful purposes to which water can be put when provided in abundance—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5366) to pension bridge builders and railroad repairers who were in actual service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 5367) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Hagerstown, Md.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 5368) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sharon, Mercer County, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 5369) providing for the erection of a public building at Washington, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5370) to amend section 39 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States"—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 5371) to establish a subtreasury at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5372) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of churches, lodges, and so forth—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Dorothea Lynde Dix—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 40) declaring the policy of the Government of the United States in reference to the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution by providing that all of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment, except its first sentence, shall be repealed—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 42) proposing to amend the Constitution by repealing the fifteenth amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 43) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish condemned cannon for a life-size statue of General Henry Leavenworth, at Leavenworth, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A resolution (H. Res. 42) referring to the several House committees certain parts of the annual message of the President of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A resolution (H. Res. 43) providing for the printing of 1,000 copies of House Document No. 775, Fifty-eighth Congress—the Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A resolution (H. Res. 44) to pay Thomas W. Conway, brother of James R. Conway, deceased, late employee of the House folding room, a certain sum of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A resolution (H. Res. 45) to define the meaning of the word "days" when leave to print is given—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRENCH: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Idaho, concerning adulteration of articles, and urging speedy legislation to prohibit the same—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the State of Idaho, asking Congress to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 5373) granting an increase of pension to John L. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5374) granting an increase of pension to Albert Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5375) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Detamore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5376) granting an increase of pension to Jacob E. Israel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5377) for the relief of Siegfried Fritz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5378) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hendrickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5379) granting an increase of pension to James Fulkineer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5380) granting a pension to Lydia Ann Daugherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5381) granting an increase of pension to J. E. Merrifield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5382) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Shepherd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5383) for the relief of John W. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5384) granting an increase of pension to John M. Coffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5385) granting an increase of pension to Alexander McConneha—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5386) granting back-pension pay to Robert Nicholls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5387) granting a pension to Mary J. Fortney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5388) for the relief of Silas Garrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5389) for the relief of J. H. Willis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5390) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Clarksburg, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5391) for the relief of Oakley Randall—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5392) to refer claim of Anne Croghan and Ellen G. McCauley to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5393) for the relief of Charles L. Barnes—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5394) for the relief of E. H. Hoult—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5395) for the relief of the heirs of Lucinda Muse Thomas—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5396) for the relief of James C. Means—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Thornton F. Cartwright—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 5398) to increase the pension to Sarah E. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5399) to place on the pension roll the name of John H. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5400) granting an increase of pension to Orson N. Earl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5401) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Linsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5402) granting a pension to Carrie L. Poole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5403) granting an increase of pension to John Lines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5404) for the relief of John Kurtz—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5405) for the relief of Albert Edward Adam Engle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5406) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Moore, alias William Moorey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5407) to remove the charge of desertion against Sanford M. Murray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5408) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Frank Van Valkenberg, alias Charles Duane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5409) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Nicholas—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5410) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Carroll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5411) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James S. Fausey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5412) for the relief of Adelaide E. Grant and Alice Adelaide Grant—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 5413) granting a pension to Oscar L. Thrash—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5414) granting a pension to Charles W. Atkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5415) granting a pension to Travis Glasscoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5416) granting a pension to William Henry McMurtry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5417) granting an increase of pension to John J. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5418) granting a pension to Mary E. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5419) granting a pension to Ida V. Rhoad—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5420) granting an increase of pension to Charles Alfred De Arnaud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5421) for the relief of Benjamin Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5422) granting a pension to William Barrett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5423) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Overby Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5424) granting an increase of pension to John J. Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5425) granting an increase of pension to Nellie B. Newton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5426) for the relief of Martha J. England—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5427) to amend the records of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5428) for the relief of Ahijah Macy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5429) to restore Charles H. Campbell to the Army and transfer him to the retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5430) to amend the records of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5431) to amend records of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5432) for the relief of George W. Symmes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5433) for extra compensation to Capt. John Stewart—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 5434) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5435) for the relief of the Third Presbyterian Church, of New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5436) for the relief of the board of commissioners of Judah Touro Almshouse, Orleans Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5437) for the relief of the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines, deceased—to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5438) for the relief of the State National Bank of New Orleans, formerly Louisiana State Bank—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5439) for the relief of owners of rents in Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5440) for the relief of the estates of Francis A. Gonzales and Antonio Gonzales—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5441) for the relief of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5442) for the relief of Fredrick Fuhr—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5443) for the relief of A. Cusimano & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5444) for the relief of the legal representatives of B. M. Horrell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5445) for the relief of Hugh W. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5446) for the relief of John W. Tobin's heirs—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5447) for the relief of the Union National Bank, of New Orleans, as the successor of the Union Bank of Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5448) for the relief of John Rhodes and wife—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5449) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5450) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund certain moneys collected by the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5451) to authorize Charles E. Fenner, executor of George E. Payne, deceased, to prosecute his claim before the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 5452) granting an honorable discharge to Nathaniel Cobb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 5453) for the relief of Jacob A. Henry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 5454) for the relief of H. Grant Artis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5455) for the relief of George W. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5456) for the relief of Walter Langley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5457) for the relief of Frank W. Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5458) for the relief of A. T. Hayden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5459) for the relief of Thomas Drake—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5460) for the relief of Nancy Gates—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5461) for the relief of the estate of William Kelley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5462) for the relief of F. L. Hall—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5463) granting a pension to Sarah A. Harl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5464) granting a pension to Solomon Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5465) granting a pension to Caroline Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5466) granting a pension to William Varner Dykes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5467) granting a pension to Ann J. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5468) granting a pension to Francis C. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5469) granting a pension to Susan V. Childress—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5470) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Dennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5471) granting an increase of pension to John W. Balee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5472) granting an increase of pension to Wesley S. Witty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5473) granting an increase of pension to Curtis A. Brashear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5474) granting an increase of pension to Edmon H. Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5475) granting a pension to Isaac J. Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 5476) for the relief of S. C. Stewart, administrator of the estate of Dr. J. M. Curry, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5477) granting a pension to Edward Ousley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5478) granting a pension to Elizabeth Mullins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5479) granting a pension to Mary Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5480) granting a pension to Julia A. Patton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5481) granting a pension to Mary A. M. Pettyjohn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5482) granting a pension to Dorcas Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5483) granting a pension to Eliza J. Woody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5484) granting a pension to Elizabeth Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5485) granting a pension to Horace D. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5486) granting a pension to Maggie Carroll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5487) granting a pension to Arelia C. Pool—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5488) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Foster—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5489) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Baird—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5490) granting an increase of pension to Jobery Mullinax—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5491) to pension the widows of Mexican soldiers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5492) to pension the widows of Mexican soldiers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5493) granting accrued pension to Arelia C. Pool—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5494) to pay accrued pension to Maggie Carroll—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5495) for the relief of Mary A. Elliott—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5496) for the relief of Hiram A. Darnell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5497) for the relief of Cora A. Booth—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5498) for the relief of George W. Burrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5499) for the relief of Jasper N. Martin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5500) granting a pension to Hiram A. Darnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5501) for the relief of William T. Edwards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5502) for the relief of Thomas J. Benton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5503) for the relief of Andrew J. Sanders—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5504) for the relief of Jesse Elliott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5505) for the relief of Abram Patton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5506) for the relief of Milton Holt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5507) for the relief of John D. Lowry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5508) for the relief of Samuel Garner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5509) for the relief of Russell Savage—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5510) for the relief of James B. Fowler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 5511) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Bohn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5512) granting an increase of pension to John Allman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5513) granting an increase of pension to Charles Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5514) granting an increase of pension to Anna A. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5515) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Bloxham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5516) granting an increase of pension to Levi B. Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5517) granting an increase of pension to George W. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5518) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Eck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5519) to correct the military record of Walter Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5520) to correct the muster roll of Company G, Sixteenth Iowa Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5521) granting an honorable discharge to Smith N. Vosseller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5522) to correct the muster of Alvin F. Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5523) granting an increase of pension to Bunnel Hickham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 5524) granting a pension to Florance Whitaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5525) granting a pension to William E. Watson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5526) granting a pension to certain officers and men of the Fourth Regiment of Arkansas Mounted Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5527) granting a pension to John G. McClain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5528) granting a pension to James M. Herndon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5529) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. D. J. Booth, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5530) for the relief of heirs of Manning Harris—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5531) for the relief of Shadrack H. Wren—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5532) for the relief of heirs of A. J. Howard and J. H. Spivey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5533) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin F. Ball—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5534) for the relief of certain occupants and owners of land in Monroe County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5535) for the relief of William A. Haley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5536) for the relief of A. J. L. Stevens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5537) for the relief of James C. Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5538) for the relief of the estate of William McCreight, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 5539) for the relief of the State of Rhode Island—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 5540) granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Spicely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5541) granting a pension to John T. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5542) granting a pension to William A. Cowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5543) granting a pension to Felix Hendrickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 5544) granting an increase of pension to Wendle Poor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5545) granting an increase of pension to Marshal M. Angleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5546) granting an increase of pension to James Eastwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5547) granting an increase of pension to James Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5548) granting an increase of pension to John Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5549) granting an increase of pension to S. E. Lookingbill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5550) granting a pension to Nerva J. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5551) granting a pension to Amos E. Albritton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5552) granting a pension to R. J. Jamison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 5553) granting an increase of pension to Oliver L. Kendall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 5554) granting an increase of pension to James T. Saunderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5555) granting an increase of pension to Andrew P. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 5556) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel M. Davenport—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5557) granting an increase of pension to William Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5558) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5559) granting an increase of pension to George A. Currier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 5560) granting an increase of pension to Henry Chubb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5561) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5562) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5563) granting an increase of pension to Amos B. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5564) granting an increase of pension to Albert G. Cluck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5565) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus W. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5566) granting an increase of pension to William G. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5567) granting an increase of pension to Sanford Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5568) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. P. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5569) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5570) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5571) granting an increase of pension to William Cary—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5572) granting a pension to June Plankington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5573) granting a pension to Ashley R. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5574) granting a pension to Betty Elmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5575) granting a pension to Jane Cowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5576) granting a pension to Luke Morrissey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5577) granting a pension to Mrs. John S. Branner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5578) granting a pension to Sina Underwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5579) for the relief of Christ Schrey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5580) granting a pension to Perry Abbett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5581) to remove the limitation in the payment of arrears of pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5582) for the relief of Capt. M. R. W. Grebe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5583) for the relief of Miss Lou Jahn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5584) for the relief of John Brewer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5585) for the relief of Eric E. Walgren—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5586) for the relief of James Farrell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5587) for the relief of J. Ware Butterfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): A bill (H. R. 5588) granting a pension to Caroline Hultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5589) granting a pension to Rachel A. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5590) granting a pension to Elizabeth Clay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5591) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon M. Lucky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5592) granting an increase of pension to Newton W. Vawter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5593) granting an increase of pension to Hensley H. Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5594) granting an increase of pension to George R. Brumblay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5595) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5596) granting an increase of pension to Anna Nodler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5597) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5598) granting a medal to Mortimer S. Longwood—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 5599) for the relief of the estate of James H. Hardesty, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5600) for the relief of John Nay—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5601) for the relief of Thornton A. Merrifield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5602) granting a pension to Anna Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5603) granting a pension to Abner G. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5604) granting a pension to John Sutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5605) granting an increase of pension to James S. Pelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5606) granting an increase of pension to Frances P. McMurtrie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5607) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Biggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5608) granting an increase of pension to John E. Fries—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5609) granting an increase of pension to Albert Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5610) granting an increase of pension to Mary Petermann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5611) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Levi Burdine—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5612) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of the legal heirs of John Harper, deceased, to certain lands in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5613) authorizing additional compensation to the assistant commissioners to the industrial exhibition at Melbourne, Australia—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 5614) granting an increase of pension to Henry Coue—to the Comminttee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 5615) granting an increase of pension to John Coleman, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5616) granting an increase of pension to Edgar Schroeders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5617) granting a pension to Ellen Nelson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 5618) granting a pension to Eunice Putman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 5619) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith, alias Waldron De Clarenze—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5620) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Niefenegger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 5621) for the relief of George T. Pettengill, lieutenant, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5622) for the relief of M. D. Wright and Robert Neill—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5623) for the relief of E. De Atley & Co.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5624) granting a pension to Susan E. Potter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5625) granting an increase of pension to Hannah C. Reese—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5626) granting a pension to James W. Ralls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5627) granting an increase of pension to John C. L. Hargis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5628) granting a pension to Harrison S. Crites—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5629) granting a pension to William D. Pemberton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5630) granting an increase of pension to Edward L. Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5631) granting an increase of pension to Leonard F. Simmons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5632) granting an increase of pension to James C. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5633) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Burnet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5634) granting an increase of pension to John Redding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5635) granting a pension to Samuel J. Langdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5636) granting a pension to Julius S. Cuendet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5637) granting a pension to Russell A. McKinley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5638) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5639) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5640) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Mathews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5641) granting an increase of pension to James D. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5642) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bancroft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 5643) granting an increase of pension to Wells Briggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5644) granting an increase of pension to George J. Wilcox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 5645) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose Burton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5646) for the relief of Alexander Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A bill (H. R. 5647) granting an increase of pension to Peter Wetterich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5648) granting an increase of pension to William Hand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5649) granting a pension to Martha Kates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5650) granting a pension to Charles W. Noyes, alias Charles Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5651) for the relief of William H. Beall—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 5652) for the relief of the personal representatives of John McCabe and Patrick McCabe, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 5653) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5654) granting a pension to Moses Eggleston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5655) granting an increase of pension to Leonard F. Sommers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 5656) granting an increase of pension to Darius H. Randall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 5657) granting a pension to Emmet W. Crozier—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 5658) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5659) for the relief of Van Goolsberry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5660) for the relief of John Q. Armitage—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5661) granting a pension to U. L. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5662) granting an honorable discharge to Alva A. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 5663) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Prater—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 5664) granting an increase of pension to Julia Weeks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 5665) for the relief of W. O. Donovan and the heirs of Lizzie M. Donovan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5666) for the relief of L. L. Arrington and L. S. Arrington—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5667) for the relief of Warren B. Hutchinson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 5668) for the relief of C. A. Sprinkel—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5669) for the relief of the estate of Branon Thatcher, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5670) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Clevenger, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5671) for the relief of the estate of Robert Barr, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5672) for the relief of the estates of James and Eliza M. Lewis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5673) for the relief of William Mason—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5674) for the relief of Wesley Rankins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5675) for the relief of James W. Nickens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5676) for the relief of the trustees of Grace Episcopal Church, Berryville, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 5677) for the relief of estate of James G. Batterson, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5678) for the relief of the estate of Harriet A. Enders—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5679) for the relief of estate of Lucy J. Ford—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 5680) granting an increase of pension to Robert Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5681) for the relief of John Lewis Young—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 5682) for the relief of the estate of William H. Mason, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5683) for the relief of the estate of Daniel B. Hempsted, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5684) for the relief of the estate of Moses Pierce, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5685) authorizing the President to appoint Lieut. Commander Frederick Augustus Miller, retired, United States Navy, a commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 5686) granting an increase of pension to Adelle Tobey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5687) to correct the military record of Thomas Whittaker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5688) to correct the military record of W. H. Phillips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5689) to correct the military record of James Pace—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5690) granting an increase of pension to John F. Early—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5691) amending the records of the War Department in the case of John D. McGeehan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 5692) granting an increase of pension to H. G. Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5693) to correct the record of William Lindon, and granting him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5694) granting an increase of pension to Abraham J. M. Flinchum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5695) granting an increase of pension to William Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5696) granting an increase of pension to Peter Riffe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5697) granting an increase of pension to John J. McCoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5698) for the benefit of Elizabeth Bevins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5699) for the relief of Green Clay Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5700) extending provisions of act of June 27, 1890, to Kentucky State Militia and Provisional Kentucky Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5701) for the relief of the estate of Thomas O. Marrs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5702) for the relief of the estates of J. M. Fidler and T. O. Marrs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5703) for the relief of B. L. Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5704) granting a pension to John Hayslette—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5705) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Horn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 5706) for the relief of William C. Buttler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5707) granting an increase of pension to John P. Veach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5708) granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Fallon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5709) granting an increase of pension to Mary Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5710) granting an increase of pension to David Sharp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 5711) granting a pension to Richard H. Kelley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 5712) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Dehlendorf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5713) granting an increase of pension to Michiel Ryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5714) granting a pension to James Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5715) granting a pension to Moses Tinsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5716) granting a pension to Jacob Goetz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 5717) for the relief of the heirs of C. K. Bowen, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5718) for the relief of Ezer W. Edwards—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5719) for the relief of Piper, Aden, Goodall Company, of San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5720) to correct the military record of John Hauser, whose true name is Herman Hauser—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 5721) for the relief of the estate of William E. Ward, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5722) for the relief of the estate of Cornelius H. Evans, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 5723) for the relief of William C. Staples—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5724) granting an increase of pension to William O. Gillespie—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5725) granting an increase of pension to John G. Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5726) granting an increase of pension to Cate E. Cobb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5727) granting an increase of pension to William T. Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 5728) granting an increase of pension to William Harvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5729) granting an increase of pension to Norman H. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5730) granting an increase of pension to Tilghman Scholl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5731) granting an increase of pension to Tilghman J. Lester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5732) granting an increase of pension to Elias C. Kitchin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 5733) to correct the military record of Charles M. Mayberry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 5734) for the relief of Algernon L. Wilkinson, Kate E. Wilkinson, and Laura M. Powell, sole heirs of Laura E. Wilkinson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 5735) granting a pension to Eliza A. Camp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 5736) for the relief of the Importing and Exporting Company of the State of Georgia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5737) for the relief of the estate of Anton Borchert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5738) for the relief of the estate of John W. Anderson, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5739) for the relief of Alexander J. Thompson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5740) for the relief of the estate of Francis H. McLeod, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5741) for the relief of Mrs. S. A. Penniman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5742) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Bird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5743) for the relief of the heirs of James W. Bellah, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5744) for the relief of the estate of Mary A. Bell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5745) for the relief of Jacob Cohen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5746) for the relief of the heirs of Richard B. Sconyers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5747) for the relief of the estate of Sarah S. Maner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5748) for the relief of Virgil H. Burns—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5749) for the relief of the heirs at law of William C. Dickson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5750) for the relief of the heirs at law of Mary A. and John Cameron, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of the heirs of Caroline E. Long—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5752) for the relief of the heirs at law of Charles Evans, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5753) granting an increase of pension to Sally H. Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5754) granting a pension to James H. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5755) granting a pension to Thomas Burney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 5756) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel Muneret—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 5757) for the relief of the estate of John McNab, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5758) granting an increase of pension to Rufus D. Hastings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5759) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 5760) for the relief of Eliza J. Haines, widow of Capt. R. L. Haines, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5761) for the relief of Albert J. Stearns—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5762) for the relief of Albert J. Stearns—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5763) for the relief of Elizabeth R. Gordon—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5764) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alvin M. Ryerson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5765) for the relief of John H. Rollins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5766) for the relief of James H. De Coster—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5767) granting a pension to James L. Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5768) granting a pension to Rosetta J. Gould—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5769) granting a pension to Lois L. Nutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5770) granting a pension to Martin E. Simms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5771) granting a pension to Hannah Small Wiggin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5772) granting a pension to Jerome T. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5773) granting a pension to Mary J. Wheaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5774) granting a pension to Cornelia M. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5775) granting a pension to Joshua Daggett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5776) granting a pension to Priscilla A. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5777) granting a pension to Catherine M. Savory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5778) granting a pension to Charity Durgin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5779) granting a pension to Hannah W. Green—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5780) granting an increase of pension to John Gurney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5781) granting an increase of pension to John A. Greenlaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5782) granting an increase of pension to A. B. Washburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5783) granting an increase of pension to Edwin D. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5784) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Rich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5785) granting an increase of pension to George H. Gould—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5786) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Speed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5787) granting an increase of pension to Amos McAllister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5788) granting an increase of pension to Mercy Jennie Powers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5789) granting an increase of pension to David A. Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5790) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5791) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5792) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Bonney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5793) granting an increase of pension to Oliver J. Conant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5794) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Legrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5795) granting an increase of pension to John Atherton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5796) granting an increase of pension to W. H. H. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5797) granting an increase of pension to George F. Knowlton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5798) granting an increase of pension to Nellie P. Coyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5799) granting an increase of pension to Almena S. Willoughby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5800) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Maddocks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5801) granting an increase of pension to Algernon E. Castner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5802) granting an increase of pension to Elvira P. Gill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5803) granting an increase of pension to Edwin L. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5804) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Noyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5805) granting an increase of pension to H. M. Blackwell, alias Levi W. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5806) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Harding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5807) granting an increase of pension to T. A. Hodgdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5808) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon D. O. Lord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5809) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5810) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5811) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert D. Salsbury, alias Charles Willard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5812) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter O. Wellington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5813) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Wiley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5814) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles F. Allen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5815) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Augustin H. Finn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5816) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob Worrin Morgan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5817) to correct the military record of Rufus W. Herrick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5818) to correct the military record of David Hurlburt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5819) to correct the naval record of William Perkins—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5820) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Frank C. Whitney—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 5821) for the relief of N. C. Fears, administrator of the estate of W. S. Fears, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5822) granting a pension to Minor L. Braden—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 5823) for the relief of Henry Millingar and Charlotte Wilson, only heirs at law of James Millingar, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5824) granting an increase of pension to Richard P. Nichauls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5825) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Lake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 5826) for the relief of the estate of Edward R. Phillips, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5827) for the relief of the legal representatives of Robert I. Walton, jr., and Etta Walton, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5828) for the relief of the owners of the American schooner *Wilson and Hunting* and cargo—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 5829) granting an increase of pension to George Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MINOR: A bill (H. R. 5830) granting an increase of pension to Sylvenus Hardy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5831) granting an increase of pension to Julius Zuehlke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5832) granting a pension to Mary M. Connell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5833) granting an increase of pension to Francis Heasty, alias Francis Heastings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5834) granting an increase of pension to Ethan Allen Willey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5835) for the relief of Abraham Slover—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5836) for the relief of the estate of W. G. Hoge, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5837) for the relief of Rachael C. Stiefvater, of Chattanooga, Tenn., to reimburse for the use and destruction of property by United States Army in 1864—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5838) for the relief of the widow of the late Capt. Daniel C. Trewhitt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5839) to correct the military record of and grant a pension to Gideon M. Burriss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 5840) granting a pension to Catherine Spier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5841) granting a pension to Malinda M. Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5842) to correct the military record of Charles F. Deisch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 5843) granting a pension to Elizabeth Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5844) granting a pension to Maggie F. Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5845) granting a pension to Robert T. Knox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5846) granting an increase of pension to John M. Chandler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5847) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. P. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5848) granting an increase of pension to Erastus Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5849) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Baird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5850) granting an increase of pension to Lucas Hager—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5851) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius O'Shea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5852) granting an increase of pension to George Kauffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5853) granting an increase of pension to Quincy Corwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 5854) granting an increase of pension to Jonas Gurnee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5855) granting an increase of pension to Francis L. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5856) granting an increase of pension to Martin Offinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 5857) for the relief of Louisa McCall, executrix, and so forth, of Canton, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 5858) for the relief of John J. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5859) granting an increase of pension to Henry Shonert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5860) granting an increase of pension to John W. Riggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5861) granting an increase of pension to William P. Shelton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5862) granting an increase of pension to John G. McAllister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5863) for the relief of Sallie C. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5864) for the relief of the Bolivar Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5865) for the relief of the trustees of Harmony Methodist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5866) for the relief of Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Larkinsville, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5867) for the relief of the Masonic lodge of Tuscumbia, Colbert County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5868) for the relief of the trustees of Lebanon Methodist Episcopal Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5869) for the relief of the trustees of the Missionary Baptist Church, at Gravelly Springs, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5870) for the relief of Decatur Lodge, No. 52, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Decatur, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5871) for the relief of Dan Walden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5872) for the relief of the commissioners' court of Limestone County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5873) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of New Garden Camp Ground—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5874) for the relief of the heirs of Rebecca Haley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5875) for the relief of the heirs of George Orville Ragland, deceased, late of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5876) for the relief of Mattie P. Barnard, Katharine Caldwell, and Harry M. Rhett, heirs of Harriett M. Barnard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5877) for the relief of the trustees of Decatur (Ala.) Methodist Church South—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5878) for the relief of trustees of Presbyterian Church of Decatur, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5879) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Belew, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5880) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Foster—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5881) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Bellefonte, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5882) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, at Bellefonte, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5883) for the relief of the estate of Marius B. Cawthon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5884) for the relief of Joseph Lightfoot—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5885) for the relief of William B. Olive—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5886) for the relief of John C. Thomas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5887) for the relief of W. C. Tipton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5888) for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Trousdale—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5889) for the relief of Margret L. Watkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5890) for the relief of Nancy M. Weaver—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5891) for the relief of John Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5892) for the relief of the estate of John Wesson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5893) for the relief of William M. Underwood—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5894) for the relief of A. H. Laugham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5895) for the relief of the estate of Peter H. Gold, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5896) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Annie E. Montrose, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5897) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin B. Coffee, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5898) for the relief of Phillip D. Wright—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5899) for the relief of Griffin Callahan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5900) for the relief of B. G. Chandler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5901) for the relief of M. G. Jetton, J. P. Jetton, D. M. Jetton, B. H. Jetton, and M. G. Williams, heirs at law of Mitchell Jetton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5902) for the relief of James A. Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5903) for the relief of Ira G. Wood—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5904) for the relief of William C. Bragg—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5905) for the relief of Jackson Stone—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5906) for the relief of J. W. Smart—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5907) for the relief of the estate of Jesse Vann, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 5908) granting an increase of pension to William Hogg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5909) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bynon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5910) granting an increase of pension to Catharine R. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5911) granting a pension to Edward D. Lockwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5912) granting a pension to James Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5913) granting a pension to Helen Goll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5914) for the relief of Samuel P. Dresser—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 5915) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5916) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Routzong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5917) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Bollinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5918) granting an increase of pension to James F. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5919) granting an increase of pension to Soloman B. F. Fugate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5920) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5921) granting an increase of pension to Soloman Fry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5922) for the relief of Paschal Henshaw—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5923) for the relief of M. J. Conley, heir of Harmon Conley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5924) to remove the charge of desertion from Samuel J. Lair—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 5925) granting an increase of pension to D. L. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 5926) granting a pension to Sarah Pitman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5927) for the relief of the board of trustees of West Tennessee College, Jackson, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 5928) for the relief of T. H. B. Myers, surviving partner of John Myers & Son—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5929) for the relief of the estate of W. F. Sanderson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5930) for the relief of John L. Brown and

the estates of A. T. Redditt and William G. Judkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 5931) granting an increase pension to Robert L. Narrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5932) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5933) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. W. C. Pittinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5934) granting an increase of pension to John Ehde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5935) granting a pension to James A. Roark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 5936) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Neilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 5937) granting an increase of pension to John Fellows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5938) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. McClaskey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5939) granting an increase of pension to James Brody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHALL: A bill (H. R. 5940) for the relief of G. W. Browder—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5941) for the relief of the estate of John B. Ege, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5942) for the relief of the estate of Richard M. Harrison, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5943) for the relief of W. H. Harrison—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5944) for the relief of the estate of John J. Mitchell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5945) for the relief of the heirs of William Walton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5946) for the relief of Sallie R. Walton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5947) for the relief of the estate of Richard Wiseman, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5948) for the relief of the estate of David B. Tennant, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5949) for the relief of R. A. Young—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5950) for the relief of Pickrell & Brooks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5951) for the relief of Lettie Myers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5952) for the relief of J. A. Shackleton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 5953) granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Sprinkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5954) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue duplicate gold certificate, in lieu of one lost, to Lincoln National Bank, of Lincoln, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 5955) granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Overton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 5956) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Wagoner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5957) granting a pension to Henry J. Steck—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 5958) granting an increase of pension to Allen L. Garwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 5959) for the relief of the estate of Annie E. Gardiner, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5960) for the relief of the estate of the First National Bank, of Newton, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 5961) granting a pension to Rosa Lee Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5962) granting an increase of pension to George W. Bachus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5963) granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Boon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Postal Progress League of California, praying for legislation for the establishment of a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of George Whiting and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Reading Circle, No. 89, of Newcastle, Pa., for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of A. M. Reed, pastor of United Presbyterian Church of Conway, Pa., for law to suppress polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES: Paper to accompany bill to provide for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of A. J. Caufman—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, Philadelphia Commercial Exchange, Philadelphia Drug Exchange, Grocers and Importers' Exchange, Trades League, Philadelphia Bourse, Vessel Owners and Captains' Association, Board of Port Wardens, Manufacturers' Club, Board of Harbor Commissioners, Lumbermen's Exchange, and Mast Builders' Exchange, for legislation, under authority of the Secretary of War, to survey the Delaware River for purpose of determining feasibility and cost of securing a channel of adequate width and 30 feet deep at mean low water from Philadelphia to the sea—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Vesuvius Council, No. 116, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Twenty-third Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indians, for adequate laws for amelioration of condition of the Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Flint, Erving & Stoner, of Pittsburg, for two classes of mail matter only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Flint, Erving & Stoner, of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring railway control by Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Maine, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Maine, favoring law for a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Maine, against any change in Grout law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of William T. Sherman Council, No. 55, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CHANEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Felix Hendrickson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Vesuvius Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the State assembly of California, favoring establishment of a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FLACK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Eunice Putnam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George J. Wilcox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Lewis Kates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Business Men's Club of Cincinnati, Ohio, against repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Business Men's Club of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring Interstate Commerce Commission control of railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Peter Witterich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition for relief of Cooper Walker—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Paper to accompany bill for relief of H. J. Fulmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Twenty-third Lake Mohawk Conference of Friends of the Indian, for adequate laws governing the Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Allegheny River Boatman's Association, favoring appropriation for improvement of Allegheny River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of the heir of Harriet Haines, asking reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the heirs of John R. Almond, asking reference of war claims to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of the trustees of Grace Episcopal Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Adelle Tobey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of P. D. and P. of A., No. 547, of Freeport, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 547, ratifying petition to Congress by the Connecticut Valley Conference, at Springfield, Mass., November 12, 1905, for law to make unnecessary the use of wood alcohol—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of residents of Montclair, N. J., for removal of tariff duty on works of art—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE: Petitions of Charles A. Gerasch Council, No. 1004; Phil H. Sheridan Council, No. 287; Cedar Council, No. 416, and Fogelsville Council, No. 403, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and Washington Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, No. 592, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of M. D. Burket—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: Resolutions adopted by a mass meeting of the people of Rome, Ga., condemning the persecution of the Jews by Russia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Rufus D. Hastings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Benjamin F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petitions of Eureka (Ga.) Council, No. 7, and Griffin (Ga.) Council, No. 4, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Henry Mullingar and Charlotte Wilson to have their claim referred to the Court of Claims for a finding under the act of Congress of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary A. Barrod—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Gideon M. Burris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Francis Heasty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Paper to accompany bill for relief of August Westfield, Joseph B. Nichols, Herbert C. Miller, Asa Tout, Amanda C. Welch, Samuel P. Caree, and Charles W. Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of Harry White and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Petition of Daniel Boone Division, No. 489, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring control of railway rates by Interstate Commerce Commission and for legislation that will increase effectiveness of existing laws governing rebates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Postal Progress League, of California, for parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of Valley Grange, No. 52, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring amendment to the oleomargarine law by striking out the word "knowingly"—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Lestina M. Gifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of 100 citizens of Oil City, Pa., for law to prevent nullification of State liquor laws and no-license ordinances by "original packages" and other interstate-commerce tricks—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SNAPP: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Fellows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: Petition of the heirs of Sarah Laboyteau, of Pasquotank County, N. C., asking reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James F. Hare—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Vatchel Carman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert B. Beardsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas A. Banks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William F. Worley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John C. Keach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Eddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William T. Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles Martine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John H. Sprouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles H. Charles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of David B. Wacaset—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel Shropshire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of A. R. Matheny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Isaac Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Jeremiah E. Waldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph H. Wagoner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: Petitions of citizens of Rockhill, Bucks County, Pa.; Camp No. 669, of Keelersville, Bucks County, Pa., and Lewis J. Hunorld and 21 others, of Hatfield, Montgomery County, Pa., asking further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEBB: Petitions of Newton Council, No. 24, of Newton, N. C., and Eseola Council, No. 86, of Saginaw, N. C., Junior Order United American Mechanics, and the Central Labor Union of Charlotte, N. C., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of E. R. Philips—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 11, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

JAMES H. BERRY, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, and EDWARD W. CARMACK, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relative to the vessel ship *Chace*, Thomas Johnston, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relative to the vessel schooner *Farmer*, Nathan S. Thompson, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relative to the vessel schooner *Thetis*, Russell Kilbourn, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the Trustees of the Christ Reformed Congregation, of Middletown, Md., *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the as-

sistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Rosa M. Bowden, Zenobia Porter, Mary E. Bowden, and Martha Bowden Gustin, heirs of Lemuel J. Bowden, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of William H. Bucklin *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of William Lunenburger, administrator of Uriah Lunenburger, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FEES OF CLERKS OF COURTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, submitting certain proposed changes in the existing law relative to the appropriation for fees of clerks, United States courts; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

EXPENSES OF TRIAL OF INDIANS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting a draft of a bill to repeal section 11 of the Indian appropriation act of June 30, 1890, relative to the expenses incident to the trial of Indians committing certain offenses within the Territories or within a State; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FEES OF COMMISSIONERS OF COURTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, submitting certain proposed changes in the existing law relative to the appropriation for fees of commissioners, United States courts; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

PAY OF BAILIFF OF COURTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, submitting certain proposed changes in the existing law relative to the appropriation for pay of bailiffs, etc., United States courts; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting a draft of a bill to make sections 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 18 of the act of May 28, 1896, being the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, applicable to the office of the United States district attorney for the southern district of New York and his assistants, except as otherwise provided for in the act; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF INAUGURATION DAY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from Henry B. F. Macfarland, chairman of the national committee on the proposed change of inauguration day, transmitting a list of the governors of the States and citizens of the District of Columbia who have accepted service upon the committee, and calling attention to the necessity for the proposed change of inauguration day; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ANNUAL REPORT OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1905; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PURCHASE OF ARMY SUPPLIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Assistant Secretary of War recommending certain legislation providing that the purchase of supplies and the procurement of services for all branches of the Army service be made hereafter in open market in the manner common among business men when the aggregate of the amount required does not exceed $500, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EXPENDITURES OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Assistant Secretary of War relative to certain expenditures and appropriations of the War Department; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EFFICIENCY OF THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EFFICIENCY OF THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to increase the efficiency of the Ordnance Department; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, inclosing the draft of a bill to provide for final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, and recommending early and favorable action by Congress; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Select Committee on the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, and ordered to be printed.

KINGSTON HARBOR (MASSACHUSETTS) SURVEY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. On the last legislative day there was laid before the Senate a letter addressed to the Vice-President from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter of the Chief of Engineers, with a report relative to a preliminary examination of Kingston Harbor, Massachusetts, which should have been directed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It was misdirected by an inadvertence of the War Department. Without objection, the communication will be withdrawn and returned to the War Department.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriations for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to that city and county reservoir sites on the Tuolumne River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the Ohio Shippers' Association, of Columbus; of the Grain Dealers' National Association of Toledo, in the State of Ohio, and of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Barbers' Union Business Association of Savannah, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation establishing an examination board of barbers in each city in the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the American Medical Association, praying for the enactment of legislation enlarging the powers of the United States Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of the American Medical Association, praying for the enactment of legislation regulating the practice of medicine in the Territory of Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the establishment of freer trade relations between the United States and Canada; which were read, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolutions relative to the establishment of freer trade relations between the United States and Canada.

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts favors such action by the Congress of the United States as will cause the establishment of freer trade relations between the United States and the Dominion of Canada and between the United States and Newfoundland as soon as it is possible to secure such relations without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or American industries, and without sacrificing the American policy of protection to American industries, under which not only the manufacturing, but also the agricultural and mercantile interests of the Commonwealth have largely prospered. The test of

protective legislation, however, should not be "Is a duty demanded?" but "Is a duty needed?"

The general court approves the action recently taken unanimously by the members of the delegation from this Commonwealth in the Congress of the United States, favoring the readjustment of the tariff at the earliest possible time, and it relies with confidence upon them to do all that may properly be done to protect and advance all the interests of Massachusetts when the work of readjustment shall be undertaken by the National Congress.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *March 17, 1905.*

Adopted. Sent up for concurrence.

JAMES W. KIMBALL, *Clerk.*

SENATE, *March 22, 1905.*

Adopted in concurrence.

HENRY D. COOLIDGE, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

JAMES W. KIMBALL,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts, favoring the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution regulating the hours of labor; which were read, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Resolutions relative to an amendment of the National Constitution enabling Congress to enact laws regulating the hours of labor.

Resolved, That in the opinion of the general court of Massachusetts it is desirable that the Constitution of the United States should be so amended as to place it clearly within the power of Congress to enact laws regulating the hours of labor in the several States according to some uniform system; and the Senators and Representatives of this Commonwealth in Congress are hereby requested to use their influence to secure the adoption of a resolution proposing such an amendment to the Constitution.

Resolved, That properly attested copies of these resolutions be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *March 15, 1905.*

Adopted. Sent up for concurrence.

JAMES W. KIMBALL, *Clerk.*

SENATE, *March 15, 1905.*

Adopted in concurrence.

HENRY D. COOLIDGE, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

JAMES W. KIMBALL,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the removal of the duty on hides; which were read, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolutions relative to the removal of the duty on hides.

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts favors such action by the Congress of the United States as will cause the removal of the duty upon hides.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *March 16, 1905.*

Adopted. Sent up for concurrence.

JAMES W. KIMBALL, *Clerk.*

SENATE, *March 21, 1905.*

Adopted in concurrence.

HENRY D. COOLIDGE, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

JAMES W. KIMBALL,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the transfer of the Life-Saving Service to the Navy Department; which were read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Resolutions relative to the transfer of the Life-Saving Service to the Navy Department.

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts favors the transfer of the Life-Saving Service to the Navy Department and requests the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States to favor legislation for accomplishing this purpose.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

SENATE, *March 14, 1905.*

Adopted. Sent down for concurrence.

HENRY D. COOLIDGE, *Clerk.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *March 17, 1905.*

Adopted in concurrence.

JAMES W. KIMBALL, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

HENRY D. COOLIDGE, *Clerk of the Senate.*

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts, relative to rates of transportation on railroads; which were read, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Resolutions relative to rates of transportation on railroads.

Whereas experience has shown that the differential railroad rates charged by the trunk lines on freight from interior points in the United States to the Atlantic seaboard, which were originally intended to equalize through rates by competing railroad and steamship lines from western points to foreign ports, now permit of the establishment and maintenance of lower through rates by way of the ports of Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Newport News than by the port of Boston, thus diverting from Boston a large amount of export freight, which, under equal conditions as regards railroad rates, would otherwise come over New England lines, and causing thereby serious injury to the commerce of this Commonwealth: Therefore,

Resolved, That the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts favors the abrogation of those differential railroad freight rates which discriminate against our principal port as a point of export, and cordially approves the action taken before the Interstate Commerce Commission and elsewhere by citizens of this Commonwealth to secure an equitable adjustment of railroad rates, to the end that Boston may be able to secure its fair share of export traffic.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives from this Commonwealth in the Congress of the United States.

SENATE, *March 14, 1905.*

Adopted. Sent down for concurrence.

HENRY D. COOLIDGE, *Clerk.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *March 21, 1905.*

Adopted in concurrence.

JAMES W. KIMBALL, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest.

HENRY D. COOLIDGE, *Clerk of the Senate.*

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of Aroostook Lodge, No. 393, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Aroostook, Me., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Harriet B. Coolidge and 3 other citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the destruction of the old frigate *Constitution;* which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SMOOT presented a petition of the legislature of Utah, praying for the passage of the so-called "good-roads bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Whereas Hon. W. P. BROWNLOW, Congressman from Tennessee, has introduced into Congress a resolution providing for an appropriation by the Federal Government of $24,000,000 to be distributed among the States of the Union according to their population for Federal cooperation in road building, on condition that the States, counties, and towns raise an equal proportion to that which they receive from the Federal Government; and

Whereas should said bill become a law, the State of Utah will receive its proportionate benefit from the Federal Government; and

Whereas the several counties of this State are desiring State aid and are asking for State appropriation to assist them in the improvement and construction of their roads; and

Whereas there is great need for improving the highways of this State: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the governor, senate, and house of representatives of the State of Utah, believing in the principle of national, State, county, and town cooperation in the construction of main highways, not only for the benefit of the agriculturists, but for the benefit of the consumers of agricultural products; and also believing in the great proposition that the expenditure of public moneys for the purpose of improving and increasing the internal facilities, wealth, and commerce of the nation is of equal importance to the spending of money on the rivers and harbors; we therefore heartily indorse the provisions of the Brownlow bill and desire its passage.

And further be it resolved, That we ask our Senators and Congressman to use all honorable efforts in passing this bill in order to secure to the State of Utah the benefits of national aid in road construction.

And be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the honorable President of the Senate, the honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives, the honorable chairman of the Agricultural Committee, and to each of the honorable Senators and Congressman from this State.

THOMAS HULL, *Speaker of the House.*
S. H. LOVE, *President of the Senate.*
JOHN C. CUTLER, *Governor.*

Attest:
[SEAL.]

C. S. TINGEY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF UTAH,
Office of the Secretary of State, ss:

I, Charles S. Tingey, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 6, passed by the sixth legislature of the State of Utah, as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 1st day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of Local Council No. 66, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Amagansett, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of Local Division No. 99, Brotherhood of Railroad Freight and Baggage Men, of Mechanicsville, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to diminish the power of railroads to make their own rates and control their earnings; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of Winona Council, No. 1, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Woonsocket, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Minnesota, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the

State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. HOPKINS presented a petition of the board of trustees of the sanitary district of Chicago, Ill., praying that an appropriation be made to make navigable the waterway from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Florsheim & Co., of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to place raw hides and sole leather on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented a petition of Local Council No. 41, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Newport Center, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of St. Albans Division, No. 24, Order of Railway Conductors, of St. Albans; of Otter Creek Division, No. 347, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Rutland; of Local Division No. 25, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, of Woodsville, and of Bellows Falls Division, No. 106, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Bellows Falls, all in the State of Vermont, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a petition of the Dakota annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Dakota, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah, and praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a memorial of the Dakota annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 684, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented the petition of A. Sutherland, of Mound City, S. Dak., and the petition of W. W. De La, of Houghton, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of certain legislation recommended by the American Reciprocal Tariff League; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Horace Fishback, of Brookings, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation relative to rates on certain classes of mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. STONE presented a petition of Garnett Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ewing, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a commission to revise the present tariff laws; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FORAKER presented petitions of Randolph Grange, No. 119, of Atwater; Carriage Makers' Club of Cincinnati; South Side Business and Improvement Association, of Columbus; Manufacturers' Club of Cincinnati; Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland; Board of Trade of Portsmouth; Builders' Exchange of Youngstown; Board of Trade of Massillon; Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association of Toledo; Metal Trades Association of Cincinnati; Furniture Exchange of Cincinnati; Receivers and Shippers' Association of Dayton; Riverside Grange, No. 1552, of Zanesville; Retail Grocers' Association of Germantown; Northern Trumbull County Farmers' Institute, of Cortland; Huntsburg Grange, No. 1588, of Huntsburg; Valley Farmers' Club, of Marietta; Tuscarawas County Pomona Grange, of New Philadelphia; Stark County Pomona Grange, of Beach City; Greenspring Farmers' Institute, of Greenspring; National League Commission Merchants, of Cincinnati; United Commercial Travelers of America, of Cincinnati; Retail Merchants' Board of Trade of Steubenville; Champaign County Farmers' Institute, of Mechanicsburg; Ohio Shippers' Association, of Columbus, and sundry citizens of Hagerman, Montpelier, Nova, Lexington, Ostrander, Coshocton, West Lafayette, Avondale, Fredericktown, Mount Vernon, Coolville, Bartlett, North Washington, Kenton, Hicksville, Edgerton, Beidler, Tuscarawas, Canal Dover, Navarre, and Cincinnati, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Union Council, No. 176, of Bokes Creek; Donnels Creek Council, No. 121, of North Hampton; Ohio Valley Council, No. 21, of Bellaire; Old Glory Council, No. 234, of Cincinnati; Lockland Council, No. 115, of Lockland; High Cliff Council, No. 183, of Antiquity; Butler Council, No. 93, of Hamilton; Cumminsville Council, No. 75, of Cincinnati; Shelby Council, No. 64, of Shelby; Hillsboro Council, No. 44, of Hillsboro; Norwood Council, No. 226, of Norwood; General Stark Council, No. 25, of Alliance; St. Paris Council, No. 224, of St. Paris; Ludlow Falls Council, No. 175, of Ludlow; Lost Creek Council, No. 52, of Conover; New Moorefield Council, No. 107, of New Moorefield; G. W. Hirst Council, No. 132, of New Weston; West Liberty Council, No. 138, of West Liberty; Advance Council, No. 71, of Centerville; William McKinley Council, No. 218, of Canton; Oken Council, No. 228, of Moscow; Portsmouth Council, No. 38, of Portsmouth; Rockwood Council, No. 105, of Rockwood; Youngstown Council, No. 51, of Youngstown; Bushnell Council, No. 163, of Springfield; Fidelity Council, No. 215, of Fidelity; Flag of Our Union Council, No. 160, of Ravenna; Yellowtown Council, No. 145, of Yellowtown; Montgomery Council, No. 62, of Montgomery; Future Great Council, No. 290, of Toledo; Bigelow Council, No. 342, of Richwood; Sandy Valley Council, No. 109, of Sandyville; Liberty Council, No. 70, of Osnaburg; Phœnix Council, No. 85, of Cincinnati; Seneca Council, No. 58, of Fostoria; Wilmington Council, No. 34, of Wilmington; Bright Star Council, No. 97, of Yellow Springs; Honor Council, No. 24, of Dayton; Favorite Council, No. 200, of Piqua; Syracuse Council, No. 233, of Syracuse; Troy Council, No. 191, of Troy; Anona Council, No. 165, of Hamersville; Tecumseh Council, No. 182, of Enon; United Council, No. 66, of Mutual; General Meade Council, No. 213, of Gettysburg; Crown Council, No. 35, of Dayton; Fremont City Council, No. 111, of Fremont City; Catawba Council, No. 167, of Catawba; Newtown Council, No. 230, of Newtown; Valley Council, No. 140, of McConnelsville; Martins Ferry Council, No. 39, of Martins Ferry; Byesville Council, No. 73, of Byesville; Xenia Council, No. 67, of Xenia; New Era Council, No. 229, of Cincinnati; Crescent Council, No. 219, of Cincinnati; Pride of the Northwest Council, No. 32, of Findlay; Attica Council, No. 317, of Attica; American Union Council, No. 104, of Russell; John A. Logan Council, No. 119, of Nelsonville; Chester Council, No. 127, of Westchester; Painesville Council, No. 216, of Painesville; Star City Council, No. 277, of Miamisburg; K. of P. Climax Council, No. 337, of Franklin; General William H. Lawton Council, No. 147, of Greenville; Macksburg Council, No. 247, of Macksburg; West Salem Council, No. 168, of West Salem; Harvey Rice Council, No. 211, of Cleveland; Warwick Council, No. 117, of Tuscarawas; Riverdale Council, No. 30, of Dayton; Falls Council, No. 221, of East Monroe; Storms Creek Council, No. 108, of Terre Haute; Southern Ohio Council, No. 299, of Cincinnati; Beacon Lights Council, No. 57, of Cincinnati; Magnetic Council, No. 231, of Bellbrook; Piqua Council, No. 80, of Piqua; Western Star Council, No. 340, of Sidney; Queen City Council, No. 130, of Cincinnati; Colerain Council, No. 26, of Groesbeck; Samuel J. Randall Council, No. 96, of Youngstown; Tri-County Council, No. 47, of Loveland; Paul Revere Council, No. 101, of Canal Dover; Chambersburg Council, No. 142, of Bladen; Kyger Council, No. 154, of Kyger; Barnesville Council, No. 190, of Barnesville; Pride of the East Council, No. 8, of East Liverpool; Glass Council, No. 59, of Glass; Amity Council, No. 87, of South Lebanon; Woodward Council, No. 49, of Cincinnati; Pleasant Ridge Council, No. 212, of Pleasant Ridge; Wayne Township Council, No. 227, of Good Hope; Young America Council, No. 136, of Tiffin; Miami Council, No. 7, of Dayton; Losantville Council, No. 141, of Cincinnati; Guiding Star Council, No. 133, of St. Bernard; Harmony Council, No. 50, of Cincinnati; Southern Star Council, No. 174, of Mount Carmel; Plain View Council, No. 330, of Dayton; Alpha Council, No. 326, of Middletown; Addison Council, No. 207, of Christiansburg; Nathan Hale Council, No. 172, of North Lawrence; Buckeye Council, No. 23, of Senecaville; Daniel Webster Council, No. 161, of Barberton; Summit Council, No. 222, of Lewisville; Vienna Royal Council, No. 15, of Vienna Cross Roads; Columbia Council, No. 54, of Doanville; Price Hill Council, No. 210, of Cincinnati; Springfield Council, No. 240, of Springfield; Bethel Council, No. 187, of Donnelsville; Andover Council, No. 208, of Andover; Gallipolis Council, No. 269, of Gallipolis; Washington Council, No. 12, of Canton; Rawson Council, No. 46, of Rawson; John Adams Council, No. 158, of Manchester; Imperial Council, No. 88, of South Solon; Benton Ridge Council, No. 321, of Benton Ridge; St. Clair Council, No. 6, of Eaton; Cedarville Council, No. 37, of Cedarville; New Straitsville Council, No. 223, of New Straitsville; Capital City Council, No. 196, of Columbus; Juniata Council, No. 279, of Tuppers Plains; Muskingum Council, No. 40, of Marietta; Good Will Council, No. 178, of Gnadenhutten; Steubenville Council, No. 144, of Steubenville; James A. Garfield Council, No. 118, of Canton; Independence Council, No. 124, of Dayton; West Manchester Council, No. 128, of West Manchester; O. W. Holmes Council, No. 41, of Canton; Ensign Bagley Council, No. 123, of Massillon; Wil-

liamsburg Council, No. 114, of Williamsburg; Cleves Council, No. 27, of Cleves; Custer Council, No. 29, of Columbus; Charleston Council, No. 135, of South Charleston; Mayflower Council, No. 81, of Jeffersonville; Lawrence Council, No. 193, of Ironton; Rising Star Council, No. 131, of Pitchin; Sedalia Council, No. 192, of Sedalia; Nevada Council, No. 95, of Nevada; Leo Council, No. 3, of Swiftsville; Arcanum Council, No. 149, of Arcanum; Woodstock Council, No. 201, of Woodstock; Walnut Hills Council, No. 125, of Cincinnati; General Marion Council, No. 162, of Marlboro; Bethlehem Council, No. 79, of Cincinnati; Madison Council, No. 17, of Madisonville; Fairmount Council, No. 155, of Cincinnati; Red, White, and Blue Council, No. 177, of Palestine; Starry Flag Council, No. 151, of Verona; McClellan Council, No. 126, of New London; Lime City Council, No. 206, of Marion; Friendship Council, No. 186, of Cincinnati; Lebanon Council, No. 19, of Lebanon; Walter Copsey Council, No. 89, of Spring Valley; Star Spangled Banner Council, No. 170, of New Richmond; Leesville Council, No. 319, of Leesville Cross Roads; Hiawatha Council, No. 102, of Bethel; Sunshine Council, No. 344, of Osborn; Mad River Council, No. 56, of Urbana; Valley Council, No. 140, of McConnelsville; Excelsior Council, No. 83, of Home City; Copus Council, No. 60, of Ashland; Star Council, No. 106, of Galion; J. W. Whitman Council, No. 122, of Hollansburg; Eagle Council, No. 4, of Shawnee; Tri-County Council, No. 47, of Loveland; Magnetic Council, No. 231, of Bellbrook; Tippecanoe Council, No. 313, of Inland; Gallipolis Council, No. 269, of Gallipolis; St. Clair Council, No. 6, of Eaton; Cumminsville Council, No. 75, of Cincinnati; Bethel Council, No. 187, of Donnelsville; Reliable Council, No. 181, of Mogadore; G. W. Hirst Council, No. 132, of New Weston; Crown Council, No. 35, of Dayton; Pleasant Hill Council, No. 86, of Pleasant Hill; Anona Council, No. 165, of Hamersville; Bushnell Council, No. 163, of Springfield; Harmony Council, No. 50, of Cincinnati; Washington Council, No. 12, of Canton; Montgomery Council, No. 62, of Montgomery; Norwalk Council, No. 189, of Norwalk; Miami Council, No. 7, of Dayton; Cozaddale Council, No. 78, of Cozaddale; Macksburg Council, No. 277, of Macksburg; Brighton Council, No. 324, of Cincinnati; Star Spangled Banner Council, No. 170, of New Richmond; Rushsylvania Council, No. 236, of Rushsylvania; Muskingum Council, No. 40, of Marietta; Stars and Stripes Council, No. 159, of Phillipsburg; Rockwood Council, No. 105, of Rockwood; Arcanum Council, No. 149, of Arcanum; Beacon Light Council, No. 57, of Cincinnati; James A. Garfield Council, No. 118, of Canton, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and Kilndrawers' Local Union No. 17, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, of East Liverpool; Camp Washington Council, No. 34; Hampton Council, No. 77; Lone Star Council, No. 197, and Fulton Council, No. 328, of Cincinnati; Progress Council, No. 202, of Cleveland; Scipio Council, No. 332, of Republic; Seneca Chief Council, No. 292, of Melmore; Jamestown Council, No. 31, of Jamestown; Purity Council, No. 98, of Mansfield; De Graff Council, No. 139, of De Graff; Hannibal Council, No. 28, of Hannibal; Curtis Council, No. 45, of Little Hocking; Hand in Hand Council, No. 36, of Clarington; Miami Valley Council, No. 103, of Waynesville; Enterprise Council, No. 331, of Bridgeport; Cheshire Council, No. 164, of Cheshire; Toronto Council, No. 10, of Toronto; Kennonsburg Council, No. 72, of Kennonsburg; General Putnam Council, No. 20, of Dennison; Empire Council, No. 68, of Fletcher; Mad River Council, No. 56, of Urbana; Commodore Perry Council, No. 209, of Akron; Stars and Stripes Council, No. 159, of Phillipsburg; Highland Council, No. 204, of New Petersburg; Excelsior Council, No. 83, of Home City; Grand Council, No. 335, of Bellefontaine; Laurie Council, No. 185, of Ruby; Brookville Council, No. 325, of Brookville; Philo Council, No. 112, of Philo; Montrose Council, No. 156, of Dalton; Patrick Henry Council, No. 84, of Canton; Freedom Council, No. 63, of Mansfield; Helping Hand Council, No. 61, of Springfield; Middlebranch Council, No. 262, of Middlebranch; Lewisburg Council, No. 22, of Lewisburg; Blanchester Council, No. 134, of Blanchester; Champion Council, No. 2, of Springfield; Paintersville Council, No. 94, of Paintersville; General McPherson Council, No. 110, of Canal Fulton; Girard Council, No. 150, of Girard; Newport Council, No. 255, of Newport; Reliable Council, No. 181, of Mogadore; Lakeside Council, No. 120, of Perry; Lincoln Council, No. 16, of Massillon; Norwalk Council, No. 189, of Norwalk; Copus Council, No. 60, of Ashland; Addyston Council, No. 91, of Addyston; Look Out Council, No. 48, of East Greenville; Old Clermont Council, No. 137, of Batavia; Golden Rod Council, No. 149, of Tippecanoe City; Tippecanoe Council, No. 313, of Inland; Thomas Jefferson Council, No. 100, of North Industry, and James G. Blaine Council, No. 33, of Springfield, Junior Order United American Mechanics, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the rigid enforcement of immigration regulations and the enactment of such additional laws as will afford protection against the depressing industrial effect of the unrestricted admission of foreigners to the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of Lorain Division, No. 296, of Lorain; Galion Division, No. 16, of Galion; Put in Bay Division, No. 208, of Springfield; William Bramley Division, No. 522, of Chicago Junction; Devereux Division, No. 167, of Cleveland; Cleveland Division, No. 31, of Cleveland; Forest City Division, No. 318, of Cleveland; Gem City Division, No. 358, of Dayton; Wellsville Division, No. 170, of Wellsville; Watson Division, No. 360, of Massillon, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; Lake Shore Lodge, No. 183, of Collinwood; Lodge No. 9, of Columbus; Western Reserve Lodge, No. 243, of Ashtabula; Safety Lodge, No. 142, of Toledo, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen; Bellevue Division, No. 134, of Bellevue; Point Pleasant Division, No. 233, of Middleport; Cleveland Division, No. 14, of Cleveland; Toledo Division, No. 26, of Toledo; Licking Division, No. 166, of Newark, Order of Railway Conductors; Cincinnatus Lodge, No. 148, of Cincinnati; Maple City Lodge, No. 470, of Painesville; Kanawha Star Lodge, No. 398, of Middleport; James Harvey Lodge, No. 21, of Youngstown; Lucas Lodge, No. 613, of Toledo; Franklin Lodge, No. 628, of Columbus; Columbus Lodge, No. 175, of Columbus; Dennison Lodge, No. 421, of Dennison; J. M. Ferris Lodge, No. 132, of Cleveland; W. A. Rang Lodge, No. 425, of Chicago Junction; Buckeye Lodge, No. 35, of Galion; and Lake Front Lodge, No. 260, of Cleveland, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Delta Subdivision, No. 480, of Cincinnati; Conneaut Subdivision, No. 273, of Conneaut; Devereux Subdivision, No. 167, of Cleveland; William Bramley Subdivision, No. 522, of Chicago Junction; Newark Subdivision, No. 36, of Newark; Van Wert Subdivision, No. 384, of Van Wert; Cleveland Subdivision, No. 31, of Cleveland; Galion Subdivision, No. 16, of Galion; Centennial Subdivision, No. 457, of Air Line Junction; Scioto Valley Subdivision, No. 72, of Columbus; Crestline Subdivision, No. 306, of Crestline; Chillicothe Subdivision, No. 65, of Chillicothe; Ethel Barker Subdivision, No. 651, of Columbus; and Put in Bay Subdivision, No. 208, of Springfield, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the employment of locomotive engineers who have not had an experience of one year as such or of three years as locomotive fireman; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New Philadelphia, Hillsboro, Salineville, Fremont, Conneaut, Eagleville, Norwalk, Georgetown, Mechanicsburg, Bethesda, Barnesville, and Gallipolis, all in the State of Ohio, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. LONG presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 556) granting an increase of pension to William H. Egolf; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 555) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Hill; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 558) granting an increase of pension to Abijah Chamberlain; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 557) granting an increase of pension to Mariot Losure; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 563) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Martin; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 564) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Hyatt; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 565) granting an increase of pension to Lumbard D. Aldrich; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 566) granting an increase of pension to George Wiley; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of Local Division No. 80, Brotherhood of Railroad Freight and Baggage Men, of Nashua, N. H., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Lutheran Church of Upton, Pa., praying for an

investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CLARK of Montana presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of Hamilton, Mont., praying for the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KNOX presented petitions of Sherwood Council, No. 160, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; Stroh Council, No. 731, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Weissport; Paul Revere Council, No. 441, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pricedale; Annville Council, No. 954, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Annville; Spring Garden Council, No. 18, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia; Wicomisco Council, No. 57, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Lykens; Star of American Council, No. 305, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Rices Landing; Colonial Council, No. 605, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of York; Steelton Council, No. 162, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Steelton; Chas. A. Gerasch Council, No. 1004, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Kutztown; John R. Marlin Council, No. 20, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia; Cedar Council, No. 416, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wescosville; General Cameron Council, No. 851, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Mount Joy; Vanderbelt Council, No. 104, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Vanderbelt; Dale Council, No. 642, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Johnstown; Major Jenning Council, No. 367, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Shenandoah; Bainbridge Council, No. 128, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; Star of the West Council, No. 465, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Allegheny; Victory Council, No. 443, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Marion; Morning Star Council, No. 29, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Fayette City; Banner Council, No. 310, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cokeville; Andrew G. Curtin Council, No. 67, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of McKees Rocks; Cherry Council, No. 243, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cherryville; Friendship Council, No. 201, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Washington; Smoky City Council, No. 119, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; Rock Council, No. 54, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Glen Rock; Milroy Council, No. 635, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Milroy; Moss Rose Council, No. 292, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Seven Valleys; Henry Seybert Council, No. 520, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Abington; Hilldale Council, No. 235, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Allegheny; Meridian Sun Council, No. 542, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Tidal; Paintersville Council, No. 211, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New Stanton; Patriotic Council, No. 822, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Scranton; Welcome Council, No. 134, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; Springtown Council, No. 929, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Springtown; Hoboken Council, No. 384, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Hoboken; Phil H. Sheridan Council, No. 287, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Allentown; Wm. J. Byars Council, No. 282, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wilkesbarre; Rescue Council, No. 15, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philadelphia; Vesuvius Council, No. 116, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Sharpsburg; Decatur Council, No. 613, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Tarentum; Susquehanna Council, No. 89, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wrightsville; Akron Council, No. 906, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Akron; McKeesport Council, No. 109, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of McKeesport; John Grey Council, No. 249, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; Wanamie Council, No. 549, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wanamie; General McClellan Council, No. 150, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Verona; Lancaster Council, No. 912, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Lancaster; Iron City Council, No. 171, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; Pride of Mountain City Council, No. 472, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Altoona; Col. T. D. Lewis Council, No. 1015, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Scranton; Penns Park Council, No. 973, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Penns Park; Coal Valley Council, No. 98, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Coal Valley; Orient Council, No. 72, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Johnstown; Crystal Council, No. 300, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Jeanette; Bolivar Council, No. 570, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bolivar; Pipersville Council, No. 620, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pipersville; Youghlougheny Council, No. 255, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Suterville; Justice Council, No. 307, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Glen Lyon; Watsontown Council, No. 514, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Watsontown; Carpenters' Union No. 406, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Bethlehem; Local Union No. 321, Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Connellsville; Blue Mountain Lodge, No. 694, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Marysville; Central Trades and Labor Council, of Dubois; Local No. 206, Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Newcastle; Lodge No. 153, Order of Railway Conductors, of Mauchchunk; York Typographical Union, of York; Pottsville Division, Order of Railway Conductors, of Pottsville; all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NIXON presented a memorial of the legislature of Nevada, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation admitting Arizona and New Mexico into the Union as one State; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial relative to the protest by the Territory of Arizona and her people against the measure pending in Congress seeking to make one State of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico.

Whereas the house of representatives of the twenty-third legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, the council concurring, has by resolution appealed to the sense of justness and fairness of this honorable legislature, urging of us that our Senators and Representative in Congress be requested to give a just and careful consideration to the protests and objections advanced by the citizens of Arizona against the passage of the measure now pending before the Senate of the United States designed and seeking to make one State of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico; and

Whereas the sympathy of this honorable body is with the Territory of Arizona, and it is its wish that the said Territory may be granted independent statehood: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the State of Nevada (the assembly concurring), That our Senators and Representative in Congress be notified that this is our desire.

And resolved, That the governor be, and he hereby is, requested to transmit an engrossed copy of this resolution to each of them and also to his excellency the governor of the Territory of Arizona.

LEM ALLEN,
President of the Senate.
C. H. MCINTOSH,
Secretary of the Senate.
SAMUEL PLATT,
Speaker of the Assembly.
H. E. FREUDENTHAL,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Approved March 4, 1905.

JOHN SPARKS, *Governor.*

STATE OF NEVADA,
Department of State, ss:

I, W. G. Douglass, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original senate joint concurrent resolution No. 11, now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of State, at my office, in Carson City, Nev., this 17th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.]

W. G. DOUGLASS, *Secretary of State.*
By J. W. LEGATE, *Deputy.*

Mr. NIXON presented a petition of the legislature of Nevada, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the unrestricted admission of Japanese into the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly joint memorial and resolution to Congress relative to the unrestricted admission of Japanese into the United States.

Your memoralist, the legislature of the State of Nevada, in session assembled, most respectfully, and with grave concern, represents to the Congress of the United States the manifest evil of the unrestricted admission of Japanese into this country; that from their habits, customs, and traditions as a race of people the truth is apparent they can not assimilate with the white race; that from their cunning, industry, and commercial enterprise their greater foothold upon American soil renders their presence more alarming and threatening to the foundation of institutions founded and brought to a high state of perfection by the white people; that as laborers in competition with the white race their mode of life, congregating in large numbers in rude hovels and subsisting on cheap foods largely imported from their mother country, they enter our fields of labor at wages forcing the American toiler into idleness and poverty, which in turn not infrequently results in riots and bloodshed; that from our geographical position the Pacific coast States are first to receive this invasion, first to suffer from their presence, and naturally first to ask the parent Government for relief against the admission of these undesirable people, whose customs and superstitions are deadening to every principle of American citizenship: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That our United States Senators be instructed and our Congressman requested to use all honorable means in Congress and before the proper Departments of the General Government to prevent the unrestricted admission of Japanese into the United States.

Resolved further, That the governor be requested to transmit a certified copy of this joint memorial and resolution to the President of the

United States, to each of our United States Senators, and to our Member of Congress.

LEM ALLEN,
President of the Senate.
C. H. MCINTOSH,
Secretary of the Senate.
SAMUEL PLATT,
Speaker of the Assembly.
H. E. FREUDENTHAL,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Approved March 17, 1905.

JOHN SPARKS, *Governor.*

STATE OF NEVADA,
Department of State, ss:

I, W. G. Douglass, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and correct copy of the original assembly joint memorial and resolution to Congress relative to the unrestricted admission of Japanese into the United States, now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of State, at my office, in Carson City, Nev., this 25th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] W. G. DOUGLASS, *Secretary of State.*
By J. W. LEGATE, *Deputy.*

Mr. NIXON presented a petition of the legislature of Nevada, praying for the enactment of legislation to encourage rifle practice and marksmanship; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution and memorial to Congress relative to encouraging rifle practice and excellence in marksmanship among citizens of the United States.

Whereas the Congress of the United States has under consideration bills appropriating $1,000,000 annually, as proposed by the national board for the promotion of rifle practice, such proposed appropriation being intended for use in encouraging rifle practice and excellence in marksmanship among the citizens of the United States, so as to render them quickly available as efficient soldiers in time of war; and

Whereas our permanent military establishment must, in the nature of circumstances, be small, and in the event of war with one or more of the first-class powers of the world we must depend almost entirely upon our citizen volunteers to provide our fighting force; and

Whereas the European powers, being fully aware that a nation of riflemen is invincible, are making strenuous and continued effort to encourage rifle practice and promote good marksmanship with the weapons of war among their people, every inducement being offered to the boys and youth to practice, while the United States, admittedly the most progressive of the large nations of the earth, has done nothing in this direction, although a far greater proportion of its soldiery than that of any other country must be drawn from civil life in case of war; and

Whereas the action of the Congress of the United States in proposing national appropriations annually for the promotion of rifle practice and excellence in marksmanship may be properly considered as the most important and far-reaching measure in the interests of the national defense and national training proposed in the history of this country: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the State of Nevada (the assembly concurring), That the Representatives in Congress from the State of Nevada be, and they hereby are, requested to use their most active and earnest efforts to secure the enactment of proposed legislation looking toward national appropriations for the purpose of encouraging rifle practice and excellence in marksmanship.

And be it further resolved, That his excellency the governor be, and he is hereby, requested to forward an engrossed copy of this resolution to each of our Senators and to our Representative in Congress.

LEM ALLEN,
President of the Senate.
C. H. MCINTOSH,
Secretary of the Senate.
SAMUEL PLATT,
Speaker of the Assembly.
H. E. FREUDENTHAL,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Approved March 7, 1905.

JOHN SPARKS, *Governor.*

STATE OF NEVADA,
Department of State, ss:

I, W. G. Douglass, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original senate joint resolution and memorial No. 10, now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of state, at my office, in Carson City, Nev., this 9th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] W. G. DOUGLASS, *Secretary of State.*
By J. W. LEGATE, *Deputy.*

Mr. NIXON presented a petition of the legislature of Nevada, praying for the enactment of legislation restricting persons who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States from enjoying the same rights as citizens of the United States with respect to the land and mining laws; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint and concurrent resolution relative to the naturalization of citizens.

Whereas under the land and mining laws of the United States it is provided that all persons who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States of America shall have the same rights as those who are already citizens; and

Whereas a large number of persons declare their intention to become citizens of the United States of America, under the laws provided therefor, for the purpose of enjoying the benefits of the land, mining, and other laws, yet never become citizens, and while enjoying the benefits of citizenship are required to bear none of the burdens thereof: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the State of Nevada (the assembly concurring), That we are heartily in favor of such legislation as will require persons declaring their intention of becoming citizens under the laws of the United States of America to become such within a reasonable period after they are eligible or forfeit all benefits or privileges acquired under our laws.

And resolved, That a copy of this resolution shall be sent to each of our Senators and to our Representative in Congress.

LEM ALLEN,
President of the Senate.
C. H. MCINTOSH,
Secretary of the Senate.
SAMUEL PLATT,
Speaker of the Assembly.
H. E. FREUDENTHAL,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Approved March 16, 1905.

JOHN SPARKS, *Governor.*

STATE OF NEVADA,
Department of State, ss:

I, W. G. Douglass, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original senate joint and concurrent resolution relative to the naturalization of citizens, now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of state, at my office, in Carson City, Nev., this 25th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] W. G. DOUGLASS, *Secretary of State.*
By J. W. LEGATE, *Deputy.*

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Orange, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Elizabeth, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a corps of commercial agents to promote and extend the American trade abroad; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of Pequot Council, No. 24, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Berlin, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of Preston City Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Norwich, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of the present oleomargarine law; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of the Teachers' Club of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to set aside and protect the Colorado cliff dwellings in that State as a national park; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the Colorado Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, praying for the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend realroad-rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Colorado Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of cattle on railroad cars; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Real Estate Exchange of Denver, Colo., praying that an appropriation be made for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a post-office building in that city; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Grand Junction, Colo., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Weston, Colo., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of southern Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation to construct reservoirs for irrigation purposes in the Rio Grande Valley in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 107, American Federation of Labor, of Colorado Springs, Col., and a petition of Local Council No. 12, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Duquesne, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BURKETT presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 885) granting an increase of pension to John Timmerman; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Boise, Idaho, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

CARE OF INSANE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. GALLINGER. At the third session of the Fifty-eighth Congress a resolution was adopted by the Senate instructing the Committee on the District of Columbia "to make careful investigation during the recess of Congress as to the environment and condition of the soldiers and sailors now inmates of the Government Hospital for the Insane, with a view to the adoption of a plan to segregate them from the other inmates of that institution, report to be made to the Senate at the beginning of the next session."

The Committee on the District of Columbia have given this matter some consideration, having sent the resolution to the superintendent of the Government Hospital for the Insane for his opinion and report. That official has sent to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia a communication covering the points of the resolution.

The Committee on the District of Columbia desire to be excused from the further consideration of the matter, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? If not, the Committee on the District of Columbia is excused from the further consideration of the matter, and the subject is referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 1159) granting a pension to Louis T. Frech; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 1160) to correct the military record of John McKinnon, alias John Mack; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1161) for the relief of the estates of Aaron Van Camp and Virginius P. Chapin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1162) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Cook; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1163) granting an increase of pension to Martha G. Cushing; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 1164) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Bedell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1165) granting an increase of pension to James Moss; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1166) to correct the military record of Peleg T. Griffith; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1167) for the relief of Addison C. Fletcher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1168) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service," approved April 12, 1902; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1169) for the refund of certain tonnage duties; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1170) repealing an act entitled "An act to extend the time for presenting claims for additional bounties," and its amendments and extensions, so far as they limit the time for presenting claims for additional bounties granted to soldiers by the twelfth and thirteenth sections of the act of July 28, 1866; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1171) granting an increase of pension to Walter S. Sylvester;

A bill (S. 1172) granting an increase of pension to Asaph H. Witham (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1173) granting an increase of pension to James M. Fernald (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1174) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Morgan;

A bill (S. 1175) granting an increase of pension to John A. Wilcox (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1176) granting a pension to Sarah E. Presson Flagg.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1177) to regulate the retirement of certain veterans of the civil war; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1178) providing for the resurvey of a township of land in Colorado; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1179) for the relief of Benjamin P. Loyall; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1180) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to try, adjudicate, and determine certain claims for compensation for carrying the mails and pay for the discontinuance of postal service;

A bill (S. 1181) to provide for the payment of overtime claims of letter carriers excluded from judgment as barred by limitation;

A bill (S. 1182) for the relief of the estate of Mary N. Cox, deceased;

A bill (by request) (S. 1183) for the relief of J. A. Shackleton;

A bill (S. 1184) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company;

A bill (S. 1185) for the relief of Letitia Tyler Semple;

A bill (S. 1186) for the relief of James Downs;

A bill (S. 1187) for the relief of the heirs at law of Capt. John Lewis;

A bill (S. 1188) for the relief of the Richmond Locomotive Works, successor of the Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1189) for the relief of Bolivar Sheild;

A bill (S. 1190) for the relief of the trustees of Massaponax Baptist Church, Massaponax, Va.;

A bill (S. 1191) for the relief of R. H. Hayden and Emma Hayden, executrix of the estate of Logan F. Hayden, deceased;

A bill (S. 1192) for the relief of Grace Episcopal Church, Berryville, Va. (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1193) for the relief of William H. Howard and Oliver D. Lewis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1194) for the relief of Joseph T. Chance and the heirs of John R. Burton, deceased;

A bill (S. 1195) for the relief of Thomas Johnson, or his legal representatives;

A bill (S. 1196) for the relief of the heirs of Lemmus J. Spence, deceased;

A bill (S. 1197) for the relief of William J. Lewis;

A bill (S. 1198) for the relief of David R. Mister; and

A bill (S. 1199) for the relief of John Henry Edwards.

Mr. MARTIN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1200) granting a pension to Esther G. Wharton; and

A bill (S. 1201) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Preston (with accompanying paper).

Mr. KNOX introduced a bill (S. 1202) granting a pension to Mary T. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1203) granting a pension to Albert B. Lawrence; which was reaed twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1204) to award a medal of honor to Maj. John O. Skinner, surgeon, United States Army, retired; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McENERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1205) for the relief of the heirs of Victor Faisans;

A bill (S. 1206) for the relief of T. Alonzo Walker and Augusta C. Todd; and

A bill (S. 1207) for the relief of the estate of Amy L. Mahoudeau, deceased.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1208) to relieve Charles F. Held of the charge of dishonorable dismissal;

A bill (S. 1209) for the relief of B. J. D. Irwin;

A bill (S. 1210) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph W. Johnson; and

A bill (S. 1211) to correct the military record of John Alspaugh.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1212) granting an increase of pension to John S. Wilcox;

A bill (S. 1213) granting an increase of pension to Llewellyn M. Hartley; and

A bill (S. 1214) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Oleson.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 1215) to correct the military record of William Fleming; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1216) to reimburse John Waller, late postmaster at Monticello, N. Y., for money expended in carrying the mails; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FOSTER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1217) for the relief of the estate of Henry Ware, deceased;

A bill (S. 1218) for the relief of Louise Powers McKee, administratrix;

A bill (S. 1219) for the relief of the board of commissioners of Judah Touro Almshouse, of New Orleans;

A bill (S. 1220) for the relief of the estate of Frederick Arbour, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1221) for the relief of J. de L. Lafitte.

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1222) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Vincent;

A bill (S. 1223) granting a pension to Mary E. Bronaugh; and

A bill (S. 1224) granting an increase of pension to William A. Bowles (with accompanying papers).

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 1225) for the relief of William K. Denny; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1226) to provide for free trade between the Philippine Islands and the United States of America; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. BURROWS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1227) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Patterson;

A bill (S. 1228) granting an increase of pension to Julia L. Plimpton (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1229) granting a pension to Amanda Howell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1230) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Gaskill (with accompanying papers).

Mr. SUTHERLAND introduced a bill (S. 1231) to reimburse the Becker Brewing and Malting Company, of Ogden, Utah, for loss resulting from robbery of the United States mails; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 1232) to amend section 918 of the Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1233) to amend clause 4, subdivision A, of section 3 of the act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, as amended February 5, 1903; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1234) to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederate army and navy who died in northern prisons and were buried near the prisons where they died, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1235) for the relief of W. C. Harrell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1236) to authorize payment to the Henry Philipps Seed and Implement Company for seed furnished to and accepted by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1902; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1237) granting a pension to Louisa Amen;

A bill (S. 1238) granting an increase of pension to John Christoff;

A bill (S. 1239) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. McGarvey;

A bill (S. 1240) granting an increase of pension to Dana W. Hartshorn (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1241) granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. Dowell (with accompanying papers).

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 1242) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1243) providing for compulsory education in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1244) to amend section 605 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to corporations (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1245) to amend sections 2, 10, and 12 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1895.

Mr. SMOOT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1246) granting an increase of pension to William F. Wilson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1247) granting an increase of pension to John R. Conynghan;

A bill (S. 1248) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Bean (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1249) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Keith;

A bill (S. 1250) granting an increase of pension to John W. Halley; and

A bill (S. 1251) granting an increase of pension to Peter Burns (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. SMOOT introduced a bill (S. 1252) to annex a portion of Arizona Territory to the State of Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1253) granting an increase of pension to Peter King;

A bill (S. 1254) granting an increase of pension to Orlando H. Langley;

A bill (S. 1255) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Marshall;

A bill (S. 1256) granting an increase of pension to Lewis D. Moore;

A bill (S. 1257) granting an increase of pension to Patrick O'Day;

A bill (S. 1258) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Paige;

A bill (S. 1259) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Peabody;

A bill (S. 1260) granting an increase of pension to Frank Pugsley;

A bill (S. 1261) granting an increase of pension to Edwin P. Richardson;

A bill (S. 1262) granting an increase of pension to John Roby;

A bill (S. 1263) granting an increase of pension to George G. Sargent; and

A bill (S. 1264) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Shiney.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 1265) to erect a memorial tablet to Ensign John R. Monaghan, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1266) for the relief of John M. Hill; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1267) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to construct a bridge across the Spokane River, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1268) granting an increase of pension to William Lownsberry;

A bill (S. 1269) granting an increase of pension to Charles Edwin Smith;

A bill (S. 1270) granting an increase of pension to John C. Barr; and

A bill (S. 1271) granting an increase of pension to Edward Irwin.

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 1272) for the relief of the State of Rhode Island; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CLARK of Montana introduced a bill (S. 1273) granting an increase of pension to Eleanora A. Keeler; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 1274) authorizing a public building at Washington, N. C.;

A bill (S. 1275) authorizing a public building at Kinston, N. C.;

A bill (S. 1276) authorizing a public building at Henderson, N. C.; and

A bill (S. 1277) authorizing a public building at Fayetteville, N. C.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1278) for the relief of William Richards;

A bill (S. 1279) for the relief of T. R. Davenport;

A bill (S. 1280) for the relief of Susan C. Schroeder, daughter and heir of Susan Allen, deceased;

A bill (S. 1281) for the relief of John G. Young;

A bill (S. 1282) for the relief of the Cape Fear and People's Steamboat Company;

A bill (S. 1283) for the relief of Thomas S. Lutterloh;

A bill (S. 1284) for the relief of the heirs of D. W. Morton;

A bill (S. 1285) for the relief of D. S. Barrus and others;

A bill (S. 1286) for the relief of William Foy and H. B. Lane, executors of Mrs. H. B. Lane, of North Carolina;

A bill (S. 1287) for the relief of W. B. Whitfield;

A bill (S. 1288) for the relief of John Burke Morris;

A bill (S. 1289) for the relief of the heirs and distributees of H. W. Hargrove; and

A bill (S. 1290) for the relief of the estate of William C. Lewis.

Mr. McLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 1291) for the relief of James W. Watson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1292) for the relief of the heirs of John Linton, deceased;

A bill (S. 1293) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Gardner, deceased;

A bill (S. 1294) for the relief of Emily Donnelly, widow of James M. Donnelly, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1295) for the relief of the heirs of Gladney, Gardner & Co.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 1296) for the relief of the estate of James Makoy, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 1297) for the relief of D. J. Holmes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SPOONER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1298) granting an increase of pension to Francis W. Usher;

A bill (S. 1299) granting an increase of pension to Ludwig Schultz (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1300) granting an increase of pension to Ceylon C. Lincoln (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1301) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kohl (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1302) granting an increase of pension to William A. Murray (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1303) granting a pension to Harrison Brott (with accompanying papers).

Mr. OVERMAN introduced a bill (S. 1304) for the construction of a driveway and approaches to the national cemetery at Salisbury, N. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1305) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Salisbury, in the State of North Carolina; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1306) for the relief of the estate of D. L. Pritchard, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1307) for the relief of Frank A. White; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1308) granting an increase of pension to Emilie Wood Reich; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1309) granting a pension to Mary R. Ragsdale; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 1310) granting an increase of pension to C. S. M. Hooton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1311) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Barboursville, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 1312) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Charleston, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 1313) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Boothsville, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 1314) for the relief of the trustees of Zion Protestant Episcopal Church, of Charles Town, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 1315) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bunker Hill, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 1316) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Springfield, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 1317) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Petersburg, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 1318) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Flatwoods, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 1319) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Ridenour, deceased;

A bill (S. 1320) for the relief of Jessie W. Graham, sole heir of Jesse Graham, deceased;

A bill (S. 1321) for the relief of the estate of James Watson, deceased;

A bill (S. 1322) for the relief of John Whittington;

A bill (S. 1323) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas G. Flagg, deceased;

A bill (S. 1324) for the relief of George W. Board;

A bill (S. 1325) for the relief of Harmon Snyder;

A bill (S. 1326) for the relief of the heirs of Charles A. Dinkle, heirs of John F. Dinkle, and J. Daniel Dinkle;

A bill (S. 1327) for the relief of Christine M. Core, Ella Core Tabler, and Jane F. Martin, sole heirs of Andrew S. Core, deceased;

A bill (S. 1328) for the relief of Thomas McCallister;

A bill (S. 1329) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Custer, deceased;

A bill (S. 1330) for the relief of Joseph Duncan;

A bill (S. 1331) for the relief of the estate of Henry Gannon, deceased;

A bill (S. 1332) for the relief of the estate of James H. Hardesty, deceased;

A bill (S. 1333) for the relief of the estate of Oliver Milburn, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1334) for the relief of the estate of Levi Moler, deceased.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 1335) to extend the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, to the members of the company of Indian scouts under command of Brig. Gen. Alfred Sully in 1864 and 1865; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (S. 1336) providing for the allotment and distribution of the tribal funds of the Yankton tribe of Sioux Indians in the State of South Dakota; and

A bill (S. 1337) providing for the allotment and distribution of the tribal funds of the Sisseton and Wahpeton tribe of Sioux Indians in the State of South Dakota.

Mr. FRAZIER introduced a bill (S. 1338) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Claiborne; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1339) for the relief of the estate

of Dr. Thomas J. Coward, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURKETT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1340) granting an increase of pension to John Leavitt;

A bill (S. 1341) granting an increase of pension to Fred Preisinger; and

A bill (S. 1342) granting an increase of pension to Morton M. Noah (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 1343) for the relief of Well C. McCool; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1344) for the relief of John M. Burks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LODGE. I introduced a bill last week providing for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States. Owing to an error of the copyist, one of the sections of the bill was repeated, making two sections where there should have been only one—repeating the same section. Therefore I will reintroduce the bill corrected, that I may have a correct print. The old print should be withdrawn. I ask unanimous consent, also, that there may be 400 additional copies printed for the use of the State Department.

The bill (S. 1345) to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts requests that 400 additional copies of the bill just introduced be printed for the use of the State Department. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1346) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to fix the compensation of inspectors of customs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1347) granting a pension to Martha W. Pollard;

A bill (S. 1348) granting an increase of pension to James W. Bliss, alias James Warren (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1349) granting an increase of pension to Daniel C. Earle (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1350) granting an increase of pension to Michael Cullen (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1351) granting an increase of pension to Dexter E. W. Stone (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1352) granting an increase of pension to Michael Scannell (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1353) granting a pension to Ellen Harriman (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1354) granting a pension to Lydia Jones (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1355) granting a pension to Michael J. Meehan;

A bill (S. 1356) granting a pension to Catherine M. Brown (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1357) granting an increase of pension to Orlando C. Pinkham (with accompanying papers).

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 1358) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of additional lighthouse districts," approved July 26, 1886; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1359) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Boss; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON (for Mr. CLAPP) introduced a bill (S. 1360) for the relief of William Leech; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (for Mr. CLAPP) introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1361) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. J. Kent; and

A bill (S. 1362) granting an increase of pension to William O'Brian.

Mr. KEAN introduced a bill (S. 1363) granting an increase of pension to Barzillas P. Irons; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1364) for the relief of John T. Spence or his legal representatives; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 1365) providing for the placing of an elevator in the public building at Boise, Idaho; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. STONE introduced a bill (S. 1366) for the relief of Abigail Stover; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1367) granting an increase of pension to Almon Foster;

A bill (S. 1368) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hicks; and

A bill (S. 1369) granting a pension to Abraham Smith.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 1370) for the relief of William H. Hugo, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 1371) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel E. Bratton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 1372) for the relief of Edmonia Brooke Taliaferro; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1373) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from Washington to the Arlington estate property; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SMOOT introduced a bill (S. 1374) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

Mr. HEMENWAY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1375) granting an increase of pension to Reuben A. Miles;

A bill (S. 1376) granting a pension to Adam Werner; and

A bill (S. 1377) granting an increase of pension to John R. Brown.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 1379) for the relief of the heirs of the estate of Melissa Cathright, deceased, of Colbert County, Ala.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. KEAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 8) authorizing the President to reappoint Henry L. Harris, jr., as first lieutenant in the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which I ask to have read at length, as it is a very short one, in order that I may make an explanation.

The bill (S. 1378) to amend the act to regulate commerce was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act to regulate commerce approved February 4, 1887, be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows: At the end of the first section add the following:

"Whenever the Interstate Commerce Commission, created by this act, shall, upon complaint and hearing, decide that any charge made for such service is unjust and unreasonable, it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, to fix a maximum reasonable rate for such service, and to make an order specifying the time, which shall be within thirty days after the date of such order, when such rate shall take effect; and thereafter such rate shall be the only lawful rate which the carrier may collect until changed by further order of the Commission."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to explain the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEYBURN. Will the Senator from South Carolina allow me to introduce a bill?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

[The bill introduced by Mr. HEYBURN appears under its appropriate heading.]

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. FORAKER. I wish simply to inquire what is the business before the Senate to which the Senator from South Carolina desires to address himself?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina introduced a bill and asked unanimous consent of the Senate, after it was read, that he might explain it. The Senate gave the consent and the Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. FORAKER. I have no objection to the Senator explaining the bill, of course, but I should be gratified if the bill could be read again. I should be glad to hear it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I should be glad to have it again read.

The Secretary again read the bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the bill does not really need any explanation, for it is in the fewest possible words and in the plainest terms that I could study up to accomplish a result which seems to be much sought after by millions of people in this country and a great many of us.

There are perhaps a dozen bills of one kind and another relating to this subject pending in the two branches of Congress. We have three distinct propositions before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, and there are more than that, or twice as many as that, at the other end of the Capitol.

This subject was brought to the attention of the country last winter in a very clear and distinct way by the passage in the other House of the Esch-Townsend bill, which came over here and died. We have had hearings during the summer before the Interstate Commerce Committee relating to this subject, which will be submitted to the Senate in due time in printed form, some five or six volumes nearly as large as the Revised Statutes.

It seems to me that there is no need of so much time being given to the granting of relief to the people if it is really the purpose of Congress to do so. We were considering in committee the Interstate Commerce Commission bill, as it is called, a bill prepared by the Interstate Commerce Commission and sent to us for consideration or examination. I do not know that it has been introduced as yet in this body, but still we have had it under advisement and it has been printed, and I will say that it embraces some forty or fifty or seventy-five pages—I do not know how many, but it is a great big pamphlet—but there are so many ideas embraced in it, all looking to and varying this one idea into such an avalanche of words, that I have thought it worth while, at the suggestion of some of my brethren on that committee of both parties, to try to get at the kernel of the proposition—the concrete proposition, the simple, straightforward, unadulterated idea that the commerce of the country is suffering from railway oppression or discrimination, and that there is now no adequate tribunal or method by which relief can be granted; and dreading the result of too many words, the effect which the courts would certainly bring about, if we should launch a bill like that coming from the Interstate Commerce Commission, in litigation for the next ten years; knowing that every single, solitary sentence, section, and word in the law to regulate commerce has been made the subject of judicial scrutiny, and has had its meaning, purpose, and scope passed upon and set down, I thought it advisable and wise and best, from my point of view, to go at the plain proposition whether or not it is the will of Congress to grant to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to regulate rates upon complaint, which the Supreme Court has declared it does not possess.

That is the whole subject, to my mind, that we ought to first consider. Of course there are other grievances and abuses in relation to transportation, railway rates, and all that kind of thing which I know need amendment and straightening out. We have several propositions looking to dealing with differentials, terminal charges, private railway cars, and all that, I know, and I will be ready to cooperate in reaching some legislation that will do away with those abuses. But the one idea that I want to press home and endeavor to get action upon is the simple proposition to grant to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to fix rates after it has discovered by its investigation that the existing rate is unfair, unjust, and contrary to law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to ask the Senator if I correctly understand his proposition as embraced in the bill to mean that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be given the power to fix rates and that there shall be no appeal to the courts permitted; that it shall be absolute.

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, no; the Supreme Court has declared—and the Senator is familiar with the decision—that under the Constitution Congress has no such power, and it is not worth while for us to say in a bill that we are going to give that power, because the court would pay no attention to it and would declare such a bill unconstitutional. That is one of the how-not-to-do-it ways that I want to keep away from.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I understand the bill to read, it is that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have the right to absolutely fix the rate, which shall be the recognized rate until the Commission itself sees fit to change it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the Senator's proposition?

Mr. TILLMAN. That is the Senator's proposition.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is going further than I think has heretofore been suggested from any quarter, is it not?

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will pardon me, he is just merely playing with words.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not at all.

Mr. TILLMAN. Because I could have added those words, that the railway should have the right to go into the courts to seek redress; but you can not take away, if you should try to do so, a right guaranteed to them in the Constitution itself.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, that answers my question, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. This important matter, Mr. President, as I said, is pressing for solution or for settlement. I do not know, of course, what the temper of the Senate or of Congress is, and I can not tell what the Senate will do with it, but I feel very earnestly that something ought to be done, and done at once, knowing that if this bill is made the law the next week after it has become a law the machinery will begin to move to grant this redress. I would almost be willing, if it was not contrary to the rules—but the emergency is not so great as that—to ask for a suspension of the rules and let us take up the bill. Of course that would be, in the light of the rules, an absurdity, for my friend from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] promised me, without reading this, that any bill that was not any longer than I had said in committee mine would be, he would be almost ready to vote for without seeing it; and so I will anticipate that he will, of course, fall in behind this idea; but if I am mistaken, that is all right.

All I want to do is to emphasize my position, and, as I believe, the Democratic position, that the country wants redress of this grievance; it wants relief from the oppression which business is now suffering under; and, to my mind, this simple, concrete proposition, that the courts have practically already decided, will grant that relief. After a while, if there should be additional legislation that is needed, that will come along in due time, and I shall be ready to cooperate with anyone in seeking to get it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill, having been read twice by its title, will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FORAKER. If I may be allowed to do so, I should like to say a word or two in answer to what has just been said by the Senator from South Corolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. President, the bill that has just been introduced by the Senator from South Carolina, and to which he has briefly spoken, is, in my judgment, the best rate-making bill that has been introduced in Congress since this subject came up for consideration and since we have been studying the subject. It is the best, Mr. President, because manifestly it would do the least harm.

The Senator confines himself to an authorization of the Interstate Commerce Commission to make maximum rates in one particular kind of case, namely, where excessive or extortionate rates have been complained of and there has been a hearing. It does not propose to go beyond that. There is no provision in the bill for minimum rates; there is no provision in it about differentials; there is nothing in it that interferes with, or can interfere with, the continuous successful operation of the provisions of the Elkins law, under which rebates and discriminations are now prohibited and under which a remedy against them is provided.

Mr. President, in saying what I have, I minimize the necessity for any legislation of this character. The bill is aimed solely at excessive rates. We have been told by authority the Senator will not question—for the authority is no other than the President of the United States himself—that there is but little complaint of excessive or extortionate rates—at least but little that has come to his knowledge—so little that he does not apprehend that the conferring of the rate-making power upon the Interstate Commerce Commission or some other governmental tribunal would result in the lowering of rates to such an extent as that the wages of the railway employees would be put in any jeopardy whatever.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes.

Mr. CARMACK. The Senator from Ohio has used the words "excessive rates." I understand the language of the bill introduced by the Senator from South Carolina is "unjust and unreasonable rates."

Mr. TILLMAN. The bill speaks for itself, and will prove whether I occupy the attitude the Senator from Ohio seeks to attribute to me.

Mr. FORAKER. The language of the bill is, following the language employed in the act which the Senator is proposing to amend, "unjust and unreasonable rates," and the fixing of a maximum reasonable rate; in other words, by all construction, this would be regarded as being aimed at rates that are higher than they should be.

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes.

Mr. FORAKER. Now, you may call them "unreasonable," you may call them "excessive," or you may call them what you see fit to call them; we all understand exactly what is meant.

Mr. CARMACK. The point I was making, if the Senator will permit me, is that the bill does not mean that the rate itself must of necessity be absolutely extortionate, but if the rate is relatively higher than it ought to be, then it would be unreasonable.

Mr. FORAKER. I call attention to the fact that this bill would not deal with a rate that was only relatively higher. I will come to that in a moment, if it is necessary to protract this discussion.

I want now, only briefly, to justify myself in a statement I made a moment ago, that this is the best proposition that has yet been brought to the Congress, if the Government is to go into the rate-making business to any extent whatever, because it would be the least harmful.

Now, Mr. President, what is it that there is complaint about? The Senator from South Carolina spoke about this as a measure calculated to relieve the people from the oppression of which they are now complaining all over the country. Is there any complaint about excessive rates or rates that are in and of themselves unreasonable and unjust because too high? The uniform testimony is that there is nothing of that kind of any serious moment to complain of. There are undoubtedly some excessive rates, undoubtedly some rates which in and of themselves are higher than they should be; but the opinion of all who have testified before the Senate committee on that subject, and the opinion of all who have expressed themselves on that subject, including the most distinguished advocates of the proposition that the Government shall go into the rate-making business, is that rates are on the average in and of themselves just and reasonable and low enough; that there is no such complaint of rates that they are too high as to justify one in saying that the people are being oppressed in that way.

What is it that the people now complain of? They complain of rebates and of discriminations. So far as rebates are concerned, we legislated on that subject three years ago now almost—in February, 1903—when we passed the so-called Elkins law. In that measure we provided a remedy against rebates. Up to that time the giving of rebates was justly regarded as the worst abuse practiced by the railroads of this country upon the shippers of this country. I had the honor to be a member of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce then, as I have now. I had something to do with the putting of that act in the form in which it was finally passed and in which it became a law. We undertook then to deal with rebates and with discriminations. What is the result? According to the testimony of every man who has spoken on this subject before our committee—every man on both sides of this controversy, I think without exception, since that law was enacted and put into force—rebates have practically been discontinued; and, if not discontinued, all unite in saying that the statute thus put upon the statute books by the Congress of the United States is all the legislation that it is necessary to enact in order to provide a legislative remedy full, ample, and complete against that kind of abuse.

Mr. Bacon, who is chairman of the Shippers' Association, who came here as the head and front of this movement—a most estimable man, a worthy, truthful man, for whom I have the highest personal regard because of the good character and good temper he has displayed under all circumstances—testified before the committee—and it has been quoted over and over again in the discussions since he made the statement—that the Elkins law in the provision to which I have called attention makes ample provision against rebates. The testimony is that they have been practically discontinued since the enactment of that statute; and, if not, that the law is all that they have a right to expect of Congress in order that they may be discontinued by enforcing the law.

In that law, Mr. President, we have provided a remedy. The Senator from South Carolina recognizes that, and that is one of the good features of his bill. The Senator proceeds upon the idea that the law already upon the statute book—he evidently proceeds upon that idea—is ample, as he knows it to be, and as all know it to be who have investigated the subject, to prevent the practice of giving rebates. Hence he does not deal with that evil. The mere conferring of power upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to make rates manifestly does not afford any remedy against rebates, for rebates may be granted by the railroads as against rates made by the Commission as well as against rates made by themselves.

Neither is there any remedy that the Senator would adopt in the suggestion that was made in the President's message on this subject, that where one of a number of competing roads grants secret rebates and the Commission learns of it they shall have authority to break up the practice by fixing as the maximum rate the rebate rate—the lower rate. There is no remedy in that, because, Mr. President, I think upon consideration nobody would insist upon what would be so unreasonable in its operation as that would be.

In a case where between two given points there were three lines, we will say, in competition, and one cut the rates, then the Interstate Commerce Commission might solve it by fixing that as the maximum rate for that road in order to punish it. The trouble is that it would be fixing the rate that the other two competing roads would be compelled immediately to accept, thus penalizing the roads which had obeyed the law, or else they would have to lose their business to the other road, which would be a worse penalizing still.

So it is, Mr. President, I know enough of the Senator from South Carolina, I know enough of his powers of analysis, I know enough of his mental operations, to know he does not purpose, in giving the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to fix a maximum rate, to break up rebates in any such way as that; and yet it must be done in that way or some other such way if it is to to be dealt with by the mere conferring of the right or the granting of the power to make maximum rates upon the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Now, passing rebates and passing excessive rates, what is left? Discriminating charges.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I have not yet had an opportunity to read all of the testimony taken before the committee, but before the Senator from Ohio passes from the question of reasonable or unreasonable rates, I should like to ask him if it was not reasonably established in those hearings, first, that the rates on lumber from the Southwest were unreasonable; second, that the rates on cattle from the South and Southwest to the Northwest, to feeding stations, were unreasonable; and if it was not established, in the third place, that in numberless cases of ordinary rates they were unfair and unreasonable in this, that they discriminated improperly and unfairly against localities?

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I was just coming to the last suggestion of the Senator. As to the other suggestions he makes, there is much testimony before the committee tending to support what the Senator contends for in that respect. I did not say that there were not unreasonable rates; what I did say was that undoubtedly there are some unreasonable rates. There may be unreasonable rates as to lumber. It may be that there are unreasonable rates in certain instances as to live stock, which the Senator has mentioned. It may be that in many other instances there are unreasonable rates in the sense that they are too high. It would be exceedingly strange if there were not, for these rates cover the whole country, every section of it and every kind of traffic; but what I said was this, that it has been conceded and admitted before the committee and everywhere else by all who have discussed this subject that on the average rates in and of themselves are not unreasonably high, and that, so far as the mere correction of unreasonable rates is concerned, there is no widespread oppression in the country of which the people are now making complaint. What the people have been making complaint about, and justly making complaint about, and what we should provide a remedy against, and what I stand here to help provide a remedy against, is, first, rebates; and, in the second place, the discrimination between localities and between individuals, of which the Senator speaks.

What I was calling attention to was that this measure of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], if I understand it, confines itself to unreasonable and unjust rates. It does not undertake to deal with rebates, and I suppose the reason is because we have already dealt with them with that degree of satisfaction to which I have called attention. It does not undertake, as I understand it, to deal with discrimination between localities or between commodities or between individuals.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. What would the Senator propose to do about the unreasonable things done as to localities, commodities, and individuals?

Mr. FORAKER. I am going to speak about that. I am just coming to it.

I do not understand the bill of the Senator from South Carolina to apply to rebates or to discriminations between localities, but to be confined in its operation to the correction of rates that are unreasonably high.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator will allow me, I apprehend from his remarks that he proposes to correct one evil and not do anything about the others.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not understand the Senator's inquiry.

Mr. DANIEL. I stated that I apprehended from the tone of the Senator's remarks, if not his expression, that his idea was to pass this proposition of the Senator from South Carolina, and leave the relative discriminations as to localities, commodities, and persons untouched.

Mr. FORAKER. Oh, no, Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia entirely misunderstands me. I started out by saying that this was the best rate-making bill that has been suggested. I adhere to that. It is the simplest, and will do the most good, if anything of that kind is to be put into our legislation, and do the least harm. Nothing else has been proposed that will do anything else except incalculable harm.

Now, I come to answer the Senator from Virginia. I am not going to vote for this bill; I do not want the Senator to get that impression; I am just throwing a few bouquets to the Senator from South Carolina; none, however, that he does not deserve, for his bill does have the merit of brevity and simplicity. It goes straight to the mark, as the Senator always goes straight to the mark; and it would accomplish just what he wants to accomplish, I imagine. But what I am calling attention to is that the bill does not undertake to deal with rebates, as I understand it, and does not undertake to deal with discriminations between localities or any other kind of discriminations. I should have said the reason he does not undertake to deal with rebates, in my opinion, is that he knows that the present law to remedy rebates is working successfully, efficiently, and satisfactorily.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Ohio allow me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I thought that that law was sufficient; and I still think so——

Mr. FORAKER. As against rebates.

Mr. TILLMAN. But since the suit begun by Messrs. Harmon and Judson, under the instructions of the Attorney-General, had such a miserable and pitiful fiasco, I am led to say that until the Executive stops protecting Cabinet officers from the operation of the law and whitewashing them, we will never have anything done under that law so long as we have the present man in the White House. It is not the fault of the law. The law is all right.

Mr. FORAKER. I am not to be diverted from the discussion of what is properly before the Senate by a reference on the part of the Senator from South Carolina to a particular transaction with respect to which he may think that the President or some other official fell short of doing full duty. If so—if anybody fell short of duty—it is not the fault of the law.

I was proceeding, as I said, upon the assumption that the reason the Senator from South Carolina does not undertake to deal with rebates is that he knows rebates are already successfully dealt with, so far as the law can deal with them. I am glad to have the Senator so state. So we will pass by the question of rebates. He is dealing simply with excessive rates. I do not mean to be put in the attitude of saying there are no excessive rates, but I do want, when I come to discuss that question, to show, in addition to what I have already said about it, that they are not the crying evil and that we can in a better way provide a complete remedy against excessive rates. I am going to discuss my own bill in a few days, and I think I can make every unbiased mind understand that in the courts, immediately upon the presentation of a complaint, there is a complete remedy against excessive rates in the mere exercise of judicial power and without resort to anything that is so radical and revolutionary in its character as to have the Government go into the rate-making business.

Now as to discriminations between localities, coming to what the Senator from Virginia called my attention to, they are the subject of much complaint, but this bill does not undertake to deal with them. Let us assume, Mr. President, that there is a complaint before the Commission—and I speak of this particularly in view of what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] suggested—that there is a discrimination between roads centering at one particular point, coming from different points. Nobody complains, confining ourselves to that one complaint, that any rate is too high. The highest rate is conceded to be no more than is just and reasonable if it were standing by itself. But they say the relative adjustment is such that the differential amounts to a discrimination. One locality may be only half the distance removed that the other competing locality is, and yet the two may have substantially the same rate.

Will any man tell me how fixing a maximum rate will cure the differential in which is involved the injustice by merely fixing a maximum rate? You can not do it; and the Interstate Commerce Commission have recognized that fact in the bill which they framed and sent to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee for its consideration, and which is now pending before that committee. They recognized it by providing in that bill that the Commission shall not only have power to fix a maximum rate, but also shall have power to fix a minimum rate; power, if you please, Mr. President, not only to say that the rate from A to B shall be reduced, but, in order to break up the differential that is complained of, power to say that the rate from C to B shall not be reduced, but shall remain where it is or be raised to a point higher than it is.

The Senator from South Carolina has not undertaken to deal with that question. Until somebody undertakes to deal with it, there will be no remedy presented to this body or any other which will give to the people of this country in its operation as law any remedy for that complaint. Does anybody imagine for one minute that the people of this country would long tolerate the fixing by any body, any tribunal, any Government authority, of a minimum rate below which it would be unlawful for a railroad to reduce its rate if it saw fit?

I am pretty familiar with one kind of complaint involving this identical question. We have heard of it for years in Cincinnati. Years ago we had no direct communication with the South. We are situated on the Ohio River. We were anxious to have southern trade. Louisville had the advantage over us of having the Louisville and Nashville, which carried its products into the heart of the South. To overcome that disadvantage we did what no other municipality in this country has done. At an expense of $30,000,000 we built a road of our own, which we still own and control and operate through a lessee. Our purpose was to get into the South by a direct line, which would enable us to compete with Louisville. We were looking to the markets of Chattanooga and Atlanta and Meridian and beyond.

When our railroad was completed and was opened for business, and we commenced to ship into the South, what happened? We found not only Louisville in competition with us, but we found New York, 800 miles away, enjoying practically the same kind of a rate into Atlanta and almost as good a rate into Chattanooga as we enjoyed. With Cincinnati only 400 miles away and New York 800 miles away and the rates practically the same, there was an outcry that Cincinnati was being discriminated against; and everybody naturally thought she was, and it may be that she was. But there is a reason for all these things if you will only investigate and find out what it is, and we were not long investigating until we learned that there was another factor besides distance that played not only an important but a controlling part in fixing rates for these various roads. When we investigated we found out that although New York was 800 miles and we were only 400 miles from those points—I am speaking, of course, only in round figures—yet water transportation had such an influence in fixing rates that the railroads out of New York, having to compete with water transportation, were compelled to fix the low rate they did or else everything would go by water instead of rail. We have been fighting that proposition ever since.

Now, it is proposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the bill they have sent to us and with which Senators are all familiar, that that differential shall be cured. I take that as an illustration simply. How? They say the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have power not only to fix a maximum rate, but also to fix a minimum rate, and the power to control differentials. What does that mean? It means they are not only to sit in judgment as to whether or not the rate from Cincinnati to Chattanooga or to Atlanta is too high relatively, and whether it shall be reduced, but also as to whether the rates from Boston and New York and Philadelphia and Baltimore, and all the other Atlantic seaboard cities are too low relatively, and therefore to fix a minimum below which those rates can not be reduced. So they provide in the bill; and what is the provision? Their provision relates only to rail and to part rail and part water. But, Mr. President, unless they apply it to all-water

interstate transportation it will be ineffective to accomplish any good. It will be ineffective, because the very minute you fix the minimum by rail in connection with water the water route has only to reduce the rate and everythng goes by water instead of by rail. But shall we stop water competition by fixing a minimum rate?

Now, the Senator from South Carolina has wisely abstained, in the drawing of his bill, from undertaking to deal with any such proposition as that. He has wisely abstained, because it is an utter impossibility to deal successfully through any kind of a Government tribunal or agency of the nature of the Interstate Commerce Commission with a difficulty of that nature. The only way you can deal with it is by going into court with your complaint, and going there at once. A court of equity has complete power and you can not take it away, and you can not limit it, or circumscribe it, or deny it, no matter how much you may write it down in the bill. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina in that respect.

The courts of equity, without any legislation on the subject, have complete jurisdiction to entertain such a complaint from any individual citizen who may set up that he is a shipper and is interested. He can thus invoke the exercise of the power of a court of equity. Yet legislation is necessary in that regard, because no individual shipper should be required to embark in litigation with a railroad on the other side about a matter of such minor consequence as the difference may be in a particular rate that is charged. When the shipper goes into court to make a contest of that character against a road, he represents the whole community. He represents not only one community, but many communities. He represents all shippers situated as he is. It is a quasi public proceeding in its nature and in its effect, and we should, by statutory provision, make it so. That is what I have undertaken to do in the bill I have framed. We should provide that whenever there is a complaint of that kind filed with the Commission, it should be sent at once, if there be probable ground for it, to the court, which will sit in judgment, not to make a rate—the court has no power to make rates; that is a legislative function—but to determine whether or not an unjust differential is being enforced, and if so, to find what would be a just differential, and require, by its proper order, the parties interested to conform to it, which would mean that the railroads might fix their rates higher or lower, so far as that order was concerned, but they must fix them so as to make a correct relative adjustment. That is what we are aiming at. We in our part of the country are not complaining of rates in and of themselves. We are complaining of the relative adjustments that we think are wrong and injurious and disadvantageous to us and what we want is a remedy against that condition. We do not want a measure brought in here which I think I can show even to the satisfaction of the Senator from South Carolina is an unconstitutional measure. We do not want a measure brought in here which, whether it be unconstitutional or not, will involve us in all kinds of litigation as to its validity.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator say that this bill is unconstitutional?

Mr. FORAKER. No; but at another time I shall undertake to speak on that question.

Mr. TILLMAN. What does he mean to show is unconstitutional?

Mr. FORAKER. I mean to show that the Government has not any constitutional power to make rates in the way proposed through a commission. That Congress may make rates——

Mr. TILLMAN. Then the Supreme Court are in error, because they said that very thing.

Mr. FORAKER. The Supreme Court has not said any such thing as I have read and understood its decisions. Not only is there at the threshold a question as to the right of Congress to make a rate, but there is a question beyond it, of which I have not any doubt at all, and that is whether, this being a legislative power, we have a right to delegate it in the way proposed to a commission or anybody else.

It is one thing to say that the rates shall be so much per ton per mile on a certain kind of a road and under certain conditions, and authorize a commission to make a mathematical calculation and fix those rates in specific figures, and quite another thing to intrust to a commission the work of using legislative discretion in fixing specific rates. It is an entirely different thing for Congress to say rates shall be just and reasonable and then commit to somebody else the exercise of the legislative discretion with which Congress alone is invested. That is a wholly different thing.

The proposition that this is not a delegation of power when discretion is to be exercised is to my mind untenable; but at another time, as I have said, I shall take that up. I only rose to say a great many less words than I have spoken, in answer to the Senator from South Carolina, chief of which were intended to be in the nature of a congratulation to him upon having framed in so few words so simple a measure, if we are going into that business at all; it is simple and easily understood, and, assuming that it could be upheld in the courts, the least harmful of anything that has been suggested, because it confines itself, as I understand, to what really there is no serious complaint about. That is, it does not undertake to deal with rebates; it does not undertake to deal with discriminations; and it does not undertake to interfere with the statute now in force which has been found to be the most salutary legislation that has been placed on the statute books since the original interstate-commerce act was passed in 1887.

Mr. TILLMAN rose.

Mr. FORAKER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I thought the Senator from Ohio was through.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from Ohio allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. Did I understand the Senator to say that Congress has the power to make rates and that Congress can not delegate that power to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. FORAKER. What I said was that a great many very excellent lawyers are of the opinion that Congress itself does not have the power to make specific rates. About that I will express no opinion. It may be they are in error. But what I said—and as to this I have no doubt whatever in my mind—was that Congress has no power to delegate to a commission, except in an administrative way, authority to make rates, because that is a delegation of legislative power pure and simple, and you can not find a rule in any of the books or in any of the decisions that will uphold it.

Mr. CLAY. I think I understand the Senator. The Senator, then, denies to Congress the power so to amend the interstate-commerce law as to permit the Interstate Commerce Commission to hear complaints as to whether or not rates are unjust and unreasonable, and if they find they are, to reduce them. The Senator contends that Congress can not delegate to the Interstate Commerce Commission that power?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes. I contend that the delegation of legislative power—I am not undertaking to specify it, but as a general proposition—is prohibited.

Mr. CLAY. I also understand the Senator to say that at present the subject of rebates has been dealt with, and I agree with him——

Mr. FORAKER. Yes.

Mr. CLAY. And so with discriminations. The long and short haul clause of the interstate-commerce act is practically a nullity now under the decisions of our courts, and I understand the Senator to contend that Congress can not go any further than we have gone so far as concerns giving the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to prescribe and fix rates.

Mr. FORAKER. I do. I am opposed to giving the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to fix rates as a matter of policy. I am opposed to it as a matter of power, except in a purely administrative way. I am opposed——

Mr. CLAY. I will say that I do not agree with the Senator from Ohio in the position he has taken.

Mr. FORAKER. I am opposed to it because of the want of power when coupled with legislative discretion, and because, in my opinion, it is bad policy.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. I must have misunderstood the Senator from Ohio, but if I understood him correctly he asserts that when Congress confers upon the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to fix a reasonable rate in substitution for an unreasonable one it delegates to the Interstate Commerce Commission the legislative power of Congress, and therefore it is not competent under the Constitution for Congress to pass that kind of a law. Did I understand the Senator to say that?

Mr. FORAKER. That is my opinion if the power be conferred in a legislative way without any qualification whatever, and I see it as plain as a pikestaff.

Mr. BAILEY. Then let me inquire: The Senator from Ohio does not believe that the same reasoning would apply to the commissions created in the several States, which have themselves been authorized not to substitute reasonable for unreasonable rates, but to initiate and fix the rates in the first instance?

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, that is a different question, dependent upon the particular legislation and the power that is

lodged in the legislative department of the particular State government; and when the case is presented we will measure it. What I am referring to is the fact that we are authorized by the Constitution to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations, and there are a great many very good lawyers who think that even Congress has no right to fix the price at which transportation shall be furnished any more than it has a right to fix the sum which engineers and conductors and other employees of a railroad shall be paid for their services. A great many good lawyers so contend. I say upon that question I express no opinion, but I have been very greatly impressed with some of the arguments which have been made in behalf of that proposition. I have always supposed that under the power to regulate commerce we ourselves have the right to fix rates, but I have always been of opinion, and never so clearly as since I have investigated the subject, as I have been trying to do during the past summer, that the Congress has no constitutional power to delegate to a commission the legislative authority to make specific rates.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Ohio pardon me for another interruption?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Ohio is well aware, of course, that in the Mississippi commission case—I believe the style of the case is Stone against Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, as I recall it—that very question was distinctly raised. The counsel for the railroad company assailed the constitutionality of the Mississippi law upon the ground that it was a delegation of legislative authority, and the Supreme Court of the United States held that it was not a delegation of legislative authority.

Mr. FORAKER. Under the constitution of Mississippi.

Mr. BAILEY. The court did not predicate its decision upon any peculiar language of the constitution of Mississippi. It seems to me the cases are on all fours. If it was not a delegation of legislative authority for the legislature of Mississippi to empower a railroad commission to fix rates within that State—and, of course, it could only fix them within that State—then it can not be safely asserted to be a delegation of legislative authority for Congress to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to perform precisely the same office with respect to interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. FORAKER. At the proper time. I can not yield at present. I have only a few minutes. I have already taken more time than I intended. I will examine the case suggested by the Senator from Texas, and give to the Senator the grounds upon which I differentiate that case from the one I have mentioned.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to say that I have great respect for any opinion the Senator from Ohio may express upon a question of law after he has investigated it, and he will permit me to say that we will rejoice at the opportunity for that discussion.

Mr. FORAKER. I am glad to make the Senator from Texas happy. We will all be happy many times, Mr. President, before we get through with this discussion.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. On the point the Senator from Ohio was discussing, with reference to the delegation by Congress of the legislative power to fix rates, I understand him to say that Congress can not confer on the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to fix rates because of lack of authority to delegate legislative power. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FORAKER. I claim that as a general proposition Congress can not delegate legislative power. The question is whether this is legislative power.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask the Senator what difference is there in principle between the delegation by Congress of legislative power to a commission to fix rates, and the delegation by Congress of that legislative power to railroad companies to fix rates?

Mr. FORAKER. There is not any delegation of the power to railroad companies. The railroad companies are public utilities, quasi-public corporations, engaged in the transportation of freight and passengers as common carriers, and we have a right to regulate their business. But nevertheless they remain privately owned, although they are doing a public service, and whatever is privately owned the private owners have a right to fix the price of if they are going to part with it to somebody else.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator is certainly mistaken. Only one word or so, and I shall not interrupt the Senator further.

By implication at least, Congress has delegated this legislative power to corporations, and in a number of cases it has done so expressly, as, for instance, in the case of the Texas and Pacific Railroad Company, which is a corporation created by Congress and engaged in interstate commerce. Congress clothed that company with the power to fix just and reasonable rates, and in the exercise of that legislative power that corporation does fix reasonable and just rates for interstate commerce. That is the same power that the bill of the Senator from South Carolina proposes to delegate to the Interstate Commerce Commission. There is no difference in principle, Mr. President, I submit to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, between the cases.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FORAKER. I will yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania with great pleasure after I shall have answered the Senator from Texas.

If Congress had not said of the subsidized roads, to one of which the Senator has referred, as they did, in making the grant to them and under the circumstances, that they should fix only reasonable and just rates, they would have had the power to fix them anyway. It was in the nature of a limitation and not a conferring of power, and such a legislative declaration was but declaratory of the rule at common law. If there had been not one syllable in any statute on the subject, any shipper could have gone into a court of competent jurisdiction and enjoined the road from charging more than a just and reasonable rate, because that is all under the law it is entitled to charge. So there was no conferring of legislative power.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. KNOX. May I make an inquiry of the Senator from Ohio? I recognize that he has stated the correct rule—that the legislative power of Congress can not be delegated. But is it not the true rule that while you can not delegate the entire legislative power, Congress may prescribe a rule and leave the application of the rule in specific cases to an administrative body, so if the act of Congress provided that rates should be fair and just and reasonably remunerative, or used any other definition that it might see fit to impose, it could delegate to the Commission the power to apply that rule to specific cases as they arise; and has not that been specifically decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in Field *v.* Clark in construing the tariff act of 1890?

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator has asked that question. It enables me in the most pointed way to show the distinction between what may be conferred and what can not be conferred. In the case of Field against Clark the President was authorized, when a certain state of facts came to his knowledge, to make proclamation. From and after the issuing of such proclamation Congress said the tariff duty should be thus and so. Now, the Supreme Court held what? That that was not a delegation of legislative authority; that nothing was conferred upon the President of the United States except only an administrative duty to ascertain a state of facts, to issue a proclamation, and then the will of Congress went into operation.

That illustrates exactly what I undertook to say a minute ago. The Congress may say with respect to railroad rates, you shall charge so much a mile on coal, and so much a mile on wheat, and so much a mile on corn, and so much a mile on live stock. Then it can appoint a commission and confer upon it power to name the specific rates. The commission can take a yardstick, measure it off, and determine what the rate shall be by a mathematical calculation. Congress may provide that any road having an income of a named amount over and above all operating expenses shall be allowed to charge so much and no more, and a commission may be authorized to ascertain, as an administrative function, what the rate shall be, applying the conditions that Congress first named.

But when the Congress says reasonable rates shall be charged, that is a law without any declaration of a commission, and although it is important as a statutory provision in another aspect, as I shall point out when I come to discuss this question, it leaves what? A legislative discretion. In the case of Clark against Field there was no legislative discretion conferred on the President. In the illustrations I have given no legislative discretion is allowed, only a positive duty is affirmatively imposed, and it is the duty of the commission to ascertain and write down the figures that show the result of their computation.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President——

Mr. FORAKER. I will yield in just a moment.

But whenever the Congress says we will appoint a commission to ascertain what is just and reasonable, how much shall be charged for carrying cotton from Memphis to the cotton mills of Georgia and South Carolina and North Carolina, and how much shall be charged to carry cotton from Memphis to the North, to Cincinnati, and to New England, and how much shall be charged, taking into consideration everything—the land competition and the water competition also. for the river that runs to the South is in direct competition with the railroads that run to the North—I say there is a discretion that is legislative in its character, as to the fixing of what the rate is, and whenever you undertake to confer upon a subordinate tribunal a legislative discretion you go beyond the limit that Congress is authorized by any decision anywhere, of the Supreme Court or any other, to go in conferring such power. No gentleman can produce any decision that warrants the conferring of any such power. I think I can bring one after another here that draws the distinction just as I have drawn it, and which gives us a guaranty in advance that if we so legislate here as to destroy the law we now have on the statute books and undertake to put such a provision as a number of these that have been suggested on the statute books instead, we will be simply in a situation where we shall have no law at all on the subject.

Now, I believe that is all I care to say at this time.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I only want in a word to apologize to the Senate for having precipitated prematurely, it would appear, a debate on the legality and constitutionality of this kind of a law.

Mr. SPOONER. It was not with malice aforethought?

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, it was not with any malice aforethought, but I love to set you lawyers by the ears, and then watch you pull one another's wool. [Laughter.]

I can not understand the purpose and object of the Senator from Ohio in going into the merits of this proposed legislation and undertaking to interpret the meaning of the little, simple amendment to the act to regulate commerce which I have introduced. I was not surprised, of course, to have him finally wind up, after complimenting me so highly, by the statement that he would not vote for it. I knew he would not vote for it. I had not the remotest idea that he had any purpose of that sort.

But I want to say to him that when we come to deal with the question of a remedy for discriminations and preferentials and all that kind of thing I am sure I shall meet him halfway, and go as far as he dare go toward granting that relief.

I am after one simple, single proposition, as I have said already, and that is to grant to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to give relief when they have found that there is injustice and unreasonableness in a rate already in force; that is all. As I said, to do one thing at a time is in law, I believe, nearly as good a maxim as in business and many other things. If a man spreads himself out all over creation, he gets knocked into holes somewhere, and that is especially the case with a proposed law. I have found that to be true by experience.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, it was not my purpose to prolong this debate——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator to the fact that the discussion is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. CULBERSON. I wish to ask one question of the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas will proceed.

Mr. CULBERSON. Of course I do it in a friendly spirit to this measure.

The last paragraph of the bill provides that thereafter such rate shall be the only lawful rate which the carrier may collect until changed by further order of the Commission. What I wish to ask the Senator in the spirit of trying to perfect his measure is whether he proposes thereafter for all time to take from the railroad companies authority to change that particular rate?

Mr. TILLMAN. I propose in this measure to give the power to grant relief. I am not in the slightest degree uneasy that the railroad companies will ever come and ask to be permitted to lower it, but the shippers may in time come to see that a rate fixed by the Railroad Commission this year may year after next or five years hence be too high for the then condition; and, of course, if the shipper came and said to the Commission that a certain rate was unreasonable and unjust and could prove it, the Commission would grant the relief from its own order that it had made in the first instance.

Mr. CULBERSON. I was expressing no opinion myself on the provision of the bill, but was making an inquiry of the Senator, whether with reference to a particular rate which the Interstate Commerce Commission may put into effect at any time, say, between New York and Cincinnati or between New York and Chicago, it is the intent of this bill and is it his purpose now that the rate fixed by the Commission shall be permanent to the extent that the railroad companies themselves would have no authority to change it?

Mr. TILLMAN. Undoubtedly; because, as I said, I have no idea that a railroad company will ever undertake to reduce the rate fixed by the Commission of its own motion.

Mr. CULBERSON. They are not allowed, under the bill?

Mr. TILLMAN. As it would be the maximum rate they might reduce it, but I do not want them to do it. I am only after getting relief for the people—the producers and shippers—not the railroads. They will always take care of themselves, here and everywhere else, and if they found it desirable to reduce a rate fixed by the Commission, and could show good reasons for it, I would think it a very easy thing to have the Commission make a new order in the case as no shipper could possibly object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from South Carolina will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GAMBLE submitted an amendment authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Mary S. Rouse, a member of the Yankton band of Sioux Indians, for lands heretofore allotted to her in the State of South Dakota, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Artie Barber, a member of the Yankton band of Sioux Indians, for lands heretofore allotted to her in the State of South Dakota, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO STATEHOOD BILL.

Mr. FORAKER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1158) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; which were referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. FRYE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

CHARLES E. HOOKS.

Mr. ALLISON (for Mr. PROCTOR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place upon the rolls of the Senate as a messenger the name of Charles E. Hooks, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

PANAMA CANAL APPROPRIATION.

The bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title.

Mr. ALLISON. I move the reference of the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, which is the usual course.

Mr. KITTREDGE. I ask that the bill be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The bill was read the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall be subject to the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled "An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the pubic debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900, the same as though said bonds were issued under the provisions of said act of March 14, 1900.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $11,000,000 to continue the construction of the isthmian canal, to be expended under the

direction of the President in accordance with the said act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, approved June 28, 1902, and for each and every purpose connected with the same, the said sum to continue available until expended: *Provided*, That all expenditures from the appropriation herein made shall be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds authorized in section 8 of the said act approved June 28, 1902.

SEC. 3. That the President shall annually, and at such other periods as may be provided, either by law or by his order, require full and complete reports to be made to him by the persons appointed or employed by him in charge of the government of said Canal Zone, the construction of said Panama Canal, and the operation of said Panama Railroad, including an itemized account of all moneys received and expended, which said reports shall be by the President transmitted to Congress. And any of the persons appointed or employed by the President in connection with the said government or the said work of construction or operation shall give to Congress or to either House of Congress such information as may at any time be required either by act of Congress or by the order of either House of Congress in relation to their respective actings and doings and the receipt and expenditure of money. The President shall annually cause to be made, by the persons appointed and employed by him in charge of the government of said Canal Zone and the construction of said canal, estimates of expenditures and appropriations, in detail as far as practicable, which estimates shall be submitted to Congress in the manner provided in section 5 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes." And no money shall be expended for any of the purposes named in this act except in accordance with appropriations made by Congress, except that the moneys received in the ordinary course of business from the operation of the Panama Railroad and the property and rights appertaining thereto may be expended, so far as necessary, in defraying the expenses of such operation, including maintenance, without being covered into the Treasury of the United States, and such moneys are hereby appropriated for such purpose, and monthly reports of such receipts and expenditures shall be made to the President by the person or persons in charge.

Mr. HOPKINS. I did not understand as to whether the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa was simply a request or whether it was a motion.

Mr. ALLISON. I made a motion. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa moves that the bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOPKINS. I should like to hear from the Senator the reasons he has for taking the bill from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, the committee to which we think it legitimately belongs.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, as I understand the measure it is an ordinary deficiency appropriation and one of an emergent character. All such appropriations, under the custom of the Senate and under its rules, have always been referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I know of no exception where such a bill appropriating money has been referred to another committee.

Of course, I do not expect in the slightest degree to interfere with the jurisdiction of any other committee of the Senate, and especially not to interfere with the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. I take it there can be no question that this is a pure and simple appropriation in the nature of a deficiency, and, therefore, the bill should go to the Committee on Appropriations.

The matters that are mentioned in the first section and in the fourth section are mere incidents. If the first section was legislation—important legislation—it would naturally go to the Committee on Finance, but I take it that no one supposes the first section is anything more than a regulation as respects the appropriation itself. The last section is simply a provision for estimates, etc., in the future.

Therefore it seems to me that naturally and properly the bill should go to the Committee on Appropriations, where all appropriations go of public money in pursuance of law that are not specially provided for under our rules. There are certain committees which have jurisdiction, by the rules of the Senate, over specific appropriations, as the army appropriation, the navy appropriation, etc., but all other appropriations go naturally to the Committee on Appropriations, according to the custom of the Senate.

If there is legislation on this bill which is important and which is likely to give rise to controversy between the two Houses, then it is the duty of whatever committee has the bill to strip it of that legislation. Here is an emergency, so stated by the President, and by the Secretary of the Treasury, who makes and submits an estimate of a deficiency, which deficiency estimate was referred to the Committee on Appropriations in the House, as all deficiency estimates are referred there, and as all deficiency estimates are referred here.

So, Mr. President, I can see no reason whatever why the Committee on Interoceanic Canals should take charge of an appropriation that does not come within the province of the authority of that committee. I think it would be hardly worth while in the case of this appropriation to depart from the uniform rule and custom of the Senate. It is so emergent that I have no doubt the appropriation will be made in some form. There may be conditions which it will be necessary to apply to the appropriation itself, but certainly the bill should not contain any legislation.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President, it is with great diffidence personally—and I am sure I speak the sentiments of the members of the Interoceanic Canal Committee as well—that I differ from the Senator from Iowa upon the proper committee to which this bill should go. We do not agree with the statement that all appropriation bills excepting those specifically enumerated in the rules of the Senate should go to the Committee on Appropriations. Senators will observe by an examination of the rules of the Senate that while the committees are named in the rules they do not define the jurisdiction of any of the committees, and it is left for the Senate, except in the case of certain specified appropriation bills, to determine which committee shall take jurisdiction of a certain subject-matter which comes before it.

Originally in the Senate as well as in the House all appropriation bills would go to the Committee on Appropriations. A few years ago in both branches of Congress this question was taken up, and a large number of appropriation bills were taken from the Committee on Appropriations that that committee had jurisdiction of and given to other committees, like the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was given the power to appropriate regarding all matters touching that arm of the service, and the Committee on Agriculture, to which was given the authority to make appropriations relating to all questions which came before that committee. The same is true of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads and several other committees.

Now, the Senator from Iowa says that all other appropriations should go to the Committee on Appropriations. That, as I understand it, is not the reading of the rule. Rule XVI, which I infer from his remarks he invoked in his favor, says:

All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except the following bills.

Which are the specific bills I have in part enumerated.

The Chair will note that the Committee on Appropriations have jurisdiction of only general appropriation bills. What are the general appropriation bills? They are the legislative, executive, and judicial bill; the sundry civil bill, and other bills where the law has specifically provided for appropriations. Everybody understands when we speak of the legislative, executive, and judicial bill that certain specific appropriations are to be made for that branch of the Government, and when we speak of the sundry civil bill we understand that certain specific appropriations are to be made under that bill.

If this Rule XVI is to be properly interpreted, in my judgment deficiency bills do not go to the Committee on Appropriations. They may have gone there as a matter of course without any objection being made, but a deficiency bill is not a general appropriation bill, because if the appropriations were properly made on all appropriation bills there would be no deficiency. It is a bill that is prepared to meet certain deficiencies where the expenditures have exceeded the amount appropriated. A deficiency bill may cover items in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, in the sundry civil appropriation bill, and in the military appropriation bill, the post-office appropriation bill, and the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLISON. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. HOPKINS. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. The question the Senator from Illinois now raises was raised in the Senate some years ago, and by a very large majority the Senate decided that under the rules a general deficiency bill was included.

Mr. WARREN. All deficiency bills.

Mr. ALLISON. The question was as to the general deficiency bill, and it was decided that the general deficiency bill was within the sixteenth rule.

I will say to the Senator, however, that I am not relying wholly upon the sixteenth rule. I am relying upon the uniform and universal custom of the Senate and upon other laws and rules that govern appropriations. The Secretary of the Treasury is required every year to submit estimates of appropriations. What for? In pursuance of laws passed before that time. Whenever there is a law requiring the expenditure of money, there is an appropriation required, and under that situation these matters have always been referred, and the estimates have been referred, to the Committee on Appropriations. It has been the uniform custom.

Mr. MORGAN. Were any estimates submitted for this bill?

Mr. ALLISON. The estimates were submitted, but they have not yet reached the Senate. The estimates have been sent by the Secretary of the Treasury to the House of Representatives, and those estimates were referred to the Committee on Appro-

priations in the House. But because of the absolute emergency for this appropriation, there being no committees, a Member of the House rose in his place and asked unanimous consent for the consideration of this bill. It was not referred to any committee of the House for the reason that there were no committees there. But here we have committees to which these bills are ordinarily referred in full play and ready to consider all questions, whatever they are.

Mr. HOPKINS. I am entirely familiar with the custom the Senator has called the attention of the Senate to, that the Secretary of the Treasury makes his estimate for certain appropriations. That is covered by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. That is one of the general appropriation bills referred to in Rule XVI. The other reports that come to us from the various Cabinet officers are covered by the general appropriation bills I have referred to. They are not covered by the deficiency bill.

I was saying when interrupted by the Senator that the deficiency bill does not come within the language or the spirit of Rule XVI. If there has been a decision of the Senate at some previous time, in the investigations I have given to the subject I have been unable to find it, but of course I take in its full measure the statement of the Senator upon that subject.

But now, Mr. President, granting that to be true, I contend that this is *not* a deficiency bill. It is an emergency bill, but it is not a deficiency bill. The Senator smiles at that statement, but it is absolutely true and correct.

Mr. SPOONER. It is an emergency bill because it is a deficiency bill, is it not?

Mr. HOPKINS. Not at all. It is an emergency bill because the conditions at Panama at present and the condition of the Commission require an emergency expenditure of money; that is all. It is a deficiency to what bill? To any bill that came from the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. HALE. It is an emergency bill because of the deficiency which arises, as all deficiencies do, from a lack of appropriation. That is what a deficiency is. It is that a previous Congress has not appropriated money enough out of the Treasury. When the time comes around and the money is not ample for the work, there is a deficiency. There has never been but one rule, and that is that all deficiencies upon every subject shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I have charge of the naval appropriation bill in the Naval Affairs Committee. The Senator here has charge of the army appropriation bill in the Committee on Military Affairs. But when there is a deficiency because we had not appropriated money enough in the last year it goes to the Committee on Appropriations. We shall never have any jurisdiction or any general proper control of deficiencies unless one committee deals with them.

Two years ago the Naval Committee reported nearly $100,000,000 on the naval appropriation bill. When the year expired, the Secretary of the Navy said it was not money enough, that the Department wanted $16,000,000 more. As in this case, the money appropriated was not sufficient. I never raised the question that that bill ought to go to the Naval Committee. The fault was that the Naval Committee proposition of appropriation did not give money enough. It was a general question of deficiency, a lack of appropriation, and went to the Committee on Appropriations without dissent by anyone.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] simply reiterates the statement of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], that where these regularly established bills have been passed and a deficiency arises, such bills go to the Committee on Appropriations. But that is not the condition here. There has never been made any appropriation, aside from the appropriation in the general law that was passed which created the authority to purchase the interest of the French Company and to establish a commission to commence the construction of this canal. That authority came, not from the Committee on Appropriations, not from the Naval Committee, but from the Interoceanic Canals Committee, a committee that we contend should take jurisdiction of this matter. Why not, Mr. President? Why should the Committee on Appropriations take charge of this bill? They are not authorized under the rules of this body to investigate the subject-matter of the construction of that canal; they are not supposed, as is the committee to which we belong is supposed, to make thorough investigation so as to intelligently on the moment pass upon this question. The subject as to whether the $16,500,000 asked for should be granted is as foreign to the Committee on Appropriations as it is to the Committee on Finance, and there is no more reason why this bill should go to the Committee on Appropriations than there is why it should go to the Committee on Finance.

This bill is composed of two sections. The first section is one that relates to the taxing of bonds. If we were to follow out literally the points which have been raised by the Senator from Iowa, this bill would have to be separated, and one portion of it go to the Committee on Finance and the other to the Committee on Appropriations. But under the practice that has thus far prevailed in this body the Interoceanic Canals Committee has jurisdiction of both subjects and can deal with section 1 as well as it can with section 2. If this committee is to have any power or authority on these matters, it should certainly not only have the power that is granted in section 1, but it should have the power that is granted in section 2.

Mr. President, this is a new question before this body, and it is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Senate to determine whether the Committee on Interoceanic Canals shall have the authority to control the appropriations which relate to the construction of the canal or whether that authority shall be taken from it and given to the Committee on Appropriations. It is, as I have said, a new—and it is an open—question and one that can be determined here, that will settle the future status of both of those committees.

We contend, Mr. President, that this authority should be given to the Interoceanic Canals Committee. Why? Because the Committee on Appropriations is already overworked; for the same reason that a few years ago the members of the Senate here insisted that the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads should have authority to make appropriations for the postal service; for the same reason that the Senate a few years ago insisted that the Military Committee, which investigates everything relating to that branch of the Government, should have the authority to make appropriations for it; for the same reason that the Committee on Agriculture have now the authority to make appropriations in relation to agriculture.

In contending for this, Mr. President, we are not taking anything from the Committee on Appropriations that should be granted to it. Everybody knows that the distinguished Senator who is chairman of that committee is one of the most overworked men of this body; every Senator appreciates that every member of that committee has now more work than he should do. The members of the Interoceanic Canals Committee are ready and willing to take charge of this subject, as they believe under the rules of the Senate they should. Why deprive them of it? If the Committee on Appropriations are to take this power from the Interoceanic Canals Committee, they had better take all of the work of that committee, for there will then be but little left.

I appeal, Mr. President, to the members of this body to protect the Interoceanic Canals Committee, and give them the same power relating to every subject that is within the jurisdiction of that committee that a few years ago the Senate gave to the Military Committee and to the other committees which I have named.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois wholly misapprehends the point I have made respecting this appropriation. I simply appeal for the ordinary, customary, and usual methods of the Senate, which have prevailed here at least since I have been a member of this body.

The Senator also misunderstands, as I believe, the province of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. I understand him to say now that he wants it settled here whether or not the Committee on Appropriations shall examine the question of the appropriation of money in the first instance for the construction of this canal for all future years. The Senator claims that right now, as a jurisdictional question, for the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. Why, Mr. President, the only reason that this comes here as a separate bill without consideration by the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives is that the House had no Committee on Appropriations, and this was such an emergent deficiency that they passed the bill without reference to a committee by unanimous consent in the body itself.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that both the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the Fifty-eighth Congress and a member of the Appropriations Committee of the other House in the Fifty-eighth Congress raised the question when the distinguished member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House brought in the bill. That bill was presented in the House and controlled by the Member from Iowa, Mr. HEPBURN, who is the chairman of that committee, corresponding to the Interoceanic Committee in the Senate. He opened the debate, closed it, and absolutely controlled the conduct of the bill in the House.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly, Mr. President, we must be all familiar with that fact.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes, Mr. President, but the point the Senator from Iowa was making was that because there was no Committee on Appropriations in the other House that committee did not take the bill. This other committee had not been given to the House by the Speaker at that time, but it was recognized that the old chairman had the authority to bring in the bill and to conduct its passage through the House.

Mr. ALLISON. Why, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois seems to again misapprehend what I have said. The bill was submitted by a Member of the House, not a member of any committee, for the reason that there were no committees. I have before me the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting this deficiency estimate to the House of Representatives, and it will be seen from this printed document that the Speaker of the House referred this estimate to the Committee on Appropriations. If that committee had been appointed, it would have had jurisdiction of this estimate sent by the Secretary of the Treasury.

But, Mr. President, I am not going to stick in the bark about this business. I want to call attention to another matter as respects the question of jurisdiction. Here was a legislative act passed three years ago—in 1902. It did come from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, as it was legislation providing for the construction of the isthmian canal, and most important legislation with reference to that construction, covering routes and various other things. By reason of that legislation it became necessary to provide a certain sum of money to do certain things in order to make that legislation effective. So $40,000,000 was appropriated for the purchase of the rights of the French company in that canal, and an indefinite sum was appropriated for the purpose of acquiring from the United States of Colombia a strip necessary to construct the canal. Then there was appropriated $10,000,000 for the purpose of beginning the construction of the canal. In the mean time, after that act was enacted, the Canal Zone passed from the control of the United States of Colombia, and the indefinite sum which had been appropriated to pay for that Canal Zone was transferred to the State of Panama. Thereupon an appropriation was made of $10,000,000 to carry out the treaty with Panama.

Mr. KITTREDGE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. ALLISON. With pleasure.

Mr. KITTREDGE. From what committee did that report and that provision come?

Mr. ALLISON. What provision?

Mr. KITTREDGE. The one the Senator has just mentioned.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know.

Mr. KITTREDGE. It came from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, the committee to which we desire that this bill shall be referred.

Mr. ALLISON. I only know that it appears in a deficiency bill.

Mr. KITTREDGE. It came in a bill that was approved by the President on the 28th day of April, 1904.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. KITTREDGE. And that came from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals after a conference.

Mr. ALLISON. I may be mistaken. I thought it was embodied in a deficiency bill.

Mr. KITTREDGE. The Senator is entirely mistaken. It came from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, and was in a bill reported by that committee.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that. I only mentioned that, Mr. President, as an incident. That is not the real point of this question. There was a provision that this canal should, if the Panama route should be selected, cost the amount appropriated under the provisions of the law of 1902, and $130,000,000 in addition. But no appropriation was made for that $130,000,000. An appropriation was made, however, for $10,000,000 to begin the work.

Mr. President, this is an appropriation that must be made from time to time in pursuance of that statute, as every other appropriation recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is made in pursuance of a statute.

The Senator from Illinois talks about the Military Committee having control of all appropriations regarding military affairs. Why, Mr. President, every year we appropriate large sums in the sundry civil bill for military purposes. We appropriate for public buildings, although there are statutes requiring such public buildings to be erected; but unless there is an appropriation accompanying such a statute, which sometimes happens, the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction of that subject; and so, as was well stated by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], if there are deficiencies in the appropriations for the transportation of the Army, or the pay of the Army, or in any matter relating to the Army, such bills do not go to the Military Committee, but they go to the Committee on Appropriations, which considers all deficiencies.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to ask him a question?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I desire to ask the Senator whether it is his contention that all appropriations relative to the interoceanic canal shall go to the Committee on Appropriations, or if he limits that contention to the case of a deficiency? I am asking for information, and not for the purpose of argument.

Mr. ALLISON. I will answer the Senator with pleasure. Under existing law and the custom of this body, as well as of the other legislative body, all future appropriations for the canal will be embodied in the sundry civil appropriation bill, which comes to us from the House of Representatives. If there is need for a further deficiency appropriation for the current fiscal year in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal, in accordance with the rules of the House such deficiency appropriation will be brought in here in a general deficiency bill. Therefore I answer the Senator that, unless the Senate believes the rules which have prevailed here shall be discarded and changed, all appropriations relating to the Panama Canal must in the future be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I am perfectly frank about that.

Mr. BACON. The Senator will readily understand the pertinency of the inquiry. If the general subject of appropriations for the interoceanic canal is one properly within the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, I confess I can see no reason why a deficiency appropriation for the canal should be made an exception.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that to be true.

Mr. BACON. I can very readily understand why the contention might be well based that all appropriations relative to the canal should be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals; but if the general rule is one which gives to the Appropriations Committee jurisdiction of these appropriations, I can see no special reason why there should be an exception made in the case of a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly, Mr. President, these appropriations in the future will go to the Committee on Appropriations unless the Senate by a vote shall decide that they ought not to go there. They will appear here on bills that must be referred to the Committee on Appropriations in the future, whether deficiency bills or regular bills, because that committee has jurisdiction of the appropriations under the general administration of the Government, with the exception laid down in Rule XVI, not only according to that rule, but according to the custom theretofore prevailing.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. It has occurred to me, Mr. President, from the haste with which this bill has come to us from the House, without being referred to a committee or examined into, but having been the subject of a sharp debate and having been cut down there, that it ought to be very closely scrutinized by some committee and some light thrown on it.

Of course, I am only a new member of the Appropriations Committee, and have had very little to do with the work of that committee except to hear the reports of subcommittees that have had various appropriation bills under consideration—and they have usually been railroaded through without much explanation or discussion—but we are entering on an entirely new thing. When it is taken into consideration that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has jurisdiction of a bill which annually carries four or five million dollars, and other committees of a similar character have jurisdiction of bills carrying moderate appropriations, and not only have jurisdiction in regard to money spending but everything else, it seems to me that we have got no use for the Committee on Interoceanic Canals unless we give them jurisdiction of canal appropriation bills. We are not going to legislate any more about the canal. We have already settled the question of site and done everything, in fact, in a legislative way, and it is now only a question of spending money economically and judiciously.

I confess that I have very serious doubts whether, with the burdens that are already on the Appropriations Committee—not on me, but on the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] and the other old and experienced members of that committee who have been pretty long in harness, and many of whom have onerous

duties on other important committees in addition to those connected with the Appropriations Committee; for example, the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who is chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and so on—I do not see how the Appropriations Committee—I being a very small part and parcel of it—can give that examination into this particular canal subject that it deserves and ought to receive, in order that proper explanations may be made; whereas if the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, which has nothing else to do especially, is allowed to examine the matter and report and explain to us when the bills appropriating money for the canal come in, I think such a method of procedure would be preferable as a matter of economy.

I know the Senator from Iowa is an economist, and that he has never squandered any money or favored any appropriation, so far as I know, while I have been a member and watched him in the Appropriations Committee, that I did not think was perfectly legitimate, and all that kind of thing; still I conceive, if the matter is left with the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, we shall have the canal built more economically, and we shall prevent some of the abuses which have already crept in.

I looked at the catalogue of salaries of the canal employees the other day, which excited such a wrathy debate in the House, and it occurred to me that if we are going to appropriate money out of hand here in this double-quick fashion, without thorough scrutiny by some committee somewhere, the Panama Canal will cost us $300,000,000 instead of $150,000,000 or $170,000,000, or some such sum.

I should like to know from the Senator what is the use of the Interoceanic Canal Committee if we are not going to let it take in hand, or at least recommend to the Senate or to the Appropriations Committee, bills providing money for the construction of the canal?

It used to be, and I believe it still is, necessary to have an amendment intended to be proposed to a general appropriation bill approved by the committee which has jurisdiction over that particular subject before it can go on an appropriation bill, whether it be the deficiency bill or the sundry civil appropriation bill, or any of the general appropriation bills. If we are to follow the general policy of the Committee on Appropriations taking jurisdiction of all the canal appropriations, and the Committee on Interoceanic Canals is to have no jurisdiction over such matters, I foresee that there will be—well, I dread a scandal; I dread stealing, to speak in honest Anglo-Saxon. I am tired of this miserable humbug of graft. In honest Anglo-Saxon it is stealing to pay these enormous salaries to these people. The auditor for the Canal Commission gets $10,000 a year, as I understand, while his superior in the Treasury Department, who has to superintend and pass upon his work, gets four or five thousand dollars.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from South Carolina, in asking me quite a lengthy question as to the duties of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, has answered it himself. That committee is a most important committee and certainly will have most important duties to perform.

In regard to the matter last mentioned by the Senator, this bill authorizes the President of the United States to fix the salaries of canal employees. They ought to be fixed by law.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is right.

Mr. ALLISON. The Appropriations Committee does not fix the salaries of the employees of the Canal Commission.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will see that his suggestion is carried out. If he uses his influence, I am sure that these salaries will not only be fixed by law but that we shall have a voucher covering every expenditure of money.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator now interrupts me to say that he hopes I will see to it. The Committee on Appropriations, by the rules of the Senate, are not allowed to originate legislation. Other great committees of this body recommend bills to be made into laws, and the Appropriations Committee recommends the appropriation of the money authorized to be expended by those laws. So it is the duty of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals to overhaul this whole question and recommend legislation upon it with reference to every detail. If excessive salaries are being paid, let those salaries be fixed and reduced under this law. As it now stands, the President of the United States is authorized to fix the salaries of the canal employees. Their salaries can not be reduced, therefore, without a change of existing law, and the Committee on Appropriations, especially in this emergency bill, would not undertake to change the statute as respects the great amount of such salaries; but the matter ought to be taken up by a committee having charge of the subject, and it ought to be dealt with in detail.

We pay every clerk in every Department of the Government a certain amount of money—$1,200 or $1,000 or $900, and so on, as the classification may be; we vote ourselves a specific salary; and yet we must appropriate the money annually. It is the business of the Committee on Appropriations to recommend such appropriations, but it is not its business to fix the salaries of the Supreme Court judges or the salaries of the various public functionaries who execute the laws. It is the business of the committees that have charge of these subjects to deal with the question of salaries, and it is not the business of the Committee on Appropriations to do so. Therefore I think the Committee on Interoceanic Canals will be a very important one, not only as respects the laws which shall govern the administration of this great work, but as respects the Canal Zone itself, which is now part of our country, so far at least as the construction and maintenance of the canal is concerned. We will be guided, and should be guided, by the light which they give to us and the laws which they propose from time to time respecting this subject.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I was just going to remark that of course I do not expect the Senator to bring in an amendment to this particular measure in regard to salaries. When I spoke of the immense influence which the Senator knows he wields, I had reference to the suggestion or advice which he could give and put those instrumentalities in motion on the other side of the Chamber, which is responsible for legislation, and see that such a law was enacted. That is all I had reference to.

But now while I am speaking I want to ask the Senator, if it is a wise and proper thing—and it has been so considered—to allow the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to have jurisdiction of proposed legislation relating to the Agricultural Department and also to pass upon the agricultural appropriation bill, why would it not be a wise thing, when it can not be doubted that the appropriations for the interoceanic canal will be something in the neighborhood of ten or fifteen million dollars a year, to let the Committee on Interoceanic Canals have jurisdiction and control of that expenditure and to let it be responsible to the Senate, so as to be able to explain to the Senate what that money is being spent for and to guarantee to us, so far as the committee can do so, that it is being economically and honestly spent?

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina and the Senate believe that the Appropriations Committee will not deal with this question as intelligently, as prudently, and as safely as another committee of the body, then they can take the business of appropriations away from that committee. We are just as much entitled to the consideration of this appropriation bill as we are to the consideration of other appropriation bills of like character. If these appropriations are to be segregated and divided up piecemeal, let them be divided, and eliminate from consideration the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat. The Senator admits that his committee will not take into consideration the subject of these excessive salaries that are being paid to these men. Now, this is an appropriation for the purpose of paying the expenses of proceeding with the work in reference to the Panama Canal. I do not know what per cent, but possibly 40 or 50 or 60 per cent, of the entire sum is paid out in excessive salaries, though I do not necessarily mean the particular ones that are mentioned here. Why not, then, let the committee which is to deal with the bill appropriating the sum of ten or eleven million dollars deal at the same time with the question of how it shall be applied—whether it shall be continued in the payment of those salaries or whether it shall be paid out in salaries that will be reasonable, so that every dollar that is expended under the bill, which is to be passed as an exigency, will meet the exigency as well of excessive salaries as the running of the canal? It seems to me, Mr. President, that the Senator's own explanation that his committee will not take cognizance of that feature of the case properly relegates the whole subject to a committee that will take cognizance of it.

Mr. ALLISON. I will answer the Senator's question by asking him another. Does he think the Committee on Appropriations, having in charge the legislative bill or the sundry civil bill, could reduce the compensation of the Supreme Court judges from $12,500 to $9,000? The Senator wholly misunderstood me when he says I admit certain things. I stated a fact, which is

that the law now provides a method for fixing the salaries. It is a law which came from the Canal Committee or some similar committee, and the Committee on Appropriations, under the rules of the Senate, have no right to change existing law. Therefore I stated in answer to the Senator from South Carolina——

Mr. HEMENWAY. Will the Senator from Iowa permit a question at this point?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. HEMENWAY. The duty of what committee is it to legislate upon this question?

Mr. ALLISON. It is the duty of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, and no other committee can do it under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Under the rules of both the House and the Senate, whose duty is it to appropriate?

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Then the Committee on Interoceanic Canals could meet to-morrow, if they desired, this appropriation bill having gone to the Committee on Appropriations, where it belongs and recommend such legislation as they saw fit fixing the salaries?

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly, and submit their recommendation to the Committee on Appropriations or to the Senate. But I merely suggested the question of legislation in order to draw the distinction which prevails in this body and always has prevailed here since the Committee on Appropriations was established, namely, that the Committee on Appropriations is not a legislative committee. It does not legislate except in reference to specific and particular appropriations, and it only legislates as respects existing laws regarding appropriations. Therefore there is ample scope and opportunity for the distinguished gentlemen—and I highly respect them all—who belong to the committee, or will belong to it in the ordinary course of business of the Senate, to perfect the laws respecting the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I take the position I do because I agree so absolutely and so thoroughly with what the Senator from Iowa has stated, that the Committee on Appropriations is a committee not dealing with general legislation in fixing salaries, but which reports appropriations to pay the expenses of general legislation passed upon the advice of other committees. It seems to me that this particular measure, carrying with it not only matters that pertain to a subject which would naturally go before the Committee on Finance, but also an appropriation, and also dealing with a subject-matter which the Senator says his committee could not and properly would not deal with—that is, the question as to how the money shall be expended—ought to go to a committee which would say how it should be expended and which has the authority to determine and report to the Senate how it should be expended.

Mr. President, in reference to the other suggestion made by the Senator from Iowa, that that committee would not deal in any way with general legislation, it seems to me that he himself makes the proposition that we are to have simply a report upon the matter of the expenditure of this money, without any information whatever as to what it is to be exepnded for or whether it should be expended for that particular purpose; a report without going into the details as to the necessity of the legislation, or the workings of the Panama Canal Commission, because that is general legislation. That is just the information we want at the present time.

Mr. ALLISON. It is the special business of the Committee on Appropriations to examine into every application for an appropriation—its necessity and propriety, and whether there is a law authorizing it. It is not its duty to recommend a change of existing law. That is the argument I made. I have no doubt the Canal Committee will examine the question with care, if it is referred to them, and I am sure the Committee on Appropriations will do so, and I will try, if I can, to invoke the attention and labor of my friend the Senator from South Carolina on that committee, to aid in accomplishing the purpose we have.

Mr. HOPKINS. Before the Senator from Iowa takes his seat will he allow me a question?

Mr. ALLISON. I will.

Mr. HOPKINS. Take the example raised by the Senator from South Carolina, that a subordinate in the Commission is receiving a salary of $10,000 and reports to his superior, who receives a salary of four or five thousand. Now, as I understand the argument of the Senator from Iowa, if this bill should go to the Committee on Appropriations that committee has no power to correct that evil, if it be an evil, but if it goes to the Interoceanic Canals Committee that committee can determine, in reporting the appropriation whether or not that salary shall be $10,000 or shall be reduced, by accompanying the appropriation with proper legislation determining how the sixteen million, or whatever amount may be appropriated, shall be expended by the Commission. It seems to me that the very argument made by the Senator from Iowa is an argument against the bill going to the Committee on Appropriations and is a potent reason why the Senate should send it to a committee that can lop off any of these extravagant salaries and can determine in what manner the money shall be expended by the Commission.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow me for a moment, the Committee on Interoceanic Canals have no more jurisdiction of that subject on an appropriation bill than we have. It is that the Canal Committee wants to introduce important legislation on an appropriation bill, and use the emergency of the appropriation as a means to force the passage by Congress of such legislation without consideration? It is the very element and essence of the rule that there shall not go upon an appropriation bill legislation changing existing law. So the rule——

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the Senator allow me right here?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes.

Mr. HOPKINS. The Senator has forgotten the point I made a few moments ago, and that is that this is not entirely an appriation bill. It is somewhat the same kind of a bill as that which was originally passed to authorize the Government to purchase the canal strip and commence the construction of the canal. That bill contained legislation as well as an appropriation.

Now, this bill provides in the first section for certain bonds and for the taxation of those bonds, and that is a reason why I contend that the bill itself should go to the committee which has power and authority to legislate upon section 1 as well as section 2. According to the statement of the Senator from Iowa, nothing can be done by his committee with section 1, as they can only take charge or jurisdiction of section 2. If this bill goes to the Interoceanic Canals Committee, the whole subject can be considered, and, as I have said, Mr. President, while the committee is considering the whole subject it can look into the evils which have been suggested by the Senator from South Carolina, and if it finds that there is reason for it, it can by appropriate legislation correct any of those errors.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois now suggests that the Committee on Appropriations have not jurisdiction over section 1. It has come to us from the House, and of course we must consider it. But that is leather and prunella. Section 1 could be passed in a moment as separate legislation coming from the Committee on Finance, where it belongs. It is a mere change of a provision, which can be made at any moment or almost any moment by the two Houses.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me right on this very subject?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. This measure has already passed the House. It is now before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. ALLISON. It is.

Mr. McCUMBER. In all probability it will be reached and disposed of in a very short time. There hardly seems to me ground for the assumption——

Mr. ALLISON. These salaries have already been earned, under the orders and directions of the President. This is a deficiency bill. I will say to the Senator that there is ample time to deal with these salaries within the next two months, when another deficiency bill must come before the Senate for its consideration, and when the appropriations for the next year must come before the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. MORGAN. Can the Senator from Iowa point out or state to the Senate in what the deficiencies consist?

Mr. ALLISON. Can I?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. Can you state to the Senate in what the deficiencies consist?

Mr. ALLISON. I can, of course, at the proper time and in a general way. But they are deficiencies.

Mr. MORGAN. At the proper time is when we are considering the question, it seems to me.

Mr. ALLISON. But we are not considering it now. We are merely considering the question of reference.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say to the Senator from Iowa that I can not regard any deficiency as existing unless the estimates show it.

Mr. ALLISON. We have estimates. There are estimates.

Mr. MORGAN. Where are they? Let the estimates be read.

Mr. ALLISON (exhibiting). There is an estimate sent by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the House had more detailed estimate in its debate, and the Secretary of War promises to give and is ready to give the full details and the particulars of the deficiencies.

Mr. MORGAN. I object to a decision of this question until the papers get before the Senate. We ought to know what we are acting upon.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] a few minutes ago remarked that when this matter came before his committee he would try to do certain things, with the aid and assistance of the Senator from South Carolina, and he would specifically call the attention of the Senator from South Carolina to those things. If I did not know how eminently and thoroughly kind-hearted and genial the Senator from Iowa is, I would have taken that as a sarcastic allusion to my insignificance as a member of the Appropriations Committee, because no one feels his unimportance there more than I do.

Mr. ALLISON. I ought to have said, in connection with the Senator from South Carolina, that he has had very little knowledge of what was being done in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not allowed to be there until the report comes from the subcommittee, and then it is railroaded through.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator happens to be on some important subcommittee, and if he has not been there it is his own fault. I am glad to say that I regard him as one of the most valuable and industrious members of the Committee on Appropriations, and I regret exceedingly that for the last year or two he has not been able to be present with us in our long and continuous deliberations in that committee.

The railroading business of course occasionally occurs when we are hurried for time, but there is ample time always to consider the great appropriation bills which are referred to that committee, and we always have had the benefit since the time——

Mr. TILLMAN. After such a bouquet thrown at me by such a distinguished member of the Senate I suspect that I ought to subside, but I want to make myself more clearly understood.

I do not charge that the Appropriations Committee since I have had the honor to be a member of it has ever railroaded any measure. I used the wrong phrase. Of course while there have been an apparent hurry and a rush there that did not give some Senators who were not on the subcommittee an opportunity to get the fullest possible light, still I have had so much reliance upon the knowledge and integrity of purpose of its distinguished chairman that in a great many instances I have swallowed everything and anything that came along without even a question.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator knows very well that at the short session important appropriation measures come to us within two or three days of adjournment, and it is necessary that they should be considered, apparently in haste, although, as a matter of fact, they are carefully considered.

Mr. TILLMAN. I understand all that, and if I have said anything that in any wise would create the impression that the Committee on Appropriations does not perform its duty in the most laborious and conscientious manner I want to disavow any such hint or assertion.

But the Senator has remarked to-day in this debate that it is the policy, and the settled policy, of the Senate never to put general legislation on appropriation bills, when he knows, when I know, when every member of this body knows, that it is so common an occurrence that it is simply pitiable to see how our rules are stretched and even trampled under foot whenever a majority see fit to do so.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly. But I would say before the Senator begins that he ought to take cognizance of the fact that as an humble and subordinate member of the Committee on Appropriations I am getting in very bad odor with the high and mighty leaders in that committee for having the effrontery to express a personal opinion on this matter. But I honestly think and believe that this thing needs legislation right now, and that these salaries should be stopped; there should be an end to these exorbitant steals that are going on, even if the President of the United States has lent the prestige of his great name and his wisdom and judgment to their being proper compensation.

Mr. HOPKINS. It is my knowledge of the honesty and frankness of the Senator from South Carolina which prompts the question. I understood him to say that already the work of the Committee on Appropriations on the bills of which it now has jurisdiction is of such a character that members who are not on particular subcommittees know but little about the items in the various appropriation bills considered by such subcommittees, which bills he characterized as being railroaded through the general committee when they are reported to the full committee, and if a member of the Appropriations Committee is not on the subcommittee having under consideration the particular bill, he knows but little of what is contained in the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. TILLMAN. That is correct to this extent. The subcommittees usually have on them men of long experience and thorough familiarity with the Government and the law, who are always ready, if not always able, to give a satisfactory answer. Some of us sometimes differ with them as to whether a certain appropriation is sufficiently economical or something like that, but then we defer to their superior judgment and knowledge. That is about the statement of the fact.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not desire to extend this discussion. We have been told this is an emergency bill, and that we ought to put it through as rapidly as possible. Everybody knows that this bill is going to pass. I think everybody here believes it will pass practically as it came from the House. As has been said, whatever may be the complaint about salaries, they have been earned, and they are due, or will be due in a few days.

Mr. TILLMAN. They have been promised, not earned, I would suggest.

Mr. TELLER. They have been earned. We authorized the President of the United States to select these officers and fix their compensation. He has fixed it. We might repeal the law; perhaps we ought to; but certainly we will not be indecent enough here to deny that the gentlemen who went into office under those appointments are entitled to their money. We are bound to pay it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question right at this point?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will not the salaries continue right along at the same rate?

Mr. TELLER. They will.

Mr. McCUMBER. And will they not be earned in the future at the same rate until some other measure is passed?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Should we not act immediately upon it through some committee authorized to act on the subject?

Mr. TELLER. The committee on this subject can to-morrow morning, if they choose, present a bill. They do not have to take this bill as the basis of their action. Any member of the committee can introduce a bill here. The committee can do it as a committee. Individual members of the committee can do it as individuals. They are not tied up or hampered.

Now, I do not know whether all of these salaries are to be complained of. Some of them, I think, might be properly criticised. Some of them I do not think probably could be criticised. That is the province of the Canal Committee, if it sees fit to take it up.

But it is not an appropriation committee. It has never had the authority of this body to present an appropriation bill. I will venture to say, Mr. President, that no committee of the Senate has ever in its history attempted to take an appropriation bill until there had been a rule of the Senate, carefully considered and deliberately passed, authorizing it to take charge of the bill. The Committee on Interoceanic Canals are assuming here that they have superior ability to handle this question, and they are insisting—at least that seems to be the theory of the Senator who catechised me a moment since—that they must have an appropriation bill on which to put this legislation.

Mr. President, there is a rule of the Senate which prohibits them, even if they were an appropriation committee, as it prohibits the established general Appropriation Committee, from introducing on an appropriation bill general legislation. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina that again and again we have abused that rule, not because the committee brought such amendments here, but because the Senate time and again in the last twenty-five years have said, when an appropriation bill was before the Senate, "This is an appropriate and proper time to put on legislation." Therefore the Senate and not the committee have put upon the bills such legislation.

I do not mean to say—it is not a question presented—that if the proposition were made here to give to the Canal Committee jurisdiction of every question touching this subject I would not vote for it, but I know and they know that they now have jurisdiction of the question whether the salaries are proper. They now have jurisdiction of all questions of any importance connected with this subject, except it may be merely the one of appropriating money. I can see an argument in favor of allowing the committee to take charge of the question of future appropriations. I can see that they ought, of all committees, to determine the question, if we attempt to determine it at all, what shall be the character of the canal—whether it shall be a

canal with a lock 90 feet high, or whether it shall be a canal with a lock of 60 feet or 30 feet, or whether it shall be a sea-level canal.

Mr. President, those are the questions to which the committee should address themselves. It will add nothing to their glory, nothing to their strength, nothing to their reputation to pass on the pending bill. These other questions are immediate questions that the American people want the committee to settle, and not whether we shall pay a dept which has been incurred legally and properly. Whether it has in every instance been judiciously incurred with respect to the amount of the salaries, is a matter left to the discretion of the President. I am not prepared to say that he has abused his discretion, and if he did abuse it, it does not make any difference; Congress has to pay it, and Congress ought to pay it like men. The Canal Committee would not dare to come in here and say they had reduced salaries on an appropriation bill, and if they did, whatever I might think about it, I would vote that that was a question, owing to the fact that we authorized the President to fix the salaries, which we ought to take up and settle with care and not with haste.

This bill, by every rule of the Senate, by every tradition, should go to the Committee on Appropriations, and unless the Senate is prepared to record here now its lack of faith in the intelligence and integrity of that committee it will not vote to send the bill to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. Let the chairman of that committee come here to-morrow and put in an amendment of the rules, if he wants control and the committee wants control of these appropriations, and the Senate will deal with it and determine whether there is just and proper ground to say that the Committee on Interoceanic Canals can handle that question better than the established Committee on Appropriations, and the proceeding will be dignified and in accordance with the usual practice of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think the policy of the Senate in regard to appropriations has been long and well settled. All appropriation measures go to the Committee on Appropriations, and the only cases in which appropriation bills have been taken from that committee have been, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] has said, by a special rule removing an entire bill, covering an entire subject; and it has been done without reference to any specific case. This is a proposal not to take an appropriation bill away from the Committee on Appropriations and give it to another committee, but to take a certain appropriation relating to a specific subject and hand it over to another committee. We have pending no appropriation bill for the completion and maintenance of the Panama Canal. It is an incidental expense so far. If the Senate wants to make the canal the subject of a separate bill and to make a rule covering it, as they have covered the post-office and post-roads, the military, and the naval bills, that is the proper way to deal with it.

But I submit suddenly to take a deficiency bill, as this is, from the committee where it has always been and give it to a committee whose functions have thus far been purely legislative is violative of all our practice, and I think a dangerous proceeding. I have the honor to be chairman of the Committee on the Philippines, a committee constituted to deal with a new and distinct subject. That committee has reported many measures, some of them involving a great deal of expense. I have tried to the best of my ability to defend and maintain the prerogatives of that committee, but it never occurred to me that we had any right to take charge of appropriations connected with the Philippine Islands. There have been naval appropriations connected exclusively with those islands; there have been military appropriations connected exclusively with the Philippine Islands; but it never occurred to me that those ought to go to my committee. We have left appropriations to certain defined committees, committees which would bring in a bill solely for the purpose of appropriation.

Nothing is better settled, Mr. President, to take another example in the practice of the Senate, than the control of the Committee on Foreign Relations over treaties. We have reported more than once to the Senate and had ratified treaties carrying the necessity of a large appropriation. In order to carry out the treaty it was necessary to make a large appropriation, as in the case of the treaty with Spain. But I do not think it has ever occurred to anyone that because the Committee on Foreign Relations was responsible for the action which necessitated the appropriation the appropriation in any sense came within their jurisdiction.

If we are to turn the canal appropriations over to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals it ought to be done, as all other changes of appropriations have been made, by a separate rule giving them control of it, not as an isolated appropriation, but as a bill devoted to that specific subject.

It has been said that we violate constantly the rule against putting legislation on appropriation bills. I think we do, and very unwisely, but that does not affect the merit of the rule or the good service that it does in a great many ways.

I believe it is always unfortunate to mix legislation and appropriations, if it can possibly be avoided. If these salaries are to be cut down and fixed by law, then the committee having control of legislation ought to do it, and it ought not to be done on an appropriation bill. We have all of us, I think, at times attempted to get changes of salaries or advances through an appropriation bill, but that is one direction in which legislation has always been refused.

Mr. President, I have no possible interest in this question, except the general one of the good business of the Senate, for I am a member of neither committee. It seems to me that to take this bill, which is to all intents and purposes a deficiency bill, and remove it from the committee to which all deficiency bills are given and put it into the hands of another committee, which is a legislative committee charged with most important legislative duties, and begin by mixing it up with legislation from that committee and using it as a foundation for legislation in regard to salaries, would be most prejudicial to the conduct of the business of the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the question of reference, which is the only one now before the Senate, it seems to me to be controlled by the question as to what is the present rule. If it be true, and I am inclined to think it is, that under the rule this subject-matter belongs to the Appropriation Committee, I can see no reason why this particular deficiency bill should go to any other committee.

Now, as to the general merits of the question, I am not prepared to say but that the subject of appropriations for the canal should belong to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, and when that question comes before the Senate in a proposition to change the present rule of the Senate, it is possible I may give my vote in favor of the jurisdiction over such appropriations being thereafter exercised by that committee.

There is, however, in this connection one matter which I think will have to be practically dealt with, and the solution of which strikes me as one of some difficulty. There can be no question of the fact that Congress ought to exercise its discretion, and I should say its duty, in seeing that salaries and all expenditures for the canal are kept within proper bounds; and yet I am at a loss to see how, except in the making of appropriations, Congress can control the expenditures relating to the salaries of officers and the wages of employees and other expenditures of like character.

It will be found to be an extremely difficult if not an impossible thing to prescribe salaries for the vast army of officers and of employees that will be necessary in the construction of the canal. There are but five officers specified in the canal act whose salaries, as the law now exists, could be prescribed by law. Of course, before salaries can be prescribed, the officers must be identified and specified by law, and the only officers who are identified and specified by the existing law are the five Commissioners.

This is a matter, Mr. President, not entirely for the first time now considered by me, because it so happens that I am the author of the section of the law which relates to the creation of the Canal Commission, and the question as to the regulation of the salaries, or prescribing the salaries, was considered by me to some extent at the time I undertook to frame that provision of the existing law.

Mr. MORGAN. You did not put anything of that sort in your amendment, did you?

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, I will endeavor to state exactly what the case is. The law directing the construction of the canal, as everyone knows, originated in the bill which was framed and introduced by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. As thus introduced by him it did not contain a provision for the creation of a commission. The provision in the present law requiring the appointment of a commission was added to the bill by an amendment drawn and offered by myself. In endeavoring to frame this provision of the law creating the canal commission, I was confronted by the impossibility of prescribing salaries of officials unless you could prescribe who the officers should be. This was impracticable, because no one, however familiar he might be with such a vast work, could anticipate and provide for all the details of the work and prescribe the number and character of the officers it would require. For that reason it was necessary to make a provision for the fixing of salaries of officers and wages of employees as it is done in the existing law, to wit, by the Commission, with the approval of the President. The existing law gives to the President of the United States

the power to fix the salaries of the Commissioners, and then, providing for the appointment of other officers and men, it gives to the Commission the fixing of their salaries, with the approval of the President.

And, sir, the same difficulty that presented itself to me when I was endeavoring to frame the amendment requiring the appointment of a Commission confronts us now.

In what way, Mr. President, will it be possible for either of these committees to recommend legislation with reference to the salaries which are to be enjoyed by these officers and employees unless we shall first say who the officers and employees shall be? The only way, it occurs to me, that it is possible to correct any extravagance in salaries is in limiting the appropriations made for their payment. It has been suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] that where the service has already been rendered of course the salaries must be paid. Conceding that to be true, a large part of this appropriation is not for salaries which have already been earned, but for salaries which are hereafter to be earned by the same officers between now and the expiration of the present fiscal year.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to suggest to the Senator that while that statement is probably accurate as the bill came before the House, the very purpose of the House in striking off the $5,000,000 and something was to make it apply only to the salaries and expenditures already incurred. The difficulty was that they could not tell from the report exactly what was the amount, and so they guessed somewhat at it.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. In all the many salaries that this Government pays are there any that are fixed on appropriation bills?

Mr. BACON. No, there are not, so far as I know, except it is practically done in certain cases. I think I am correct in saying that even where the law fixes a salary at one figure the Appropriation Committee sometimes appropriates a less amount for the payment of the salary of the officer. I think I am correct, and if I am incorrect the Senator from Iowa will correct me in the statement that this has sometimes occurred.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BACON. I think that is the case. I think it will be found to be so.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to suggest, if the Senator will allow me, that the Committee on Appropriations sometimes makes a less appropriation than the amount at which the law fixes the salary.

Mr. BACON. That is exactly what I meant and endeavored to say.

Mr. TELLER. They do not change the statute; they leave it there.

Mr. BACON. The Senator misunderstood me if he so understood me to say. I meant to say exactly what the Senator from Colorado now says, that there have been in many instances an appropriation for the payment of an officer less than the amount fixed by the law as his salary.

Mr. LODGE. Are there any cases where the office is created in an appropriation bill—I mean practically are there any cases?

Mr. BACON. I do not know of any, and there is nothing which I am saying or endeavoring to say——

Mr. LODGE. That is just what I was going to ask the Senator.

Mr. BACON. There is nothing which I said intended to suggest that there should be any such legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LODGE. In this case, in order to reach those offices where some persons think the salary is too large, would it not be necessary first to create them by law? Because they now exist under a general law according to the President's direction.

Mr. BACON. That is the very difficulty to which I was endeavoring to call the attention of the Senate, the difficulty of legislating with reference to a salary unless there is an office fixed by law. The only officers whose positions are fixed by law in this particular case are the five Commissioners. Of course it is perfectly within the competency of Congress to say that the five Commissioners shall receive only a certain amount, but how we can make any general law which will apply to anyone who is not himself an officer recognized by the law I do not understand.

This is the only way I can see that the difficulty can be met. When we come to appropriate and a particular instance is called to the attention of Congress or of the Senate, this body dealing particularly with the matter, that a particular officer, such a one for instance as has been instanced, who is receiving $10,000 when possibly $5,000 might be considered as a proper salary, it would be competent in the bill appropriating the money to say that that particular person, occupying such a position and discharging such and such duties, should thereafter receive only such an amount, and make an appropriation in accordance with the same.

I see that I have the approval of the distinguished and honored chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. ALLISON], and it encourages me to repeat what I said in the beginning, that I do not see how any committee, either the Interoceanic Canals Committee or the general Appropriations Committee, can deal with the subject of salaries by general legislation. If evil there be, it can only be met and coped with by some such method as that which I have suggested, by limiting in the appropriation bill the amount which is to be received by a person discharging certain duties, and in the absence of that there is no other way to do it that I see, except for Congress to undertake the Herculean and impossible task of saying what shall be this vast army of officers and employees and by fixing the salary of each.

For that reason it seems to me, Mr. President, that we are met by quite a difficulty when we come to carry out the suggestion which has been made here by more than one Senator on each side of this question—that one committee should deal with legislation and the other committee deal with appropriations. It seems to me, as a first impression, that the committee which is to scrutinize all these expenditures and to determine whether those relating to salaries, as well as other expenditures, are upon a proper scale should also have charge of the appropriation bill for the work of the canal, because I can see no way in which the remedy can be applied except in limiting the appropriations in each case where a reduction is required. This scrutiny will be a vast work of innumerable detail, and will involve a labor requiring the entire attention of any committee.

I think it true, of course, that there are many subjects matter of detail connected with this work which can be dealt with by legislation; but I am speaking of the matter of salaries and wages and like expenditures. I may be wrong, but it is worthy of suggestion to Senators who can give thought to it that it is impossible by general legislation to fix the matter of these salaries certainly, unless we are prepared first to define who shall be the officers and then say what their salaries shall be. While the present inclination of my mind is in favor of giving the entire subject of canal appropriations to the Canal Committee, in my judgment the present rule of the Senate requires that this bill shall go to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DANIEL. To my mind, Mr. President, this proposition is a plain one. This is an appropriation bill to discharge an obligation already incurred by the Government of the United States. We have made debts. We are obliged to pay them. No one has any notion of repudiating them after the fact of incurring the obligation, and in natural and in due course this bill should, of course, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, the committee designated and formed by the Senate for the purpose of discharging the function which we are invited to perform by the very tenor of the bill.

It has been suggested that a legislative committee formed for wholly distinct and divergent purposes should be the recipient of this reference. That would seem to be a strange suggestion, one out of the due and orderly course of our daily administration.

It has been said that would be convenient to the views entertained by some gentlemen that these salaries are too extravagant. That thought suggests itself in another direction, but not to the reference of this bill. It may be that at the proper time the question will be debatable upon this floor as to whether or not it were wise to repose the power, ordinarily pertaining to the legislative body, to designate the salaries and to apportion the salaries of administrative offices. But that has been done. We are dealing with facts accomplished and not with facts proposed.

It has been suggested that one committee will find it convenient to propose legislation to accompany this bill. No one committee of this body has an iota of privilege in that respect that does not pertain to every other committee. The committee to whom it is suggested to refer the bill has no range of purview one inch beyond what belongs to the Appropriations Committee.

As I read the rule, Mr. President, let me suggest that this is not a general appropriation bill. It is a special appropriation bill. It is not a general deficiency bill, but a special deficiency bill as to revenue about certain things. Anyone on the floor of the Senate has a right to offer an amendment to the bill. Any committee to which it may be referred, whether you call it the Appropriations Committee or the Interoceanic Canals Committee, no matter what its name, may amend the bill, and any Senator here, who has spoken in a contrariwise direction to

these thoughts, has the right here to offer his amendment and have it duly considered; at least that is the case as I read the rule.

I can not see, Mr. President, that any consideration whatever has been suggested which should induce the Senate to depart from its ordinary, from its natural, and from its customary method of action.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, if I were to consult my personal wishes about this matter I would try to escape from the labor and the responsibility of considering this very important bill in the committee of which I have the honor to be a member. I would devolve that duty entirely upon the great committee which has been so long established in the Senate and which has so long engineered the financial operations of the United States. But I see that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] is giving some attention to what I am saying, and I wish to call his attention to the fact that the part of the appropriation bill we are considering is the first section, which I will read for his information, if he has not heard it read. The first section of this bill, relating to the financing of the canal and containing no appropriation, should go to the Senator's Committee on Finance, where I think the bankers are eagerly hoping and expecting that it will receive his paternal care.

I will read the first section:

That the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall be subject to the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled "An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900, the same as though said bonds were issued under the provisions of said act of March 14, 1900.

Section 2 then starts out bravely with the proposition—

That there is hereby appropriated—

Not any money to carry into effect section 1. Everybody knows that no money is required to carry into effect section 1. None is provided in this bill. When I saw that, from the other side of the Chamber, there was considerable anxiety, and, perhaps, some feeling about the destiny of this bill as to its consideration in committee, I was wondering to myself what could be the cause of this trouble; and when I heard the big guns from that side of the Chamber turn loose upon it in such a strenuous way I concluded that there was a great deal more here than the question of appropriation.

Now, the peculiar feature of this bill is in the first section. That is a legislative feature. It is intended to make these bonds available for banking. That is all of it. How much appropriation is there in that? Why can not the committee which has charge of the canal take into consideration the provision of the fund that may be necessary hereafter, without further appropriation, if you please, from Congress, in order to go on with the work of completing the canal? Giving to the President of the United States, as the law now is, or as it is conceded to be on all sides of the Chamber, the right to expend this money in any way and to any amount and upon anybody that he chooses, without any question being asked, even by the Congress of the United States. All that vast amount, $130,000,000, to be raised on these bonds is to be, under the provisions of this act, thrown into the hands of the President. When he gets that I suppose he will feel at liberty to turn his heels or his back upon Congress and say, "I do not need any more appropriation from you; I have got $130,000,000 here, which I can sell bonds to raise. I have enough for present needs. When more is wanted, I will inform Congress."

The bankers of the United States are far more interested in the passage of this bill as an emergency bill than are the people of the United States or the Congress of the United States. They want to handle these bonds. They want us by this legislation to place these bonds on the footing of bonds that can be made the basis of banking in the United States. That is the great question in this bill. Senators know that they have as much power and right to vote upon this salary question on a bill reported from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals as upon a bill reported by the old and substantial Committee on Appropriations of this body. So it makes no difference where the bill comes from. We will still be allowed to offer amendments, unless under some rule of the Senate they are out of order—and I do not think they are—for the purpose of limiting the salaries upon this bill, or for the purpose of ascertaining how much money shall be paid to each of these individuals as salaries in proportion to the work he has done, in proportion to the rules and requirements of justice and equity.

So far from its being an appropriation bill, it is a bill strictly legislative in its character. Its most important formidable feature is in the first section, which everybody will admit contains no hint of an appropriation. Then, as to an appropriation for a deficiency, it is alleged on all sides here that that deficiency has occurred. I am not satisfied that any deficiency has occurred. I understand a deficiency to mean an insufficiency of money to carry on the operations of the Government not hitherto supplied by Congress, which in consequence of certain embarrassments or certain exigencies the authorities have promised to pay in excess of the amount appropriated.

No appropriation has ever been made by the Congress of the United States for any salary whatever to any officer of the canal. Those appropriations have been left to the discretion of the President by the application of a bulk sum, to be distributed by him as he sees proper. It is impossible for me to conceive of a deficiency existing under the laws of the United States, in such conditions, unless somebody has outreached his authority in creating obligations upon the United States. If such a thing as that has occurred, it ought to be stopped right now. We have got a canal to build which is going to cost at the very least $300,000,000, and when we have expended $300,000,000 we shall not have a canal. At the same time we must go on and expend it; and I am going to vote with you to spend every dollar you want. But how is it to be when we approach the end of the job? Suppose, in the meantime, under the conditions that now exist, when everything is left to the discretion of the President as to expenditure, when we approach the distant day when this canal shall be completed, we find that the $300,000,000 appropriated by Congress has been expended and another $100,000,000 contracted for by the President of the United States remains as a deficiency. We are now laying the predicate for such a situation in this bill. We ought to begin to define deficiency in respect of this matter; as to who has the power to create it, and by what means he will create the deficiency. Before we pass upon this very important question the Senate ought at least to have an estimate of the actual deficiency—not the round sum, but an estimate of the particulars in which the deficiency exists or has occurred. We find at this early day that such restrictions are necessary for the safety of the Treasury.

From debates in the House of Representatives upon this subject I would suppose—I know nothing about it personally—that this deficiency consists largely in the payment of extraordinary salaries, which have exhausted the funds hitherto appropriated for canal construction; also in the purchase of material that perhaps will not be used for five or ten years to come; and for various other matters which have been contracted for by persons—not salaried officers, not officers appointed under law, not officers whose tenure is limited or whose authority is prescribed by law, but officers appointed by the President, whose salaries are fixed by the President, and paid by the President, and so forth.

What right have these men, in this nebulous and unorganized state, when there is not a Senator on this floor who knows the names of the officers that are known—what right have these men to contract debts against the United States to the amount of $18,000,000, and what right have we to call it a deficit when it is only a gross violation of statute laws?

The question whether or not there is a deficit is one to be inquired into. I think, Mr. President, that the Committee on Interoceanic Canals is quite as capable of ascertaining whether there is any deficit as is the Committee on Appropriations, for the Committee on Appropriations can only ascertain what is the deficit, if there is any, by reference to some statute law. The Committee on Interoceanic Canals may find a way to ascertain that the deficit exists that we are obliged to shoulder rather than inflict reproach upon the Administration; they may find a way to do it; but before they find their way to do that they have to state some reason, some principle, upon which this deficit has been lawfully contracted. So it is not a deficit.

What about the emergency? Is there any emergency about paying these debts? What are they? To whom are they due? Under what contract? Are they due to foreigners who have sold goods to the Panama Canal Company or foreigners who have sold goods to the Isthmian Canal Commission in England or Germany or France and have sent them over here for the purpose of avoiding our tariff duties upon them? Are they debts to those people, or are they due to American citizens, who are under the disability of having a large duty imposed on everything that they import from abroad and therefore are manufacturing goods at an enormous profit under the cover and shelter of that protection? I want to know; I have a right to know; and the Committee on Interoceanic Canals is quite as able to ascertain that—not speaking of myself, of course—as is the Committee on Appropriations. Look at the majority of that committee, Mr. President—the Republican majority of that committee. There is not an abler body of men in this Senate than

is on the Republican majority of that committee. They may not be as venerable as some, but they are as able as the venerables have ever been or are now. Why should we withdraw this bill from them in order to get a higher range of Republican ability to pass upon Republican measures? I can not quite understand the logic of that situation, nor do I believe that that is the motive.

I think the whole business is to jam through this bank feature in the first section of this bill. I have not expressed any opinion about what my vote will be in committee or anywhere else upon that bank feature, but it is a subject for discussion, for very grave consideration here, whether the banks of the United States—how many thousand are there, six, or seven, or eight thousand national banks?—shall meet in their congresses and come to the conclusion that the Government of the United States shall not raise any money on its bonds to build a canal unless it will give them the privilege of banking upon those bonds. We may think that privilege is too large now; we may prefer to increase the rate of interest from 2 to 3 per cent rather than give the banks the opportunity of throttling the Government and saying, "You shall not build the canal until you pay us a part of these profits." There are questions and questions and questions involved in the first section of this bill that are as far from the question of appropriation as is the sun from the earth. All this is a makeshift and a make-pretense when we call this an appropriation bill or when we call it a deficiency bill or when we call it an emergency bill.

What is the urgency? Are you going to hold up the canal until you get the money? You have done that already, you are holding it up now, and not working upon it, and your chief of engineers has so stated it in printed papers, in the magazines. Mr. Shonts has stated that he has stopped work now, not because you have not got the money or the credit, but because you have not settled the plan of canal after working upon it for fully three years. You have been considering legislation upon the Spooner law and the discussion which followed that upon the treaty and other matters. For three years you have been trying to come to some conclusion about what the plan of the canal should be, and we are as far from it to-day as we were three years ago. Now, the plan of that canal is the real emergency. Until that plan is before Congress and has been acted upon, there can be no wise legislation in respect to the canal.

Already, Mr. President, the history of the Panama Canal is fully as bad as the first three years of the history of the old De Lesseps Panama Canal—not perhaps so deeply stained with fraud and graft, as it is called, but as to reckless expenditure, as to the wasteful use of the money of the people, as to the carelessness as to what the results are going to be, as to insufficiency and incompleteness of knowledge of what we are doing, and what we can do, we are as far in the woods to-day as the De Lesseps canal was three years after it was projected; and we have gone on with this job for three dreadful years. That is the emergency. It is to keep up appearances and our national eclat and reputation for doing things that emergency appropriations are demanded to supply unlawful deficiencies.

But in view of the fact that there is no plan for the canal, in view of the fact that Doctor Gorgas has been running his hygienic measures with great success, it appears, but at the loss of five or six months of working time on the canal; in view of that enormous and terrible handicap resting upon the whole business, when our agents have driven away those who have not deserted and gone home, and have discharged others and sent them away and have suspended work, waiting for more patent excavators and the like of that, and have created $18,000,000 of debt, which there is not a dollar appropriated to pay, there arises this emergency deficit that can only be accounted for by failure to do things—a deficiency created by men who had no authority, or even color of law, under which to create it, and you come here and call it not only a deficiency, but an emergency deficiency! The emergency, Mr. President, is in the situation I have just been describing. There is no true emergency here.

When the Committee on Appropriations reports this bill to the Senate—if the bill shall be referred to that committee—I think I might afford a little effort at prophecy by saying they will probably bring back the first section without amendment. I think I might do that. They might probably retort upon me, "Why, your Interoceanic Canal Committee will do the same thing." They might go still further, and say I would vote for it if I could not make it any better. They might do that; but when that bill comes into the Senate, when somebody gets up and proposes an amendment to it, they will say that is new legislation on an appropriation bill; and out it goes. We do not want gentlemen to be hampered and confined in any such strait as that. We do not want to have the rules of the Senate to lock our tongues and our mouths and prohibit us from asking for a vote upon a motion to amend the first section. Then it will be a regular appropriation bill, an emergency appropriation bill, to meet a deficit. Of all bills in the world which will not bear outside legislation, general legislation outside of its particular phraseology, this is that bill. The minority, whoever they may be, or the majority who think we are paying too much tribute to the banks and had better raise the percentage of interest from 2 to 3 per cent rather than to accommodate the banks in their demand upon us, will be silenced by the rule of the Senate. This is an appropriation bill, it will be said, and being such, and coming from the Committee on Appropriations, it is not liable to amendment by any proposition that has any feature or symptom of general legislation in it, and there we are.

Mr. President, when this bill goes to that Appropriations Committee, it being the first effort at appropriation in respect of the canal in any detail by Congress, the precedent will be established, and the honorable gentlemen who have charge of that committee, the majority of it—the minority is, of course, beyond all expression weak—these gentlemen will find themselves bereft of all power to control this canal, for the real control of the canal will be in the regulation of the appropriations.

This is not a general bill of appropriations; it is not a bill to provide for deficiencies created to carry on the Government. It is a special appropriation bill, and therefore it is not really and properly subject to the rules which are invoked here to-day, that all appropriation bills shall go to the Committee on Appropriations. Now, when these gentlemen get hold of this bill, old and venerable and distinguished and able, as they are, they will sit down, Mr. President, and they will commence manufacturing a lot of offices and distributing the money among them in a purely legislative way. They are obliged to do it—to manufacture the offices, first, by legislation, and distribute the money and come back here and ask us to accept it. They have been pluming themselves on the fact, and I have been greatly comforted so long as I have been in the Senate by the fact, that the Appropriations Committee could not legislate; for, if they had the power to appropriate the money and could legislate also, Mr. President, it would be like uniting the sword and purse in the hands of the President of the United States—a dangerous thing to do, even with that magnificent body of gentlemen who have so long, so ably, and so faithfully served this country and never yet have made a slip of it. But there is a younger generation coming along here, and we do not know exactly what they are going to do. There may be some ambitious men among them, who would like to take the same liberties with the Treasury of the United States that the President takes, and they would say, "Send your bills here, if there is any color of money in them at all; send your bills to us, and we will legislate upon the bills first, and next make the appropriations." If there is anything more important than the exercise of that function that the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate of the United States exercises in such a conservative way of being the distributors, according to their judgment, of as much money as we are able to pay under laws that exist, it is that they are without the right or the privilege of making any enactment of law. That is the proposition that stands best and truest, and will stand longest in favor of the rectitude of the legislation of the Government of the United States.

I regret very much to see the anxiety of these gentlemen in reaching out for legislative powers when they have proclaimed for so many years here, and so righteously, that Congress ought not to put anything in their reach that looked like legislation or put upon their bills anything that looked like legislation. Let them act according to their professions and renounce every opportunity that comes to them to unite the legislative and the appropriations function. Instead of that, we find them to-day in anxious pursuit of this new scheme, where the legislative power and the appropriation power are united in respect to all the future transactions of this great and lamentable concern that we call the Panama Canal. I expected to see the aged gentlemen, Senators on that Appropriations Committee, rise and say, "We renounce the temptation you place before us to control this big canal business." But I am afraid that when they were considering the first section and saw the banking operation of it and the bond operation of it they lost their virtue for a moment and forgot themselves, and here they are crying out and clamoring for a chance to pass a banking bill upon this pretended appropriation bill for an isthmian canal. Why not leave that provision out? Why send that to them? When you refer that to them in preference to referring it to a legislative committee, you declare that it is a subject of appropriation, not a subject of legislation, and when you make that declaration, Mr. President, you violate all the truths which can be written in the English language.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of

the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to refer the bill to the Committee on Appropriations. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BULKELEY (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER]. If he were present, he would vote "nay" and I should vote "yea."

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator form Illinois [Mr. CULLOM]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PETTUS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE].

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 40, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Aldrich	Burnham	Gallinger	Overman
Alger	Carter	Hale	Perkins
Allee	Clark, Wyo.	Hemenway	Simmons
Allison	Clarke, Ark.	Heyburn	Smoot
Ankeny	Daniel	Kean	Spooner
Bacon	Dolliver	Lodge	Stone
Berry	Flint	Long	Sutherland
Beveridge	Foraker	McCreary	Teller
Blackburn	Foster	Mallory	Warner
Brandegee	Frye	Nixon	Warren

NAYS—23.

Bailey	Dubois	Knox	Morgan
Burkett	Frazier	Latimer	Nelson
Carmack	Fulton	McCumber	Piles
Clapp	Gamble	McLaurin	Scott
Clay	Hopkins	Millard	Tillman
Culberson	Kittredge	Money	

NOT VOTING—24.

Bulkeley	Depew	Hansbrough	Pettus
Burrows	Dick	McEnery	Platt
Burton	Dillingham	Martin	Proctor
Clark, Mont.	Dryden	Newlands	Rayner
Crane	Elkins	Patterson	Taliaferro
Cullom	Gorman	Penrose	Wetmore

So the bill was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, in the course of the remarks made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] this morning I interrupted him to call his attention to a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in respect to the right and power of a State to authorize a railroad commission to fix rates within that State. I declared that the counsel for the railroad company in that particular case had contended against the validity of the law upon the express ground that it was a delegation of legislative power. It had been some years since I had read the case, and I was stating merely my recollection of it. I find that it is even stronger than I stated it. It was not the contention of the attorneys for the railroad only, but the court itself in the very beginning of the opinion states that as one of the arguments in support of the decree below, the court below having held the Mississippi statute unconstitutional. After stating the facts, Chief Justice Waite, who delivered the opinion of the court, continued:

> The argument in support of the decree below is:
> 1. That the statute under which the commissioners are to act impairs the obligation of the charter contract of the Mobile and Ohio Railroad Company.

It is fair to say that two distinguished justices dissented from the opinion of the court, basing their dissent upon the ground that the Mississippi act did not impair the obligation of the contract with the particular railroad which was a defendant in this case.

> 2. That it is, so far as that company is concerned, a regulation of commerce among the States;
> 3. That it denies the company the equal protection of the laws and deprives it of its property without due process of law;
> 4. That it confers both legislative and judicial powers on the commission, and is thus repugnant to the constitution of Mississippi; and
> 5. That it is void on its face by reason of its inconsistencies and uncertainties.

The court considers, in order, each ground stated, and referring to the fourth contention, that the act of the Mississippi legislature conferred both legislative and judicial functions upon the commission which the act created, the Supreme Court declared—dismissing it in one brief paragraph—

> The Supreme Court of Mississippi has decided in the cases of Railroad Commission *v.* Yazoo and Mississippi Railroad Company, and Railroad Commission *v.* Natchez, Jackson and Columbia Railroad Company—

My opinion is that is a misprint. It should be the Natchez, Jackson and Columbus—

> not yet officially reported, that the statute is not repugnant to the constitution of the State "in that it creates a commission and charges it with the duty of supervising railroads. To this we agree, and that is all that need be decided in this case.

I take it that it will be difficult to distinguish—I mean to distinguish upon that particular objection—between the power of a State legislature to delegate its right to fix rates and the power of the Federal Congress to delegate its right to fix rates. If the State of Mississippi can create a commission and authorize that commission to fix the rates which the railroads should receive for their services in that State, and our highest court holds that not an unlawful delegation of the legislative power of that State, I am utterly unable to perceive how it can be successfully contended that a law of Congress empowering a commission created by Congress to substitute a reasonable for an unreasonable rate is an unwarranted delegation of our power.

Now, it is true, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio this morning, that this case only involved the validity of that law under the constitution of Mississippi, but as I suggested to him, neither the State court nor the United States Supreme Court predicates its decision upon any peculiar language of the constitution of Mississippi. Where the constitution had authorized and created a commission, as in the case of our own State, it might then be contended that there was a difference, but if it is a delegation of the legislative authority I doubt if a State, even by constitutional enactment, could make such a law valid, because I am inclined to think that the Supreme Court of the United States would hold that any law which authorized a commission to exercise the legislative functions of a State is not the due process of law as required by the Constitution of the United States.

In other words, I am inclined to think that the requirement that all property rights in this country shall be adjudicated and protected under the due process of law would lead the Supreme Court of the United States to hold a provision in a State constitution which authorized the delegation of its legislative power to be void and without effect.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, when during the discussion this morning the Senator from Texas called my attention to this case, I did not distinctly recall what the case was. But after I took my seat I sent to the Library and got the case, and I find it not to be in conflict with what I had stated, in answer to which the Senator cited the case. What I stated was that I did not understand that it had been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, in any case or by any other court, that legislative power could be constitutionally delegated to a commission such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, or any other tribunal.

Mr. BAILEY. Of course the Senator from Ohio did not understand me to assert that legislative power can be delegated?

Mr. FORAKER. No; certainly not. The Senator agreed with me on that general proposition, but differed with me as to the application of it.

I then went on to say that it was a delegation of legislative power to confer on a commission the power to fix specific rates, except only where they did it in an administrative way, illustrating it with some instances which I gave on the spur of the moment. However, I then sent for this case to see whether or not I was in error in the statement I had made that there was no decision of the Supreme Court in conflict with the statement in that respect which I had made. I find that the question that we were discussing is not involved in this case at all.

This was a case, Mr. President, where a suit was brought to enjoin the commissioners of the State of Mississippi from applying to the railroad that was complaining the provisions of a statute one section of which conferred on the railroad commissioners of that State the power to fix maximum rates. No maximum rate had been fixed. No action whatever had been taken under that statute by the railroad commissioners of the State of Mississippi. So the precise question we have been discussing was not involved. But the main question involved was whether or not that statute was in conflict with the charter of the railroad, which they claimed was in the nature of a contractual obligation, binding on the State, conferring upon the railroad the power to fix its own rates. The Supreme Court held that this legislation was not in conflict with that right which had been conferred upon the railroad in its charter; and it nowhere considered whether or not it was competent for the legislature to confer on the commission the power to make a rate. What it says upon that subject is that the State of Mississippi has the power to fix railroad rates. Nobody disputes that. The sovereignty of the State is supreme and complete, and it can do that.

Another and very different question arises as to the constitutional power of the United States, acting through Congress, to fix rates. It is very ably insisted by some lawyers that the power has not been conferred by the States upon the Federal Government to fix rates, even by an act of Congress. But I

was careful to say I do not now agree with that proposition. There is a good deal to be said, however, in support of it.

Mr. BAILEY rose.

Mr. FORAKER. I was about to call attention to what the case really is and what the Court really decided.

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator from Ohio will permit me to call his attention to one point, he can answer both at once.

Mr. FORAKER. Very well.

Mr. BAILEY. He now raises rather a different question. When I first interrupted the Senator it was with respect to what I understood him to say in reference to the delegation of legislative authority. I understood him to contend that to authorize the Commission to make rates was a delegation of legislative authority, and therefore not permissible.

Mr. FORAKER. Not in all cases.

Mr. BAILEY. Then in answer to that I called his attention to the decision in the Mississippi case. The Senator is mistaken when he says the court has never held that any State has a right to create a commission to fix rates. They precisely held that in the Reagan case. They held the rates as fixed by the railroad commission of Texas invalid and not enforceable, because they held that those particular rates were confiscatory. But they expressly held the law itself, which authorized the fixing of rates by a commission, to be a valid exercise of the power of the State. The Reagan case holds distinctly, unequivocally, and without any question that a State may create a commission and authorize it to fix railroad rates; and the rates when so fixed must be respected by the railroads unless they are confiscatory.

Mr. FORAKER. We will come to the Reagan case in due time. I want to get through with this case before I leave it. This is the case the Senator cited this morning. I sent to the Library for it. I have it here. I read it. I have it in my hand now. I want to point out what this case decides. I wish to show it does not decide any such thing—saying it with all proper respect—as that it is competent for the legislature to confer upon a commission the right to fix specific rates where it must exercise the legislative discretion that is involved in legislation.

Now, it will be borne in mind that I differentiated. I said this morning there might be a lawful authorization of a commission to fix rates where a rule was prescribed by the legislature that left nothing for that body to do except only to make a mathematical calculation or to make some sort of computation. They could do that—that is an administrative act—where it was necessary only to ascertain a state of facts to give effect and operation to something the legislature had declared should go into effect and operation when such a state of facts was declared to exist, as in the case of Field against Clark.

In the case which the Senator cited this morning I find the principal question involved was whether or not the provision made by the legislature of Mississippi, conferring on the commission the general power of regulation, including the power to fix maximum rates, was in violation of a charter provision under which the railroad was organized and took its franchises and was operating which conferred upon it the power to make its own rates. The Court held that there was no conflict.

The last paragraph of the syllabus shows what the court decided in that respect:

> The provisions of the statute of Mississippi of March 11, 1884, creating a railroad commission, are not so inconsistent and uncertain as to necessarily render the entire act void on its face—

Clearly indicating that there were a number of provisions, as they afterwards say in so many words, under which serious questions might arise, and undoubtedly would arise if the statute should be put into operation, upon which it was not necessary for the court then to pass and upon which it did not pass, but reserved the same until the questions actually arose.

Now, turning to the opinion of the Court, I call attention to the fact that what the Court says is this, which nobody disputes:

> It is now settled in this court that a State has power to limit the amount of charges by railroad companies for the transportation of persons and property within its own jurisdiction, unless restrained by some contract in the charter, or unless what is done amounts to a regulation of foreign or interstate commerce.

Nobody denies that the State has that power. The question whether or not the State, acting through the legislature, in attempting to exercise that power had the right to delegate it to a subordinate tribunal which the legislature created—and that is the question here involved—the Supreme Court does not pretend to pass upon. That is what it says at that point. Now, let me call attention to what the Court says further on. After discussing this whole subject, at page 331 the Court says, concluding that branch of the discussion:

> Under pretense of regulating fares and freights the State can not require a railroad corporation to carry persons or property without reward; neither can it do that which in law amounts to a taking of private property for public use without just compensation or without due process of law. What would have this effect we need not say now, because no tariff has yet been fixed by the Commission—

Reserving the whole subject about which we are having a discussion now—

> and the statute of Mississippi expressly provides "that in all trials of cases brought for a violation of any tariff of charges as fixed by the Commission it may be shown in defense that such tariff so fixed is unjust.

Now, further, at the conclusion of the next paragraph, page 333, the Court, after pointing out the nature of the statute, that a portion of it relates to rates and a portion of it to ordinary police regulations, says:

> The first three of these relate entirely to proceedings for fixing charges and supervising the tariff, and the rest, like the correlative requirements of the company, are mere police regulations, which the commissioners are to enforce. All this comes clearly within the supervising power of the State in the administration of the affairs of its domestic corporations.

Nobody disputes that the State has the power to do that. The question is whether or not the State, acting through the legislature, shall exercise this power directly, or whether, being legislative in its character, it can confer the power upon some subordinate tribunal to represent it.

> We conclude, therefore, that the charter of the company contains no contract the obligation of which is in any way impaired by the statute under which the commissioners are to act.

That shows what the Court was discussing. Now, on page 334 the Court says:

> Every person, every corporation, everything within the territorial limits of a State is, while there, subject to the constitutional authority of the State government. Clearly under this rule Mississippi may govern this corporation, as it does all domestic corporations, in respect to every act and everything within the State which is the lawful subject of State government. It may, beyond all question, by the settled rule of decision in this court, regulate freights and fares for business done exclusively within the State.

That is as far as the Court goes, and nobody disputes that proposition. The State may do it. The State may by its legislature enact what shall be maximum rates, but the question is whether or not the State undertaking to exercise that undisputed power and authority has the right to constitute a subordinate tribunal and invest it with the legislative power which the constitution of the State has reposed in the legislature.

Now, I say that nowhere—I will address myself to the Reagan case after I have looked at it again, and if I am mistaken about it I will be only too glad to make proper acknowledgment of the same—I say that nowhere, according to my present understanding of these cases (and I have read all of them) has the Supreme Court said that the legislative power to make rates can be delegated to a commission. And when I say that I do not mean that the Court has not said that the power to make rates may be conferred on a commission. It can be; it has been; and it has been upheld, but always after the legislature has fixed a rule for the commission to be governed by in taking its action, which deprives the commission of the exercise of any legislative discretion. The differentiation is between investing the tribunal with legislative discretion and simply making it an administrative body.

Mr. President, that was recognized in the President's message. The Senator from Texas must have noted—he could not help it; his legal mind is such it could not possibly have escaped him—that the President was careful to say this power should be conferred on an administrative body; "purely administrative body," I think, was the language. To say it shall be purely administrative does not, however, make it so. It is a "purely administrative body," not because you name it such, but because the powers conferred on it make it such, if it be an administrative body at all.

You can not say that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have power to make rates, taking into consideration all the conditions that give rise to competition; that they shall exercise judgment as to the weight to be attached to this, that, and the other factors entering into a problem, and then arrive at a conclusion and make a rate. You can not say they can do that without investing them with legislative discretion.

Mr. SPOONER. Which is the legislative function in the operation to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. FORAKER. The legislative function is in fixing a rate that calls for the exercise of judgment, that calls for the exercise of discretion. There would be no legislative discretion if, as I said this morning, Congress were to say that the rate shall be so much on this or that or the other commodity per ton per mile, or if it should say the rate shall be so and so over a road earning so much per mile within a certain time. It would be a matter then of administration for the board to make a calculation upon and reach a conclusion in regard to it.

There is in such case no discretion. In the other case there is discretion, and that is the point which runs through all these authorities. That is a point which is not touched in this case at all.

It is getting late and we have a lot of other matters to attend to.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Ohio is putting his point with great strength and vigor. What I would like from him is a statement upon the distinct point he is now touching, whether it is easy in a statute to draw this distinction or differentiation so as to make plain where the legislative power is kept in the legislative body and the administrative functions are imposed upon another body. Is that an easy thing to do? From his study and investigation of this great subject, has the Senator the belief that his proposition is easily translatable into statute language?

Mr. FORAKER. No, Mr. President; I do not think it is easy to make a law that is constitutional conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to make rates, because to make it constitutional Congress must prescribe the conditions that shall govern rates, so that there shall be nothing left to the Commission except that which is administrative or mere computation. I think it would be very easy for us to confer upon them the right to make rates at so much per ton per mile, but I think it would be very bad policy, and therefore I do not think there is any likelihood of our enacting legislation of that kind. We might find some other and easier way, but what I mean is that it is not easy, if you establish a rule by the conditions you name, to permit rates to be made as they always have been made in this country, as a result of competition and the operation of the laws and the forces of trade and commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, a moment only. I agree with all the Senator from Ohio read from the opinion of the court in the Mississippi case, and my only complaint is that he did not read the only paragraph in the opinion which is precisely pertinent to the issue between him and me.

The Senate will remember that this morning, when the Senator from Ohio expressed the opinion that it was not competent for Congress to delegate, as he expressed it, its legislative power to the Commission, I inquired if I understood him to contend that the proposal to authorize the Interstate Commission to fix rates was such an unlawful delegation of our authority. He replied that I did, and then I reminded him rather inaccurately that the counsel for the railroads in the Mississippi case had urged that very contention, and that the court had overruled it. I sent for the decision, which I said a moment ago I had not read for several years, and I find it is even stronger than I stated; that it was not the contention of counsel only, but the restatement by the court itself of all the contentions in the case; and the court states one of the contentions to be that the law was invalid because it conferred judicial and legislative power upon that Commission.

I want to remind the Senator from Ohio, when he says that this case simply asserts the power of the State to control rates, that he overlooks the fact that the Court sustains the validity of the Mississippi law which created a commission to fix those rates. The very substance, the very essence of the law whose validity was sustained in the Stone case was the commission created by the legislature of Mississippi, which was given the power to fix rates, not so much per ton per mile, but they were given the power to fix rates.

My own opinion is that this tribunal which we commonly call a "railroad commission" is administrative rather than legislative; but to say that the legislature has the power to fix the rate and deny it the right to select the most appropriate and the only safe means of executing that power, would be, I venture to say, with all due respect to the Senator, an obvious absurdity. If the legislature have the power to fix the rate, then surely the legislature must have the power to create an administrative board to carry out its will; and that practically is what the court says in the Reagan case.

But if the Senator turns from the Mississippi case, overlooking the fact that that law was sustained when attacked, and when one of the very grounds of attack was that it was a delegation of legislative power, which the State was not competent to make——

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BAILEY. I will. But I was right in the middle of a sentence.

Mr. FORAKER. Oh, I beg pardon.

Mr. BAILEY. I yield cheerfully.

Mr. FORAKER. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the very limited extent to which the Supreme Court upheld this law.

They say on page 336:

The argument on this branch of the controversy—

As to the validity of the statute—

contains much that might have been useful if addressed to the legislature while considering the bill before its final enactment, but we find nothing in it to show that the statute as it now stands is altogether void and inoperative.

Having pointed out that there were many things under the statute which would perhaps be held to be so, the question was all the while whether this general statute should be allowed to go into operation, and whether, if it did, it would violate the charter rights of the road, which it was contended were involved.

Mr. BAILEY. But the court would never have said it was a question addressing itself either to the judgment or the conscience of a legislature, if that legislature had undertaken to abdicate its legislative functions and to delegate them to another body. I venture to say that if a sovereign State should in its constitution solemnly provide that some other body than the legislature should exercise the legislative function and any man's rights were imperiled or destroyed under the decision of this nonlegislative body exercising legislative functions, he would find a ready redress for the wrong in the Federal courts of this country, and the Supreme Court of the United States, in my judgment, would unhesitatingly declare that he had been deprived of his property without due process of law. For a century, the Senate must know, one invariable test of the due process of law has been that legislatures must exercise legislative powers and courts must exercise judicial powers; and if a State should so far forget the wisdom of our system as to confer its legislative powers upon the court and clothe the legislature with the judicial function such an enactment would not stand the test of an hour's scrutiny in any enlightened court in this land.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. SPOONER. Of course, it has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States, as I remember, that the fixing of a rate to take effect in the future is a legislative function.

Mr. BAILEY. The court in the Reagan case says "legislative or administrative."

Mr. SPOONER. Very well; I think the Court changed that afterwards. But what I want to ask the Senator is whether the question of the reasonableness of a rate, having been fixed by a railroad company and challenged, is, in his opinion, an administrative question.

Mr. BAILEY. The reasonableness of that particular rate is a judicial question. The courts held——

Mr. SPOONER. I thought the Senator called it an administrative question.

Mr. BAILEY. No; the reasonableness of the rate established—the question as to whether it is reasonable or not—is a judicial inquiry or a judicial question, but the establishment of it is an administrative function, in my judgment. The court says in the Reagan case:

It is doubtless true——

Mr. SPOONER. Of course, if the Senator will allow me, I do not disagree with him. Whether a rate exacted from John Smith for a specified service be an unreasonable rate or not——

Mr. BAILEY. That is a judicial question.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator will agree with me that that is absolutely a judicial question.

Mr. BAILEY. I do; otherwise the court could not determine whether it was confiscatory or not.

Mr. SPOONER. Is the question whether that rate, having been held to be a reasonable rate, shall be effective in the future as a maximum rate, a matter of legal province, or is it legislative or is it administrative?

Mr. BAILEY. Is the Senator through with the question?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I think it is an administrative, or rather a legislative, question, and then if the legislature desires that it shall be reduced, the extent to which it can be or may be reduced can be assigned by the legislature to an administrative board. Of course, when you present the question to a court as to the reasonableness of an existing rate, that question is determined by conditions existing then, determined not only by conditions existing at the time the railroad fixed the rate, but the court must take into consideration conditions existing at the time when it is called upon to pass its judgment.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President——

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Ohio will permit me to

finish the quotation which I had begun from the Reagan case. The court in that case declares:

It is doubtless true, as a general proposition, that the formation of a tariff of charges for transportation by a common carrier of person or property is a legislative or administrative rather than a judicial function.

Further on in that very case the State of Texas contended that it was not a judicial question whether the rate existing was a reasonable one or not, but a purely legislative one, over which the courts had no control. The Supreme Court of the United States decided adversely to the contention of our State in that respect, and held they could pursue an inquiry into the reasonableness of these rates, and now for the last time I remind the Senator from Ohio that in that very case the Supreme Court declares the law of Texas constitutional, although the inferior court—and if it were parliamentary I would use the word "inferior" to describe the judge as well as the court—the inferior court held that the law was unconstitutional. The Supreme Court of the United States overruled that decree to that extent, but they enjoined the enforcement of the rate, because upon an elaborate consideration as to the value of the property and the schedule of the rates they held that those rates would not return a sufficient sum upon the property to protect the railroad in its rights; and that to enforce that schedule of rates would be confiscatory and therefore unlawful. Upon that ground only they enjoined not the law, for they set aside the decree of the court that held the law void, but they enjoined the enforcement of the tariff schedule adopted by the commission under the law.

Mr. FORAKER. I shall not undertake at this late hour of the evening to take up the discussion of the Reagan case. I will reserve until to-morrow or some other convenient time the right to make some remarks in answer to the Senator's comments upon that case. I think, in view of the pressure for executive business, I will wait until to-morrow or some other convenient time to call the Senator's attention to what is a lawful rate. My contention is that the statute has already fixed the lawful rate; and I want to speak in answer to the Senator's suggestion about the right of a court to enjoin everything that is exacted in excess of what is lawful. That is not making a rate. It is only giving effect to the rate that Congress has already prescribed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such testimony as may be taken by the committee or its subcommittees in connection with appropriation bills, and to have the same printed for its use, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 12, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 11, 1905.

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

Civil Engineer Mordecai T. Endicott, United States Navy, for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. This nomination is forwarded to supersede the nomination of Commissioner Endicott in which his title was given as that of rear-admiral, United States Navy. The change in title is necessary to make the same consistent with Navy Department regulations.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Herman F. Cellerius, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Ohio, to succeed Bernard Bettmann, resigned. Mr. Cellerius is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate. This nomination is to correct error in nomination made December 6, 1905, wherein Mr. Cellerius's name was spelled Cellarious.

DEPUTY AUDITOR.

S. John Abbott, of Delaware, to be Deputy Auditor for the Treasury Department, in place of Aloysius E. Bowling, deceased. Mr. Abbott is now serving under a temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

William G. Dearing, of Kentucky, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Louisville, in the State of Kentucky, to succeed Cicero M. Barnett, whose term of office will expire by limitation February 9, 1906.

NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

James O. Lyford, of New Hampshire, to be naval officer of customs in the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Infantry arm.

First Lieut. George B. Pond, Third Infantry, to be captain from October 6, 1905, vice Morrison, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Dana T. Merrill, Twenty-third Infantry, to be captain from October 10, 1905, vice Bash, Seventh Infantry, detailed as commissary.

First Lieut. Alexander M. Wetherill, Thirteenth Infantry, to be captain from October 11, 1905, vice Rowan, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles N. Murphy, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be captain from October 29, 1905, vice Faison, Thirteenth Infantry, detailed as quartermaster.

First Lieut. Theodore A. Baldwin, jr., Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be captain from October 30, 1905, vice Andrus, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harry W. Bathiany, Third Infantry, to be first lieutenant from September 22, 1905 (subject to examination required by law), vice McCook, Second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Fred H. Turner, Twenty-third Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 4, 1905, vice Coleman, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edwin O. Saunders, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 6, 1905, vice Pond, Third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Walter Krueger, Thirtieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 10, 1905, vice Merrill, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Beverly C. Daly, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 11, 1905, vice Wetherill, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Asa L. Singleton, Fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 24, 1905, vice Norwood, Twenty-third Infantry, resigned.

Second Lieut. Arthur L. Bump, Eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 29, 1905, vice Murphy, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Willis E. Mills, Ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 30, 1905, vice Baldwin, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Gilbert A. McElroy, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 30, 1905, vice Brandle, First Infantry, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Samuel J. M. McCarrell, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania. (A reappointment, his term expiring December 11, 1905.)

William A. Northcott, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of Thomas Worthington, term expired.

William E. Trautmann, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. An original appointment under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1905, entitled "An act providing for an additional circuit judge in the seventh judicial circuit, and for the appointment of an additional judge for the northern district of Illinois, and for creating an additional district in the State of Illinois, to be known as the eastern district of Illinois, and for the appointment of a judge and other officers of said district, and for changing the boundaries of the districts in Illinois, and for establishing places for holding court in the several districts thus created."

Charles B. Morrison, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of Solomon H. Bethea, appointed judge northern district of Illinois.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Aulick Palmer, of the District of Columbia, to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia. (A reappointment, his term expiring January 8, 1906.)

Charles P. Hitch, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. An original appointment under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1905, entitled "An act providing for an additional circuit judge in the seventh judicial circuit, and for the appointment of an additional judge for the northern district of Illinois, and for creating an additional district in the State of Illinois, to be known as the eastern district of Illinois, and for the appointment of a judge and other officers of said district, and for changing the boundaries of the districts in Illinois, and for establishing places for holding court in the several districts thus created."

Leon A. Townsend, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate in the place of Charles P. Hitch, nominated to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

T. N. Allen, of Olympia, Wash., to be receiver of public moneys at Olympia, Wash., vice John O'B. Scobey, resigned.

COMMISSIONERS OF IMMIGRATION.

Hart H. North, of California, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of San Francisco, Cal. (Reappointment.)

Louis T. Weis, of Maryland, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Baltimore, Md., to take effect on December 19, 1905. (Reappointment.)

George B. Billings, of Massachusetts, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Boston, Mass., to take effect on December 17, 1905. (Reappointment.)

John J. S. Rodgers, of Pennsylvania, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Philadelphia, Pa. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

Edward J. Williams to be postmaster at Ketchikan, in the district of Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1904.

ARIZONA.

Frieda F. Mashbir to be postmaster at Safford, in the county of Graham and Territory of Arizona, in place of Kate Tuttle, resigned.

ARKANSAS.

S. W. Andrews to be postmaster at Walnut Ridge, in the county of Lawrence and State of Arkansas, in place of Mabel R. Sharum, resigned.

James R. Hudson to be postmaster at De Queen, in the county of Sevier and State of Arkansas, in place of James R. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1905.

CALIFORNIA.

Richard J. Murphy to be postmaster at Folsom City, in the county of Sacramento and State of California, in place of Christian L. Ecklon, resigned.

FLORIDA.

George C. Crom to be postmaster at Ocala, in the county of Marion and State of Florida, in place of Henry C. Groves. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1904.

GEORGIA.

Annie Ard to be postmaster at Lumpkin, in the county of Stewart and State of Georgia. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Walter I. Cooper to be postmaster at Sylvania, in the county of Screven and State of Georgia. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Rutledge A. Griffin to be postmaster at Quitman, in the county of Brooks and State of Georgia, in place of Rutledge A. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1905.

Thomas K. Heinsohn to be postmaster at Sylvester, in the county of Worth and State of Georgia. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

IDAHO.

J. M. Elder to be postmaster at Coeur d'Alene, in the county of Kootenai and State of Idaho, in place of David F. Mason, removed.

ILLINOIS.

Hibben S. Corwin to be postmaster at Peru, in the county of Lasalle and State of Illinois, in place of Hibben S. Corwin. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

George H. Forster to be postmaster at Tonica, in the county of Lasalle and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

William H. Gilliam to be postmaster at Vienna, in the county of Johnson and State of Illinois, in place of William H. Gilliam. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

Albert W. McIntire to be postmaster at Mendota, in the county of Lasalle and State of Illinois, in place of Albert W. McIntire. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

Sidney B. Miller to be postmaster at Cairo, in the county of Alexander and State of Illinois, in place of Sidney B. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

George J. Patterson to be postmaster at Genoa, in the county of Dekalb and State of Illinois, in place of Carl B. Crawford, deceased.

William H. Voelpel to be postmaster at Morton, in the county of Tazewell and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Loren E. Wheeler to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Sangamon and State of Illinois, in place of Loren E. Wheeler. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

William Strassberger to be postmaster at Purcell, in District Eighteen, Indian Territory, in place of Benjamin L. Robertson, resigned.

INDIANA.

Lawrence V. Buskirk to be postmaster at Bloomington, in the county of Monroe and State of Indiana, in place of Lawrence V. Buskirk. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

William F. Coats to be postmaster at Columbus, in the county of Bartholomew and State of Indiana, in place of William A. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

John W. Emison to be postmaster at Vincennes, in the county of Knox and State of Indiana, in place of Thomas H. Adams. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

Samuel E. Gray to be postmaster at Terre Haute, in the county of Vigo and State of Indiana, in place of Samuel E. Gray. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

Fred Kimbley to be postmaster at Orleans, in the county of Orange and State of Indiana, in place of Fred Kimbley. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

John McCartney to be postmaster at Scottsburg, in the county of Scott and State of Indiana, in place of John W. Martin, deceased.

Harry J. Martin to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Johnson and State of Indiana, in place of Harry J. Martin. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

Charles T. Miller to be postmaster at Cannelton, in the county of Perry and State of Indiana, in place of Charles T. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

Herman Miller to be postmaster at Hope, in the county of Bartholomew and State of Indiana, in place of Herman Miller. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

Archie R. Orr to be postmaster at Carlisle, in the county of Sullivan and State of Indiana. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Taylor Reagan to be postmaster at Plainfield, in the county of Hendricks and State of Indiana, in place of Taylor Reagan. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

Joseph A. Yockey to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Marshall and State of Indiana, in place of Joseph A. Yockey. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1905.

IOWA.

Edwin N. Bailey to be postmaster at Britt, in the county of Hancock and State of Iowa, in place of Edwin N. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1905.

William W. Boylan to be postmaster at Hubbard, in the county of Hardin and State of Iowa, in place of William W. Boylan. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1905.

H. E. Deater to be postmaster at Shenandoah, in the county of Page and State of Iowa, in place of C. N. Marvin. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1905.

Frank C. Downey to be postmaster at Dexter, in the county of Dallas and State of Iowa, in place of Frank C. Downey. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1905.

Rodney G. Hawkins to be postmaster at Wapello, in the county of Louisa and State of Iowa, in place of Rodney G. Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1905.

Elmer E. Johnston to be postmaster at Rockwell City, in the county of Calhoun and State of Iowa, in place of Elmer E. Johnston. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1905.

Charles V. Hoffman to be postmaster at Oskaloosa, in the county of Mahaska and State of Iowa, in place of Charles V. Hoffman. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1905.

John Morrison to be postmaster at Hedrick, in the county of Keokuk and State of Iowa, in place of John Morrison. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1905.

Jacob Mummert to be postmaster at Prairie City, in the county of Jasper and State of Iowa, in place of Jacob Mummert. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1905.

William H. Nolte to be postmaster at Holstein, in the county of Ida and State of Iowa, in place of William H. Nolte. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1905.

C. H. Smith to be postmaster at Rock Rapids, in the county of Lyon and State of Iowa, in place of William D. Junkin, resigned.

KENTUCKY.

John M. Kennedy to be postmaster at Monticello, in the county of Wayne and State of Kentucky. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

Thomas E. Myers to be postmaster at Greenup, in the county of Greenup and State of Kentucky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

LOUISIANA.

Louise Alvarez to be postmaster at Covington, in the parish of St. Tammany and State of Louisiana, in place of Louise Alvarez. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1905.

B. F. Dudley to be postmaster at Mansfield, in the county of De Soto and State of Louisiana, in place of Isabel C. Taylor, removed.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Charles F. Bryant to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in place of Charles F. Bryant. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

William C. Hinman to be postmaster at Great Barrington, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts, in place of William C. Hinman. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

William I. Marble to be postmaster at Webster, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in place of William I. Marble. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

J. Henry Norcross to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in place of J. Henry Norcross. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Eugene S. Thatcher to be postmaster at Housatonic, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts, in place of Eugene S. Thatcher. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Orlando P. Robinson to be postmaster at Ayer, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in place of Orlando P. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

MICHIGAN.

Shelby C. Field to be postmaster at Sparta, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan, in place of Charles H. Loomis, deceased.

Wallace J. Smith to be postmaster at Cadillac, in the county of Wexford and State of Michigan, in place of Samuel J. Wall, deceased.

MINNESOTA.

H. W. Severns to be postmaster at West Concord, in the county of Dodge and State of Minnesota, in place of M. Miller Severns, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI.

W. T. Branch to be postmaster at Winona, in the county of Montgomery and State of Mississippi, in place of James M. Leverett, removed.

Anna Durham to be postmaster at Clarksdale, in the county of Coahoma and State of Mississippi, in place of Anna Durham. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

Alice S. McLean to be postmaster at Greenwood, in the county of Leflore and State of Mississippi, in place of Alice S. McLean. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1902.

Rosa M. Ruff to be postmaster at Houston, in the county of Chickasaw and State of Mississippi. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Emma Pringle to be postmaster at McHenry, in the county of Harrison and State of Mississippi, in place of Robert C. Sharbrough, resigned.

MISSOURI.

Francis M. Harrington to be postmaster at Kirksville, in the county of Adair and State of Missouri, in place of Robert D. Hamilton, removed.

W. O. Keffer to be postmaster at Liberal, in the county of Barton and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential October 1. 1905.

Frank McKim to be postmaster at Tarkio, in the county of Atchison and State of Missouri, in place of Thomas T. Wilson, resigned.

MONTANA.

O. M. Baldwin to be postmaster at Stevensville, in the county of Ravalli and State of Montana, in place of William E. Baggs, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Josiah Coombs to be postmaster at Spencer, in the county of Boyd and State of Nebraska. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Samuel G. Pheasant to be postmaster at Osceola, in the county of Polk and State of Nebraska, in place of Henry H. Campbell, resigned.

NEVADA.

Edward R. Collins to be postmaster at Goldfield, in the county of Esmeralda and State of Nevada. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Charles L. Bemis to be postmaster at Marlboro, in the county of Cheshire and State of New Hampshire. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Charles C. Wright to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire, in place of Walter W. Mason, deceased.

NEW JERSEY.

William M. Bergen to be postmaster at Belmar, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey, in place of Samuel L. Gillin, resigned.

Nathan W. C. Hays to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey, in place of Nathan W. C. Hays. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1903.

Wilson D. Gill to be postmaster at Paulsboro, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

NEW YORK.

Burdette T. Burlingham to be postmaster at McGraw, in the county of Cortland and State of New York, in place of Burdette T. Burlingham. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Theodore F. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Newark Valley, in the county of Tioga and State of New York, in place of Theodore F. Chamberlain. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

William W. Gregory to be postmaster at Roscoe, in the county of Sullivan and State of New York. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Fred Greiner to be postmaster at Buffalo, in the county of Erie and State of New York, in place of Fred Greiner. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Thomas Liddle to be postmaster at Amsterdam, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York, in place of Thomas Liddle. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1905.

David M. Pratt to be postmaster at Elmira, in the county of Chemung and State of New York, in place of David M. Pratt. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

George F. Rising to be postmaster at Hoosick Falls, in the county of Rensselaer and State of New York, in place of George F. Rising. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Horace Selleck to be postmaster at Holland, in the county of Erie and State of New York, in place of Horace Selleck. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

William A. Smyth to be postmaster at Owego, in the county of Tioga and State of New York, in place of William A. Smyth. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John G. Brown to be postmaster at Red Springs, in the county of Robeson and State of North Carolina, in place of John G. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1905.

Mary Green to be postmaster at Warrenton, in the county of Warren and State of North Carolina, in place of Mary Green. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1905.

Victoria L. Martin to be postmaster at Tarboro, in the county of Edgecombe and State of North Carolina, in place of Victoria L. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1905.

Adolphus R. Wilson to be postmaster at Dunn, in the county of Harnett and State of North Carolina, in place of Adolphus R. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1905.

C. G. Rosemond to be postmaster at Hillsboro, in the county of Orange and State of North Carolina. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Clarence C. Banks to be postmaster at Lansford, in the county of Bottineau and State of North Dakota. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

William H. Bush to be postmaster at Oakes, in the county of Dickey and State of North Dakota, in place of Martin N. Chamberlin, resigned.

Henry T. Nelson to be postmaster at Courtenay, in the county

of Stutsman and State of North Dakota. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

OHIO.

Grant Coats to be postmaster at Rockford, in the county of Mercer and State of Ohio, in place of Grant Coats. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1904.

John Finsterwald to be postmaster at Athens, in the county of Athens and State of Ohio, in place of Cornelius D. Gist, deceased.

Frank A. Geesey to be postmaster at Archbold, in the county of Fulton and State of Ohio, in place of Frank A. Geesey. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

Fred D. Pierce to be postmaster at Wakeman, in the county of Huron and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

OREGON.

Chester G. Coad to be postmaster at Dallas, in the county of Polk and State of Oregon, in place of Chester G. Coad. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1905.

Abel W. Severance to be postmaster at Tillamook, in the county of Tillamook and State of Oregon, in place of Abel W. Severance. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Charles W. Betts to be postmaster at Newhope, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Harry L. Johnson to be postmaster at Laceyville, in the county of Wyoming and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Mary S. Murphy to be postmaster at Crafton, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Alfred Turtle, resigned.

Perry A. Sanborn to be postmaster at North East, in the county of Erie and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Perry A. Sanborn. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1903.

William S. Schlichter to be postmaster at Sellersville, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania, in place of William S. Schlichter. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1905.

William E. Wade to be postmaster at Saegerstown, in the county of Crawford and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

William C. Brown to be postmaster at Belton, in the county of Anderson and State of South Carolina, in place of James E. Horton, removed.

TENNESSEE.

Robert H. Hayes to be postmaster at Lewisburg, in the county of Marshall and State of Tennessee, in place of G. A. McLane, deceased.

Zada Wade to be postmaster at Kenton, in the county of Obion and State of Tennessee. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

TEXAS.

James T. Ballard to be postmaster at Beeville, in the county of Bee and State of Texas, in place of John W. Bell, deceased.

John M. Clark to be postmaster at Yoakum, in the county of De Witt and State of Texas, in place of John M. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1903.

Frank L. Bradley to be postmaster at Gilmer, in the county of Upshur and State of Texas, in place of Frank L. Bradley. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1904.

UTAH.

E. Harvey Belcher to be postmaster at Vernal, in the county of Uinta and State of Utah, in place of Simon P. Dillman, resigned.

VIRGINIA.

Emmet W. Brittle to be postmaster at Wakefield, in the county of Sussex and State of Virginia. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

Lulu O. Hoge to be postmaster at Blacksburg, in the county of Montgomery and State of Virginia, in place of William C. Ellett. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1903.

WASHINGTON.

J. P. Rosebaugh to be postmaster at Harrington, in the county of Lincoln and State of Washington, in place of Francis M. Lighthizer, resigned.

WISCONSIN.

William S. Gilpin to be postmaster at Osseo, in the county of Trempealeau and State of Wisconsin. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Nathan D. Maxon to be postmaster at Walworth, in the county of Walworth and State of Wisconsin. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 11, 1905.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Edwin V. Morgan, of New York, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Cuba.

John Barrett, of Oregon, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Colombia.

John Hicks, of Wisconsin, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Chile.

William W. Russell, of the District of Columbia, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Venezuela.

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES.

R. S. Reynolds Hitt, of Illinois, to be secretary of the embassy of the United States at Rome, Italy.

John W. Garrett, of Maryland, to be second secretary of the embassy of the United States at Berlin, Germany.

Paxton P. Hibben, of Indiana, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at St. Petersburg, Russia.

SECRETARIES OF LEGATION.

Paul Grand d'Hauteville, of Rhode Island, now secretary of the legation to the Netherlands and Luxemburg, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Berne, Switzerland.

Roger Sherman Gates Boutell, of Illinois, now secretary of the legation at Berne, Switzerland, to be secretary of the legation of the United States to the Netherlands and Luxemburg.

George L. Lorillard, of Rhode Island, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Copenhagen, Denmark.

William F. Sands, of the District of Columbia, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Panama, Panama.

Henry L. James, of Wisconsin, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States at Habana, Cuba.

CONSULS-GENERAL.

George C. Cole, of West Virginia, to be consul-general of the United States at Buenos Ayres, Argentine Republic.

Alfred L. M. Gottschalk, of New York, lately consul at Callao, to be consul-general of the United States at Callao, Peru.

Edward H. Ozmun, of Minnesota, now consul at Stuttgart, to be consul-general of the United States at Coburg, Germany.

Arnold Shanklin, of Missouri, to be consul-general of the United States at Panama, Panama.

CONSULS.

George N. Ifft, of Idaho, to be consul of the United States at Chatham, Ontario, Canada.

Francis B. Keene, of Wisconsin, to be consul of the United States at Geneva, Switzerland.

Gabriel Bie Ravndal, of South Dakota, to be consul of the United States at Dawson City, Yukon Territory, Canada.

John B. Richardson, of Kansas, to be consul of the United States at Jalapa, Mexico.

Evan E. Young, of South Dakota, to be consul of the United States at Harput, Turkey.

William Harrison Bradley, of Illinois, now consul-general at Manchester, to be consul of the United States at Manchester, England.

Frank Dillingham, of California, now consul at Aix la Chapelle, to be consul of the United States at Stuttgart, Würtemberg.

Pierre Paul Demers, of New Hampshire, to be consul of the United States at Barranquilla, Colombia.

Milo A. Jewett, of Massachusetts, now consul at Sivas, to be consul of the United States at Trebizond, Turkey.

John Edward Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Dalny, Manchuria.

Harry A. Conant, of Michigan, to be consul of the United States at Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

Edward A. Creevey, of Connecticut, to be consul of the United States at Yarmouth, Nova Scotia.

James W. Davidson, of Minnesota, to be consul of the United States at Antung, China.

James E. Dunning, of Maine, to be consul of the United States at Milan, Italy.

Thomas D. Edwards, of South Dakota, to be consul of the United States at Ciudad Juarez, Mexico.

Ernest L. Harris, of Illinois, to be consul of the United States at Chemnitz, Saxony.

MARSHALS.

Seth Bullock, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota.

Frank H. Tyree, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of West Virginia.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

George H. Lyman, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts.

Rufus A. Soule, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of New Bedford, in the State of Massachusetts.

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

Frank M. Boyle to be postmaster at Valdez, in the district of Alaska.

ARKANSAS.

Robert B. Board to be postmaster at Mena, in the county of Polk and State of Arkansas.

Edgar H. Finch to be postmaster at Crossett, in the county of Ashley and State of Arkansas.

James M. Hill, jr., to be postmaster at Hartford (late Gwynn), in the county of Sebastian and State of Arkansas.

Frank H. Kennedy to be postmaster at Cottonplant, in the county of Woodruff and State of Arkansas.

CONNECTICUT.

Willard Baker to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Litchfield and State of Connecticut.

George B. French to be postmaster at Ivoryton, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

Edward D. Gilbert to be postmaster at Higganum, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

Wilson M. Reynolds to be postmaster at Newtown, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

INDIANA.

Fremont M. Neal to be postmaster at Jonesboro, in the county of Grant and State of Indiana.

Frank Sheets to be postmaster at Mooresville, in the county of Morgan and State of Indiana.

John A. Zahm to be postmaster at Notre Dame, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

Rena Russell to be postmaster at Krebs, in district 15, Indian Territory.

Adolphus D. Orcutt to be postmaster at Coweta, in district 7, Indian Territory.

KENTUCKY.

Charles H. Berryman to be postmaster at Lexington, in the county of Fayette and State of Kentucky.

James M. Carey to be postmaster at Morehead, in the county of Rowan and State of Kentucky.

James L. Grissom to be postmaster at Burnside, in the county of Pulaski and State of Kentucky.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Charles W. Abbott to be postmaster at Reading, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

George B. Bennett to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

Charles A. Chase to be postmaster at Holyoke, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts.

William F. Craig to be postmaster at Lynn, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts.

Henry A. Hutchinson to be postmaster at Dedham, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

Isadore J. Barnett to be postmaster at Onaway, in the county of Presque Isle and State of Michigan.

Thomas E. Dawson to be postmaster at Sandusky (late Sanilac Center), in the county of Sanilac and State of Michigan.

Arthur J. Gibson to be postmaster at Central Lake, in the county of Antrim and State of Michigan.

James G. Hines to be postmaster at Stockbridge, in the county of Ingham and State of Michigan.

George L. Lusk to be postmaster at Bay City, in the county of Bay and State of Michigan.

Otis Miner to be postmaster at Lake Odessa, in the county of Ionia and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

Ferdinand H. Berning to be postmaster at Renville, in the county of Renville and State of Minnesota.

Ivan R. Gillpatrick to be postmaster at Biwabik, in the county of St. Louis and State of Minnesota.

Owen Wangensteen to be postmaster at Lake Park, in the county of Becker and State of Minnesota.

MISSISSIPPI.

Margaret N. Cabaniss to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Hinds and State of Mississippi.

James G. Cammack to be postmaster at Rolling Fork, in the county of Sharkey and State of Mississippi.

Henry E. Davis to be postmaster at Wiggins, in the county of Harrison and State of Mississippi.

George W. Field to be postmaster at Grenada, in the county of Grenada and State of Mississippi.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Harry M. Eaton to be postmaster at Littleton, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

Charles C. Wright to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

OKLAHOMA.

David Barrett to be postmaster at Prague, in the county of Lincoln and Territory of Oklahoma.

George Brophy to be postmaster at Woodward, in the county of Woodward and Territory of Oklahoma.

RHODE ISLAND.

Edgar E. Matteson to be postmaster at Apponaug, in the county of Kent and State of Rhode Island.

WISCONSIN.

Lydia Chapman to be postmaster at Horicon, in the county of Dodge and State of Wisconsin.

Nettie J. Danielson to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Taylor and State of Wisconsin.

Frank C. Densmore to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Walworth and State of Wisconsin.

Ida E. Gilbert to be postmaster at Blair, in the county of Trempealeau and State of Wisconsin.

Byron R. Godfrey to be postmaster at North Milwaukee, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin.

Edward Morrissey to be postmaster at Delavan, in the county of Walworth and State of Wisconsin.

Hans S. Olson to be postmaster at Weyauwega, in the county of Waupaca and State of Wisconsin.

Horatio S. Tipple to be postmaster at West Allis, in the county of Milwaukee and State of Wisconsin.

Charles E. Wood to be postmaster at Mukwonago, in the county of Waukesha and State of Wisconsin.

VIRGINIA.

William E. Cunningham to be postmaster at Louisa, in the county of Louisa and State of Virginia.

John W. Thompson to be postmaster at Dayton, in the county of Rockingham and State of Virginia.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Columbus W. Law to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of Harrison and State of West Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 11, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 7, 1905, was read and approved.

INCREASING MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That section 1 of Rule X be, and hereby is, amended as follows:

By increasing by one member each of the following-named committees: Ways and Means, Judiciary, Banking and Currency, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Rivers and Harbors, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Post-Office and Post-Roads, Public Lands, Indian Affairs, Territories, Insular Affairs, Railways and Canals, Mines and Mining, Public Buildings and Grounds, Militia, Patents, Invalid Pensions, Pensions, District of Columbia, Irrigation of Arid Lands, Census, Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By increasing by two members the Committee on Manufactures and by three members the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By inserting after the designation of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture the following:

"On Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, to consist of seven members."

Resolved, That Rule XI be amended as follows:

By inserting after paragraph 50 a new paragraph, as follows:

"51. In the Department of Commerce and Labor: To the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor."

And by renumbering the succeeding paragraphs of Rule XI, and by amending in accordance with such renumbering the reference to clause 60 of Rule XI contained in paragraph 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to grant me a little time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that this resolution gives the Republicans one additional member upon the

committees which we have heard named. Upon the committee where the three additional members are provided for the Republicans in the House get two and the Democrats one. Some time since I was afraid that the Democratic membership upon the committees would be reduced. The Speaker has solved the problem by increasing the Republican membership without reducing the Democratic membership. Indeed, we get one additional place on this committee where the three are provided for. This was largely done at my own suggestion as a method of reaching a modus vivendi between the two parties. The Republican party has 64 per cent of the membership of the present House. They are taking now two-thirds of the places, which is 66⅔ per cent—practically two-thirds—of the membership. As two-thirds is a vulgar fraction which approximates nearer the decimal 64 per cent than any other vulgar fraction, I want to say to the House and to the country that I think we can well afford to give the unanimous consent.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say just one word with regard to what the gentleman from Mississippi has said. Of course the justification for the increase in the number of members of the various committees arises out of the fact that this is a House of 386 Members, whereas the largest House heretofore has consisted only of 356 Members. In all cases where there has been no increase of the membership of the committees the relative standing on the committees of the Republicans and the Democrats is precisely the same as it was in the last House. Where there is an increase of one, that increase has gone to the Republican representation, but with that increase the proportion of the minority on these committees is in its favor, greater than was the proportion in favor of the minority in the Fifty-second and the Fifty-third Congresses.

The only addition provided for by the resolutions to the increase in the number of Members is the increase of one committee—the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, which has not heretofore been provided for—and the change in the numbers of the paragraphs in two or three rules, rendered necessary by the introduction of this new committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Does this rule provide how many members shall be on each committee? I did not hear it as it was read.

Mr. DALZELL. No; it does not.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. All this matter, then, will be left to the Speaker as it was before?

Mr. DALZELL. It rests with the Speaker; certainly.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair lays before the House an announcement of the following committees. The Chair also desires to state that the rules provide for two Delegates from the Territories on the Committee on Territories. Last session the House, by unanimous consent, added all the Delegates as members of that committee. There are still four Delegates, and without objection the four Delegates will be named upon that committee. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the committees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee on Elections No. 1.—Messrs. James R. Mann, Illinois; Llewellyn Powers, Maine; Charles L. Knapp, New York; H. Olin Young, Michigan; Grant E. Mouser, Ohio; Mial E. Lilley, Pennsylvania; Ollie M. James, Kentucky; Ernest E. Wood, Missouri; Moses L. Broocks, Texas.

Committee on Elections No. 2.—Messrs. Marlin E. Olmsted, Pennsylvania; James M. Miller, Kansas; Capell L. Weems, Ohio; Rockwood Hoar, Massachusetts; James F. Burke, Pennsylvania; Arthur P. Murphy, Missouri; Joshua F. C. Talbott, Maryland; Adam M. Byrd, Mississippi; Mounce G. Butler, Tennessee.

Committee on Elections No. 3.—Messrs. Michael E. Driscoll, New York; H. Burd Cassel, Pennsylvania; William E. Humphrey, Washington; Henry T. Bannon, Ohio; Marshall Van Winkle, New Jersey; Frank B. Fulkerson, Missouri; Choice B. Randell, Texas; Claude Kitchin, North Carolina; John Gill, jr., Maryland.

Committee on Ways and Means.—Messrs. Sereno E. Payne, New York; John Dalzell, Pennsylvania; Charles H. Grosvenor, Ohio; James T. McCleary, Minnesota; Samuel W. McCall, Massachusetts; Joseph W. Babcock, Wisconsin; Ebenezer J. Hill, Connecticut; Henry S. Boutell, Illinois; James E. Watson, Indiana; Charles Curtis, Kansas; James C. Needham, California; William Alden Smith, Michigan; John S. Williams, Mississippi; Samuel M. Robertson, Louisiana; Champ Clark, Missouri; William Bourke Cockran, New York; Oscar W. Underwood, Alabama; Daniel L. D. Granger, Rhode Island.

Committee on Appropriations.—Messrs. James A. Tawney, Minnesota; Henry H. Bingham, Pennsylvania; Lucius N. Littauer, New York; Walter P. Brownlow, Tennessee; Washington Gardner, Michigan; Frederick H. Gillett, Massachusetts; Walter I. Smith, Iowa; Joseph V. Graff, Illinois; Abraham L. Brick, Indiana; J. Warren Keifer, Ohio; Martin B. Madden, Illinois; Leonidas F. Livingston, Georgia; George W. Taylor, Alabama; Stephen Brundidge, jr., Arkansas; John J. Fitzgerald, New York; A. S. Burleson, Texas; John A. Sullivan, Massachusetts.

Committee on the Judiciary.—Messrs. John J. Jenkins, Wisconsin; Richard Wayne Parker, New Jersey; De Alva S. Alexander, New York; Charles E. Littlefield, Maine; Robert M. Nevin, Ohio; Henry W. Palmer, Pennsylvania; George A. Pearre, Maryland; James N. Gillett, California; Charles Q. Tirrell, Massachusetts; John A. Sterling, Illinois; Benjamin P. Birdsall, Iowa; John H. Foster, Indiana; David A. De Armond, Missouri; David H. Smith, Kentucky; Henry D. Clayton, Alabama; Robert L. Henry, Texas; John S. Little, Arkansas; William G. Brantley, Georgia.

Committee on Banking and Currency.—Messrs. Charles N. Fowler, New Jersey; George W. Prince, Illinois; William A. Calderhead, Kansas; Llewellyn Powers, Maine; Henry McMorran, Michigan; Capell L. Weems, Ohio; George D. McCreary, Pennsylvania; Joseph R. Knowland, California; George E. Waldo, New York; Cassius M. Shartel, Missouri; Everis A. Hayes, California; John W. Weeks, Massachusetts; Elijah B. Lewis, Georgia; Arsene P. Pujo, Louisiana; Carter Glass, Virginia; O. W. Gillespie, Texas; Ollie M. James, Kentucky; George S. Legare, South Carolina.

Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.—Messrs. James H. Southard, Ohio; Justin D. Bowersock, Kansas; Thomas Hedge, Iowa; George W. Cromer, Indiana; Solomon R. Dresser, Pennsylvania; Ira W. Wood, New Jersey; Joseph R. Knowland, California; William C. Lovering, Massachusetts; Mial E. Lilley, Pennsylvania; Thomas E. Scroggy, Ohio; John W. Gaines, Tennessee; Timothy D. Sullivan, New York; Thomas W. Hardwick, Georgia; R. G. Southall, Virginia; J. Thomas Heflin, Alabama; R. M. Wallace, Arkansas; Jonah K. Kalanianaole, Hawaii.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.—Messrs. William P. Hepburn, Iowa; James S. Sherman, New York; Irving P. Wanger, Pennsylvania; James R. Mann, Illinois; William C. Lovering, Massachusetts; Fred C. Stevens, Minnesota; Charles H. Burke, South Dakota; John J. Esch, Wisconsin; Francis W. Cushman, Washington; Charles E. Townsend, Michigan; Joseph H. Gaines, West Virginia; James Kennedy, Ohio; Robert C. Davey, Louisiana; William C. Adamson, Georgia; William H. Ryan, New York; William Richardson, Alabama; Charles L. Bartlett, Georgia; Gordon Russell, Texas.

Committee on Rivers and Harbors.—Messrs. Theodore E. Burton, Ohio; Blackburn B. Dovener, West Virginia; Roswell P. Bishop, Michigan; Ernest F. Acheson, Pennsylvania; De Alva S. Alexander, New York; George P. Lawrence, Massachusetts; James H. Davidson, Wisconsin; James McLachlan, California; William Lorimer, Illinois; Wesley L. Jones, Washington; J. Adam Bede, Minnesota; Edgar C. Ellis, Missouri; Rufus E. Lester, Georgia; John H. Bankhead, Alabama; Stephen M. Sparkman, Florida; Joseph E. Ransdell, Louisiana; George F. Burgess, Texas; Benjamin G. Humphreys, Mississippi.

Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.—Messrs. Charles H. Grosvenor, Ohio; Edward S. Minor, Wisconsin; William S. Greene, Massachusetts; Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan; Frank C. Wachter, Maryland; Charles E. Littlefield, Maine; William E. Humphrey, Washington; William H. Flack, New York; Benjamin P. Birdsall, Iowa; William W. Wilson, Illinois; James E. Watson, Indiana; Edmund H. Hinshaw; Nebraska; Thomas Spight, Mississippi; Allan L. McDermott, New Jersey; Joseph A. Goulden, New York; Harry L. Maynard, Virginia; Swagar Sherley, Kentucky; Gilbert B. Patterson, North Carolina.

Committee on Agriculture.—Messrs. James W. Wadsworth, New York; E. Stevens Henry, Connecticut; Gilbert N. Haugen, Iowa; Charles F. Scott, Kansas; Kittredge Haskins, Vermont; George W. Cromer, Indiana; William Lorimer, Illinois; Franklin E. Brooks, Colorado; Henry C. Adams, Wisconsin; Charles R. Davis, Minnesota; Daniel F. Lafean, Pennsylvania; William W. Cocks, New York; John Lamb, Virginia; Sydney J. Bowie, Alabama; Asbury F. Lever, South Carolina; South Trimble, Kentucky; Ezekiel S. Candler, jr., Mississippi; Scott Field, Texas; William H. Andrews, New Mexico.

Committee on Foreign Affairs.—Messrs. Robert R. Hitt, Illinois; Robert Adams, jr., Pennsylvania; Robert G. Cousins, Iowa; Charles B. Landis, Indiana; James Breck Perkins, New York; David J. Foster, Vermont; Theobold Otjen, Wisconsin; Adin B. Capron, Rhode Island; Nicholas Longworth, Ohio; J. Sloat Fassett, New York; Edwin Denby, Michigan; William B. McKinley, Illinois; William M. Howard, Georgia; Henry D. Flood, Virginia; Charles A. Towne, New York; William B. Lamar, Florida; William S. McNary, Massachusetts; John N. Garner, Texas.

Committee on Military Affairs.—Messrs. John A. T. Hull, Iowa; John H. Ketcham, New York; Richard Wayne Parker, New Jersey; Adin B. Capron, Rhode Island; Frank W. Mondell, Wyoming; George W. Prince, Illinois; Elias S. Holliday, Indiana; H. Olin Young, Michigan; George R. Patterson, Pennsylvania; Julius Kahn, California; Loren Fletcher, Minnesota; Beman G. Dawes, Ohio; William Sulzer, New York; James Hay, Virginia; James L. Slayden, Texas; Robert F. Broussard, Louisiana; Joshua F. C. Talbott, Maryland; Ariosto A. Wiley, Alabama; Bird S. McGuire, Oklahoma.

Committee on Naval Affairs.—Messrs. George Edmund Foss, Illinois; Henry C. Loudenslager, New Jersey; Thomas S. Butler, Pennsylvania; Sydney E. Mudd, Maryland; Robert G. Cousins, Iowa; Ernest W. Roberts, Massachusetts; Edward B. Vreeland, New York; George Alvin Loud, Michigan; Arthur L. Bates, Pennsylvania; George L. Lilley, Connecticut; W. Aubrey Thomas, Ohio; Albert F. Dawson, Iowa; Adolph Meyer, Louisiana; John F. Rixey, Virginia; W. W. Kitchin, North Carolina; Lemuel P. Padgett, Tennessee; Harvey C. Garber, Ohio; Alexander W. Gregg, Texas.

Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.—Messrs. Jesse Overstreet, Indiana; John J. Gardner, New Jersey; Nehemiah D. Sperry, Connecticut; Thomas Hedge, Iowa; Joseph C. Sibley, Pennsylvania; Howard M. Snapp, Illinois; Herman P. Goebel, Ohio; Halvor Steenerson, Minnesota; William H. Stafford, Wisconsin; Archibald B. Darragh, Michigan; Victor Murdock, Kansas; John W. Dwight, New York; John A. Moon, Tennessee; James M. Griggs, Georgia; David E. Finley, South Carolina; James T. Lloyd, Missouri; John H. Small, North Carolina; Wilson S. Hill, Mississippi; Marcus A. Smith, Arizona.

Committee on the Public Lands.—Messrs. John F. Lacey, Iowa; James M. Miller, Kansas; Eben W. Martin, South Dakota; Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan; Andrew J. Volstead, Minnesota; Joseph M. Dixon, Montana; Philip Knopf, Illinois; John J. McCarthy, Nebraska; Burton L. French, Idaho; Sylvester C. Smith, California; Asle J. Gronna, North Dakota; William T. Tyndall, Missouri; John L. Burnett, Alabama; William W. Rucker, Missouri; John W. Gaines, Tennessee; Adam M. Byrd, Mississippi; Clarence D. Van Duzer, Nevada; Joseph T. Robinson, Arkansas; Marcus A. Smith, Arizona.

Committee on Indian Affairs.—Messrs. James S. Sherman, New York; Charles Curtis, Kansas; John F. Lacey, Iowa; Thomas F. Marshall, North Dakota; Webster E. Brown, Wisconsin; Charles H. Burke

South Dakota; Charles L. Knapp, New York; Binger Hermann, Oregon; Charles B. Buckman, Minnesota; Edmund H. Hinshaw, Nebraska; Herschel M. Hogg, Colorado; Harry C. Woodyard, West Virginia; John H. Stephens, Texas; William T. Zenor, Indiana; Charles C. Reid, Arkansas; Claude Kitchin, North Carolina; Wyatt Aiken, South Carolina; Clarence D. Van Duzer, Nevada; Bird S. McGuire, Oklahoma.

Committee on the Territories.—Messrs. Edward L. Hamilton, Michigan; Abraham L. Brick, Indiana; Adin B. Capron, Rhode Island; George N. Southwick, New York; Llewellyn Powers, Maine; James McKinney, Illinois; Ralph D. Cole, Ohio; Edwin W. Higgins, Connecticut; John M. Reynolds, Pennsylvania; Frank B. Klepper, Missouri; John A. Moon, Tennessee; Charles C. Reid, Arkansas; James T. Lloyd, Missouri; Jack Beall, Texas; Edwin Y. Webb, North Carolina; Augustus O. Stanley, Kentucky; Bird S. McGuire, Oklahoma; Marcus A. Smith, Arizona; William H. Andrews, New Mexico; Jonah K. Kalanianaole, Hawaii.

Committee on Insular Affairs.—Messrs. Henry A. Cooper, Wisconsin; Edgar D. Crumpacker, Indiana; Edward L. Hamilton, Michigan; Marlin E. Olmsted, Pennsylvania; George W. Smith, Illinois; Charles E. Fuller, Illinois; Moses P. Kinkaid, Nebraska; Amos R. Webber, Ohio; William H. Graham, Pennsylvania; Elbert H. Hubbard, Iowa; Herbert Parsons, New York; Duncan E. McKinlay, California; William A. Jones, Virginia; Malcolm R. Patterson, Tennessee; William T. Zenor, Indiana; William W. Rucker, Missouri; George G. Gilbert, Kentucky; Robert N. Page, North Carolina; Tulio Larrinaga, Porto Rico.

Committee on Railways and Canals.—Messrs. James H. Davidson, Wisconsin; Ernest W. Roberts, Massachusetts; Elias Deemer, Pennsylvania; Charles L. Knapp, New York; George H. Huff, Pennsylvania; Harry C. Woodyard, West Virginia; Allen F. Cooper, Pennsylvania; Henry T. Bannon, Ohio; Hiram R. Burton, Delaware; John L. Burnett, Alabama; Thomas A. Smith, Maryland; Thomas B. Davis, West Virginia; James O'H. Patterson, South Carolina; Jacob Ruppert, jr., New York.

Committee on Manufactures.—Messrs. Joseph C. Sibley, Pennsylvania; William S. Greene, Massachusetts; Henry McMorran, Michigan; Nathan W. Hale, Tennessee; Pleasant T. Chapman, Illinois; Charles B. Law, New York; Henry C. Allen, New Jersey; Gustav A. Schneebeli, Pennsylvania; Charles H. Weisse, Wisconsin; John T. Hunt, Missouri; Thomas M. Bell, Georgia; Joseph T. Johnson, South Carolina; W. W. Kitchin, North Carolina.

Committee on Mines and Mining.—Messrs. Webster E. Brown, Wisconsin; Thomas H. Dale, Pennsylvania; Charles F. Scott, Kansas; George F. Huff, Pennsylvania; Joseph M. Dixon, Montana; John N. Williamson, Oregon; Joseph Howell, Utah; Robert W. Bonynge, Colorado; Cassius M. Shartel, Missouri; Augustus O. Stanley, Kentucky; J. Thomas Heflin, Alabama; Gordon Lee, Georgia; John T. Hunt, Missouri; Charles C. Reid, Arkansas; William H. Andrews, New Mexico.

Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.—Messrs. Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; Edwin C. Burleigh, Maine; Benjamin F. Howell, New Jersey; James P. Conner, Iowa; Eben W. Martin, South Dakota; Edward S. Minor, Wisconsin; William A. Rodenberg, Illinois; George W. Norris, Nebraska; Frederick Landis, Indiana; John E. Andrews, New York; John H. Bankhead, Alabama; William G. Brantley, Georgia; Charles R. Thomas, North Carolina; Morris Sheppard, Texas; Joseph T. Johnson, South Carolina; Eaton J. Bowers, Mississippi.

Committee on Pacific Railroads.—Messrs. Thomas S. Butler, Pennsylvania; Michael E. Driscoll, New York; Theobold Otjen, Wisconsin; Henry W. Palmer, Pennsylvania; Moses P. Kinkaid, Nebraska; Sydney E. Mudd, Maryland; William B. McKinley, Illinois; Albert F. Dawson, Iowa; James L. Slayden, Texas; David E. Finley, South Carolina; Henry T. Rainey, Illinois; William C. Houston, Tennessee; John S. Little, Arkansas; William B. Lamar, Florida.

Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.—Messrs. George W. Prince, Illinois; Thomas Hedge, Iowa; William A. Rodenberg, Illinois; George F. Huff, Pennsylvania; Charles B. Buckman, Minnesota; Allen F. Cooper, Pennsylvania; William W. Tyndall, Missouri; Robert F. Broussard, Louisiana; Robert B. Macon, Arkansas; Finis J. Garrett, Tennessee; John C. Floyd, Arkansas; E. E. Wood, Missouri.

Committee on Education.—Messrs. George N. Southwick, New York; William E. Humphrey, Washington; Andrew J. Volstead, Minnesota; Marshall Van Winkle, New Jersey; Edmund W. Samuel, Pennsylvania; Sylvester C. Smith, California; Anthony Michalek, Illinois; Edwin Y. Webb, North Carolina; Asbury F. Lever, South Carolina; Finis J. Garrett, Tennessee; Thomas A. Smith, Maryland; John C. Floyd, Arkansas.

Committee on Labor.—Messrs. John J. Gardner, New Jersey; Richard Bartholdt, Missouri; Samuel W. McCall, Massachusetts; Edward B. Vreeland, New York; James P. Conner, Iowa; Herman P. Goebel, Ohio; Kittredge Haskins, Vermont; George W. Norris, Nebraska; William Randolph Hearst, New York; John T. Hunt, Missouri; Henry T. Rainey, Illinois; A. O. Stanley, Kentucky; Thomas B. Davis, West Virginia.

Committee on Militia.—Messrs. Edward De V. Morrell, Pennsylvania; John A. T. Hull, Iowa; George W. Smith, Illinois; Halvor Steenerson, Minnesota; Butler Ames, Massachusetts; William O. Smith, Pennsylvania; Frank J. Le Fevre, New York; Henry C. Allen, New Jersey; Frank S. Dickson, Illinois; Jacob Ruppert, jr., New York; Aristo A. Wiley, Alabama; John A. Keliher, Massachusetts; John Gill, jr., Maryland; John C. Floyd, Arkansas.

Committee on Patents.—Messrs. Frank D. Currier, New Hampshire; Solomon R. Dresser, Pennsylvania; Joseph M. Dixon, Montana; Edward H. Hinshaw, Nebraska; Robert W. Bonynge, Colorado; William W. Campbell, Ohio; Andrew J. Barchfeld, Pennsylvania; John C. Chaney, Indiana; Charles McGavin, Illinois; William Sulzer, New York; George S. Legare, South Carolina; Edwin Y. Webb, North Carolina; Robert G. Southall, Virginia; John Gill, jr., Maryland.

Committee on Invalid Pensions.—Messrs. Cyrus A. Sulloway, New Hampshire; Samuel W. Smith, Michigan; William A. Calderhead, Kansas; Elias Deemer, Pennsylvania; Elias S. Holliday, Indiana; Thomas W. Bradley, New York; Charles E. Fuller, Illinois; Pleasant T. Chapman, Illinois; John C. Chaney, Indiana; Don C. Edwards, Kentucky; George H. Lindsay, New York; Frank A. Hopkins, Kentucky; Charles H. Weisse, Wisconsin; John A. Keliher, Massachusetts; James M. Gudger, jr., North Carolina; Lincoln Dixon, Indiana.

Committee on Pensions.—Messrs. Henry C. Loudenslager, New Jersey; George R. Patterson, Pennsylvania; William H. Draper, New York; Philip P. Campbell, Kansas; Butler Ames, Massachusetts; Herschel M. Hogg, Colorado; Nicholas Longworth, Ohio; Joseph B. Bennett, Kentucky; Frank S. Dickson, Illinois; William Richardson, Alabama; Frank A. McLain, Mississippi; Wyatt Aiken, South Carolina; Robert B. Macon, Arkansas; James M. Richardson, Kentucky.

Committee on Claims.—Messrs. James M. Miller, Kansas; Charles Q. Tirrell, Massachusetts; Joseph Howell, Utah; William H. Graham, Pennsylvania; George E. Waldo, New York; Grant E. Mouser, Ohio; Charles McGavin, Illinois; John Welborn, Missouri; Zeno J. Rives, Illinois; Henry M. Goldfogle, New York; Claude Kitchin, North Carolina; Jack Beall, Texas; Dorsey W. Shackleford, Missouri; Finis J. Garrett, Tennessee; Frank Clark, Florida.

Committee on War Claims.—Messrs. Thaddeus M. Mahon, Pennsylvania; Theobold Otjen, Wisconsin; Gilbert N. Haugen, Iowa; Kittredge Haskins, Vermont; Elias S. Holliday, Indiana; James H. Southard, Ohio; John L. Kennedy, Nebraska; Frank B. Fulkerson, Missouri; Thetus W. Sims, Tennessee; Thomas Spight, Mississippi; Henry D. Clayton, Alabama; James O'H. Patterson, South Carolina; Gordon Lee, Georgia.

Committee on Private Land Claims.—Messrs. George W. Smith, Illinois; Thomas F. Marshall, North Dakota; Francis W. Cushman, Washington; George A. Castor, Pennsylvania; Martin L. Smyser, Ohio; William S. Bennet, New York; Marion E. Rhodes, Missouri; William A. Jones, Virginia; George G. Gilbert, Kentucky; William R. Smith, Texas; Robert M. Wallace, Arkansas; Charles H. Weisse, Wisconsin; Thomas A. Smith, Maryland; Jonah K. Kalanianaole, Hawaii.

Committee on the District of Columbia.—Messrs. Joseph W. Babcock, Wisconsin; Samuel W. Smith, Michigan; Amos L. Allen, Maine; Edward De V. Morrell, Pennsylvania; Campbell Slemp, Virginia; Philip P. Campbell, Kansas; William H. Wiley, New Jersey; William S. Greene, Massachusetts; Jacob A. Beidler, Ohio; E. Spencer Blackburn, North Carolina; Edward L. Taylor, jr., Ohio; Jacob Van V. Olcott, New York; Thetus W. Sims, Tennessee; Adolph Meyer, Louisiana; Edward W. Pou, North Carolina; Frank A. McLain, Mississippi; Dorsey W. Shackleford, Missouri; Marcus C. L. Kline, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Revision of the Laws.—Messrs. Reuben O. Moon, Pennsylvania; Charles T. Dunwell, New York; Martin L. Smyser, Ohio; Rockwood Hoar, Massachusetts; Charles B. Law, New York; Newton W. Gilbert, Indiana; Joseph B. Bennett, Kentucky; Frank B. Klepper, Missouri; Robert Bruce Macon, Arkansas; Swagar Sherley, Kentucky; Edward W. Pou, North Carolina; John T. Watkins, Louisiana; William C. Houston, Tennessee.

Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.—Messrs. Frederick H. Gillett, Massachusetts; John F. Lacey, Iowa; Charles N. Fowler, New Jersey; Justin D. Bowersock, Kansas; James R. Mann, Illinois; William O. Smith, Pennsylvania; Amos L. Allen, Maine; Jacob A. Beidler, Ohio; Edward W. Pou, North Carolina; William T. Zenor, Indiana; Robert G. Southall, Virginia; Mounce G. Butler, Tennessee; John T. Watkins, Louisiana.

Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.—Messrs. John H. Gaines, West Virginia; Cyrus A. Sulloway, New Hampshire; Binger Hermann, Oregon; George W. Norris, Nebraska; Franklin E. Brooks, Colorado; Charles T. Dunwell, New York; William W. Campbell, Ohio; James F. Burke, Pennsylvania; William W. Rucker, Missouri; O. W. Gillespie, Texas; Thomas W. Hardwick, Georgia; James E. Ellerbe, South Carolina; John T. Watkins, Louisiana.

Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.—Messrs. Nehemiah D. Sperry, Connecticut; Justin D. Bowersock, Kansas; Amos L. Allen, Maine; Andrew J. Barchfeld, Pennsylvania; Thomas E. Scroggy, Ohio; John L. Burnett, Alabama; George H. Lindsay, New York; James M. Gudger, jr., North Carolina; Ezekiel S. Candler, jr., Mississippi; Harvey C. Garber, Ohio.

Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.—Messrs. Frank W. Mondell, Wyoming; William A. Reeder, Kansas; John W. Dwight, New York; Thomas F. Marshall, North Dakota; Allen F. Cooper, Pennsylvania; John N. Williamson, Oregon; Ralph D. Cole, Ohio; John L. Kennedy, Nebraska; Clarence D. Van Duzer, Nevada; William R. Smith, Texas; Henry T. Rainey, Illinois; William R. Hearst, New York.

Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.—Messrs. Benjamin F. Howell, New Jersey; Robert Adams, jr., Pennsylvania; Augustus P. Gardner, Massachusetts; Burton L. French, Idaho; Robert W. Bonynge, Colorado; Frederick C. Stevens, Minnesota; Ira W. Wood, New Jersey; William S. Bennet, New York; Everis A. Hayes, California; Jacob Ruppert, jr., New York; John L. Burnett, Alabama; James E. Ellerbe, South Carolina; John M. Moore, Texas; Thomas M. Bell, Georgia.

Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics.—Messrs. Roswell P. Bishop, Michigan; Jacob A. Beidler, Ohio; Zeno J. Rives, Illinois; David H. Smith, Kentucky; George H. Lindsay, New York; Eaton J. Bowers, Mississippi.

Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.—Messrs. John H. Ketcham, New York; Robert Adams, jr., Pennsylvania; John W. Weeks, Massachusetts; Rufus E. Lester, Georgia; Charles A. Towne, New York; William S. McNary, Massachusetts.

Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.—Messrs. Robert G. Cousins, Iowa; Edward De V. Morrell, Pennsylvania; Philip Knopf, Illinois; Ebenezer J. Hill, Connecticut; John Lamb, Virginia; Frank A. Hopkins, Kentucky; John N. Garner, Texas.

Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.—Messrs. George P. Lawrence, Massachusetts; J. Adam Bede, Minnesota; Campbell Slemp, Virginia; John M. Reynolds, Pennsylvania; George F. Burgess, Texas; Malcolm R. Patterson, Tennessee; Joseph L. Rhinock, Kentucky.

Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.—Messrs. Joseph W. Fordney, Michigan; Ernest F. Acheson, Pennsylvania; Edwin W. Higgins, Connecticut; Choice B. Randell, Texas; Lemuel P. Padgett, Tennessee; William C. Adamson, Georgia.

Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department.—Messrs. Irving P. Wanger, Pennsylvania; William H. Flack, New York; George W. Cromer, Indiana; Carter Glass, Virginia; John M. Moore, Texas; Frank Clark, Florida.

Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.—Messrs. Edward S. Minor, Wisconsin; Blackburn B. Dovener, West Virginia; George R. Patterson, Pennsylvania; Henry C. Adams, Wisconsin; Robert N. Page, North Carolina; Moses L. Broocks, Texas; Wilson S. Hill, Mississippi.

Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.—Messrs. William A. Calderhead, Kansas; Eben W. Martin, South Dakota; John J. McCarthy, Nebraska; Henry M. Goldfogle, New York; John H. Stephens, Texas; Adam M. Byrd, Mississippi.

Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.—Messrs. Charles E. Littlefield, Maine; William E. Humphrey, Washington; Charles R. Davis, Minnesota; Edmund W. Samuel, Pennsylvania; Henry D. Flood, Virginia; Ezekiel S. Candler, jr., Mississippi; Robert C. Davey, Louisiana.

Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor.—Messrs. David J. Foster, Vermont; William M. Calder, New York; Arthur P. Murphy, Missouri; Anthony Michalek, Illinois; A. P. Pujo, Louisiana; Morris Sheppard, Texas; T. D. Sullivan, New York.

Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.—Messrs. James A. Hughes, West Virginia; James N. Gillett, California; Augustus P. Gardner, Massachusetts; E. Stevens Henry, Connecticut; John H. Small, North Carolina; South Trimble, Kentucky; Scott Field, Texas.

Committee on Accounts.—Messrs. H. Burd Cassel, Pennsylvania; James A. Hughes, West Virginia; Frank D. Currier, New Hampshire; William H. Draper, New York; Ernest M. Pollard, Nebraska; Marion E. Rhodes, Missouri; Charles L. Bartlett, Georgia; Allan L. McDermott, New Jersey; Joseph A. Goulden, New York.

Committee on the Census.—Messrs. Edgar D. Crumpacker, Indiana; Edwin C. Burleigh, Maine; James A. Hughes, West Virginia; Charles T. Dunwell, New York; Butler Ames, Massachusetts; Hiram R. Burton, Delaware; Nathan W. Hale, Tennessee; William M. Calder, New York; Charles S. Wharton, Illinois; James Hay, Virginia; Gilbert B. Patterson, North Carolina; Joseph T. Robinson, Arkansas; Sydney J. Bowie, Alabama; Thomas W. Hardwick, Georgia.

Committee on the Library.—Messrs. James T. McCleary, Minnesota; Samuel W. McCall, Massachusetts; James P. Conner, Iowa; William M. Howard, Georgia; Charles R. Thomas, North Carolina.

Committee on Printing.—Messrs. Charles B. Landis, Indiana; James B. Perkins, New York; James M. Griggs, Georgia.

Committee on Enrolled Bills.—Messrs. Frank C. Wachter, Maryland; William W. Wilson, Illinois; Frederick Landis, Indiana; George A. Castor, Pennsylvania; James T. Lloyd, Missouri; Henry T. Rainey, Illinois; Lincoln Dixon, Indiana.

Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.—Messrs. Augustus P. Gardner, Massachusetts; James S. Sherman, New York; Justin D. Bowersock, Kansas; William A. Rodenberg, Illinois; Joseph Howell, Utah; Harry C. Woodyard, West Virginia; Ernest M. Pollard, Nebraska; Newton W. Gilbert, Indiana; James McKinney, Illinois; Frank J. Le Fevre, New York; Charles L. Bartlett, Georgia; Harry L. Maynard, Virginia; George S. Legare, South Carolina; Henry M. Goldfogle, New York; Marcus C. L. Kline, Pennsylvania; Joseph L. Rhinock, Kentucky.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. Byrd, a Representative from the State of Mississippi, and Mr. Loud, a Representative from the State of Michigan, appeared before the bar and took the oath of office.

PRINTING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. HULL. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration and passage of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

PRINTING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON POST-OFFICES AND POST-ROADS.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business during this Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

LEAVES TO SIT DURING THE SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I also offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and any subcommittee thereof, be allowed to sit during the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be considered as agreed to. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be considered as agreed to. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

PRINTING FOR WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has just been read. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JENKINS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has just been read. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. JENKINS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

PRINTING FOR THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall have authority to order such printing and binding done as it may deem to be necessary, connected with the transaction of the business of said committee, during this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has just been read. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. GROSVENOR, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a request for unanimous consent. In the debate on the Panama Canal bill last week I stated to the Committee of the Whole House that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and myself had requested certain data from the Isthmian Canal Commission more in detail than we were then able to lay before the House. A portion of that data I have now received, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent for the printing in the RECORD the data to which he refers. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, while that is very much in the nature of locking the door after the horse is gone, I do not object.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is asked.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say I do not object.

There was no objection; and the data referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The data is as follows:

List of salaries of members and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission receiving more than $2,000 per annum.

[Revised December 9, 1905.]

THE COMMISSIONERS.

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Army or navy pay deducted from salary paid by Commission.
T. P. Shonts	Chairman of Commission	$30,000	
C. E. Magoon	Commissioner and governor of Zone.	17,500	
M. T. Endicott, U. S. N.	Commissioner	7,500	$6,220
O. H. Ernst, U. S. A.	do	7,500	5,220
P. C. Hains, U. S. A.	do	7,500	4,125
B. M. Harrod	do	7,500	

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES AT WASHINGTON.

J. B. Bishop	Secretary to Commission	$10,000	
W. L. Pepperman	Assistant chief	3,000	
E. S. Benson	General auditor	10,000	
H. C. Lewis	Chief deputy general auditor	2,800	
D. W. Ross	General purchasing officer	10,000	
H. J. Gallagher, U. S. N	Deputy general purchasing officer.	6,480	$3,500
J. G. Jester	Disbursing officer	3,100	
A. Anderson	Assistant purchasing agent, New York.	2,400	

List of salaries of members and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission receiving more than $2,000 per annum—Continued.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES AT WASHINGTON—continued.

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Army or navy pay deducted from salary paid by Commission.
C. A. Devol, U. S. A.	Assistant purchasing agent, San Francisco.	$5,076	$4,076
W. P. Armstrong	Law clerk	2,400	
E. B. Hardin	Chief draftsman	2,400	
H. L. Stuntz	Auditing clerk	2,100	
E. F. Maurer	Draftsman	2,100	

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION ON ISTHMUS.

W. B. Starke	Local auditor	$4,500	
C. S. Todd	Chief clerk	2,400	
E. J. Williams	Disbursing officer	[a]5,000	
G. C. Schafer, U. S. N.	do	[a]5,000	$2,400
W. M. Wood	Chief clerk	3,000	
J. P. Waldrop	Cashier	3,000	
C. T. Schwegler	Assistant chief clerk	2,400	
J. A. Embry	Pay clerk	2,400	
C. C. Metcalf	do	2,400	
E. Lepiez	Clerk	2,160	
J. E. Kidwell	Pay clerk	2,100	
E. C. Tobey, U. S. N.[b]	Chief division material and supplies.	[b]6,000	2,400
W. G. Tubby[b]	do	[b]9,000	
V. S. Jackson, U. S. N.	Assistant chief material and supplies.	4,500	2,400
E. Hauer	do	3,000	
J. Burk	do	2,700	
J. H. Cotter	do	2,500	
E. T. Paterson	Traveling inspector	3,000	
J. J. Jackson	Bookkeeper	2,500	
A. J. Hollenbec	Division storekeeper	2,500	
C. S. Prentiss	do	2,500	
M. H. Carpenter	Lumber inspector	2,500	
G. V. Crowell	Member board of appraisal	2,400	
H. Leonard	Chief clerk	2,100	

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND SANITATION.

C. E. Magoon	Governor	[c]	
H. D. Reed	Executive secretary	$3,600	
R. A. Lane	Assistant secretary	3,000	
I. Galindo	Legal adviser	4,000	
J. J. Reidy	Plumbing inspector	2,400	
J. K. Baxter	Civil-service secretary	2,100	
J. M. Keedy	Prosecuting attorney	5,000	
F. M. Durand	Chief justice	6,500	
H. A. Gudger	Associate justice	6,000	
L. C. Collins	do	6,000	
N. C. Gorgas, U. S. A.	Chief sanitary officer	10,000	$4,950
E. C. Smith	Chief of division	2,100	
A. I. Kendall	Bacteriologist	3,000	
H. R. Carter, U. S. M. H. S.	Director of hospitals	8,000	3,500
B. W. Caldwell	Physician	2,400	
R. T. Burr	do	2,400	
R. L. Bartlett	do	2,400	
W. F. Smith	do	3,000	
H. T. Summersgill	do	3,000	
J. P. Randall	do	3,000	
A. L. Haines	do	2,400	
J. L. Phillips, U. S. A.	Superintendent hospital	7,000	3,850
T. C. Lyster, U. S. A.	Surgeon and specialist	4,500	3,696
A. B. Herrick	Pathologist	4,000	
S. T. Darling	do	2,400	
J. P. Bates	Physician	3,000	
W. Brem, jr	do	2,400	
S. Coolridge	do	2,400	
J. P. Lacroidade	do	2,400	
H. C. Curl, U. S. A.	Superintendent hospital	5,000	2,640
E. P. Beverly	Chemist	3,000	
L. Noland	Pathologist	3,000	
N. E. Williamson	do	2,400	
P. de Obarrio	Superintendent hospital	3,600	
J. H. Purnell	Health officer	3,600	
E. H. Wheeler	do	3,000	
J. A. Le Prince	Chief sanitary inspector	3,600	
J. F. Hoskinson	Assistant sanitary inspector	2,100	
J. C. Perry, U. S. M. H. S.	Chief quarantine officer	7,000	3,250
M. E. Connor	Assistant quarantine officer	2,400	
J. Tomaselli	Physician	2,400	
G. R. Shanton	Chief of police	3,000	
T. M. Cook	Collector of revenues	5,000	
A. M. Miller	Surveyor	2,100	
C. C. Pierce	Quarantine officer	3,300	
E. W. Clarke	Division engineer	6,000	
W. I. Baucus	Assistant engineer	2,700	
H. W. Durham	Resident engineer	3,600	

[a] Paymaster Schafer was succeeded as disbursing officer on the Isthmus of Panama by Mr. Williams in the latter part of November. The outgoing officer will be carried on the rolls while engaged in the closing of his accounts, when his services with the Commission will terminate. Mr. Williams is required to give bond in the sum of $200,000 and to pay the annual premium thereon, amounting to $360.

[b] Paymaster Tobey was succeeded by Mr. Tubby, also in the latter part of November. This outgoing officer will be carried on the rolls only until he closes his accounts.

[c] See Commissioners' salaries.

List of salaries of members and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission receiving more than $2,000 per annum—Continued.

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND SANITATION—continued.

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Army or navy pay deducted from salary paid by Commission.
H. P. Linnell	Resident engineer	$3,600	
C. E. Marshall	Assistant engineer	2,700	
E. C. McFarland	Chief clerk	2,100	
R. G. Castel	Chief of division	2,100	
G. A. Heath	Supervisor	2,100	
J. E. Wood	do	2,100	
G. V. Barril	Instrument man	2,100	

DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING.

J. F. Stevens	Chief engineer	$30,000	
J. G. Sullivan	Assistant chief engineer	15,000	
E. P. Shannon	Private secretary	3,000	
H. F. Tenny	Assistant secretary	2,400	
C. F. Burtoncini	Chief of division	3,000	
J. Smith	Manager labor and quarters	7,200	
H. Burnett	Assistant manager labor and quarters.	3,600	
R. E. Wood, U. S. A.	Superintendent	3,000	$1,935
W. Bodette	Hotel manager	2,280	
J. M. Maguire	Superintendent	2,400	
W. G. Shea	do	3,000	
C. L. Parker	Chief clerk	2,100	
R. W. Glaw	Chief of division	2,100	
T. O'Connell	Labor agent	3,600	
S. W. Settoon	do	2,400	
J. A. Tabor	do	3,000	
H. A. Smith	Assistant engineer	[a]3,000	
L. Park	do	[a]3,000	
J. J. Loftus	do	[a]2,400	
W. E. Dauchy	Division engineer	9,000	
J. G. Holcombe	do	7,500	
G. D. Brooke	Superintendent motive power and machinery.	6,000	
F. B. Martby	Division engineer	6,000	
W. Gerig	do	5,000	
R. M. Arango	do	3,600	
H. F. Dose	Resident engineer	4,800	
E. Zeok	do	3,600	
A. B. Nichols	do	3,300	
W. G. Comber	do	3,300	
W. B. Ruggles	do	3,300	
A. C. Harper	do	3,300	
R. W. Hebard	do	3,000	
J. L. Little	do	3,000	
F. R. Bartles	Assistant engineer	3,000	
C. T. Kenley	do	3,000	
O. F. Lackey	do	3,000	
C. M. DuBois	do	3,000	
C. L. Carpenter	do	3,000	
M. W. Tenny	do	3,000	
J. Hayes	do	2,700	
G. M. Wells	do	2,400	
A. Raggi	do	2,400	
F. O. Martin	do	2,400	
J. A. Card	do	2,400	
E. C. Smith	do	2,400	
W. F. R. Griffith	do	2,400	
G. P. Philip	do	2,400	
G. F. Anger	Steam-shovel engineer	2,280	
W. H. Bedell	do	2,280	
J. A. Baker	do	2,280	
P. M. Bates	do	2,280	
W. H. Bates	do	2,280	
T. Custy	do	2,280	
H. H. V. Fleming	do	2,280	
W. Holcomb	do	2,280	
F. Loulan	do	2,280	
J. J. Meehan	do	2,280	
L. Ward	do	2,280	
T. C. Freeman	do	2,280	
A. N. Arnold	do	2,280	
J. H. Averill	do	2,280	
E. C. Cummings	Master mechanic	3,600	
A. L. Robinson	do	3,000	
U. Lorentz	do	2,700	
W. J. Thomas	do	2,700	
E. C. Harrington	do	2,700	
E. J. Banta	do	2,400	
W. F. Carey	Superintendent	3,000	
J. Monahan	do	3,000	
T. W. Osterheld	do	3,000	
J. MacFarlane	do	3,000	
C. N. Boswell	do	3,600	
E. S. Claybourn	do	2,400	
L. M. Lepper	do	2,400	
T. Jobe	Supervisor	2,400	
L. B. Murray	do	2,400	
C. L. Thorne	do	2,100	
E. E. Rigney	do	2,100	
W. D. Waltman	do	2,100	
J. Gradison	do	2,100	
C. E. Garrett	do	2,100	
M. Regis	Boss mechanic	2,100	
G. W. Steiner	General foreman	2,220	
J. D. Stevens	Shop foreman	2,100	

[a] Messrs. Smith, Park, and Loftus are temporarily engaged as labor agents, securing at points in the United States employees for the engineering department on the Isthmus.

List of salaries of members and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission receiving more than $2,000 per annum—Continued.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING—continued.

Name.	Position.	Salary.	Army or navy pay deducted from salary paid by Commission.
W. D. Holland	Foreman	$2,100	
H. F. Younge	do	2,100	
W. W. Lindsey	do	2,100	
J. E. Morrissey	do	2,100	
F. Corbin	do	2,100	
H. B. Mattimore	do	2,100	
J. E. Fogerty	do	2,100	
J. A. Fornander	do	2,100	
J. J. Eason	do	2,100	
P. J. Griffin	do	2,100	
H. F. Cody	do	2,100	
H. G. Halleck	do	2,100	
W. E. Kepperly	do	2,100	
A. K. Stone	Train master	2,400	
A. Sessions	do	2,400	
W. L. Thompson	Instrument man	2,100	
T. F. Boltz	do	2,100	
G. S. Walsh	do	2,100	
H. R. Clark	do	2,100	
R. B. Manter	do	2,100	
S. Tatum	do	2,100	
F. W. Doty	Chief clerk	2,100	
S. J. Kennedy	do	2,100	
E. H. Morrice	Timekeeper	2,100	
W. M. Belding	Master builder	6,000	
A. M. Burtt	Assistant master builder	2,600	
P. O. Wright	Architect	3,000	
J. H. Barbour	Chief clerk	2,100	
G. H. Ruggles	Assistant engineer	2,700	
G. A. Caldwell	Draftsman	2,100	
W. H. Farrington	do	2,400	
P. Perkins	do	2,100	
C. L. Stockelberg	Superintendent	2,400	
H. E. Daly	do	2,400	
A. G. Evans	do	2,400	
C. A. Luck	do	2,400	
P. J. Downey	do	2,100	
L. M. Lipsett	do	2,100	
J. P. Kyte	do	2,100	
F. B. Thomas	do	2,100	
T. F. McGrath	Assistant superintendent	2,100	
J. D. Wood	Expert machinist	2,400	
S. M. Hitt	Instrument man	2,100	
W. G. Uffendell	do	2,100	

E. S. BENSON, *General Auditor.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 6, 1905.*

Statement of status of the fiscal affairs of the Isthmian Canal Commission when taken up by the present Commissioners on April 3, 1905.

Appropriated funds in the United States Treasury available for expenditures	$7,429,068.27
Cash in the hands of collecting and disbursing officers	610,422.00
Total	8,039,490.27
The total amount expended to April 1, 1905, from appropriation of June 28, 1902, was	1,977,684.40
The miscellaneous collections to April 1, 1905, were	17,176.67
The expenditures of the present Commission from April 1 to June 30, 1905, amounted to	2,031,857.36
The amount paid for indebtedness incurred prior to April 1, 1905, was	788,371.51
The amount paid for current expenses, supplies, and equipment purchased after April 3, 1905, was	1,243,485.85
Miscellaneous receipts from April 1 to June 30, 1905, amounted to	49,446.22
There were also collected from April 1 to June 30 miscellaneous receipts pertaining to the period prior to April 1, 1905, in the sum of	26,336.40

———— ————, *General Auditor.*

DECEMBER 9, 1905.

Statement of general and department of administration expenditures from July 1 to September 30, 1905.

	For indebtedness incurred—		Total.
	Prior to April 1, 1905.	After April 3, 1905.	
GENERAL.			
The Isthmian Canal Commission:			
Salaries of Commissioners		$7,629.58	$7,629.58
Transportation		118.72	118.72
Furniture and fixtures	$1.00	268.25	269.25
Transportation employees to and from Isthmus	11,952.38	18,868.73	30,821.11
Contingent expenses	10.25	8,693.50	8,703.75
Office of committee on engineering:			
Salaries and wages		65.00	65.00
Transportation		292.27	292.27
Furniture and fixtures		829.29	829.29
Contingent expenses		92.59	92.59

Statement of general and department of administration expenditures from July 1 to September 30, 1905—Continued.

	For indebtedness incurred—		Total.
	Prior to April 1, 1905.	After April 3, 1905.	
GENERAL—continued.			
Special commissioner, J. L. Bristow:			
Extra compensation		$2,500.00	$2,500.00
Per diem and traveling expenses		1,147.35	1,147.35
Contingent expenses		.43	.43
Secretary to special commissioner:			
Per diem and traveling expenses		287.90	287.90
Contingent expenses		1.20	1.20
Board of consulting engineers:			
Salaries and wages		207.00	207.00
Per diem and traveling expenses		1,658.50	1,658.50
Transportation		387.08	387.08
Contingent expenses		3.75	3.75
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.			
The chairman:			
Salaries and wages		5,625.00	5,625.00
Contingent expenses		54.00	54.00
Office of administration:			
Salaries and wages		16,711.96	16,711.96
Transportation		731.75	731.75
Furniture and fixtures	$452.83	3,206.90	3,659.73
Contingent expenses	390.28	6,574.93	6,965.21
The general auditor, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages		9,110.73	9,110.73
Transportation		148.55	148.55
Furniture and fixtures		1,247.21	1,247.21
Contingent expenses	2.50	225.01	227.51
The general auditor, Isthmus office:			
Salaries and wages		12,866.00	12,866.00
Furniture and fixtures		303.00	303.00
Contingent expenses		1,450.45	1,450.45
Disbursing officers, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages		2,115.00	2,115.00
Transportation		77.60	77.60
Furniture and fixtures		267.44	267.44
Contingent expenses		107.10	107.10
Disbursing officers, Isthmus office:			
Salaries and wages		7,585.89	7,585.89
Transportation	469.75	270.40	740.15
Contingent expenses	7.22	6,086.65	6,093.87
MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES.[a]			
Purchased in United States	159,892.19	740,689.56	900,581.75
Purchased on Isthmus	3,748.50	99,201.83	102,950.33
Steamers owned		1,300,000.00	1,300,000.00
Floating equipment	8,868.84		8,868.84
COST OF PURCHASE, HANDLING, AND TRANSPORTATION OF MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES.[a]			
The general purchasing officer, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages		10,286.00	10,286.00
Transportation		249.30	249.30
Furniture and fixtures	127.00	1,557.16	1,684.16
Services of inspectors	111.28	6,800.71	6,911.99
Transportation of inspectors	58.55	407.61	466.16
Contingent expenses		2,822.11	2,822.11
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, New York office:			
Salaries and wages	6.23	2,571.65	2,577.88
Transportation		9.76	9.76
Furniture and fixtures	18.25	439.29	457.54
Contingent expenses	4.35	1,103.75	1,108.10
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, New Orleans office:			
Salaries and wages		611.11	611.11
Transportation		55.90	55.90
Furniture and fixtures		21.85	21.85
Contingent expenses		134.06	134.06
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, Tacoma office:			
Salaries and wages		482.61	482.61
Transportation		224.90	224.90
Furniture and fixtures		193.07	193.07
Contingent expenses		120.30	120.30
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, San Francisco office:			
Salaries and wages		166.66	166.66
Material and supplies division on Isthmus, office of chief of material and supplies:			
Salaries and wages		22,487.54	22,487.54
Transportation of employees	541.72	45.00	586.72
Contingent expenses	362.44	281.52	643.96
Freight, advertising, etc	48,116.79	74,929.79	123,046.58
Storehouses:			
Salaries and wages		111,511.31	111,511.31
Contingent expenses	100.00	300.83	400.83
Total, first department	235,242.35	2,495,521.89	2,730,764.24

[a] Material and supplies purchased and cost of purchase, handling, and transportation of material and supplies are common to the several divisions, offices, and classes of work and are to be distributed to them in equitable proportion.

Statement of department of government and sanitation expenditures from July 1 to September 30, 1905.

	For indebtedness incurred— Prior to April 1, 1905.	For indebtedness incurred— After April 3, 1905.	Total.
The executive office:			
Salaries and wages		$19,217.73	$19,217.73
Transportation	$1,822.50	1.00	1,823.50
Furniture and fixtures		129.15	129.15
Contingent expenses	180.00	1,798.46	1,978.46
The Zone treasurer:			
Contingent expenses		25.00	25.00
The administration of justice:			
The prosecuting attorney—			
Salaries and wages		1,738.73	1,738.73
Contingent expenses	348.33	214.20	562.53
The supreme court—			
Salaries and wages	403.75	3,114.65	3,518.40
Transportation		15.35	15.35
Contingent expenses		1.86	1.86
The circuit court—			
Salaries and wages		3,518.43	3,518.43
Transportation		15.35	15.35
Contingent expenses		14.40	14.40
The collector of revenue and director of posts:			
Customs service—			
Salaries and wages		1,055.45	1,055.45
Contingent expenses		.92	.92
Division of internal revenue:			
Salaries and wages		1,192.28	1,192.28
Traveling expenses		28.15	28.15
Contingent expenses		15.36	15.36
Postal service:			
Salaries and wages, superintendence		1,371.83	1,371.83
Salaries and wages, postmasters		1,219.91	1,219.91
Salaries and wages, railway mail clerks		587.08	587.08
Transportation of mails	560.60	539.88	1,100.48
Traveling expenses	59.62		59.62
Contingent expenses		51.91	51.91
Division of education:			
Salaries and wages, superintendence		540.45	540.45
Contingent expenses		92.12	92.12
Division of estates:			
Salaries and wages		360.29	360.29
Contingent expenses		.92	.92
Land department:			
Salaries and wages		2,438.69	2,438.69
Surveying expenses		1,494.53	1,494.53
Contingent expenses		93.54	93.54
Police and prisons:			
General headquarters—			
Salaries and wages		3,596.49	3,596.49
Transportation	5.50		5.50
Furniture and fixtures		7.68	7.68
Contingent expenses		78.73	78.73
La Boca jail—			
Equipment	112.93		112.93
Empire penitentiary—			
Subsistence of prisoners		315.03	315.03
Municipality of Ancon—			
Salaries and wages		5,255.51	5,255.51
Transportation		28.20	28.20
Contingent expenses		81.35	81.35
Municipality of Emperador—			
Salaries and wages		6,158.54	6,158.54
Equipment		67.30	67.30
Contingent expenses		5.20	5.20
Municipality of Gorgona—			
Salaries and wages		2,284.52	2,284.52
Contingent expenses		42.03	42.03
Municipality of Buena Vista—			
Salaries and wages		1,221.96	1,221.96
Municipality of Cristobal—			
Salaries and wages		3,748.58	3,748.58
Equipment		16.65	16.65
Contingent expenses		14.00	14.00
Sanitation, hospitals and asylums:			
Office of chief sanitary officer—			
Salaries and wages		8,843.11	8,843.11
Contingent expenses	6.75	1,264.15	1,270.90
Director of hospitals—			
Salaries and wages		2,585.63	2,585.63
Contingent expenses		46.38	46.38
Ancon Hospital—			
Salaries and wages		40,412.36	40,412.36
Transportation		148.15	148.15
Subsistence		a1,396.62	1,396.62
Contingent expenses		a627.16	627.16
Miraflores Hospital—			
Salaries and wages		3,335.94	3,335.94
Paraiso Hospital—			
Salaries and wages		150.00	150.00
Culebra Hospital—			
Salaries and wages		2,210.37	2,210.37
Contingent expenses		100.00	100.00
Gorgona Hospital—			
Salaries and wages		1,731.29	1,731.29
Contingent expenses	82.50		82.50
Colon Hospital—			
Salaries and wages		13,229.20	13,229.20
Transportation	3.75		3.75
Equipment		146.15	146.15
Subsistence		a167.78	167.78
Contingent expenses	563.78	169.35	733.13
Panama, Corozal, and La Boca Dispensary—			
Salaries and wages		748.21	748.21

Statement of department of government and sanitation expenditures from July 1 to September 30, 1905—Continued.

	For indebtedness incurred— Prior to April 1, 1905.	For indebtedness incurred— After April 3, 1905.	Total.
Sanitation, hospitals, and asylums—Continued:			
Empire Dispensary—			
Salaries and wages		$864.55	$864.55
Convalescent Station at Taboga Is—land			
Salaries and wages		185.14	185.14
Gamboa and Bas Obispo Hospital—			
Salaries and wages		7.50	7.50
Cristobal Dispensary—			
Salaries and wages		150.00	150.00
Chief quarantine officer—			
Office of chief quarantine officer—			
Salaries and wages		3,246.57	3,246.57
Contingent expenses		180.79	180.79
Quarantine officer, Panama—			
Quarantine station—			
Salaries and wages		686.67	686.67
Transportation		161.85	161.85
Subsistence		3,758.25	3,758.25
Contingent expenses		252.79	252.79
Quarantine officer, Colon—			
Office of quarantine officer—			
Salaries and wages		1,190.42	1,190.42
Contingent expenses		71.15	71.15
Quarantine station, Colon—			
Salaries and wages		190.49	190.49
Transportation		60.00	60.00
Health officer, Panama:			
Office of health officer—			
Salaries and wages		8,506.84	8,506.84
Transportation		33.00	33.00
Contingent expenses		339.47	339.47
Street-cleaning service—			
Salaries and wages		6,962.51	6,962.51
Transportation		4,686.50	4,686.50
Contingent expenses		292.00	292.00
Mosquito, contagious diseases, and disinfecting service—			
Salaries and wages		43,055.53	42,055.53
Transportation		1,576.75	1,576.75
Contingent expenses		190.50	190.50
Health officer, Colon:			
Office of health officer—			
Salaries and wages	$33.50	4,279.84	4,313.34
Contingent expenses		456.58	456.58
Street-cleaning service—			
Salaries and wages		10,283.20	10,283.20
Transportation		1,406.25	1,406.25
Mosquito, contagious diseases, and disinfecting service—			
Salaries and wages		4,109.22	4,109.22
Transportation		617.50	617.50
Contingent expenses		16.10	16.10
Chief sanitary officer:			
Office of chief sanitary inspector—			
Salaries and wages		10,028.59	10,028.59
Contingent expenses	8.19	214.69	222.88
Mosquito, contagious diseases, and disinfecting service—			
Salaries and wages		55,213.59	55,213.59
Contingent expenses		3,531.06	3,531.06
Division of municipal engineering:			
Office of municipal engineer—			
Salaries and wages		249.80	249.80
Transportation	180.00	53.90	233.90
Contingent expenses	4.70	462.70	467.40
Improvement of Zone highways:			
Construction of Sabanas road—			
Salaries and wages		8,863.79	8,863.79
Contingent expenses		20.00	20.00
Construction of La Boca road—			
Salaries and wages		4,997.29	4,997.29
Contingent expenses		40.00	40.00
Construction of Ancon Hill road—			
Salaries and wages		2,264.95	2,264.95
Construction of Corozal road—			
Salaries and wages		1,659.70	1,659.70
Contingent expenses		5.00	5.00
Construction of St. Lazaro road—			
Equipment		172.08	172.08
Construction of waterworks and sewers, Panama—			
Salaries and wages		79,515.88	79,515.88
Contingent expenses		553.80	553.80
Construction of waterworks and sewers, Colon—			
Salaries and wages		12,138.41	12,138.41
Contingent expenses		1.30	1.30
Construction and maintenance of waterworks and sewers on Zone—			
Salaries and wages		43,440.72	43,440.72
Contingent expenses		23.50	23.50
Paving, Panama—			
Salaries and wages		5,266.68	5,266.68
Office buildings, Isthmus, repairs of		303.39	303.39
Total second department	4,376.40	462,576.90	466,953.30

a Deduct.

Statement of department of construction and engineering expenditures from July 1 to September 30, 1905.

	For indebtedness incurred— Prior to April 1, 1905.	For indebtedness incurred— After April 3, 1905.	Total.
Office of chief engineer:			
Salaries and wages		$23,087.01	$23,087.01
Transportation	$1,207.50	925.61	2,133.11
Furniture and fixtures		100.00	100.00
Contingent expenses	275.00	1,639.36	1,914.36
Timekeeping bureau:			
Contingent expenses		413.25	413.25
Office of manager, labor and quarters:			
Salaries and wages	4.17	22,864.23	22,868.40
Transportation		53.75	53.75
Contingent expenses	683.32	7,962.71	8,646.03
Division of meteorology and river hydraulics:			
Salaries and wages		3,672.67	3,672.67
Division of building construction:			
Expenses		285,343.51	285,343.51
Mechanical division:			
General superintendence—			
Salaries and wages		28,946.31	28,946.31
Transportation		50.00	50.00
Contingent expenses	14.78	338.04	352.82
Empire machine shops		45,911.06	45,911.06
Bas Matachin machine shops	22.50	45,548.30	45,570.80
Cristobal machine shops		43,379.98	43,379.98
La Boca machine shops, contingent expenses		2.37	2.37
La Boca ship ways		30,481.68	30,481.68
Cristobal ship ways		12,004.69	12,004.69
Corrals:			
Ancon		11,386.06	11,386.06
Corozal		35.88	35.88
Culebra		3,993.11	3,993.11
Cristobal		2,084.96	2,084.96
CANAL CONSTRUCTION.			
Colon division:			
Office of division engineer—			
Salaries and wages		1,768.53	1,768.53
Transportation	8.53		8.53
Contingent expenses	20.00	431.20	451.20
Miscellaneous construction expenses—			
Engineering		3,455.14	3,455.14
Contingent expenses		840.05	840.05
Docks—			
Transportation—			
Salaries and wages		26.67	26.67
Foundations—			
Salaries and wages	86.82	53.22	140.04
Contingent expenses	609.69	230.00	839.69
Piers, foundations—			
Salaries and wages	68.16		68.16
Equipment	135.00		135.00
Cuts, dredging—			
Salaries and wages		156.25	156.25
Harbors, dredging—			
Salaries and wages		3,375.66	3,375.66
Repairs to equipment		62.72	62.72
Chagres division:			
Miscellaneous construction expenses—			
Engineering		325.50	325.50
Cuts, foundations—			
Salaries and wages		14.00	14.00
Cuts, transportation—			
Salaries and wages		3.33	3.33
Cuts, excavations—			
Transportation of material	33.00		33.00
Contingent expenses	256.00		256.00
Gamboa division:			
Office of division engineer—			
Contingent expenses		264.97	264.97
Miscellaneous construction expenses—			
Engineering		16,502.89	16,502.89
Contingent expenses		161.94	161.94
Culebra division:			
Office of division engineer—			
Salaries and wages		4,606.95	4,606.95
Transportation	8.98		8.98
Contingent expenses		1,843.14	1,843.14
Miscellaneous construction expenses—			
Engineering		48,031.86	48,031.86
Contingent expenses		13.28	13.28
Repairs and renewals of buildings		4,238.26	4,238.26
Cuts—			
Excavations—			
Salaries and wages		42,390.41	42,390.41
Transportation of material	678.00		678.00
Repairs to equipment		192.43	192.43
Contingent expenses	8,160.91	1,280.74	9,441.65
Transportation—			
Salaries and wages		67,953.98	67,953.98
Tracks and track repairs		62,475.72	62,475.72
Repairs to equipment		4,922.08	4,922.08
Superintendent of transportation—			
Salaries and wages		175.00	175.00
Transportation		71.15	71.15
Contingent expenses		135.49	135.49
Superintendent of dumps—			
Contingent expenses		55.97	55.97
Salaries and wages		16,498.46	16,498.46
Tracks and track repairs		429.84	429.84
Culebra division—Continued.			
Cuts—			
Dumps—			
Contingent expenses		$207.42	$207.42
Tracks—			
Contingent expenses	$6.43		6.43
Dams—			
Tracks—			
Contingent expenses	153.36		153.36
Quarters for employees—			
Salaries and wages		16.20	16.20
La Boca division:			
Office of division engineer—			
Contingent expenses		45.25	45.25
Office of resident engineer—			
Contingent expenses		315.20	315.20
Miscellaneous construction expenses—			
Engineering		5,633.33	5,633.33
Contingent expenses		386.15	386.15
Harbors, dredging—			
Salaries and wages		12,854.12	12,854.12
Contingent expenses	321.91		321.91
Cuts, excavations—			
Contingent expenses		7.50	7.50
Docks, foundations—			
Salaries and wages		978.37	978.37
Material used		926.28	926.28
Contingent expenses	66.10	160.00	226.10
Dams, masonry—			
Contingent expenses	269.50		269.50
Total disbursements, third department	13,089.66	874,741,19	887,830.85

E. S. BENSON, *General Auditor.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 9, 1905.*

Detailed statement of expenditures made by settlements in the Washington office, and estimated expenditures on the Isthmus during the months of October and November, 1905.

OCTOBER, 1905.

	For indebtedness incurred— Prior to April 1, 1905.	For indebtedness incurred— After April 3, 1905.	Total.
GENERAL.			
The Isthmian Canal Commission:			
Salaries of commissioners		$1,827.92	$1,827.92
Per diem and traveling expenses		56.44	56.44
Transportation of employees to and from Isthmus		6,264.50	6,264.50
Transportation of employees on Isthmus		3,459.09	3,459.09
Contingent expenses		1,000.00	1,000.00
Office of committee on engineering:			
Transportation		83.70	83.70
Contingent expenses		60.69	60.69
Special commissioners:			
Advisory board of engineers—			
Per diem and traveling expenses, members		1,446.42	1,446.42
Salaries and traveling expenses, employees		1,280.66	1,280.66
Contingent expenses		172.75	172.75
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.			
The chairman:			
Salaries and wages		1,875.00	1,875.00
Office of administration:			
Salaries and wages		5,833.57	5,833.57
Per diem and traveling expenses		82.55	82.55
Contingent expenses	$106.21	602.71	708.92
The general auditor, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages		3,304.95	3,304.95
Per diem and traveling expenses		15.50	15.50
Contingent expenses		3.30	3.30
Disbursing officers, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages		694.98	694.98
MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES.			
Purchased in the United States	47,318.08	282,858.54	330,176.62
COST OF PURCHASE, HANDLING, AND TRANSPORTATION OF MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES.			
The general purchasing officer, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages		3,128.88	3,128.88
Services of inspectors		6,037.10	6,037.10
Per diem and traveling expenses of inspectors		235.54	235.54
Contingent expenses		22.58	22.58

Detailed statement of expenditures, etc.—Continued.
OCTOBER, 1905—Continued.

	For indebtedness incurred—		Total.
	Prior to April 1, 1905.	After April 3, 1905.	
COST OF PURCHASE, HANDLING, AND TRANSPORTATION OF MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES—continued.			
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, New York office:			
Salaries and wages		$226.10	$226.10
Contingent expenses	$39.35	301.37	340.72
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, New Orleans office:			
Salaries and wages		291.67	291.67
Contingent expenses		17.90	17.90
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, Tacoma office:			
Salaries and wages		241.67	241.67
Per diem and traveling expenses		39.30	39.30
Contingent expenses		31.70	31.70
Freight, advertising, etc	4,201.79	20,274.99	24,476.78
PURCHASE OF FURNITURE, EQUIPMENT, AND INSTRUMENTS.			
Office of administration		1,302.86	1,302.86
General auditor, Washington office		90.45	90.45
Disbursing officers, Washington office		42.50	42.50
Committee on engineering		162.75	162.75
The general purchasing officer		32.20	32.20
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents:			
New York office	41.25	274.13	315.38
New Orleans office		3.39	3.39
Special commissioners		26.01	26.01
Purchase of Panama Railroad stock		1,460.75	1,460.75
GOVERNMENT AND SANITATION.			
Chief quarantine officer, contingent expenses	10.00		10.00
Colon Hospital, contingent expenses		40.00	40.00
Postal administration, mail transportation		160.28	160.28
CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING.			
Culebra division, superintendent dumps, contingent expenses		75.00	75.00
Culebra division, cuts, excavations, contingent expenses	1,024.50	777.50	1,802.00
Bureau waterworks and sewers, transportation		112.50	112.50
Intermediate waterworks, construction division, contingent expenses		456.00	456.00
Superintendent motive power and machinery, salaries and wages		680.56	680.56
Chief engineer:			
Salaries and wages		226.68	226.68
Contingent expenses		158.00	158.00
Per diem and traveling expenses		84.90	84.90
Public amusements, salaries and wages		1,000.00	1,000.00
Total	52,741.18	348,938.73	401,679.91

Estimated expenditures on the Isthmus during the month of October, 1905.

Salaries and wages	$530,000.00
Material and supplies	55,000.00
Miscellaneous items	20,000.00
Total, October	605,000.00
Total expenditures Isthmian Canal Commission, month of October, 1905	1,006,679.91

NOVEMBER, 1905.

GENERAL.			
The Isthmian Canal Commission:			
Salaries of commissioners		$1,827.92	$1,827.92
Per diem and traveling expenses		53.65	53.65
Transportation of employees to and from Isthmus		5,005.80	5,005.80
Contingent expenses		1,000.00	1,000.00
Office of Committee on Engineering:			
Per diem and traveling expenses		16.50	16.50
Special commissioners:			
Per diem and traveling expenses		153.66	153.66
Advisory board of engineers:			
Per diem and traveling expenses, members		12,116.39	12,116.39
Salaries and traveling expenses, employees		2,757.22	2,757.22
Contingent expenses		1.25	1.25
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION.			
The chairman:			
Salaries and wages		1,875.00	1,875.00
Office of Administration:			
Salaries and wages		5,856.49	5,856.49
Per diem and traveling expenses		96.85	96.85
Contingent expenses	$435.23	4,323.27	4,758.50
The general auditor, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages		3,177.77	3,177.77
Disbursing officers, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages		665.84	665.84
Per diem and traveling expenses		18.50	18.50

Detailed statement of expenditures, etc.—Continued.
NOVEMBER, 1905—continued.

	For indebtedness incurred—		Total.
	Prior to April 1, 1905.	After April 3, 1905.	
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION—continued.			
Disbursing officers, Isthmus office:			
Per diem and traveling expenses		$59.50	$59.50
MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES.			
Purchased in the United States	$239.80	229,257.32	229,497.12
COST OF PURCHASE, HANDLING, AND TRANSPORTATION OF MATERIAL AND SUPPLIES.			
The general purchasing officer, Washington office:			
Salaries and wages		3,133.87	3,133.87
Services of inspectors		816.50	816.50
Per diem and traveling expenses of inspectors		386.04	386.04
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, New York office:			
Salaries and wages		1,087.75	1,087.75
Per diem and traveling expenses		19.00	19.00
Contingent expenses		391.71	391.71
Assistant purchasing and shipping agent, New Orleans office:			
Salaries and wages		284.16	284.16
Contingent expenses		2.50	2.50
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, Tacoma office:			
Salaries and wages		258.16	258.16
Per diem and traveling expenses		28.50	28.50
Contingent expenses		17.00	17.00
Assistant purchasing and shipping agents, San Francisco office:			
Salaries and wages		166.67	166.67
Freight, advertising, etc	2,864.19	3,018.81	5,883.00
PURCHASE OF FURNITURE, EQUIPMENT, AND INSTRUMENTS.			
Office of administration		406.70	406.70
General auditor, Washington office		54.29	54.29
General purchasing officer		18.00	18.00
Assistant purchasing and shipping agent, New York office		62.34	62.34
GOVERNMENT AND SANITATION.			
The executive office:			
Contingent expenses	202.07	303.10	505.17
Ancon Hospital:			
Salaries and wages		92.00	92.00
CONSTRUCTION AND ENGINEERING.			
Office of chief engineer:			
Salaries and wages		896.66	896.66
Per diem and traveling expenses		65.93	65.93
Contingent expenses		288.50	288.50
Floating equipment, credit	137.40		137.40
Total	3,603.89	283,061.12	283,665.01

Estimated expenditures on the Isthmus during the month of November, 1905.

Salaries and wages	$550,000.00
Material and supplies	37,000.00
Miscellaneous items	18,000.00
Total, November	605,000.00
Total expenditures, Isthmian Canal Commission, month of November, 1905	888,665.01

E. S. BENSON, *General Auditor.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 9, 1905.*

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSIAN,
Washington, D. C., December 9, 1905.

The estimates of $2,300,000 for miscellaneous material purchases from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, will cover the purchase of the following articles:

Anchors, anchor gear, and chains.
Apparatus and materials, electric.
Blocks, pulleys, etc.
Bolts, rivets, nuts, nails, lag screws, and washers.
Brushes and brooms.
Building materials: Brick, cement, lumber, doors, sash, screens, roofing materials.
Canvas, rope, twine.
Explosives.
Furniture and fittings, kitchen, house, and table.
Glass.
Hardware, miscellaneous.
Harness and horse furnishings.
Instruments and apparatus, miscellaneous.
Lamps and lamp fixtures.
Leather and belting.

Machinery and machine tools.
Metals.
Packing, rubber, and hose.
Paints, oils, chemicals, drugs, etc.
Pipe (water and sewer) fittings, plumbing supplies.
Ship, boat equipment and repair parts.
Stationery, books, and blanks.
Stoves and fixtures.
Hand tools.
Bridge materials.
Car repair parts: Wheels, axles, bolsters, journal boxes, journal bearings, coupler and repair parts, air brakes and repair parts, brake shoes, brake beams, bar and sheet iron and steel.
Castings, iron, steel, and brass.
Cranes and hoisting machinery and repair parts.
Dredge repair parts.
Drills, air, steam, and repair parts.
Engineering instruments and apparatus and repair parts.
Hospital and medical supplies.
Ice.
Locomotive repair parts: Wheels, tires, axles, journal boxes, journal bearings, coupler and repair parts, air brakes and repair parts, brake shoes, brake beams, boiler tubes, headlights, injectors, bar and sheet iron and steel.
Oils, lubricating.
Oils, illuminating.
Rails.
Steam shovel repair parts.
Track materials other than rail): Frogs, switches, switch, stands, bolts, spikes, tie plates, rail braces, rail benders, rail punches, rail saws, rail gauges, cross-ties, switch ties.
Unloaders, earth spreaders, and repair parts.

As an example of the way in which miscellaneous purchases are likely to run there is given below a statement outlining the miscellaneous purchases actually made in the month of October, 1905, which is an average month's purchases of miscellaneous supplies at the present time. It is estimated that the average miscellaneous purchases for the next seven months will approximate $325,000 per month.

Memorandum of miscellaneous purchases in October, 1905.

Laundry equipment	$5,641.69
Lead pipe and fittings	4,826.93
Iron pipe and fittings	41,507.90
Vitrified sewer pipe and fittings	13,930.98
Lumber	43,834.28
Cement	39,000.00
Wagons, carts, harness, and repair parts	7,813.85
Forage for animals	19,075.50
Machinery and tools:	
Portable well-drilling machinery and repair parts	14,456.00
Gasoline engine and parts	738.99
Pumps	336.00
Boilers	870.00
Drills	163.50
Printing machinery	837.95
Steam shovel repair parts	15,926.03
Pipe tools	421.08
Miscellaneous tools	1,762.89
Railway and track material and tools:	
Brake shoes	711.00
Other repair parts for cars	970.51
Coal-chute pockets	5,500.00
Tie plates	6,570.00
Bridge floor beams and rivets	4,402.90
Rail punches and benders	592.65
Paints and oils	1,023.75
Stationery, office supplies, and printing	10,723.33
Office furniture	1,859.66
Safes and vault doors	576.65
Typewriters	2,624.30
Police equipment, watchmen's clocks, handcuffs, etc	1,149.68
Sanitary fixtures, water-closets, urinals, etc	28,579.40
Furniture and equipment for quarters	1,632.66
Engineering instruments and draftsmen's supplies	3,434.66
Valves	1,096.40
Tents, cotton duck, sponges, etc	982.13
Repairs water sterilizers, wooden faucets, etc	1,791.00
Instruments for bureau of meterology and river hydraulics	1,355.00
Nails, bolts, rivets, and screws	214.79
Brooms, brushes, etc	108.40
Miscellaneous tools and supplies	7,078.05
Total	294,120.49

D. E. Ross, *General Purchasing Officer.*

Detail of miscellaneous supplies included in item of $4,000,000—Estimated liabilities December 1, 1905.

Sulphuric acid, beeswax, turpentine, etc	$10,934
Japanned dryer, red ocher, etc	19,447
25,000 gallons linseed oil	13,150
Tents and accessories	12,821
Swivel hooks, snatch blocks, wire rope, emery paper, etc	5,546
Iron bolts, spikes, sheathing, nails	12,466
Red and white lead	16,275
Fire hose	4,621
Rope	2,454
227,000 pounds round iron	4,566
Laundry equipment	5,604
Cement	39,000
Forage	20,535
Steam shovel repair parts	15,926
Portable well-drilling tools and repair parts	14,456
Coal-chute pockets	5,500
Bridge-floor beams and rivets	4,402
Stationery and printing	10,373
Engineering instruments, draftsmen's supplies	7,099
Pipe tongs, wrenches, and valves	1,460
Malleable iron castings	2,684
Garbage carts	450
Brass castings	2,607
Numbering machines	$756
Stationery	15,922
Crane chains	1,330
Wire cables	384
Steel vault doors	1,381
Whitewashing machines	273
Furniture and equipment for quarters	1,362
Instruments, bureau of meteorology and river hydraulics	1,355
Typewriters	2,624
Wagon parts and repair parts	7,813
Police equipment, watchman clocks, handcuffs, etc	1,149
Miscellaneous	36,614
Total	303,539

E. S. Benson, *General Auditor.*

December 9, 1905.

Statement of miscellaneous receipts from all sources.

	To April 1.	April 3 to June 30.	Total.
UNITED STATES FUNDS.			
Sales:			
Sales of material and supplies	$4,034.77	$384.55	$4,419.32
Sales of water	256.88		256.88
Electric lighting	13.20	305.57	318.77
Commissary supplies	1,438.90	23,834.73	25,273.63
Mess accounts, Ancon Hospital	3,412.65	1,670.00	5,082.65
Receipts from pay patients, Ancon Hospital	1,576.24	1,353.75	2,929.99
Mess accounts, Colon Hospital	105.00	150.00	255.00
Receipts from pay patients, Colon Hospital	768.68	207.30	975.98
Receipts from pay patients, other hospitals		7.00	7.00
Mess accounts, other hospitals	167.89		167.89
Rentals and taxes:			
Rents of land and buildings	10,439.75	2,478.42	12,918.17
Rent of equipment	15.88	1,142.56	1,158.44
Rent of material	4,163.38	475.36	4,638.74
Real-estate tax	198.29		198.29
Work done:			
Labor and material furnished	149.32	8,545.75	8,695.07
Reimbursements for overpayments and for services and supplies	377.35	2,369.77	2,747.12
50 per cent earnings joint telegraph lines		1,138.45	1,138.45
Gain on exchange of currency	459.45		459.45
Total United States funds	27,577.63	44,063.21	71,640.84
ZONE GOVERNMENT REVENUES.			
Postal revenues	7,372.25	3,671.40	11,043.65
Internal revenues:			
Slaughter tax	1,547.46		1,547.46
Tax on sale of liquor	2,511.59		2,511.59
Tax on distilling apparatus	3,703.80	1,276.73	4,980.53
Internal-revenue stamps	26.86	3.31	30.17
Stamped paper	141.22	68.72	209.94
Miscellaneous revenues:			
Court fees and fines	12.10	158.35	170.45
Police-department fines	16.68	46.00	62.68
Forfeited bonds	466.73		466.73
Examination fees	5.00	5.00	10.00
Permits to carry firearms	10.00	5.00	15.00
Quarantine receipts	58.50	148.50	207.00
Money left by deceased patients	19.40		19.40
Miscellaneous receipts	43.85		43.85
Total Zone government funds	15,935.44	5,383.01	21,318.45
Total from all sources	43,513.07	49,446.22	92,959.29

PRINTING FOR THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall have authority to order such printing and binding done as it may deem to be necessary, connected with the hearings and other business before said committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has just been read. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HEPBURN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LAMAR] rises to a question of personal privilege. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAMAR. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if this is a question of personal privilege, but I desire a formal ruling from the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not rule unless the Chair understands the question.

Mr. LAMAR. I will submit the paragraph to which I refer,

stating at the same time that I consider that paragraph a reflection upon me in my Representative capacity in Congress. I would like to ask the Chair to read it, and, if proper, to have it announced for a formal record ruling.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire the Chair to read it personally?

Mr. LAMAR. No, sir; I desire to have it read by the Clerk, and if it is in the nature of a personal privilege, or if it is personal privilege, I desire to speak upon it. If it is not, I will ask the Chair to rule upon it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Much of the trouble comes from the fact that he has removed from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD, of Missouri, and WILLIAM B. LAMAR, of Florida, the two Democrats who last year submitted to the House a subsidiary report on the Hearst railroad-rate bill.

In addition to this action, which, it is claimed, was taken by Mr. WILLIAMS without notice to the two men concerned, he yesterday made a statement that SHACKLEFORD and LAMAR had broken faith with the caucus agreement on the Davie rate bill last session.

"There is nothing personal in this," said Mr. WILLIAMS. "SHACKLEFORD and LAMAR simply broke the party agreement reached in the caucus."

Mr. LAMAR. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not a question of personal privilege, of course I do not desire to make the slightest attempt to address the House upon it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is quite clear that the paragraph read at the Clerk's desk does not present a question of personal privilege.

Mr. LAMAR. I am in doubt myself, Mr. Speaker, but I desired that it should be formally made of record in the House to estop and debar forever any possible suggestion that I did not attempt to bring that matter up here in this House.

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent if he desires to make a statement.

Mr. LAMAR. I do ask unanimous consent that I may make a statement.

Mr. PAYNE. Say ten minutes?

A MEMBER. An hour.

Mr. PAYNE. Or twenty minutes?

Mr. LAMAR. Twenty minutes. I would like to have a square deal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to make a personal statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, pending the request, and reserving the right to object, I wish to say that in the interest of Democratic harmony and effectiveness and general good feeling, which will not be promoted by washing Democratic linen for the amusement of a Republican House, I object. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LAMAR. I will not ask one thing that is unfair of this House——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I wish to ask a question.

Mr. LAMAR. I decline to be interrupted.

The SPEAKER. Well, the gentleman has not the floor. Objection has been made.

Mr. LAMAR. May I have the floor?

The SPEAKER. Objection has been made.

Mr. LAMAR. Then I will ask the minority leader if he will not withdraw that objection. I will not detain the House——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have stated my reasons for having made that objection. I have assumed the responsibility for that course, and I persist in the objection.

Mr. PAYNE. All this is out of order. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. LAMAR (to Mr. WILLIAMS). Will you call a Democratic caucus——

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is not a question for the consideration of the House of Representatives——

Mr. LAMAR. Will you call a caucus?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman can put that question to me somewhere else.

Mr. LAMAR. The gentleman went to the newspapers with this matter, and now objects here on the floor to a settlement of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman from Mississippi has not gone to the newspapers.

The SPEAKER. This is not in order. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. LAMAR. The House will understand it. I have gotten it before the House in part.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the motion to adjourn, by unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VAN DUZER, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. GRANGER, for this week, on account of illness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. TOWNSEND, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Sue M. Salsbury, no adverse report having been made thereon.

The motion to adjourn was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, December 13, 1905.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of inspections of disbursements and transfers by officers of the Army—to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate or appropriation for repairs of vessels of the Coast and Geodetic Survey—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the governor of the Territory of New Mexico submitting an estimate of appropriation for rental of offices at Santa Fe—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for national trophy and prizes for Army and militia—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, submitting recommendation for legislation respecting the fees of United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, submitting a recommendation for legislation relating to the compensation of deputy marshals and bailiffs in United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, the draft of a bill for adjusting the salaries of certain attorneys of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for carrying out the provisions of an act of Congress for the relief of the sureties of Frank A. Webb—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation claims relating to the schooner *Farmer*, Nathan S. Thompson, master—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy building submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for fuel, lights, etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Thetis*, Russell Kilbourn, master—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the ship *Chace*, Thomas Johnston, master—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Louis Nelson, administrator of estate of Samuel B. Nelson, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Robert Waters against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Julia Gailey, sole heir of estate of Hiram Gailey, against The

United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of W. A. Montgomery, administrator of estate of John Read, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the south shore of Lake Superior in vicinity of Keweenaw Point—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Lake Harbor, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the mouth of Black River and Dexter Harbor, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Conecuh River, Alabama—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Welles Harbor, Midway Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Tallahatchie River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Brier Creek, Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Ipswich River, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Pawtucket (Seekonk) River, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Upper Machodoc Creek, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Meherrin River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Quantico Creek, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Cedar Keys, Florida—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Librarian of Congress submitting an estimate of transfer appropriation for printing for the Library—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for the support of military prison at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of receipts and expenditures on account of appropriations for contingent expenses of the War Department—to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of St. Francis River, Arkansas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Big Sandy River, Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of harbor at Anacortes, Wash.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Oconto Harbor, Wisconsin—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the vicinity of Rogers City, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Matagorda Bay, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of St. Johns and Little rivers, Florida—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting a report of expenditures from the contingent fund, amount of balances due, accrued postage, etc.—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Ohio River at and near Metropolis, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Clatskanie River, Oregon—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Saugus River, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Allerton Point, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Winthrop Head, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Mystic River, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of August Schlapp against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Shallotte River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of upper White River, Arkansas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of harbor at St. Petersburg, Fla.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Warwick Creek or River, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Lloyds Harbor, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with draft of a bill, a recommendation for an appropriation to satisfy the claim of Mrs. Anne H. Wagner, widow of Col. Arthur L. Wagner—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Postmaster-General, submitting a statement of allowances to postmasters for reimbursement—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, trans-

mitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Valentine S. Brewer against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John H. Black against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Robert C. Cozine, son of John S. Cozine, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Jacob Samuel Weaver against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Sarah Ann Dobbs, widow of Nathaniel B. Dobbs, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Ellen R. Smith, widow of James R. Smith, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Andrew G. Gorrell against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Robert W. Pemberton against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Mary A. Mathews, widow of Fenelon B. Mathews, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Elizabeth Magruder, niece and heir of Alexander Magruder, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Thomas P. Caldwell against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Kate W. Milward, widow of Hubbard K. Milward, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Frank E. Foster against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Ion B. Nall against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Andrew J. Guilford against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for participation in an exposition at Milan, Italy—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect of the Treasury submitting an estimate of appropriation for public buildings at Los Angeles, Cal.; Nashville, Tenn., and Rome, Ga.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, recommending a repeal of the law allowing expenses of the trial of Indians who have committed offenses within the jurisdiction of States and Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with approval, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of War recommending legislation affecting the expenditures and appropriations of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting a report of the public property in the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post-Office Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting a recommendation for legislation relating to fees of United States commissioners—to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, recommending legislation relating to purchase of supplies in the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5964) for the construction of a waterway and barge canal connecting the waters of the Mississippi River with those of the St. Marys River, in the State of Georgia, along the landlocked waters of the coast of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, and a canal from St. Georges Sound, in Florida, to the St. Marys River, in Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5965) to regulate the removal of causes from the State courts to the Federal courts on account of prejudice or local influence—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 5966) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 5967) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Newton, State of Kansas—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5968) providing for the punishment of United States prisoners for crimes committed while confined in State penal institutions—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5969) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce and Labor and the Attorney-General to ascertain and report as to the existence of certain alleged trusts or monopolies, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5970) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 5971) authorizing the extension of T street (formerly W street) NW.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5972) granting the right to sell burial sites in parts of certain streets in Washington City to the vestry of Washington parish for the benefit of the Congressional Cemetery—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5973) to provide for the payment of damages to owners of property on account of changes of grade under acts of Congress approved February 12, 1901, which provide for the eliminating of certain grade crossings of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5974) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 5975) to purchase a painting of the frigate *Constitution*, known as "*Old Ironsides*," and entitled "Old Ironsides"—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 5976) to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 5977) to provide for the erection of an addition to the public building at Rochester, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 5978) to provide for the extension of time within which homestead settlers may establish their residence upon certain lands which were heretofore a part of the Unitah Indian Reservation, within the counties of Uinta and Wasatch, in the State of Utah—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 5979) to grant the thirty-sixth section of public lands in each township to the State of Arkansas for school purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 5980) increasing the limit of cost of public building at Meriden, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5981) for the maintenance and improvement of the Connecticut River below Hartford—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5982) for the improvement of harbor of refuge at Duck Island Harbor, Connecticut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5983) for the improvement of the Housatonic River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5984) for the improvement of the New Haven (Conn.) Harbor breakwater—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DAWES: A bill (H. R. 5985) to provide for the erection of a public building at Marietta, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 5986) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at Pine Bluff—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 5987) for an addition to the public building at Greenville, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 5988) punishing officers or employees who shall prematurely impart information which is accessible to such officers or employees—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5989) to provide for the erection of a public building at Livingston, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 5990) to prevent the locating of placer-mining claims in the district of Alaska by powers of attorney—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5991) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of North Yakima, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5992) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Walla Walla, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 5993) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building thereon at Middletown, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5994) to provide for the casting in bronze and erection in the city of Washington of the colossal equestrian group known as "The Indian Buffalo Hunt"—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 5995) to amend an act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5996) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate commutation for good conduct to United States prisoners," approved June 21, 1902—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 5997) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Grand Junction, Colo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5998) creating the Mesa Verde National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 5999) to amend section 605 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6000) to rectify the boundary line of Rock Creek Park—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6001) providing for compulsory education in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6002) granting pensions to Army locomotive firemen, and providing pensions to widows and minor children of Army locomotive firemen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 6003) to incorporate the Lake Erie and Ohio River Ship Canal, to define the powers thereof, and to facilitate interstate commerce—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6004) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to cause a survey to be made of Big Swift Creek, Craven County, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6005) for the improvement of navigation of Carrot Island Slough, Carteret County, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6006) for a survey of the waters of Bogue Sound and Beaufort Harbor, North Carolina, adjacent to the town of Morehead City, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6007) to amend chapter 1437 of the United States Statutes at Large, volume 33, part 1, Fifty-eighth Congress, entitled "An act to provide for terms of the United States district and circuit courts at Washington, N. C., approved March 3, 1905—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6008) to establish United States courts at Goldsboro, N. C.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 6009) to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 6010) to amend an act entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases," approved January 5, 1893—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6011) for the erection of a public building at Red Wing, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6012) for the erection of a public building at Faribault, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 6013) prohibiting the issuing of special-tax stamps to retail and wholesale dealers in liquors in prohibition districts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6014) requiring collectors of internal revenue to give information in certain cases—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 6015) providing for the erection of a public building at Muskogee, Ind. T.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBBER: A bill (H. R. 6061) to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 6017) to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 3, 1903, to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6018) to enable the President of the United States to call an international conference for the purpose of securing an international agreement relative to the regulation of the immigration of aliens to the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 6019) to amend an act entitled "An act to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States," Public No. 103, approved February 19, 1903, so as to restore imprisonment penalties for violations of interstate and foreign commerce laws—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 6020) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Iola, in the State of Kansas—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6021) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Beverly, in the State of Massachusetts—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 6022) providing for more frequent reports of amount of cotton ginned—to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6023) providing for daily reports of amount of cotton ginned—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 6024) to abolish the office of receiver of public moneys for land districts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6025) to amend the commutation provisions of the homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 6026) for the printing of a report on the hog industry—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 6027) to construct a post-office building at Gonzales, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6028) to make uniform the salaries of United States district attorneys and marshals in Texas—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 6029) to provide for a resurvey of township 4 north, range 13 west, St. Stephens meridian, in Perry County, Miss.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 6030) to authorize the sale and disposition of surplus or unallotted lands of the Fort Hall

Indian Reservation, in the State of Idaho—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 6031) to acquire certain ground in the District of Columbia for a Government reservation—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 6032) for the construction of a suitable vessel for the Revenue-Cutter Service for duty at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 6033) to amend section 5209, Revised Statutes of the United States, 1878—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6034) for the relief of Confederate soldiers and citizens of the Confederate States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAWNEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 6035) to amend sections 4924, 4925, 4926, and 4927 of the Revised Statutes relating to patents—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 6036) to divide the judicial district of the State of Indiana into five divisions, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 6037) to pension masters of Army transports and so forth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6038) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Elizabethtown, in the State of Kentucky—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6039) for the erection of a public building at Lebanon, Marion County, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6040) for the erection of a public building at Bardstown, Nelson County, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6041) to provide for the improvement of Rough River, in Kentucky—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6042) to provide for the improvement of Salt River, in the State of Kentucky—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6043) to provide for the further improvement of Green River, in the State of Kentucky—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 6044) to preserve and maintain the river channel and to prevent the threatened cut-off in White River, near Augusta, Ark.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 6045) providing for a United States judge for the middle and northern districts of Alabama—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6046) to establish a national military park at Perryville—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 44) requesting the President to consider the expediency of effecting a treaty with European powers providing for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands and to protect an independent government there when established—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOVERING: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 45) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish certain information concerning the cotton crop of the season of 1905 and 1906—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A resolution (H. Res. 55) authorizing the Doorkeeper of the House to employ a laborer in the ladies' reception room—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SULZER: A resolution (H. Res. 56) concerning the murder of the Jews in Russia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A resolution (H. Res. 57) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to appoint a messenger—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ACHESON: A resolution (H. Res. 58) to pay the daughter of Norton McGiffin, deceased, late employee in the House folding room, a certain sum of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 59) to pay the widow of Henry Robinson a certain sum of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 6047) granting an increase of pension to John G. W. Book—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6048) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. McCabe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6049) granting an increase of pension to J. M. Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6050) granting a pension to George Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6051) to correct the military record of George Collins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6052) granting pensions to honorably discharged soldiers who served in the Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Militia Infantry, and to their widows and minor children—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6053) granting an increase of pension to Charles Funkhauser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 6054) for the relief of Mary O'Connell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6055) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A bill (H. R. 6056) granting an increase of pension to Herman J. Trask—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6057) granting an increase of pension to Emery Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6058) granting an increase of pension to Emilie Scheldt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6059) granting an increase of pension to Elias Hanes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6060) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo B. Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6061) granting an increase of pension to William H. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6062) granting an increase of pension to Sebastian C. Goss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6063) granting an increase of pension to Maria Dyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6064) granting an increase of pension to George Reese—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6065) granting an increase of pension to Charles Crowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6066) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6067) to change the records of the War Department relative to Levi A. Meacham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6068) for the relief of Emma F. Everman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6069) for the relief of Baldwin De Bell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6070) for the relief of James C. Brickley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6071) for the relief of Erwin Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6072) for the relief of Henry Taylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6073) for the relief of George W. Ingram—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6074) for the relief of Daniel McDowell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6075) for the relief of Joseph M. Wilburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6076) granting a pension to Anna M. Case—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6077) granting a pension to Gertie Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6078) granting a pension to Samuel Short—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6079) granting a pension to Francis B. Trussell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6080) granting a pension to James H. Jobe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6081) granting a pension to Lois Van Thom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6082) granting a pension to Daniel Pack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6083) granting an increase of pension to John H. Groves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6084) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Gilbride—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6085) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Rardin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6086) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Merrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6087) granting an increase of pension to David Osborne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6088) granting an increase of pension to James R. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6089) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Pugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6090) granting an increase of pension to James F. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6091) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6092) granting an increase of pension to James McCue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELL: A bill (H. R. 6093) to correct the military record of Stephen W. Coakley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6094) granting a pension to Julia G. Aldrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 6095) granting an increase of pension to James M. Stanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6096) granting a pension to Louisa Rouseloux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6097) for the relief of Isaac Cogswell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6098) granting an increase of pension to Sadie A. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6099) granting an increase of pension to James P. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6100) for the relief of the estate of Eleanor C. Lockwood, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6101) for the relief of the estate of Charles M. Demarest, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6102) to reimburse Charlotte E. Brennan, widow of D. D. Brennan, for expenses incurred in travel from Yokohama, Japan, to Haverstraw, N. Y., after the summary discharge of said D. D. Brennan as paymaster's clerk in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6103) for the relief of Charles Backman—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6104) to reimburse John Waller, late postmaster at Monticello, N. Y., for moneys expended in carrying the mails—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6105) correcting the military record of John W. King—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6106) correcting the military record of Melvin R. Green—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R.) 6107) correcting the military record of William H. Cole—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6108) correcting the military record of Patrick Shields—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6109) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ackert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6110) granting an increase of pension to Abram W. Davenport—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6111) granting an increase of pension to Edwin R. Steenrod—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6112) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6113) granting an increase of pension to Moses Schoonmaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6114) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Douglass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6115) granting an increase of pension to Edward Sarles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6116) granting a pension to John Gainsback—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6117) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Dill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6118) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Reidy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6119) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6120) granting a pension to Harriet M. Smithers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6121) granting a pension to Margaret B. Houston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 6122) granting a pension to certain East Tennesseans engaged in the secret service of the United States during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6123) for the relief of the legal representatives of P. M. Craigmiles, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6124) for the relief of Revilow N. Spohn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6125) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stormer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 6126) granting an increase of pension to William T. Trott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6127) granting a pension to Lysander Needham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6128) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 6129) granting a pension to Nancy S. Prentiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6130) granting a pension to Benjamin R. Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6131) granting a pension to Martha S. Hackett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6132) granting a pension to Gustavus Cooley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6133) granting an increase of pension to Mary Bagley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6134) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6135) granting an increase of pension to Herbert M. Blackwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6136) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6137) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Stowell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6138) granting an increase of pension to Melvin C. Wadsworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6139) granting an increase of pension to Horace C. Webber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6140) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Gannett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6141) granting an increase of pension to Emilus A. Wellman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6142) granting an increase of pension to David Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 6143) granting a pension to James Eiffert—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6144) granting a pension to Eli Brazilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

My Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 6145) granting an increase of pension to Parris J. Latham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6146) for the relief of the estate of Harriet H. Wilcox, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 6147) granting a pension to Maud O. Worth—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6148) granting a pension to Henry P. Will—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6149) granting an increase of pension to John J. Fordney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 6150) for the relief of the heirs of William H. Blades—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6151) granting a pension to G. W. Rush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6152) granting a pension to Nancy Day—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6153) granting a pension to Ferely Newby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6154) granting a pension to Andrew W. Bonds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6155) granting a pension to Ellsworth Hobbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6156) granting an increase of pension to Iradell W. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6157) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan J. Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6158) granting an increase of pension to Henry Rittenhouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6159) granting an increase of pension to Joel Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6160) granting an increase of pension to Martin Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6161) granting an increase of pension to Horatio Ernest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6162) granting an increase of pension to William E. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6163) removing the charge of desertion from the record of D. L. d'Elysee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6164) removing the charge of desertion from the record of William Deniston—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6165) granting

a pension to Nelson Everson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6166) granting a pension to Else C. Isachsen—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 6167) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Eli Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6168) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Wilson Certain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 6169) granting an increase of pension to Daniel T. Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6170) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6171) granting a pension to Sarah A. Bargar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 6172) granting an increase of pension to Abraham K. Van Tine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6173) granting an increase of pension to George Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6174) for the relief of Charles J. Kayser—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6175) granting a pension to Van R. Gifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6176) granting an increase of pension to John Walters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6177) granting an increase of pension to John Haack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6178) granting an increase of pension to Carl W. Block—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6179) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Stamm—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6180) granting an increase of pension to Amherst F. Graves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6181) granting an increase of pension to Fayette E. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWES: A bill (H. R. 6182) for the relief of Henry C. Vincent—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6183) granting an increase of pension to Amanuel Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6184) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Weldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6185) granting an increase of pension to John F. Waxler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6186) granting an increase of pension to William Harvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 6187) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6188) granting an increase of pension to Erve H. Soule—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 6189) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Tibbits—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6190) granting an increase of pension to John J. Schneller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 6191) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Bachman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6192) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6193) granting a pension to T. M. Clarkson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6194) granting a pension to Ruth A. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 6195) for the relief of Jacob Gibbard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6196) granting a pension to Eugene H. Hillyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6197) granting an increase of pension to Lambert Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6198) granting an increase of pension to William W. Hargrave—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6199) granting an increase of pension to George A. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6200) granting an increase of pension to Susan L. Burdick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6201) granting an increase of pension to George W. Lakin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6202) granting a pension to Joseph Vernia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6204) granting a pension to Carrie A. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6205) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Engler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6206) granting an increase of pension to Stephen J. Henning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6207) granting an increase of pension to

Also, a bill (H. R. 6203) granting a pension to Viola Dilbeck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

William H. Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6208) granting an increase of pension to William D. Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6209) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Dossett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6210) granting an increase of pension to John D. McCullough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6211) granting an increase of pension to Christian Reister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6212) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Walters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6213) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Linn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 6214) granting an increase of pension to John N. Shermerhorn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6215) granting an increase of pension to James B. Bird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6216) granting an increase of pension to Stephen D. Hopkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6217) granting an increase of pension to Edward C. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6218) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6219) granting a pension to John W. Holcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6220) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Lavigne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6221) for the relief of Robert D. Benedict—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6222) for the relief of the Choctaw Nation or tribe of Indians—to the Committee on Indians Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6223) for the relief of the Creek tribe or nation of Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6224) for the relief of the Cherokee Nation of Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6225) for the relief of the Chickasaw Nation or tribe of Indians—to the Commitee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 6226) granting an increase of pension to George Bruner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6227) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 6228) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan H. Terrell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6229) for the relief of the heirs of William Tinder, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6230) for the relief of the heirs of Robert B. Love, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6231) granting an increase of pension to Boston Dillion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6232) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Holmes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6233) granting an increase of pension to John Carmical—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6234) granting an increase of pension to Jason Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6235) granting an increase of pension to Harden Golden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6236) granting an increase of pension to William Browning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6237) granting an increase of pension to David Bethusum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6238) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6239) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Vousy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6240) granting an increase of pension to John Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6241) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Noon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6242) granting an increase of pension to John D. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6243) granting a pension to M. D. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6244) granting a pension to W. H. O'Dear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6245) granting a pension to M. E. Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6246) granting a pension to Charles C. Sacrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6247) granting a pension to M. Weiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6248) granting a pension to Harriet Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6249) granting a pension to James L. Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6250) granting a pension to Amy Griffey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6251) granting a pension to Mary Weber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6252) granting a pension to John M. Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6253) granting a pension to Thomas W. Cardwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6254) granting a pension to Theodore C. Arons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6255) granting a pension to James Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6256) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Riddell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6257) granting a pension to Isaiah Proctor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6258) granting a pension to R. T. Mattingly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6259) granting a pension to Levi Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6260) granting a pension to Abe L. McAnelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6261) granting a pension to Maria Baughman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6262) granting a pension to Kate Good—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6263) granting a pension to W. D. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6264) granting an increase of pension to Abram W. Barker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6265) granting an increase of pension to Allen Demaree—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6266) granting a pension to Edgar Woolfolk—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6267) for the relief of John Taylor—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6268) for the relief of John H. McBrayer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6269) for the benefit of James Woods, administrator—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6270) for the relief of George Bentley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6271) for the relief of Madison County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6272) for the relief of Madison County, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6273) for the relief of R. Z. Moss—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6274) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church of Danville, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6275) for the benefit of D. N. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6276) for the benefit of John Wesley Eubanks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6277) for the relief of the heirs of W. L. Waddy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6278) for the relief of the heirs of Mary A. Dennis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6279) for the relief of Ben F. Bryant—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6280) for the relief of M. J. Vanarsdale—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6281) for the relief of Joseph Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of John E. Herrod—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6283) for the relief of A. Portwood—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6284) for the relief of John H. McBrayer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6285) for the benefit of the heirs of James D. McKenzie—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6286) for the relief of Ellerson Padgett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6287) for the relief of Henry P. Bottom—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6288) for the relief of Henry S. Branaman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6289) for the benefit of Henry F. Newland, executor of A. C. Newland, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6290) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Harrodsburg, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6291) for the relief of the Nicholasville Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6292) granting an increase of pension to James K. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6293) for the relief of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Crab Orchard, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6294) for the relief of Dr. William O. Robards—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6295) for the relief of Van Foreman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6296) for the relief of the Madison Female Institute, of Richmond, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6297) for the relief of Belle M. Robards, of Boyle County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6298) for the benefit of H. P. Bottom—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6299) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Bryantsville, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6300) for the benefit of Mary Conn, administratrix of John Conn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6301) for the relief of Simeon H. King's executrix—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6302) for the relief of Mrs. Eugenia D. Potts and Elizabeth Huette—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6303) for the relief of the heirs of James Madison Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6304) for the relief of Jacob Robinson's estate—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6305) for the benefit of the heirs of G. W. Rogers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6306) for the relief of B. N. C. Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6307) for the benefit of the Methodist Church at Perryville, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6308) for the relief of James G. Dunn, administrator of R. B. Dunn, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6309) for the relief of S. P. Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6310) for the relief of the heirs of John F. Logan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6311) for the relief of the heirs of John Moss—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6312) for the relief of M. C. Reynolds—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6313) for the relief of Benjamin F. Chatham—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6314) for the relief of the heirs of C. L. Carter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6315) for the relief of James M. Clowers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6316) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Stone—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6317) for the benefit of the heirs of Caleb Marratta, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6318) for the benefit of James M. Crawford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6319) for the relief of H. Manwaring—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6320) for the relief of the heirs of Archibald C. Hays—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6321) for the relief of W. G. Dunn, administrator of Cooper Dunn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6322) for the relief of E. B. Caldwell, jr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6323) for the benefit of the Harrodsburg Presbyterian Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6324) for the relief of Peter Tribble—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6325) for the relief of the estate of J. L. Walker, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6326) for the relief of Jasper N. Cooper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6327) for the relief of David Huddleson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6328) for the relief of Jonathan Jacobs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6329) for the relief of the Madison Female Institute, at Richmond, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6330) for the relief of Levi H. Hendren—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6331) for the benefit of Thomas W. Caldwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6332) for the relief of James Naylor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6333) for the relief of John Nolan, or Nolen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6334) for the relief of Milton Newcomb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6335) to correct the military record of Simeon R. Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 6336) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Ames—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6337) granting a pension to Louisa A. Demorest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6338) granting an increase of pension to Richard McCarthy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 6339) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Bryant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6340) granting an increase of pension to William D. Hatch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6341) granting an increase of pension to George Platts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6342) granting an increase of pension to John F. Wier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6343) granting an increase of pension to Robert Lappin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6344) granting an increase of pension to Edwin H. Tyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6345) granting an increase of pension to John F. Riegel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6346) granting an increase of pension to George Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6347) granting an increase of pension to Silas W. Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6348) granting an increase of pension to Brinsley Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6349) granting an increase of pension to John L. Cease—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6350) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Gaylord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6351) granting an increase of pension to David G. Glenn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6352) granting an increase of pension to Fountleroy B. Florence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6353) granting an increase of pension to John Schobert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6354) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Pickel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6355) granting an increase of pension to Barney Feeney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6356) granting an increase of pension to George B. Painton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6357) granting a pension to A. O. Doolittle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6358) granting a pension to Frank Smidt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6359) granting a pension to Edgar N. Sleeper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6360) granting a pension to Julia A. Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6361) granting a pension to Edward Hogan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6362) granting a pension to Francis E. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6363) granting a pension to Warren Casaday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6364) granting a pension to Byron C. Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6365) granting a pension to Henry Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6366) granting a pension to Elizabeth Kimball—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6367) granting a pension to John Lossing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6368) granting a pension to Daniel P. Andrus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6369) granting a pension to Alice A. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6370) granting a pension to Eva A. Cloyer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6371) for the relief of Addison L. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6372) for the relief of William Ryan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6373) for the relief of Robert McFarland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6374) for the relief of James Curran—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6375) for the relief of Hiram Marlett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6376) for the relief of C. S. Stilwell, jr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6377) for the relief of Daniel Kuhn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6378) for the relief of David L. Dorland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6379) to pay Velvia Tucker arrears of pension due her father, William N. Tucker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6380) to establish a record of service of Charles J. Werner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6381) granting a restoration of former rate of pension to John Holverson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6382) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Frank Averill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 6383) granting a pension to Anna L. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6384) granting an increase of pension to William McBeth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6385) granting an increase of pension to David Henry Hastings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 6386) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Finley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6387) granting an increase of pension to William L. Laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6388) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6389) granting an increase of pension to John Blake, alias John Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6390) granting an increase of pension to William J. N. Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6391) granting an increase of pension to Argyle Z. Buck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6392) granting a pension to Margaret E. Eveland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 6393) granting an increase of pension to William J. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6394) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Woosley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6395) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 6396) granting an increase of pension to James N. Coulter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6397) for the relief of Frank E. Lyman, jr.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 6398) granting a pension to George W. Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6399) granting an increase of pension to David Hanna—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6400) granting a pension to Harry W. Omo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6401) granting a pension to William V. Van Ostern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6402) for the relief of the legal representatives of G. B. Stimpson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6403) to correct the military record of F. A. Land—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 6404) granting a pension to Mrs. Jimmie T. Coop—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6405) granting a pension to Nora Stokes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6406) for the relief of Thomas M. Emerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 6407) granting an increase of pension to William Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6408) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Queman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 6409) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Bolt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6410) for the relief of the legal representative of Farley C. Sims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6411) for the relief of John R. Switzer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6412) for the relief of James Y. Pitts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6413) for the relief of F. G. Fuller and J. A. Mitchell, executors of the will of John O'Dell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6414) for the relief of the legal representative of Richard Henderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6415) for the relief of A. Y. Thompson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6416) for the relief of Charles A. Parkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6417) for the relief of T. J. H. Harris—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6418) for the relief of T. B. Stackhouse, a deputy collector of internal revenue for the district of South Carolina during the fiscal years 1894 and 1895—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6419) providing for the issuance of patent in fee to an Indian allottee—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6420) providing for the issuance of patent in fee to an Indian allottee—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6421) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Van Buskirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6422) granting a pension to Anthony Van Slyke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6423) granting a pension to Levi A. Canfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6424) granting a pension to George Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6425) for the relief of Thomas J. Miller—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6426) for the relief of Robert Frost—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6427) for the relief of George J. Miller—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6428) to provide for the payment to the heirs of Darius B. Randall, deceased, for certain improvements relinquished to the United States for use of the Nez Percé Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6429) granting an increase of pension to Marcus L. Box—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6430) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to German M. Rouse informer's fees for certain opium seizures—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6431) for the relief of Simon M. Preston—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6432) for the relief of John M. Hill—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6433) for the relief of Minerva Carmichael, John M. Beck, and Thomas B. Beck, surviving children of Jeffery Beck and Sarah Beck—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6434) authorizing the issuance of a certificate of merit to Robert Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 6435) granting a pension to Florence Dunham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6436) granting a pension to Mary Coates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 6437) for the relief of Samuel A. Pinyon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6438) for the relief of Joel Cross—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6439) for the relief of the trustees, or their successors in office, of the Cherokee Baptist College, located in Cassville, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6440) granting a pension to W. M. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 6441) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Carroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6442) for the relief of the estate of Chauncey Kilmer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6443) for the relief of the estate of George West—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6444) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Geiger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6445) mustering into the United States Army Frank Skinner as second lieutenant Company F, Twelfth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 6446) granting an increase of pension to Silas N. Bradshaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6447) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Davenport—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 6448) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6449) granting an increase of pension to James R. Zearing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6450) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. William A. Schmitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6451) granting an increase of pension to Adam Wucher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6452) granting an increase of pension to William H. Doherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 6453) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Marsden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6454) granting an increase of pension to Milo B. Morse—to the Commitee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6455) making appropriation to pay the estate of Samuel Lee, deceased, in full for any claim for pay and allowances made by reason of the election of said Lee to the Forty-seventh Congress and his services therein—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 6456) for the relief of Robert H. Holland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6457) for the relief of James F. Carr—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6458) for the relief of William Edward Bailey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6459) granting a pension to Thomas Allen—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6460) granting a pension to Cecilia H. Long—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6461) granting an increase of pension to Daniel G. Sterling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6462) to place Dr. Henry Smith on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6463) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Thomas J. Schrimpsher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6464) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6465) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Joyeux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6466) granting an increase of pension to James F. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6467) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Gabriel P. Keith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6468) granting an increase of pension to Matison M. Kilgore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6469) for the relief of William H. Bean—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6470) for the relief of the estate of Francis A. De Georgis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6471) granting an increase of pension to McKinney Adams, sr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6472) granting a pension to James M. Ikard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6473) to amend and correct war records so as to muster in and muster out of service in the United States Army Joshua E. Carlton, of Charleston, Tenn., and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 6474) granting an increase of pension to David Burks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6475) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6476) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Gibbons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6477) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6478) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6479) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Collahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6480) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6481) granting an increase of pension to Edward Cottingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6482) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6483) granting an increase of pension to Rolon M. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6484) granting an increase of pension to John W. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6485) granting a pension to Edward Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6486) granting a pension to Adam Mauer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6487) granting an honorable discharge to John Standacher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 6488) granting a pension to Frank Osterberg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6489) granting a pension to Mary E. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6490) granting an increase of pension to William H. Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 6491) granting an increase of pension to Albert Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6492) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6493) granting an increase of pension to Eli Boynton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6494) granting an increase of pension to William Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6495) granting an increase of pension to Phineas Hyde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 6496) for the relief of George M. Harraway—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6497) granting a pension to Eveline Fondren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 6498) granting an increase of pension to I. C. France—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6499) for the relief of John W. Fairfax—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 6500) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Bucey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6501) granting an increase of pension to William T. Snow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6502) granting an increase of pension to Charity Breeding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6503) granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Cummins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6504) granting an increase of pension to John R. Pickens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6505) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6506) granting an increase of pension to Edward N. Burns—to the Committee on Inavlid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6507) granting an increase of pension to James M. Busby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6508) granting an increase of pension to John P. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6509) granting an increase of pension to Sheldon L. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6510) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6511) granting an increase of pension to Jessie E. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6512) granting a pension to Martha Eyler—to the Committe on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6513) granting a pension to Nancy B. Ruberson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6514) granting a pension to Mary P. Crampton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6515) granting a pension to Lewis A. Vaughn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 6516) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6517) granting an increase of pension to William C. Scofield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6518) granting an increase of pension to James M. Long—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 6519) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Whybark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6520) granting an increase of pension to William M. Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6521) granting an increase of pension to Edward Weiford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 6522) granting a pension to William P. Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6523) granting an increase of pension to Walter Harwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6524) granting an increase of pension to Amos Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6525) granting an increase of pension to William J. Sager—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6526) granting an increase of pension to George C. Richards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6527) granting an honorable discharge to Henry G. Breed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 6528) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6529) granting a pension to Victoria G. Harrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 6530) for the relief of David C. McGee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6531) granting a pension to Martha L. Rummel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6532) granting a pension to Louis Reisser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6533) granting a pension to Horace Salter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6534) granting an increase of pension to Levi N. Gregory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6535) granting an increase of pension to Calvin N. Swineford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6536) granting an increase of pension to James Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6537) granting an increase of pension to William Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6538) granting an increase of pension to George H. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6539) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6540) granting an increase of pension to James Howe—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6541) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Kyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6542) granting an increase of pension to William W. Edelin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6543) granting an increase of pension to John Willett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6544) granting an increase of pension to Buford P. Moss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6545) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kinzly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6546) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6547) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Bryant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6548) granting an increase of pension to R. H. Dedrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6549) granting an increase of pension to Luther Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6550) granting an increase of pension to Fannie A. Hutchason—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6551) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6552) granting an increase of pension to George E. Muth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6553) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6554) granting an increase of pension to Peter P. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6555) granting a pension to Enoch Kessinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6556) granting an increase of pension to J. A. Kemp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6557) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jasper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6558) granting an increase of pension to Wiley R. Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6559) granting an increase of pension to Larkin Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6560) granting an increase of pension to Humphrey Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6561) granting an increase of pension to Madison Chapel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6562) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6563) granting an increase of pension to George Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6564) granting an increase of pension to John R. Kenney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6565) granting an increase of pension to Francis Marion Hatter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6566) granting an increase of pension to Roden B. Swain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6567) granting an increase of pension to N. R. Brasheor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6568) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6569) for the relief of S. G. Parker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6570) for the relief of William W. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6571) granting a pension to Elizabeth Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6572) granting an increase of pension to Clifford Haddock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6573) granting an increase of pension to E. F. Hocker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6574) granting an increase of pension to William M. Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6575) granting an increase of pension to Rawleigh M. Monin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6576) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6577) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McClure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6578) granting an increase of pension to James B. McWhorter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6579) granting an increase of pension to William Petit—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6580) granting an increase of pension to Albert B. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6581) granting an increase of pension to John C. Vanfleet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6582) granting an increase of pension to Ideral Vanfleet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6583) granting an increase of pension to John R. Vickers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6584) granting an increase of pension to Luther Towne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6585) granting an increase of pension to John W. Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6586) granting an increase of pension to William Yates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6587) granting an increase of pension to William Whitworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6588) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Farmer—to the Committee on Invalid Penisons.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6589) granting an increase of pension to M. W. Dunkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6590) granting an increase of pension to John Daly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6591) granting an increase of pension to Jerome B. Duggins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6592) granting an increase of pension to W. A. Dever—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6593) granting an increase of pension to Virginia Crump—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6594) granting an increase of pension to Martha Corder—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6595) granting an increase of pension to John T. Stasel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6596) granting an increase of pension to A. O. Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6597) granting an increase of pension to Francis Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6598) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Lankford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6599) granting an increase of pension to Mark Smock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6600) granting an increase of pension to John Brafford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6601) granting an increase of pension to James Drewry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6602) providing for the payment of certain claims growing out of the Army maneuvers at West Point, Ky., in 1903—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6603) for the benefit of the national cemetery near the city of Lebanon, in the State of Kentucky—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6604) for the relief of Anthony McAndrew—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6605) for the relief of J. R. Claybrooke—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6606) for the relief of Merril Denham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6607) for the relief of the minor children of Alice Evans, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6608) for the relief of James I. Friend—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6609) for the benefit of H. C. Wood—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6610) for the relief of the estate of R. C. Hazelip—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6611) for the relief of James Clark Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6612) for the relief of the survivors of the Cromwell Company of Home Guards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6613) granting a pension to Thomas J. Stevens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6614) for the relief of Caroline Commandun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6615) for the relief of Fannie Crump—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6616) for the relief of Columbus B. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6617) for the relief of Daniel J. Basham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6618) granting a pension to Rebecca Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6619) granting a pension to Harvey W. Kelly and Augustus Kelly, minor children of H. P. B. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6620) granting a pension to Thomas Kinkaid—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6621) granting a pension to Sebastian F. Kissinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6622) granting a pension to Samuel M. James—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6623) granting a pension to John J. Hornback—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6624) granting a pension to Matilda V. Helton and Alex. Whitehouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6625) granting a pension to Rufus Helms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6626) granting a pension to John Messinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6627) granting a pension to P. A. Milner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6628) granting a pension to Tabitha L. McGlasson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6629) granting a pension to Addie L. McFelia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6630) granting a pension to Harvey Langham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6631) granting a pension to Mary Dolores O'Neal—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6632) granting a pension to Elizabeth Stinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6633) granting a pension to James Rabern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6634) granting a pension to Henry Ramey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6635) granting a pension to Elzie Paynter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6636) granting a pension to Allen Popham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6637) granting a pension to Jacob D. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6638) granting a pension to Cynthia Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6639) granting a pension to William P. Slaughter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6640) granting a pension to Samuel Shepherd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6641) granting a pension to Thomas J. Sparkman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6642) granting a pension to Samuel T. Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6643) granting a pension to Laura Ann Willis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6644) granting a pension to Richard West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6645) granting a pension to Harriett Wheatley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6646) granting a pension to William T. Gorr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6647) granting a pension to Mary D. England—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6648) granting a pension to Richard Eubank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6649) granting a pension to Bennett Davenport—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6650) granting a pension to Adolph Denkhoff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6651) granting a pension to Lucy B. Culver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6652) granting a pension to James Bird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6653) granting a pension to Sidney Bozarth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6654) granting a pension to Jefferson G. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6655) granting a pension to Mary E. Brashear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6656) granting a pension to Anna B. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6657) granting a pension to James Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6658) granting a pension to John Logsdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6659) to place the names of William D. Rabern and George W. Raybern on the roll of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6660) granting a pension to Malvina C. Stith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6661) granting a pension to W. B. Scroggy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6662) granting a pension to William L. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6663) granting a pension to Lloyd Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6664) granting a pension to Susan Higdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6665) granting a pension to John Whitlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6666) granting a pension to Margaret Douglass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6667) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Craddock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6668) granting a pension to Alfred L. Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6669) granting a pension to Kitty Downs—the the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6670) for the relief of G. W. Ebert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6671) for the relief of J. S. Neal—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6672) for the relief of Moses Horrel—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6673) for the relief of George C. Wooley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6674) for the relief of the First Presbyterian Church, at Lebanon, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6675) for the relief of the Methodist Church at Newhaven, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6676) for the relief of the trustees of the Colored Baptist Church, of Lebanon, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6677) for the relief of the Baptist Church at Bloomfield, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6678) for the relief of Conrad Claycomb, of Kentucky—to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6679) for the relief of John Cover—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6680) for the relief of the drafted men of Pendleton and other counties, in the State of Kentucky—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6681) for the relief of Stephen Dever—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6682) for the relief of Carrie M. Boone—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6683) for the relief of Lawrence H. Rousseau—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6684) for the relief of Hubbard K. Milward—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6685) for the relief of Anderson T. Keen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6686) for the settlement of claims of volunteer soldiers by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6687) to correct the military record of Alfred J. Carter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6688) for the relief of Fred Hamilton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6689) to correct the military record of Robert H. Shofner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6690) to correct the military record of Daniel F. Tracey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6691) for the relief of Robert Hubbord—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6692) for the relief of Benjamin F. Hasson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6693) to correct the military record of Jesse M. Ball—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6694) to correct the military record of John Archbishop—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6695) to correct the military record of Ebenezer Logsdon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6696) to correct the military record of William G. Dougherty—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6697) to correct the military record of Alexander Nugent and grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6698) to correct the military record of Franklin Nix and grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6699) to amend and correct the military record of Thomas Etherton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6700) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of W. F. Akridge and grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6701) to remove the charges of desertion from the military record of James Braden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6702) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Cullen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6703) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Coats and restore him to the pension roll of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6704) removing charge of desertion from the military record of John P. Fox and to grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6705) granting an increase of pension to William H. Zachary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6706) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Stephen Greenwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6707) granting a discharge to Peter Wilson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6708) to remove the charge of desertion against Nathan Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6709) to remove the charge of desertion against W. B. Summers and to grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6710) to remove the charge of desertion against John B. Perkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6711) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of J. H. Morris and grant him a discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6712) to complete the military record of James Hicks—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6713) to remove the charge of desertion against Benjain A. Helm—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6714) to remove the charge of desertion

from the military record of Charles T. Jackson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6715) granting a pension to John M. Galloway and correct his military record—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6716) for the relief of Henry C. Bumgardner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6717) for the relief of Samuel Bartlett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6718) for the relief of Joseph Metcalfe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6719) for the relief of Benjamin O. Purvis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6720) for the relief of Mrs. Emma P. Barbour—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6721) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Bewley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6722) for the relief of D. S. Bradley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6723) for the relief of T. R. McBeath—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6724) for the relief of Stephen Duncan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6725) for the relief of George M. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6726) for the relief of David L. Terry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6727) for the relief of the estate of John Avritt, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6728) for the relief of Elijah Q. Cooper, of Kentucky—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6729) for the relief of Clement Calhoon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6730) for the relief of the heirs of Lucinda Cook—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6731) for the relief of the estate of Harrison Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6732) for the relief of Stephen Camplin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6733) for the relief of J. R. Claybrooke—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6734) for the relief of the estate of Charles Darnell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6735) for the relief of E. T. Dram—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6736) for the relief of the estate of Levi Fields, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6737) for the relief of Mrs. E. S. Golladay and Mrs. M. F. Bowling—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6738) for the relief of Abner Goodman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6739) for the relief of the estate of Harvey Woodward—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6740) for the relief of the estate of James Z. Watkins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6741) for the relief of the estate of B. J. Stoner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6742) for the relief of the estate of Samuel A. Spencer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6743) for the relief of the lawful heirs of G. W. Upton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6744) for the relief of James G. Queen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6745) for the relief of Isham Richardson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6746) for the relief of the estate of William H. Routt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6747) for the relief of the estate of Thomas W. Robinson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6748) for the relief of Thomas J. Pottinger—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6749) for the relief of Mary L. Piatt—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6750) for the relief of P. H. McDonough—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6751) for the relief of D. J. K. Maddox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6752) for the relief of the estate of William A. Nally—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6753) for the relief of F. M. Head—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6754) for the relief of James S. Iglehort—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6755) for the relief of the estate of William Harlow, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6756) for the relief of the estate of Franklin S. Whitney, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6757) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jacob Kauffman, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6758) for the relief of the estate of Robert Holbrook—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6759) for the relief of the estate of Franklin Le Grand—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6760) for the relief of Charles H. Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6761) for the relief of Charles Lee—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6762) for the relief of Lewis Anderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6763) for the relief of F. K. Beaven—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6764) for the relief of the estate of R. Colvin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6765) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Heyser—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6766) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6767) granting an increase of pension to Hobart P. Sweet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6768) granting an increase of pension to H. H. Pennington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6769) granting an honorable discharge to William J. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6770) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John A. White and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6771) granting a pension to Clarissa Roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 6772) granting an increase of pension to Edward E. Crandall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6773) granting an increase of pension to Weston Ferris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6774) granting an increase of pension to John Platt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6775) granting an increase of pension to William A. Lincoln—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6776) granting an increase of pension to Stephen C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6777) for the relief of Morgan Kavanagh—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6778) for the relief of John Moriarty—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6779) for the relief of the estate of James A. Suydam, deceased, late of Craven County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6780) for the relief of R. N. White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6781) for the relief of Zachariah Toler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6782) for the relief of the estate of George S. De Bruhl, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6783) for the relief of David J. Middleton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6784) for the relief of Calvin G. Perkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6785) for the relief of the heirs of D. W. Morton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6786) for the relief of the heirs of Nancy Wood—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6787) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph R. Bell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6788) for the relief of the heirs of Nathan D. Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6789) for the relief of W. P. Lane, administrator of W. K. Lane—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6790) for the relief of the estate of William C. Lewis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6791) for the relief of S. S. Waters—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6792) for the relief of the heirs of Edward Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6793) for the relief of the estate of B. L. Robinson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6794) for the relief of William T. Perry—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6795) for the relief of Mary N. Bryan, of Craven County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6796) for the relief of Henry K. Bryan, of Craven County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6797) for the relief of John D. Hawkins, executor of Jonathan Hawkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6798) for the relief of W. B. Whitfield—to to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6799) for the relief of Franklin Foy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6800) for the relief of Eleanor B. Cayton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6801) for the relief of Joseph B. Banks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6802) for the relief of James F. White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6803) for the relief of the heirs of Needham B. White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6804) for the relief of the heirs of C. H. Foy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6805) for the relief of James M. Howard, administrator of Thomas S. Howard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6806) for the relief of William Foy and H. B. Lane, executor of Mrs. H. B. Lane, of North Carolina—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6807) for the relief of George A. Russell, administrator of Stephen Chadwick—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6808) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Richardson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6809) for the relief of W. J. Craddock—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6810) for the relief of Stephen F. Fulford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6811) granting a pension to Julia Elgie—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6812) granting a pension to Mary J. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6813) granting a pension to Emsley Kinsauls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6814) granting a pension to Elizabeth French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6815) granting an increase of pension to Susan B. Walker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6816) to pay Mary L. Taylor for property taken during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6817) granting an increase of pension to Caleb F. Bandle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6818) granting a pension to Maria C. Waste—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6819) granting an increase of pension to Vendruth Washburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6820) granting a pension to Mary C. James—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6821) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Richard Lanigan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6822) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6823) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Getty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6824) granting a pension to Lois E. Mosier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6825) granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Vorderman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6826) granting an increase of pension to Almira G. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6827) to remove the charge of desertion against A. B. Ackerman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6828) to remove the charge of desertion against and grant an honorable discharge to Ceylon Gowdy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6829) granting an increase of pension to Sarah O. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6830) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Marshall N. Murphy, alias William R. Hallam—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6831) granting a pension to Sadie C. Steadman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6832) granting an increase of pension to George A. Breckinridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6833) granting a pension to Rollin H. Crane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6834) granting a pension to Emma C. Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6835) granting a pension to Maryetta Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6836) granting an increase of pension to Verus A. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6837) for the relief of Carl F. Kolbe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6838) granting a pension to Martha J. Hurlbut—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6839) granting a pension to Mary E. Kern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6840) granting an increase of pension to M. Cornelia Harmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6841) granting an increase of pension to Amos L. Hood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 6842) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Mary S. B. Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6843) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Franklin King—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6844) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Charles M. Seaver—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6845) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Catherine S. Fay—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6846) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Daniel A. Gregory—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6847) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Ellen Frothingham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6848) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of William S. Eaton—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6849) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Oliver H. Durrell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6850) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Salmon P. Hibbard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6851) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Horace W. Jordan—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6852) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Charles A. Kennedy—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6853) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Joseph H. Chadwick—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6854) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Robert Codman—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 6855) for the relief of the heirs of John Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6856) granting a pension to Maria Holloway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6857) granting a pension to Lucetta Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6858) granting a pension to Harriet N. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6859) granting a pension to Eva B. Koch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6860) granting a pension to Kittie C. Beach—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6861) granting a pension to Charlotte A. Dubry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6862) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6863) granting an increase of pension to Libbie D. Lowrey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6864) granting an increase of pension to Henry Good—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6865) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Voss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6866) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. How—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TYNDALL: A bill (H. R. 6867) granting a pension to Harriett O'Donnald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6868) granting a pension to members of the Enrolled Missouri Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6869) granting a pension to J. W. Mooney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6870) granting a pension to James O. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6871) for the relief of William B. Reich—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6872) granting honorable discharge to L. M. Baird—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6873) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6874) to refund duties paid by the State of New York upon arms imported in 1863—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 6875) granting a pension to Lucy A. Harding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6876) granting a pension to James Spencer, alias John Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6877) granting a pension to Sarah M. Bracey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6878) granting a pension to Lucy Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6879) granting a pension to Louisa A. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6880) granting an increase of pension to Marine D. Tackett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6881) granting an increase of pension to Nancy C. Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6882) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Hendricks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6883) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Knisell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6884) granting an increase of pension to Josie Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6885) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Armbuster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6886) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Sparks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6887) granting an increase of pension to James E. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6888) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hannah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6889) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Redout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6890) granting an increase of pension to Travis Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 6891) for the relief of David Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6892) granting a pension to John Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6893) granting a pension to Augusta Reichburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6894) granting an increase of pension to Daniel O. Corbin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6895) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Bishop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6896) granting an increase of pension to Edwin P. Gurney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6897) granting an increase of pension to Abbie B. Gould—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6898) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6899) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint John Gibbon captain and quartermaster in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 6900) granting an increase of pension to John Rawling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6901) granting an increase of pension to William G. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6902) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Pray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6903) granting an increase of pension to Alvah R. Munger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6904) granting an increase of pension to John Neugebauer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6905) granting an increase of pension to Andreas Schmidt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6906) granting an increase of pension to Albert Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6907) granting an increase of pension to Charles Graefe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6908) granting an increase of pension to Henry Braun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6909) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Albright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6910) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. MacDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6911) granting an increase of pension to William J. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6912) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6913) granting an increase of pension to John Gibbons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6914) granting an increase of pension to John Hecker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6915) to remove the charge of desertion against Jacob Imig, late a landsman on the ships *North Carolina* and *Naubuc*, United States Navy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON: A bill (H. R. 6916) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Meier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6917) granting an increase of pension to Edmund R. Strang—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6918) granting an increase of pension to Heinrich Krumdick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6919) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. C. Curtis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6920) granting an increase of pension to Simon Millison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6921) granting a pension to Eliza B. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6922) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael J. Doyle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6923) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick Frosch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6924) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Melville N. Goodrich—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6925) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George S. Green and to allow his widow, Minnie E. Green, a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 6926) granting an increase of pension to William Crouch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6927) granting an increase of pension to James W. Milligan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6928) granting a pension to C. C. Wolfe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 6929) for the relief of William R. Gunn—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6930) for the relief of Martha B. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6931) for the relief of the estate of Elkanah J. Sullivan, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6932) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hatel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 6933) granting a pension to William D. Newman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6934) granting pensions to artisans in the construction corps of the United States Army and providing pensions to widows and minor children of artisans in the construction corps of the United States Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 6935) granting an increase of pension to Darius Ault—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 6936) granting an increase of pension to William Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CASTOR: A bill (H. R. 6937) for the relief of Thomas Furey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 6938) for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 6939) granting a pension to Eliza J. Petty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 6940) granting permission to Capt. Dorr F. Tozier to accept the sword tendered him by the British Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 6941) granting an increase of pension to Alice Gearkee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6942) granting an increase of pension to Mary Driscoll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6943) granting an increase of pension to Linas Van Steenburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6944) granting an increase of pension to David P. Kimball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6945) granting an increase of pension to John S. Billups—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6946) granting an increase of pension to Elias Claunch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6947) granting an increase of pension to Charles Washburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 6948) for the relief of S. D. Sprinkle—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 6949) granting a pension to Alice W. Powers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 6950) granting an increase of pension to Smith Vaughan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULKERSON: A bill (H. R. 6951) granting an increase of pension to Alexander T. Reel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6952) granting a pension to John W. Dinwiddie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6953) granting a pension to William Kunkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6954) granting a pension to Bernardine Elfwing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6955) granting a pension to Joseph M. Bryant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6956) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6957) granting an increase of pension to Adam Kerns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6958) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Shannon—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6959) for the relief of the estate of Lucy R. Groves, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6960) to amend the record of Benjamin W. Chase—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6961) for the relief of the heirs of Melvin B. Smith—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6962) granting an increase of pension to Richard Phillips, jr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6963) granting a pension to William P. Knowlton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6964) providing for the payment of a bounty to the surviving members of the Seventeenth Unattached Company, Massachusetts Heavy Artillery, and to the widows of deceased members—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6965) to provide suitable medals for the officers and crew of the United States vessel of war *Kearsarge*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6966) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of the late William Keys—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6967) granting a pension to Minnie J. Winn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6968) for the relief of John Worthington—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6969) granting a pension to Ellen C. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6970) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Joseph W. Reed, and grant him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6971) granting a pension to William H. Booth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 6972) for the relief of the estate of John C. Bancroft—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 6973) for the relief of Harry Devlin—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6974) for the relief of W. L. Ratisseau—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6975) for the relief of George E. Robinson, successor to the Galveston Gasfitting and Plumbing Company, of Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 6976) for the refund of certain tonnage duties—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6977) granting an increase of pension to Alfred S. Isaacs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 6978) for the relief of Robert Tillson & Co., a partnership composed of Robert Tillson and Maitland Boon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 6979) for the relief of Letitia Tyler Semple—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 6980) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel E. Bratton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 6981) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to make an examination of certain claims of the State of Missouri—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6982) for the relief of James W. Jones—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 6983) granting an increase of pension Chalkley Petitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 6984) granting an increase of pension to James B. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 6985) granting a pension to Susan C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 6986) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Herbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 6987) granting a pension to Sarah H. Willhite—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 6988) granting an increase of pension to Seymour Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 6989) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Canter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 6990) for the relief of Alice M. Stafford, administratrix of the estate of Capt. Stephen R. Stafford—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 6991) granting an increase of pension to Logan A. Tallman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPPERT: A bill (H. R. 6992) granting an increase of pension to Mary Duffy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 6993) granting an increase of pension to John Sarvis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 6994) to correct the military record of Dewitt W. Hall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 6995) granting an increase of pension to William C. Herridge—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6996) for the relief of William Leech—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 6997) granting an increase of pension to A. R. Shacklett—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 6998) for the relief of the estate of Solomon Jones, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 6999) to complete the military record of James A. Sams and for an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 7000) granting a pension to Cullen E. Stanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7001) granting an increase of pension to Andrew M. Dunham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 7002) granting a pension to Noah Rickard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of National Committee on the Proposed Change of Inauguration Day, for early action on a proposed amendment to Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Washington Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, No. 404, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of S. D. Griffin, relative to navigability of the Chicago Canal—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of William O. Stillman, against proposed extension of the statutory limit of twenty-eight hours during which live stock in transit may be confined in cars without food, water, or rest—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Joint Executive Commission for the

improvement of the harbor of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Resolution of the Georgia legislature, regarding markets for American cotton goods—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of S. Altmayer and Massee-Felton Lumber Company, of Macon; Bramblett & Brother, of Forsyth; J. T. Lewis, of Woolsey, and J. G. Smith & Sons, of Barnesville, all in Georgia, for a postal law providing for two classes of mail only and the rate on first-class to be 1 cent per ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Council No. 4, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Griffin, Ga., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOWERS: Papers to accompany bill to provide for a resurvey of township 4 north, range 13 west, St. Stephens meridian, in Perry County, Miss.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOWIE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Newman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ephraim D. Achey—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of the Free Methodist Church, of Pittsburg, Pa.; the Allegheny (Pa.) Roman Catholic Church; the Washington (Pa.) Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Washington (Pa.) Baptist Church, for an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John J. Schniller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of William O. Fellman, against any amendment of law relative to live stock in transit—to the Committee on the Jndiciary.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Arthur Tibbits—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Argyle Z. Buck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolution of the Massachusetts legislature, for a constitutional amendment to enable Congress to regulate hours of labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution of the Massachusetts legislature, for Government control of railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Massachusetts legislature, favoring transfer of the Life-Saving Service to the Navy Department—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Massachusetts legislature, for freer trade relations with Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Massachusetts legislature, relative to duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of the Humane Association of Albany, N. Y., against any amendment in the existing law relative to live stock in transit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Mohonk Conference, relating to Indian Affairs—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE: Resolution of the legislature of Massachusetts, for transfer of the Life-Saving Service to the Navy Department—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Boston Division, No. 61, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, against Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the general court of Massachusetts, relative to railway transportation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resoluion of the general court of Massachusetts, relative to freer trade relations with Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the general court of Massachusetts, relative to removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the general court of Massachusetts, for an amendment of the Constitution enabling Congress to regulate hours of labor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Jews of Fall River, Mass., against persecution and outrages in Russia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of Doger Andrews & Co., of Columbus, Ohio, for repeal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Abaldo Tribe of the Improved Order of Red Men, of Hemlock, Ohio—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of Sarah R. Price, for reference of claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill (H. R. 105) for the improvement of Caney Fork River—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES: Petition relative to issuance of certificate of merit to Robert Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Morse & Rodgers, wholesale shoe dealers, of New York, for removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of F. S. Moon and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 665, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Quincy, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for improvement of court-house and post-office buildings at Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James M. Ikard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for removal of charge of desertion from Gabriel P. Keith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Samantha Schrimpsher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas R. Harris, of Marion County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Joshua E. Carlton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of E. P. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: Resolution of the legislature of the State of Missouri, for repeal of the national bankruptcy bill—to the the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the legislature of Missouri, for an appropriation for improvement of the Mississippi River at or near the foot of the Des Moines River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the legislature of Missouri, for an appropriation for the improvement of the Missouri River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the legislature of Missouri, for an amendment to Constitution for the election of Senators of the United States by direct vote of the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, resolution of the legislature of Missouri, for an appropriation for upper Mississippi Valley improvement—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of residents of Indianapolis, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Petition of Carpenters' Union, No. 350, of Tennessee, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Dames of 1846, relative to Mexican war pensions—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Mohonk Conference, relating to Indian affairs—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Martin Ottinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Francis L. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Jonas Gurnee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: Petition of the Mohonk Conference, relating to Indian affairs—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the Bethlehem Indian Association, of Bethlehem, Pa., favoring relief of Alaskan Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the Charity Organization Society of eastern Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of S. D. Griffin, relative to making navigable the Chicago Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of Summit Grange, No. 1155, of St. Marys, Elk County, Pa., for amendment of the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Cigar Maker's Union No. 122, of Warren, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of residents of Johnsburg, Pa., and Johnsburg Lodge, No. 134, Knights of Pythias, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: Petition of Washington (Pa.) Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, and Vesuvius Council, No. 116, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of William O. Stillman, against any amendment of the present law relative to live stock in transit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of S. D. Griffin, relative to building canals connecting the Great Lakes, the Mississippi River, and the ocean—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. J. Croddack—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Stephen F. Fulford—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of Frenchtown Grange, No. 149, of Monroe, Mich., favoring a tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of David Becker Post, for an amendment to the pension laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Scott Post, No. 43, asking an amendment to the pension laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of Dilworth Council, No. 12, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Charlotte, N. C., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ZENOR: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John H. Lagle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John W. Dempster and others, of New Albany, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Travis W. Tichenor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 12, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

THOMAS M. PATTERSON, a Senator from the State of Colorado, appeared in his seat to-day.

SUPPLIES TO INDIANS IN ALASKA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an account and accompanying papers presented by Bishop P. T. Rowe for expenses incurred by and through the United States commissioner at Circle City, Alaska, in the sum of $806.75, for furnishing in July of 1904 rations, etc., to Indians in the vicinity of Fort Yukon, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting the annual report of the Director of the Bureau of the American Republics; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Postmaster-General for the fiscal year 1905; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

INVESTIGATION OF BLACK SANDS OF PACIFIC SLOPE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant, a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey forwarding a report on the progress of the investigation of the black sands of the Pacific Slope, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Geological Survey, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented the petition of Liliuokalani, ex-Queen of the Hawaiian Islands, praying that she be reimbursed for certain lands taken from her by the United States in that Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a petition of Unity Epworth League, Chapter No. 6704, of the Central Methodist Episcopal Church, of Portland, Oreg., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Albuquerque, N. Mex., praying for the enactment of legislation to admit Arizona and New Mexico into the Union as one State; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Sierra Club, of California, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the recession by that State of the Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Big Tree Grove to the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 642, of Port Richmond; of Typographical Union No. 231, of San Jose; of the American Federation of Labor; of Local Council No. 22, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Oakland, and of sundry citizens of Richmond, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the Mountain View Orange and Lemon Association, of Upland; of the Indian Hill Citrus Union, of North Pomona; of the Queen Colony Fruit Exchange, of Corona; of the Citrus Association of Upland, and of the Covina Orange Growers' Association, of Covina, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the national convention of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Long Beach, Cal., praying for the repeal of the law relating to Government schools in Alaska, and also that an appropriation be made to reopen and maintain the schools now closed under the provisions of the act; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a memorial of the Importers and Wholesale Tea Dealers' Association of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation imposing a duty on tea; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Importers and Wholesale Coffee Dealers' Association of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation imposing a duty on coffee; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of Local Council No. 12, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Lynbrook, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Yonkers, N. Y., praying for the enactment of an anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Fall River, Mass., remonstrating against the oppression of the Jews in Russia; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Merchants' Association of Aitkin County, Minn., praying for the construction of a canal from Waldeck to Pineknoll, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also (for Mr. CLAPP) presented a petition of the Minnesota Shippers and Receivers' Association, and a petition of the Board of Trade of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also (for Mr. CLAPP) presented a petition of the Produce Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect perishable property intrusted to common carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented a petition of the legislature of Utah, praying that a pension be granted to the Indian war veterans of that State; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring), That the Senators and Representatives of Utah in the Congress of the United States of America be, and are hereby, requested to use their efforts to the end that Congress shall recognize the faithful services of the Indian war veterans of Utah by accepting records of such service between the years 1850 to 1872, inclusive, from the State of Utah, and filed with the Secretary of War, and by granting pay for thirty days as privates of volunteer

militia to such Indian war veterans of Utah as shall file such proof, and that the provisions of the act of July 27, 1892, as amended by the act of June 27, 1902, shall be applicable to said Indian war veterans.

S. H. LOVE, *President of the Senate.*
THOMAS HULL, *Speaker of the House.*

Approved this 9th day of March, 1905.

JOHN C. CUTLER, *Governor.*

Attest:
[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

STATE OF UTAH,
Office of the Secretary of State, ss:

I, Charles S. Tingey, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of senate concurrent resolution No. 7, adopted by the legislature of the State of Utah on March 9, 1905, and on said day approved by the governor and filed in my office, as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 17th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. ALLEE presented petitions of Local Council No. 4, of Harrington; of John M. Clayton Council, No. 24, of Clayton; of Fairmont Council, No. 39, of Angola; of Local Council No. 37, of Millville; of Telegraph Council, No. 29, of Wilmington; of Industry Council, No. 25, of Newcastle, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics; of Local Lodge No. 184, International Association of Machinists, of Wilmington; of Union Lodge, No. 3, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Georgetown, and of sundry citizens of Georgetown, all in the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FULTON presented a petition of Local Union No. 10, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers, of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the duty on grain alcohol; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 1427) granting an increase of pension to Edward C. Emerson; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

BRIDGES IN ARKANSAS.

Mr. BERRY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 410) to authorize the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Ouachita River and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas, to report it favorably with amendments.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered at the present time.

Mr. KEAN. Let the bill be read.

The Secretary read the bill; and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, in line 7, page 1, after the word "maintain," to strike out the words "a bridge" and insert in lieu thereof the word "bridges."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, to strike out all of section 2 of the bill and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. That the bridges constructed, maintained, and operated under this act and according to its limitations shall be lawful structures, and shall be recognized and known as post routes, upon which also no higher charge shall be made for the transportation over the same of the mails, the troops, and the munitions of war of the United States than the rate per mile paid for the transportation of said mails, troops, and munitions over the railroads and public highways leading to said bridges, and the United States shall have the right of way for postal telegraph and telephone purposes over said bridges.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct bridges across Ouachita River and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas."

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 7th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any bills which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. FRYE on the 11th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted on the 11th instant by Mr. ALLISON, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such testimony as may be taken by the committee or its subcommittees in connection with appropriation bills, and to have the same printed for its use, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CARMACK introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1380) for the relief of Jesse Walling;

A bill (S. 1381) for the relief of George L. Whitmore;

A bill (S. 1382) for the relief of the estate of J. T. Stringer, deceased;

A bill (S. 1383) for the relief of the trustees of the Primitive Baptist Church, of Pelham, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1384) for the relief of the estate of Washington Turner, deceased;

A bill (S. 1385) for the relief of the heirs of Simeon Graves, deceased;

A bill (S. 1386) for the relief of D. J. Rogers;

A bill (S. 1387) for the relief of the trustees of Hennegans Chapel, Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Dunlap, Tenn. (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1388) for the relief of Alexander L. Anderson;

A bill (S. 1389) for the relief of John M. Heard;

A bill (S. 1390) for the relief of Mrs. Nancy Walden (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1391) for the relief of Abner Souder (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1392) for the relief of the estate of Robert Langford, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1393) for the relief of the heirs of Erban Powell, deceased;

A bill (S. 1394) for the relief of the estate of John Rick, deceased;

A bill (S. 1395) for the relief of Alexander L. Anderson; and

A bill (S. 1396) for the relief of James B. Brown (with accompanying papers).

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1397) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Walker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1398) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Morgan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1399) granting an increase of pension to Henry Jordan; and

A bill (S. 1400) granting an increase of pension to Herbert C. Miller (with accompanying papers).

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 1401) for the relief of Isaac D'Isay; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1402) granting an increase of pension to William Russell;

A bill (S. 1403) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Hollis;

A bill (S. 1404) granting an increase of pension to Annie Young;

A bill (S. 1405) granting an increase of pension Edward Blanchard;

A bill (S. 1406) granting an increase of pension to Moses Hill;

A bill (S. 1407) granting a pension to John McCaughn;

A bill (S. 1408) granting an increase of pension to Julia W. Estes;

A bill (S. 1409) granting an increase of pension to Lyman A. Sayles;

A bill (S. 1410) granting an increase of pension to Emma Robbins;

A bill (S. 1411) granting an increase of pension to Artemus Ward; and

A bill (S. 1412) granting an increase of pension to George L. Van Dyne.

Mr. ALGER introduced a bill (S. 1413) for the relief of Thomas J. Spencer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 1414) granting an increase of pension to Sidney G. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1415) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Esler; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1416) granting a pension to Mary M. Sherman;

A bill (S. 1417) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Tilton;

A bill (S. 1418) granting an increase of pension to Levi E. Cross;

A bill (S. 1419) granting an increase of pension to John F. Green;

A bill (S. 1420) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Tyler;

A bill (S. 1421) granting an increase of pension to Harvey C. Brown;

A bill (S. 1422) granting an increase of pension to George L. Wakefield;

A bill (S. 1423) granting an increase of pension to John H. Steward;

A bill (S. 1424) granting an increase of pension to William P. Nevins;

A bill (S. 1425) granting an increase of pension to Edmund L. Carpenter;

A bill (S. 1426) granting an increase of pension to Austin Goings;

A bill (S. 1427) granting an increase of pension to Edward C. Emerson;

A bill (S. 1428) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Lamprey; and

A bill (S. 1429) granting an increase of pension to Jennie L. Overton.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming introduced a bill (S. 1430) for the relief of George Stoll and the heirs of Charles P. Regan, Marshall Turley, Edward Lannigan, James Manley, and John Hunter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1431) granting an increase of pension to William W. Lane; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1432) granting an increase of pension to John W. Foreaker;

A bill (S. 1433) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Willard;

A bill (S. 1434) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Derry;

A bill (S. 1435) granting an increase of pension to L. T. Davis;

A bill (S. 1436) granting an increase of pension to William W. Broadway;

A bill (S. 1437) granting an increase of pension to William F. Davis;

A bill (S. 1438) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Martindale; and

A bill (S. 1439) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Moore.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 1440) for the relief of the heirs of Charles and Palmyra Barre, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1441) for the relief of the heirs of Frederick Arbor, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DICK introduced a bill (S. 1442) to increase the efficiency of the militia and promote rifle practice; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1443) granting an increase of pension to Hiram C. Clark (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1444) granting a pension to Dora H. Kuhns.

Mr. LATIMER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 1445) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Chester, in the State of South Carolina;

A bill (S. 1446) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Greenwood, in the State of South Carolina; and

A bill (S. 1447) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Anderson, in the State of South Carolina.

Mr. CLARK of Montana introduced a bill (S. 1448) for the relief of the estate of James W. Mardis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1449) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Geddes (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1450) granting an increase of pension to Frances B. Kellogg.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1451) for the relief of the drafted men of Pendleton and other counties, in the State of Kentucky;

A bill (S. 1452) for the relief of Alex. Kennedy;

A bill (S. 1453) for the relief of drafted men in the State of Kentucky; and

A bill (S. 1454) for the relief of Irene E. Johnson, administratrix of the estate of Leo L. Johnson, deceased.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 1455) extending the provisions of existing pension laws to the officers and privates, their widows, children, and dependent parents, of the "Dakota Militia of 1862 and 1863;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 1456) granting a pension to Joann Morris; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1457) granting an increase of pension to Clara Y. Corben; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 1458) granting an increase of pension to Durbin L. Badley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1459) to encourage private salmon hatcheries in Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1460) for the relief of ship keepers at the Mare Island Navy-Yard, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1461) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of M. M. Carson, enlisted under the name of Thomas Cox; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 1462) to establish one or more fish-cultural stations on Puget Sound, State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Fisheries.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced a bill (S. 1463) granting an increase of pension to Anna Z. Potter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 1464) granting an increase of pension to John Dempster Croissant; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (for Mr. CLAPP) introduced a bill (S. 1465) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Fallihee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a bill (S. 1466) granting an increase of pension to Philena Davis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1467) granting an increase of pension to Laura A. Blodgett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (S. 1468) for the relief of the Cherokee tribe or nation of Indians;

A bill (S. 1469) for the relief of the Choctaw tribe or nation of Indians;

A bill (S. 1470) for the relief of the Chickasaw tribe or nation of Indians; and

A bill (S. 1471) for the relief of the Creek tribe or nation of Indians.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 1472) for the relief of the executors of the estate of Charles E. Conrad, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HEMENWAY introduced a bill (S. 1473) for the relief of Malinda S. Gray; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 1474) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Davis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1475) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for Isthmian Canal construction, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1476) granting certain lands to the town of Tincup, Colo., for cemetery purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GAMBLE submitted an amendment authorizing the payment of $200,000 to certain Sioux Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation, Crow Creek Reservation, and Standing Rock Reservation, in South Dakota, to reward them for services and sacrifice of ponies in accomplishing the rescue of Mrs. Julia Wright, Mrs. Emma Deely, and six children, in 1862, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYMENT OF NEW YORK INDIANS IN WAR OF 1812.

Mr. PLATT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That in furtherance of the purpose of Senate bill 2299, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, and Senate resolution of February 20, 1901, the Secretary of War is hereby directed to furnish the Senate, in addition to information furnished November 18, 1905, an authenticated copy of the records, muster, and pay rolls of paymasters or other officers relative to the employment of any or all of the so-called Six Nations of the New York Indians who were in the military service of the United States during the war of 1812, giving the names of all of the Indian soldiers or warriors—about 1,000 thereof, and the names of their 24 chiefs of tribes—their company, regiment or tribe to which they belonged, their time in service, whether they were paid; and if so, how many, the amount due to those not paid, if any, to include equipments, perquisites, etc., and all other allowances to which these wards of the Government may be entitled under any and all acts of Congress or army regulations.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary to report such testimony as may be taken by the Committee or its subcommittees in connection with matters before them and have the same printed for its use, and such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that said Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

SENATOR FROM FLORIDA.

Mr. MALLORY. A few days ago the credentials of James P. Taliaferro, a Senator-elect from the State of Florida, were read and placed on file during his absence. He is now present, and I ask that he be sworn in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect will present himself at the desk and take the oath prescribed by law.

Mr. Taliaferro was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. MALLORY, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 13, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 12, 1905.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

George W. Allen, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Key West, in the State of Florida. (Reappointment.)

John E. Stillman, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Pensacola, in the State of Florida. (Reappointment.)

Tip Warren, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Apalachicola, in the State of Florida. (Reappointment.)

William L. Gerrish, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Saco, in the State of Maine. (Reappointment.)

Charles H. Darling, of Vermont, to be collector of customs for the district of Vermont, in the State of Vermont, to succeed Olin Merrill, whose term of office will expire by limitation December 18, 1905.

Curtis S. Emery, of Vermont, to be collector of customs for the district of Memphremagog, in the State of Vermont, to succeed Zophar M. Mansur, whose term of office will expire by limitation December 18, 1905.

Matthew B. Macfarlane, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Tampa, in the State of Florida. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Nathan V. Harlan, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Alaska, division No. 3. A reappointment, his term expiring December 16, 1905.

Earl M. Cranston, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado. A reappointment, his term expiring December 16, 1905.

John M. Cheney, of Florida, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Florida, vice Joseph N. Stripling, whose term will expire January 22, 1906.

Marion Erwin, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia. A reappointment, his term expiring December 17, 1905.

Robert C. Lee, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi. A reappointment, his term expiring January 19, 1906.

William D. Frazee, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice Mack A. Montgomery, whose term will expire January 20, 1906.

James R. Penland, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee, vice William D. Wright, whose term expires December 16, 1905.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

John F. Horr, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida. A reappointment, his term expiring February 17, 1906.

Edgar S. Wilson, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Mississippi. A reappointment, his term expiring February 2, 1906.

Creighton M. Foraker, of New Mexico, to be United States marshal for the Territory of New Mexico. A reappointment, his term expiring December 16, 1905.

William Henkel, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York. A reappointment, his term expiring January 13, 1906.

William A. Dunlap, of Tennessee, to be United States marshall for the eastern district of Tennessee, vice Richard W. Austin, whose term expires December 16, 1905.

PENSION AGENT.

William Rule, of Knoxville, Tenn., to be pension agent at Knoxville, Tenn., vice John T. Wilder, whose term will expire January 13, 1906.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Miles Cannon, of Washington, to be register of the land office at North Yakima, Wash., by transfer from receiver of public moneys at North Yakima, vice Henry V. Hinman, deceased.

Lucius Q. C. Lamar, of Oxford, Miss., to be register of the land office at Jackson, Miss., vice Frederick W. Collins, whose term will expire January 13, 1906.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Robert G. Boyd to be postmaster at Glenellyn, in the county of Du Page and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Fritz Dorries to be postmaster at Breese, in the county of

Clinton and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Americus Gasaway to be postmaster at Herrin, in the county of Williamson and State of Illinois, in place of William A. Stotlar, resigned.

Herrick Houghton to be postmaster at Gilman, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois, in place of Miles E. Hunt, removed.

Edward A. Jeffers to be postmaster at Kankakee, in the county of Kankakee and State of Illinois, in place of Hiram J. Dunlap, resigned.

Malcomb T. McIntyre to be postmaster at Ladd, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

Mary McLaughlin to be postmaster at Lake Forest, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois, in place of Mary McLaughlin. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1899.

Edward J. Meyer to be postmaster at Des Plaines, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

Elbert C. Stanley to be postmaster at Downers Grove, in the county of Dupage and State of Illinois, in place of Charles Carpenter, resigned.

Walter Stickney to be postmaster at Warren, in the county of Jo Daviess and State of Illinois, in place of Hezekiah S. Van Dervort, removed.

Cornelius Sullivan to be postmaster at Riverside, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential October 1, 1896.

William M. Swingle to be postmaster at Athens, in the county of Menard and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

Abraham L. Williams to be postmaster at Edinburg, in the county of Christian and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12, 1905.

ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Milton D. Purdy, of Minnesota, to be assistant to the Attorney-General.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Joseph W. J. Lee, of Maryland, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Ecuador.

CONSULS.

G. Jarvis Bowens, of Virginia, to be consul of the United States at Guadeloupe, West Indies.

James C. Kellogg, of Louisiana, to be consul of the United States at Colon, Panama.

Dominic I. Murphy, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Bordeaux, France.

Thomas B. Van Horne, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Rosario, Argentine Republic.

Pendleton King, of North Carolina, to be consul of the United States at Aix la Chapelle, Germany.

Joseph A. Howells, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Turks Island, West Indies.

Alexander Heingartner, of Ohio, to be consul of the United States at Guelph, Ontario, Canada.

Carl Bailey Hurst, of the District of Columbia, to be consul of the United States at Plauen, Germany.

Thornwell Haynes, of South Carolina, to be consul of the United States at Nanking, China.

DISTRICT BOARD OF CHARITIES.

Charles P. Neill, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the board of charities of the District of Columbia for the term of three years from July 1, 1905.

Simon Wolf, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the board of charities of the District of Columbia for the term of three years from July 1, 1905.

DISTRICT POLICE JUDGE.

Alexander R. Mullowney, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the police court of the District of Columbia.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Lewis I. O'Neal, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia.

Samuel C. Mills, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia.

Luke C. Strider, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia.

Thomas H. Callan, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia.

Charles S. Bundy, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia.

COMMISSIONER TO REVISE THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

John L. Lott, of Ohio, to be a commissioner to revise the laws of the United States.

INDIAN INSPECTOR.

Frank C. Churchill, of Grafton, N. H., to be an Indian inspector.

MARSHALS.

Henry C. Pettit, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the district of Indiana.

George H. Baker, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

George W. Long, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

James H. Judkins, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama.

Walter H. Johnson, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Elmer B. Adams, of Missouri, to be United States circuit judge for the eighth judicial circuit.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Gustavus A. Finkelnburg, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Missouri.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Joseph B. Kealing, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the district of Indiana.

Joseph L. B. Alexander, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the Territory of Arizona.

Farish Carter Tate, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia.

James H. Tinsley, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky.

Reuben D. Hill, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky.

Arba S. Van Valkenburgh, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the western district of Missouri.

A. George Avery, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

Elliott Northcott, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

APPOINTMENTS IN MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Egil T. Olsen, of Illinois, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Marshall C. Guthrie, of North Carolina, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Hugh de Valin, of the District of Columbia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Asst. Surg. Thomas D. Berry to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 24, 1905.

Asst. Surg. Baylis H. Earle to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 13, 1905.

Asst. Surg. Edward Francis to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 23, 1905.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Mervin W. Glover to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 13, 1905.

Asst. Surg. John D. Long to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 14, 1905.

Asst. Surg. George W. McCoy to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 27, 1905.

Asst. Surg. Allan J. McLoughlin to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 10, 1905.

Asst. Surg. Claude C. Pierce to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 27, 1905.

Asst. Surg. Benjamin S. Warren to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 25, 1905.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Frank Lynn Austin, of Michigan, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

James Albert Alger, of Massachusetts, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Le Roy Reinburg, of the District of Columbia, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Howard Eugene Rideout, of Massachusetts, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

William Clayton Ward, of the District of Columbia, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Roger Chew Weightman, of California, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

William Benjamin Cothran, of South Carolina, to be a second assistant engineer, with the rank of third lieutenant, in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

John Thomas Carr, of Massachusetts, to be a second assistant engineer, with the rank of third lieutenant, in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Charles Iven Day, of Maine, to be a second assistant engineer, with the rank of third lieutenant, in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Lieut. Johnstone Hamilton Quinan to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. Byron L. Reed to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Lieut. James L. Sill to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Leonard Taylor Cutter to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Harry G. Hamlet to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. William Edwin At Lee to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Second Lieut. Randolph Ridgely, jr., to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Thaddeus Greaves Crapster to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Cecil Maunsell Gabbett to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. William Albert Whittier to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

To be chief gunners in the Navy from the 6th day of March, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904:

James T. Roach.
David F. Diggins.
David Hepburn.
Edwin N. Fisher.

To be chief gunners in the Navy from the 10th day of April, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904:

James C. McDermott.
John Kenyon.
Charles Hierdahl.

Gunner James Donald to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 27th day of April, 1905, after having completed six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

Gunner Adolph Hasler to be chief gunner in the Navy from the 19th day of July, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

Boatswains Charles T. Chase, Christopher J. Cooper, and James H. Doyle to be chief boatswains in the Navy from the 6th day of March, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

To be chief boatswains in the Navy from the 10th day of April, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904:

George B. Hendry.
Arthur R. Nickerson.
John Mahoney.
Ernest V. Sandstrom.
John McGrath.
Christian Crone.

To be chief boatswains in the Navy from the dates set opposite their names, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904:

Frederick Muller, from May 26, 1905.
John W. Stoakley, from August 15, 1905.
John D. Walsh, from August 29, 1905.

Gunner William Zeitler to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1904, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the "navy personnel act," approved March 3, 1899, as amended by the act of April 27, 1904.

Assistant Naval Constructors Stuart F. Smith and William G. Groesbeck to be naval constructors in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, upon the completion of eight years' service in their present grade.

Naval Constructors George H. Rock and Thomas F. Ruhm to be naval constructors in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant-commander from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Naval Constructors Frank B. Zahm, Horatio G. Gillmor, and Richard M. Watt to be naval constructors in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant-commander from the 8th day of July, 1905.

Assistant Naval Constructors William McEntee, William B. Ferguson, and John A. Spilman to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. Victor Blue to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1905.

Capt. William W. Mead to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. Casey B. Morgan to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Ensign Hollis T. Winston to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, after having completed three years' service in his present grade.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Hollis T. Winston to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Gunner Joseph Hill to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 27th day of April, 1905, after having completed six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the "navy personnel act," approved March 3, 1899, as amended by the act of April 27, 1904.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Wilbert Smith to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Robert L. Berry to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Robert A. Abernathy to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank D. Berrien to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut (Junior Grade) Paul Foley to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

To be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of February, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Alexander H. Van Keuren.
William W. Smyth.
Paul H. Fretz.
Stephen C. Rowan.
Walter S. Anderson.
Roy W. Ryden.
Henry D. Cooke, jr.
Samuel M. Robinson.
Leo Sahm.
Ralston S. Holmes.
Ernest Friedrick.
William J. Giles.
Ralph A. Koch.
Lamar R. Leahy.
Milton S. Davis.
Charles C. Moses.
Sam C. Loomis.
Alfred T. Brisbin.
Lindsay H. Lacy.
Charles A. Blakely.
Macgillivray Milne.
Wilbur R. Van Auken.
Harold R. Stark.
James D. Willson.
John S. Arwine, jr.
Austin S. Kibbee.
Martin K. Metcalf.
William Ancrum.
Hugh M. Walker.
Frank H. Sadler.
John Rodgers.
Daniel T. Ghent.

Surg. Charles M. De Valin to be a surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 3d day of March, 1903.

P. A. Surgs. Joseph C. Thompson and Frederick L. Benton to be surgeons in the Navy from the 3d day of March, 1903, to correct the dates of their promotions as confirmed on April 27, 1904.

P. A. Surg. Joseph A. Guthrie to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 15th day of December, 1904, to correct the date of his promotion as confirmed on April 27, 1904.

P. A. Surg. Ralph T. Orvis to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 1st day of March, 1905, to correct the date of his promotion as confirmed on April 27, 1904.

P. A. Surg. Will M. Garton to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 12th day of March, 1903.

P. A. Surg. Frank E. McCullough to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 9th day of June, 1903.

P. A. Surg. Francis M. Furlong to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 20th day of June, 1903.

Medical Inspector Daniel N. Bertolette to be a medical director in the Navy from the 5th day of April, 1905.

Surg. Henry G. Beyer to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 5th day of April, 1905.

P. A. Surg. David B. Kerr to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 5th day of April, 1905.

P. A. Surg. Granville L. Angeny to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 24th day of April, 1905.

Asst. Surg. Robert E. Hoyt to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 8th day of May, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

Lieut. Newton A. McCully to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 22d day of April, 1905.

Lieut. Marcus L. Miller to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edison E. Scranton to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Ensigns Daniel P. Mannix, Harry K. Cage, and Benjamin G. Barthalow to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Daniel P. Mannix to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Benjamin G. Barthalow to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harry K. Cage to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Asst. Surg. Robert A. Bachmann to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 20th day of March, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service.

Asst. Surg. Howard F. Strine to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 8th day of May, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service.

Asst. Surg. Joseph P. Traynor to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 8th day of May, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service.

Asst. Surg. John L. Neilson to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 4th day of October, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service.

Francis M. Shook, a citizen of Minnesota, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 15th day of March, 1905.

To be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 3d day of May, 1905:

Richard A. Warner, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

Paul R. Stalnaker, a citizen of Texas.

To be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 24th day of May, 1905:

Ernest O. J. Eytinge, a citizen of New York.

George M. Olson, a citizen of Minnesota.

To be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 7th day of July, 1905:

Curtis B. Munger, a citizen of California.

Edward R. Marshall, a citizen of Tennessee.

To be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 14th day of July, 1905:

Fletcher H. Brooks, a citizen of Maryland.

John B. Mears, a citizen of Virginia.

To be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 1st day of August, 1905:

George S. Hathaway, a citizen of Rhode Island.

Frank E. Sellers, a citizen of Virginia.

To be assistant surgeons in the Navy from the 21st day of September, 1905:

Edward H. H. Old, a citizen of Virginia.

George H. McConnon, a citizen of Virginia.

Edward C. White, a citizen of New Jersey.

Thurlow W. Reed, a citizen of New York.

Edward U. Reed, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Edward L. Woods, a citizen of Virginia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 14th day of October, 1905.

Robert C. Ransdell, a citizen of the District of Columbia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 24th day of November 1905.

Paymaster Frank T. Arms to be a pay inspector in the Navy from the 10th day of March, 1905, to correct the date of his promotion, as confirmed on the 16th day of March, 1905, caused by the failure of Paymaster Henry E. Jewett to qualify for promotion.

Paymaster Thomas H. Hicks to be a pay inspector in the Navy from the 13th day of March, 1905.

Paymaster Ziba W. Reynolds to be a pay inspector in the Navy from the 14th day of June, 1905.

P. A. Paymaster Rishworth Nicholson to be a paymaster in the Navy from the 14th of June, 1905.

P. A. Paymaster John D. Barber to be a paymaster in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Asst. Paymaster Jere Maupin to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Paymaster Henry E. Jewett to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Paymaster Eugene D. Ryan to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant-commander, from the 8th day of July, 1905.

P. A. Paymasters Edward T. Hoopes, Walter A. Greer, and Cecil S. Baker to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 31st day of March, 1905.

P. A. Paymasters Donald W. Nesbit, Arthur M. Pippin, John S. Higgins, and Ignatius T. Hagner to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1905.

To be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 30th day of July, 1905:

George P. Auld.
James S. Beecher.
Henry A. Wise, jr.
Henry de F. Mel.
John A. B. Smith, jr.
Felix R. Holt.
Emmett C. Gudger.
Stewart E. Barber.
Howard D. Lamar.
Frederic H. Lemly.
Ervin A. McMillan.
Eugene H. Tricou.
Alvin Hovey-King.
George A. Deering.
William C. Fite.

Harold W. Browning, a citizen of New York, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 15th day of March, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

To be assistant paymasters in the Navy from the 8th day of July, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Benjamin H. Brooke, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Thomas J. Bright, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Emory D. Stanley, a citizen of Nevada.
Lewis W. L. Jennings, a citizen of Virginia.
Brantz Mayer, a citizen of Iowa.
Swinton L. Bethea, a citizen of South Carolina.
Edward R. Wilson, a citizen of California.
William G. Neill, a citizen of West Virginia.
Harry E. Collins, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
John H. Gunnell, a citizen of New York.
Emmett H. Tebeau, a citizen of South Carolina.
Charles E. Parsons, a citizen of Maryland.
William J. Hine, a citizen of Tennessee.
Kenneth C. McIntosh, a citizen of Indiana.
Francis J. Daly, a citizen of New Jersey.
Roland W. Schumann, a citizen of New York.
Franklin P. Williams, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Leon N. Wertenbaker, a citizen of Ohio.
John J. Luchsinger, a citizen of California.
Eugene H. Douglass, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Robert K. Van Mater, a citizen of New Jersey.
William S. Zane, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
James C. Hilton, a citizen of Maryland.

Midshipman George F. Blair to be an ensign in the Navy from the 2d day of May, 1904.

Midshipman Kirby B. Crittenden to be an ensign in the Navy from the 1st day of November, 1904.

Commander Richard G. Davenport to be a captain in the Navy from the 21st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. Commander John T. Newton to be a commander in the Navy from the 21st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. Kenneth McAlpine to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 21st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles W. Forman to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 21st day of March, 1905.

Capt. George C. Reiter to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Commander John A. Norris to be a captain in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Commander Edward B. Barry to be a captain in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Benjamin Tappan to be a commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Charles F. Pond to be a commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Walter McLean to be a commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. Benton C. Decker to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. Mark L. Bristol to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. Benjamin W. Wells to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Zachariah H. Madison to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry B. Soulé to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Francis Martin to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 31st day of March, 1905.

Commander Herbert Winslow to be a captain in the Navy from the 22d day of April, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Washington I. Chambers to be a commander in the Navy from the 22d day of April, 1905.

Lieut. Commander James C. Gillmore to be a commander in the Navy from the 30th day of April, 1905.

Lieut. Levi C. Bertolette to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 30th day of April, 1905.

Capt. Willard H. Brownson to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 6th day of May, 1905.

Commander William H. Turner to be a captain in the Navy from the 6th day of May, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Charles A. Gove to be a commander in the Navy from the 6th day of May, 1905.

Lieut. George W. Logan to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 6th day of May, 1905.

Commander Albert G. Berry to be a captain in the Navy from the 16th day of June, 1905.

Lieut. Commander De Witt C. Coffman to be a commander in the Navy from the 16th day of June, 1905.

Lieut. Henry F. Bryan to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 16th day of June, 1905.

Commander Nathaniel J. K. Patch to be a captain in the Navy from the 21st day of June, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Richard Henderson to be a commander in the Navy from the 21st day of June, 1905.

Lieut. Andrew T. Long to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 21st day of June, 1905.

Commander Thomas S. Phelps to be a captain in the Navy from the 26th day of June, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Thomas D. Griffin to be a commander in the Navy from the 26th day of June, 1905.

Lieut. Edward H. Durell to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 26th day of June, 1905.

Commander Karl Rohrer to be a captain in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Henry Minett to be a commander in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1905.

Lieut. Archibald H. Scales to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Richard T. Mulligan to be a commander in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1905.

Commander Theodoric Porter to be a captain in the Navy from the 30th day of June, 1905.

Lieut. Commander William Braunersreuther to be a commander in the Navy from the 30th day of June, 1905.

Lieut. Thomas Washington to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 30th day of June, 1905.

Commander Daniel D. V. Stuart to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Commander Kossuth Niles to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Commander Warner B. Bayley, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. Commander William S. Hogg to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. Archibald H. Davis to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. Guy H. Burrage to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Commander Dennis H. Mahan to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Reynold T. Hall to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. Commander William F. Fullam to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. Frank M. Russell to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

To be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, after having completed three years' service in that grade:

Charles P. Snyder.
Carleton R. Kear.
Joseph R. Defrees.
Willis G. Mitchell.
Samuel W. Bryant.
Edward S. Jackson.
William F. Bricker.
Henry L. Wyman.
John W. Timmons.
John G. Church.
Charles N. Freeman.
Robert L. Berry.
Robert A. Abernathy.
Ward K. Wortman.
Hayne Ellis.
Frank D. Berrien.
Arthur B. Keating.
Frederick R. Naile.
Emil P. Svarz.
Wilbert Smith.
Julius F. Hellweg.
Sinclair Gannon.
Robert Morris.
John D. Wainwright.
George W. Steele, jr.
Stafford H. R. Doyle.
William K. Riddle.
William N. Jeffers.
James H. Comfort.
Paul Foley.
Carlos A. Gardiner.
Edison E. Scranton.
John W. Schoenfeld.
Clarence L. Arnold.
Stanley Woods.
Edwin H. Dodd.
Charles P. Huff.
Charles R. Train.
Hugo W. Osterhaus.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles P. Snyder to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Carleton R. Kear to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Joseph R. Defrees to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Willis G. Mitchell to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Samuel W. Bryant to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward S. Jackson to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William F. Bricker to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry L. Wyman to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Arthur B. Keating to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frederick R. Naile to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Emil P. Svarz to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Commander Albert F. Dixon to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Commander Samuel P. Comly to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Albert G. Winterhalter to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. Commander John M. Orchard to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander Augustus F. Fechteler to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander Edward E. Wright to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander Albert Gleaves to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander James P. Parker to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander Ben W. Hodges to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander Herbert O. Dunn to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander Arthur W. Dodd to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander Albert W. Grant to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander Horace W. Harrison to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander Valentine S. Nelson to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander William S. Benson to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander Frank M. Bostwick to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Commander Harry M. Dombaugh to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut Commander Thomas S. Rodgers to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Ashley H. Robertson to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Carlo B. Brittain to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. William M. Crose to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. John F. Hubbard to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Lloyd H. Chandler to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Oscar W. Koester to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. George N. Hayward to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Samuel S. Robison to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Charles F. Hughes to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Albert L. Norton to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. James H. Reid to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Edward L. Beach to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Herman O. Stickney to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Henry A. Wiley to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Frederic B. Bassett, jr., to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Herbert G. Gates to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Richard H. Jackson to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Arthur B. Hoff to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Nathan C. Twining to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Benjamin F. Hutchison to be lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Thomas P. Magruder to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Sumner E. W. Kittelle to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. William V. Pratt to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Louis McC. Nulton to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. George R. Marvell to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. John B. Patton to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. George B. Bradshaw to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Cleland N. Offley to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Louis R. de Steiguer to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. William W. Phelps to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Louis A. Kaiser to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. William C. Cole to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Charles A. Brand to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Philip Williams to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Warren J. Terhune to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. George G. Mitchell to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Cleland Davis to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. William K. Harrison to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Frank H. Schofield to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Urban T. Holmes to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Jehu V. Chase to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Henry J. Ziegemeier to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Matt H. Signor to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Claude B. Price to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Montgomery M. Taylor to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Carl T. Vogelgesang to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Charles B. McVay, jr., to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. John H. Dayton to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Lucius A. Bostwick to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. William A. Moffett to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. Julian L. Latimer to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Julius F. Hellweg to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Sinclair Gannon to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Robert Morris to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John D. Wainwright to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) George W. Steele, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Stafford H. R. Doyle to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) William K. Riddle to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) William N. Jeffers to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John W. Timmons to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles S. Freeman to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ward K. Wortman to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Hayne Ellis to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) James H. Comfort to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Carlos A. Gardiner to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) John W. Schoenfeld to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clarence L. Arnold to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Stanley Woods to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edwin H. Dodd to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles P. Huff to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles R. Train to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Capt. Edward Longnecker to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 8th day of July, 1905.

Commander John Hubbard to be a captain in the Navy from the 8th day of July, 1905.

Lieut. Commander John G. Quinby to be a commander in the Navy from the 8th day of July, 1905.

Lieut. John R. Edie to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 8th day of July, 1905.

Lieut. Reginald R. Belknap to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 18th day of July, 1905.

To be ensigns in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1901, as amended by the acts of March 3, 1903, and April 27, 1904:

Boatswain Charles H. Bullock.

Gunner John Grady.

Gunner Arthur C. Kail.

Gunner William D. Greetham.

Gunner Robert W. Kessler.

Ensign Louis J. Connelly to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1905, having completed three years' service in his present grade.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Louis J. Connelly to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

Capt. Thomas Perry to be a rear-admiral in the Navy from the 8th day of September, 1905.

Commander Alexander McCrackin to be a captain in the Navy from the 8th day of September, 1905.

Lieut. Commander James H. Glennon to be a commander in the Navy from the 8th day of September, 1905.

Lieut. De Witt Blamer to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 8th day of September, 1905.

Lieut. Commander Percival J. Werlich to be a commander in the Navy from the 9th day of September, 1905.

Lieut. John K. Robinson to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 9th day of September, 1905.

Commander Corwin P. Rees, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 30th day of September, 1905.

Lieut. Commander William R. Rush to be a commander in the Navy from the 30th day of September, 1905.

Lieut. Arthur L. Willard to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 30th day of September, 1905.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Hugo W. Osterhaus to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Ella G. Nix to be postmaster at Fort Payne, in the county of Dekalb and State of Alabama.

CALIFORNIA.

Adaline Bailhache to be postmaster at Coronado, in the county of San Diego and State of California.

Edmund L. Brown to be postmaster at San Fernando (late Fernando), in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

Daniel H. Coates to be postmaster at Campbell, in the county of Santa Clara and State of California.

Angus J. Drynan to be postmaster at Redding, in the county of Shasta and State of California.

Frank H. Duden to be postmaster at Jackson, in the county of Amador and State of California.

Albert B. Hill to be postmaster at Coalinga, in the county of Fresno and State of California.

William A. Long to be postmaster at Hanford, in the county of Kings and State of California.

GEORGIA.

Richard O. Rogers to be postmaster at Lafayette, in the county of Walker and State of Georgia.

Albert M. Smith to be postmaster at Brunswick, in the county of Glynn and State of Georgia.

IDAHO.

William W. Stephens to be postmaster at Rexburg, in the county of Fremont and State of Idaho.

George L. Wall to be postmaster at Blackfoot, in the county of Bingham and State of Idaho.

KANSAS.

Thomas C. Babb to be postmaster at Fredonia, in the county of Wilson and State of Kansas.

Willis E. Bodley to be postmaster at Quenemo, in the county of Osage and State of Kansas.

Lewis W. Breyfogle to be postmaster at Olathe, in the county of Johnson and State of Kansas.

Eben Carlsson to be postmaster at Lindsborg, in the county of McPherson and State of Kansas.

Robert I. Hillman to be postmaster at Peru, in the county of Chautauqua and State of Kansas.

Irwin C. McDowell to be postmaster at Phillipsburg, in the county of Phillips and State of Kansas.

James T. Miller to be postmaster at Altoona, in the county of Wilson and State of Kansas.

John C. Petty to be postmaster at Strong, in the county of Chase and State of Kansas.

LOUISIANA.

Arthur A. Boudreaux to be postmaster at Thibodaux, in the parish of Lafourche and State of Louisiana.

Benjamin S. Gallup to be postmaster at Hammond, in the parish of Tangipahoa and State of Louisiana.

Rudolph A. Gehringer to be postmaster at Napoleonville, in the parish of Assumption and State of Louisiana.

Cora Sharpless to be postmaster at De Ridder, in the parish of Calcasieu and State of Louisiana.

MISSOURI.

Julian Courteol to be postmaster at Granby, in the county of Newton and State of Missouri.

George K. Gwathmey to be postmaster at Lathrop, in the county of Clinton and State of Missouri.

Roscoe N. Dean to be postmaster at Norborne, in the county of Carroll and State of Missouri.

Guersant P. Herriott to be postmaster at Novinger, in the county of Adair and State of Missouri.

Clyde M. Hudson to be postmaster at Hale, in the county of Carroll and State of Missouri.

Frank P. Kitchen to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Henry and State of Missouri.

William T. Lessley to be postmaster at Glasgow, in the county of Howard and State of Missouri.

Nellie B. Shelton to be postmaster at Puxico, in the county of Stoddard and State of Missouri.

Theodore Walther to be postmaster at De Soto, in the county of Jefferson and State of Missouri.

MONTANA.

Orson B. Prickett to be postmaster at Billings, in the county of Yellowstone and State of Montana.

James McTaggart to be postmaster at Belgrade, in the county of Gallatin and State of Montana.

NEW YORK.

Emerson W. Addis to be postmaster at Brewster, in the county of Putnam and State of New York.

Samuel G. Barton to be postmaster at Gasport, in the county of Niagara and State of New York.

George C. Lane to be postmaster at Fishers Island, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York.

William E. Mills to be postmaster at Rose Hill, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York.

John N. Parsons to be postmaster at Yonkers, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Sylvester Pearsall to be postmaster at Lynbrook, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

Harry H. Pratt to be postmaster at Corning, in the county of Steuben and State of New York.

Charles J. Shults to be postmaster at Cherry Creek, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York.

Alexander S. Taylor to be postmaster at Westbury Station, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

Henry P. Tuthill to be postmaster at Mattituck, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York.

Willis G. C. Wood to be postmaster at Whitehall, in the county of Washington and State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Drury W. Deweese to be postmaster at Murphy, in the county of Cherokee and State of North Carolina.

James D. Dorsett to be postmaster at Spencer, in the county of Rowan and State of North Carolina.

Malinda A. Renigar to be postmaster at Shore, in the county of Yadkin and State of North Carolina.

William E. Snow to be postmaster at High Point, in the county of Guilford and State of North Carolina.

NORTH DAKOTA.

William H. Bush to be postmaster at Oakes, in the county of Dickey and State of North Dakota.

OHIO.

Orrin C. Andre to be postmaster at Waverly, in the county of Pike and State of Ohio.

Charles W. Brainerd to be postmaster at Mantua (late Mantua Station), in the county of Portage and State of Ohio.

Betsey Erskine to be postmaster at Lowellville, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio.

Lewis T. Marrott to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Summit and State of Ohio.

John C. McManus to be postmaster at Jewett, in the county of Harrison and State of Ohio.

George W. Nickels to be postmaster at Galion, in the county of Crawford and State of Ohio.

Ralston Russell to be postmaster at Pomeroy, in the county of Meigs and State of Ohio.

Tom J. Smith to be postmaster at West Salem, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio.

Judson N. Stone to be postmaster at Oberlin, in the county of Lorain and State of Ohio.

David B. Wilson to be postmaster at Corning, in the county of Perry and State of Ohio.

OREGON.

Harvey S. Buck to be postmaster at Sumpter, in the county of Baker and State of Oregon.

Louis J. Simpson to be postmaster at North Bend, in the county of Coos and State of Oregon.

Frank W. Welcome to be postmaster at Burns, in the county of Harney and State of Oregon.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

John E. Heustess to be postmaster at Hartsville, in the county of Darlington and State of South Carolina.

Isham A. Mayfield to be postmaster at Greer, in the county of Greenville and State of South Carolina.

Ira S. Pitts to be postmaster at Westminster, in the county of Oconee and State of South Carolina.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Erick Olson to be postmaster at Fairfax, in the county of Gregory and State of South Dakota.

William Toomey to be postmaster at Gettysburg, in the county of Potter and State of South Dakota.

TEXAS.

Harry H. Barkham to be postmaster at Plano, in the county of Collin and State of Texas.

Jefferson D. Bell to be postmaster at Bartlett, in the county of Williamson and State of Texas.

Belle W. Bridges to be postmaster at Mason, in the county of Mason and State of Texas.

Thomas F. Calhoon to be postmaster at Liberty, in the county of Liberty and State of Texas.

Gerald W. Calrow to be postmaster at Boerne, in the county of Kendall and State of Texas.

George W. Cash to be postmaster at Hubbard, in the county of Hill and State of Texas.

Joshua W. Cunningham to be postmaster at De Kalb, in the county of Bowie and State of Texas.

William A. Hawn to be postmaster at Athens, in the county of Henderson and State of Texas.

Clara I. Lockwood to be postmaster at Sealy, in the county of Austin and State of Texas.

Richard T. Polk to be postmaster at Killeen, in the county of Bell and State of Texas.

Anna J. Roach to be postmaster at Atlanta, in the county of Cass and State of Texas.

Charlie Simmons to be postmaster at Valley Mills, in the county of Bosque and State of Texas.

Harvey H. Twyman to be postmaster at Rosebud, in the county of Falls and State of Texas.

UTAH.

George W. Bryan to be postmaster at Mercur, in the county of Tooele and State of Utah.

WASHINGTON.

Jacob F. Hill to be postmaster at Davenport, in the county of Lincoln and State of Washington.

Robert H. Stapleton to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Snohomish and State of Washington.

Frank L. Turner to be postmaster at South Bend, in the county of Pacific and State of Washington.

Henry L. Votaw to be postmaster at Tacoma, in the county of Pierce and State of Washington.

WYOMING.

Ida Fowkes to be postmaster at Cumberland, in the county of Uinta and State of Wyoming.

Frank O. Thompson to be postmaster at Cody, in the county of Bighorn and State of Wyoming.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 13, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXPENDITURES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, recommending the repeal of section 3 of the act of June 30, 1879, which provides that the Attorney-General shall include in his annual report a statement of all payments or expenditures during any fiscal year out of any appropriation fund subject to requisitions from him, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relating to the vessel schooner *Lovely Lass*, William Moore, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the City of Memphis *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Karoline Mulhaupt *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the Christian Church of Corinth, Miss., *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of The Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Cleveland, Tenn., *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of The Columbia National Bank, of Columbia, Pa., *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Antonia Q. Lovell, Rosalie Q. Duncan, Fredrica Q. Ogden, Eliza T. Routh, and Louise Q. Lovell, since deceased, children and heirs at law of Gen. J. A. Quitman, deceased, and Eva C. Lovell and Alice Q. Lovell, children and heirs at law of Louise Q. Lovell, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

COURTESIES TO MEMBERS OF CANADIAN PARLIAMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate an extract from the minutes and proceedings of the Senate of Canada, expressing thanks for the cordial reception extended to the Hon. Raoul Dandurand, speaker of the Senate of the Dominion of Canada; the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, ex-premier and senator, and the Hon. Senator McSweeney at the inauguration of the President of the United States at Washington on the 4th of March last, and also for the courtesies of the United States Senate and the privileges of the floor. The extract from the minutes will be read.

The paper was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

[Extract from the minutes and proceedings of the Senate of Canada, March 17, 1905.]

With leave of the Senate, his honor the speaker made the following statement:

"HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: I deem it my duty to take this the first

opportunity of reassembling of the Senate to bring to its notice the very cordial reception which was given to your speaker and to the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, ex-premier and senator, and the Hon. Senator McSweeney at the inauguration of the President of the United States at Washington on the 4th day of March last.

"On learning of our presence in the city the President accorded us a private reception, and requested me as your speaker to convey to the Canadian Senate his high appreciation of our attendance at his inauguration, and his hearty wishes that the intercourse between the public men of both neighboring nations should be more frequent and more intimate.

"I desire at the same time, on behalf of myself and colleagues, to thank the Senate of the United States for the very gracious act it performed on the day of our arrival by adopting the following resolution, granting to us the courtesies of the Senate and the privileges of the floor of that honorable body:

"'IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
"'*March 3, 1905.*

"'On motion by Mr. SPOONER,

"'*Resolved*, That the courtesies of the Senate, including the privileges of the floor, are extended to the Hon. Raoul Dandurand, speaker of the Senate of the Dominion of Canada, and the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, ex-premier and senator of the said Dominion, who are at the capital to attend the inaugural ceremonies.

"'Attest:

"'CHARLES G. BENNETT, *Secretary.*'

"As this resolution is of record in the minutes of that body, I felt that this act of courtesy on the part of our brother Senators from over the line should be officially acknowledged and taken cognizance of as a friendly act toward our whole chamber, and duly recorded in our own proceedings.

"The Hon. Senator McSweeney, whose presence at the American capital had not been announced, was granted the same reception as that given to his colleagues."

The Hon. Mr. Ellis, moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Kerr, that the said statement be recorded in the minutes and proceedings of the Senate; that a copy of the same be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the President of the Senate.

The question of concurrence being put thereon, the same was unanimously resolved in the affirmative, and ordered accordingly.

Attest:

SAML. E. ST. O. CHAPLEAU, *Clerk of the Senate.*

EXAMINATIONS OF NATIONAL BANKS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant, a report from the Comptroller of the Treasury containing certain information concerning the reports made of national-bank examiners touching the subject of contributions to political campaigns. The Chair would ask the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] what disposition he wishes to have made of the communication. [A pause.] The Secretary will read the letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 12, 1905.

SIR: In response to a resolution passed by your body on December 7, 1905, requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to submit certain information concerning the reports made by national-bank examiners touching the subject of contributions to political campaigns, I beg to transmit the following from the report to me by the Comptroller of the Treasury. He answers the inquiries seriatim, and as follows:

"1. All reports made by national-bank examiners since March 4, 1893, have been preserved and are on file in the Comptroller's office.

"2. Since 1894 it has been the practice to make regular semiannual examinations of all national banks. Prior to 1894 only one regular examination a year was made of each bank.

"3. It is the duty and the practice of examiners to examine the expense and profit and loss accounts of banks, covering all items of expenditures for the period since the last previous examination, and the vouchers or memorandum tickets for any large or unusual item of expense.

"4. It is the duty and practice of examiners to report any illegal, wasteful, or improper use of a bank's funds or any undue proportion of expenses to earnings.

"5. While it is impossible to state positively whether any report shows any payments by any bank to any political committee, or to any chairman, treasurer, or other officer of a political committee, without an examination of each and every one of more than 100,000 reports on file of examinations made during the period covered by the resolution, to the best of my knowledge and belief such reports as have been made during my incumbency of the office of Comptroller, covering the period since October 1, 1901, do not show any payments of the nature indicated, except in one or two instances, and these were in banks of the smaller capital class and for amounts not exceeding two or three hundred dollars. The reports in these instances simply show the payment, contribution, or donation of the sum stated for local political campaign purposes, without any of the details connected with such payments.

"Careful inquiry of subordinate officers of the Comptroller's Bureau who have been connected with the Bureau prior to and since March 4, 1893, and whose duty it has been to make critical examination of examiners' reports and to prepare the letters to the banks based thereon, has failed to bring to their recollection any report showing payments of the nature indicated, except the one or two instances hereinbefore cited.

"6. To the best of my knowledge and belief, therefore, such reports do not show any payments, except as stated, of the moneys of any bank to any person, upon any voucher or without any voucher, where the circumstances of the payments suggest that the money was to be used to carry on a political campaign or for any political purpose.

"When an examiner's report shows any unlawful use of the funds of a bank by its officers, it is the practice of the Comptroller to call the attention of the directors of the bank to the matter and to require them to cause a restoration to be made of the amount unlawfully used.

"In one of the instances above referred to I know from my personal recollection the officers of the bank were called on to make good the amount thus contributed for political purposes. I have not so distinct a recollection in regard to the other case, although I am quite positive the same course must have been pursued. I do not remember the name or location of the bank, and as no one else in the office does, it would be difficult to find it without a search of all the reports, which would be a matter of many days' labor."

Respectfully submitted.

L. M. SHAW, *Secretary.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. What disposition does the Senator from South Carolina wish to have made of the communication?

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, it will appear in the RECORD, having been read, and it is, therefore, to that extent a public document. Probably I shall pursue the matter a little further by an additional resolution that will make some specifications, which will not take so much labor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The communication will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURROWS. I trust that it will be printed as a document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Santa Fe, Territory of New Mexico, praying for the enactment of legislation incorporating into the pending bill for statehood for New Mexico and Arizona a provision donating to the counties of Santa Fe and Grant, in New Mexico, and to the county of Pima and such others as may be similarly affected in Arizona, sufficient public nonmineral-bearing lands, the proceeds from the sale of which to be applied to the payment and satisfaction of all bonded indebtedness against said counties, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition of Group Four of the Iowa Bankers' Association, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the present bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Muscatine, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 634, Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Creston, Iowa, and a petition of the Charity Organization of Dubuque, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Postal Progress League of Pacific Grove, Cal., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nora Springs, Iowa, praying for the ratification of treaty of arbitration with all nations; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Des Moines Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of Chinese into the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the central committee of the National Live Stock Association of the United States, praying that increased appropriation be made for the purpose of agricultural experimental stations and for the use of the Bureau of Animal Industry, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ANKENY presented a memorial of the Harmony Club of Seattle, Wash., remonstrating against the oppression of the Jews in Russia; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Sharon, Iowa, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against the Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of Subdivisions No. 184, of Stuart; No. 159, of Cedar Rapids; No. 391, of Fort Madison; No. 203, of Perry; No. 113, of Des Moines; No. 229, of Mason City, all of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, in the State of Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the employment of men as locomotive engineers who have not had at least three years' experience as locomotive firemen or one year's experience as a locomotive engineer; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KNOX presented a petition of Central Labor Union, American Federation of Labor, of Easton, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude Chinese and Korean laborers from the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1203) granting a pension to Albert B. Lawrence; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Cumberland Valley Medical Association, of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Camp No. 215, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Ambler; Camp No. 650, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Broad Top City; Camp No. 456, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Sykesville; Camp No. 337, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Mill Hall; Camp No. 581, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Ricketts; Camp No. 65, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Lebanon; Camp No. 632, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Franklindale; Camp No. 614, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Pillow; Camp No. 28, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Adamstown; Vine Cliff Council, No. 107, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; Blairsville Council, No. 216, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Blairsville; Tescallette Council, No. 442, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; J. P. Winower Council, No. 618, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; Columbia Council, No. 43, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wilkesbarre; Good Will Council, No. 42, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Tyrone; the United Labor League of Western Pennsylvania; Local Union No. 1693, Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Harrisburg; Local No. 947, Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Ridgway, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of William E. McCall, jr., of Philadelphia; of sundry citizens of Reading; The Declaration of Independence Chapter of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, of Philadelphia; Tabernacle Presbyterian Church, of Philadelphia; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Darby; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Landsdowne; William C. Taylor, of Bethlehem; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Media; Warren H. Hershey, of New Holland; First United Presbyterian Church of Rochester; College Hill Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Beaver Falls, and Olivet Presbyterian Church, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented the memorial of B. Ezra Herr, of Rosedale, Pa., and the memorial of S. L. Johns, of Hanover, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Curtis bill," relative to a reduction of the duty on tobacco imported from the Philippine Islands; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the general board of adjustment, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Easton, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit the admission into the United States of Chinese visitors and travelers not of the cooly class; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Stone Valley; of 75 members of the United Presbyterian Church of Conway; 200 members of the First United Presbyterian Church of Rochester; 130 members of the College Hill Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Beaver Falls; 200 members of the Central Allegheny Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Allegheny; 100 members of the Free Methodist Church of Pittsburg; 186 members of the Mount Washington Baptist Church, of Pittsburg; all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committe on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Laurel Hill Grange, No. 1161, Patrons of Husbandry, of Milan; Concord Grange, No. 1141, Patrons of Husbandry, of Concord; Brandywine Grange, No. 60, Patrons of Husbandry, of Westchester; Summit Grange, No. 1155, Patrons of Husbandry, of St. Marys; Columbus Grange, No. 826, Patrons of Husbandry, of Columbus; Penfield Grange, No. 1240, Patrons of Husbandry, of Penfield; Winfield Grange, No. 1105, Patrons of Husbandry, of Carbonblack; Liberty Grange, No. 1182, Patrons of Husbandry, of Port Allegheny; Elk Lake Grange, No. 806, Patrons of Husbandry, of Elk Lake; Waterford Grange, No. 423, Patrons of Husbandry, of Waterford; Keiserville Grange, No. 508, Patrons of Husbandry, of Keiserville, and of Highland Grange, No. 980, Patrons of Husbandry, of Cochranville, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the present oleomargarine law by striking out the word "knowingly;" which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the common council of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the preservation of the forests of New Hampshire; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of Liberty Bell Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New Haven, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Epworth League of Ledyard, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the board of managers of the Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, praying that increased appropriations be made for the support of agricultural experiment stations; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a petition of the American Bar Association, praying for the continuation of the present bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Ohio Valley Council, No. 23, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Evansville; of Local Union No. 436, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of New Albany; of Sheet Metal Workers' Local Union No. 41, of Indianapolis; of Local Union No. 1380, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Bedford, and of Typographical Union No. 128, of South Bend, all in the State of Indiana; and of Local Union No. 276, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Oklahoma City, Okla., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the surviving members of the Thirty-fourth Indiana Volunteer Infantry, of Lincolnville, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to equalize pensions received by widows of soldiers; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PANAMA CANAL APPROPRIATION.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report back, with sundry amendments, the bill H. R. 480, supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes."

I also report in connection with the bill testimony taken by the Committee on Appropriations in reference to it, and I ask that the testimony may be printed as a public document. I would state to Senators that nearly all the testimony is now in print and all will be in print by to-morrow morning, or perhaps during the afternoon.

On behalf of the committee I shall ask the Senate to take the bill up for consideration to-morrow morning at the earliest practicable hour.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the bill as reported may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill as amended by the committee will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the amendments and the bill as amended, as follows:

Strike out section 1, in the following words:

"That the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans,' approved June 28, 1902, shall be subject to the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled 'An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes,' approved March 14, 1900, the same as though said bonds were issued under the provisions of said act of March 14, 1900."

In section 2, page 2, line 7, before the word "act," strike out "said."

In section 3, page 2, line 21, before the words "Canal Zone," strike out "said" and insert "the;" in line 22, before the word "Canal," strike out "said Panama" and insert "the isthmian;" in the same line, before the words "Panama Railroad," strike out "said" and in-

sert "the;" and in line 25, after the word "Congress," strike out the following:

"And any of the persons appointed or employed by the President in connection with the said government or the said work of construction or operation shall give to Congress or to either House of Congress such information as may at any time be required either by act of Congress or by the order of either House of Congress in relation to their respective actings and doings and the receipt and expenditure of money."

In section 3, page 3, line 18, after the word "purposes," strike out "named in this act" and insert "of constructing and maintaining said isthmian canal;" and in line 19, after the word "Congress," strike out the following:

"except that the moneys received, in the ordinary course of business, from the operation of the Panama Railroad and the property and rights appertaining thereto may be expended, so far as necessary, in defraying the expenses of such operation, including maintenance, without being covered into the Treasury of the United States, and such moneys are hereby appropriated for such purpose, and monthly reports of such receipts and expenditures shall be made to the President by the person or persons in charge."

So as to make the bill read:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $11,000,000 to continue the construction of the isthmian canal, to be expended under the direction of the President in accordance with the act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, approved June 28, 1902, and for each and every purpose connected with the same, the said sum to continue available until expended: *Provided*, That all expenditures from the appropriation herein made shall be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds authorized in section 8 of the said act approved June 28, 1902.

"SEC. 2. That the President shall annually, and at such other periods as may be provided, either by law or by his order, require full and complete reports to be made to him by the persons appointed or employed by him in charge of the government of the Canal Zone, the construction of the isthmian canal, and the operation of the Panama Railroad, including an itemized account of all moneys received and expended, which said reports shall be by the President transmitted to Congress. The President shall annually cause to be made, by the persons appointed and employed by him in charge of the government of said Canal Zone and the construction of said canal, estimates of expenditures and appropriations, in detail as far as practicable, which estimates shall be submitted to Congress in the manner provided in section 5 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes.' And no money shall be expended for any of the purposes of constructing and maintaining said isthmian canal except in accordance with appropriations made by Congress."

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An act making an appropriation to continue the construction of the isthmian canal, and for other purposes.'"

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa asks that the hearing before the Committee on Appropriations with respect to the bill just read be printed as a document. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senate will observe the committee recommend that the first section of the bill be stricken out—that portion of the bill relating to the amendment of the bond provision. That the committee regarded as purely a legislative provision and one which ought to go to a legislative committee. I believe the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] introduced a bill yesterday covering the provisions of the first section, which has been referred to the Committee on Finance, and I suppose it will be considered at a very early date. It ought to be. We amend certain other provisions of the bill, but that is the only section we strike out. It will appear when the bill is printed with the amendments that that is the only material change we have made in the bill. We modify somewhat the last section, so as to make it conform to existing law. The amount appropriated by the bill as it came from the House is believed to be sufficient for the present purposes of the construction of the canal, so we have not increased the amount.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. BERRY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 260) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company, to report it favorably with amendments.

Mr. FULTON subsequently said: I was unavoidably absent this morning from the Chamber when the Committee on Commerce reported favorably, with two slight amendments, the bill authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be now taken up and considered.

Mr. FRYE. Let it be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendments of the Committee on Commerce were, in section 11, page 8, line 8, after the word "within," to strike out "two years" and insert "one year;" and in the same line, after the word "within," to strike out the word "four" and insert "three;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 11. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date of approval thereof.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 1477) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against James F. Wood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1478) for the relief of Martha A. Vaughn Benton (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1479) for the relief of the firm of Bertrand & Scull;

A bill (S. 1480) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah Winter;

A bill (S. 1481) for the relief of the estate of Eliza A. Fielder, deceased, and Benjamin L. Fielder; and

A bill (S. 1482) for the relief of the heirs of John McAnulty, deceased.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 1483) for the relief of Col. Medad C. Martin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ELKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1484) for the relief of George A. Davis, administrator of Mrs. Martha N. Davis, deceased;

A bill (S. 1485) for the relief of the estate of Jacob W. Hudson, deceased;

A bill (S. 1486) for the relief of George A. Davis, administrator of Patrick Brady, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1487) for the relief of the estate of Jacob J. Foreman, deceased.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 1488) to amend section 4136, Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1489) granting a pension to Robert Hedrick;

A bill (S. 1490) granting an increase of pension to Alexander P. Hart;

A bill (S. 1491) granting an increase of pension to Alfred L. Hoult;

A bill (S. 1492) granting a pension to Mary A. Parks;

A bill (S. 1493) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Huff (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1494) granting a pension to John W. Hooser;

A bill (S. 1495) granting an increase of pension to John Holley;

A bill (S. 1496) granting a pension to James Y. Egbert;

A bill (S. 1497) granting a pension to Jesse A. Thomas (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1498) granting a pension to Jeanette G. Johnson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1499) granting a pension to Lemuel Richards;

A bill (S. 1500) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Hilfinger; and

A bill (S. 1501) granting a pension to James Olney.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 1502) for the relief of Isaac W. Busey; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1503) for the relief of David Tuckwiller and Sarah Bettie Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 1504) granting an increase of pension to Jane Livery; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NIXON introduced a bill (S. 1505) granting an increase of pension to Uriah D. Barrett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CARTER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1506) for

the relief of Capt. Frederick Ford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 1507) for the relief of Herman C. Funk; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1508) granting an increase of pension to James A. Murch;

A bill (S. 1509) granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Hodges (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1510) granting an increase of pension to Byron K. May (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PATTERSON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1511) granting an increase of pension to Marvin F. Barton;

A bill (S. 1512) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wehrle;

A bill (S. 1513) granting an increase of pension to Harriet A. Rawles;

A bill (S. 1514) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wicks;

A bill (S. 1515) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Strong;

A bill (S. 1516) granting an increase of pension to O. O. Austin;

A bill (S. 1517) granting an increase of pension to John C. Kennedy;

A bill (S. 1518) granting an increase of pension to Phineas F. Lull;

A bill (S. 1519) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Smith;

A bill (S. 1520) granting an increase of pension to Laura N. Freeman;

A bill (S. 1521) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Williams;

A bill (S. 1522) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Milam;

A bill (S. 1523) granting an increase of pension to C. A. Wyeth;

A bill (S. 1524) granting an increase of pension to John M. Berkey;

A bill (S. 1525) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah Bradfield;

A bill (S. 1526) granting an increase of pension to Theodore W. Gates;

A bill (S. 1527) granting an increase of pension to John M. Odenheimer;

A bill (S. 1528) granting an increase of pension to William H. Fletcher;

A bill (S. 1529) granting an increase of pension to James L. Small; and

A bill (S. 1530) granting an increase of pension to E. V. R. Colton.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced a bill (S. 1531) for the relief of Thomas McGrath; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 1532) for the relief of the legal representatives of the late firm of Lapène & Ferré which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1533) for the relief of George H. Green and another, administrators of George W. Green, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WARNER introduced a bill (S. 1534) providing for procurement of site and erection of a public building at Independence, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. McLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 1535) granting an increase of pension to Charles Martin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BULKELEY introduced a bill (S. 1536) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1537) to acquire land for a park approach to Connecticut Avenue Bridge over Rock Creek, District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1538) granting a pension to Indiana A. Paul; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 1539) to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1540) to increase the efficiency of the Ordnance Department of the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1541) granting an increase of pension to John Ryder; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEE introduced a bill (S. 1542) for the relief of George T. Hamilton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1543) for the relief of Albert S. Henderer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 1544) to amend an act entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican War in certain cases, approved January 5, 1893;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BAILEY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1545) for the relief of the estate of John Ivey, deceased (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (by request) (S. 1546) for the relief of the estate of William Hugley, deceased (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1547) for the relief of the estate of Robert McCoy, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. STONE introduced a bill (S. 1548) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the importation of impure and unwholesome tea," approved March 2, 1897; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1549) for the relief of the estate of R. G. Potter, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1550) for the relief of William P. Clements (with accompanying papers).

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 1551) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. McCracken; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1552) granting a pension to Granville C. West; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced a bill (S. 1553) providing for reopening and readjustment of the accounts of Joseph A. Mower, deceased, late major-general of the United States Army, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1554) for the relief of the heirs of Jenkins & Havens; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1555) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Bishop; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1556) granting an increase of pension to Hannah M. Kingsley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 1557) to authorize the accounting officers of the Treasury Department to readjust the accounts of transportation companies for the transportation of troops, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 1558) granting an increase of pension to Ella K. Dinwiddie; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1559) granting a pension to Laura Clark; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 1560) granting a pension to Stanley G. Bowron; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1561) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Miller;

A bill (S. 1562) granting a pension to Jennie R. Hunt;

A bill (S. 1563) granting an increase of pension to Frank B. Sears; and

A bill (S. 1564) granting an increase of pension to Leander C. Reeve (with accompanying papers).

Mr. FORAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1565) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James A. Knight;

A bill (S. 1566) for the relief of Isaiah Heylin McDonald; and

A bill (S. 1567) to correct the military record of Thomas M. Elliott.

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 1568) for the relief of Patrick J. Sullivan, Jeremiah McCarthy, and Bartholomew Shea, and for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of John B. Dillon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 1569) for the relief of the estate of W. W. Jackson, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO STATEHOOD BILL.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1158) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That authority is hereby granted to print and bind, for use of the Committee on the District of Columbia, such papers and documents as may be deemed necessary in connection with subjects heretofore considered, or to be considered, by said committee during the Fifty-ninth Congress.

STATUE OF COUNT DE ROCHAMBEAU.

Mr. WETMORE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committe on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the concurrent resolution passed February 2, 1904, providing for the publication of the proceedings on the occasion of the unveiling of the Rochambeau statue is hereby continued in force and excepted from the limitation of one year as provided in section 80 of the act of January 12, 1895, providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty-one minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 14, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 13, 1905.

TREASURER OF THE ISLAND OF PORTO RICO.

William F. Willoughby, of the District of Columbia, to be treasurer of the island of Porto Rico. (Reappointment.)

DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

Erastus J. Parsons, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Alabama, vice Warren S. Reese, jr., whose term will expire January 12, 1906.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Frederick W. Collins, of Mississippi, to be collector of customs for the district of Pearl River, in the State of Mississippi, to succeed William F. Swan, whose term of office will expire by limitation January 17, 1906.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Galen J. Dixon, of Independence, Cal., to be register of the land office at Independence, Cal., vice Stafford W. Austin, resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

MISSISSIPPI.

Richard O. Edwards to be postmaster at Jackson, in the county of Hinds and State of Mississippi, in the place of Richard O. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expires January 22, 1906.

William T. Martin to be postmaster at Natchez, in the county of Adams and State of Mississippi, in place of John P. Walworth, deceased.

Michael J. Mulvihill to be postmaster at Vicksburg, in the county of Warren and State of Mississippi, in place of Michael J. Mulvihill. Incumbent's commission expires January 21, 1906.

Nannie S. Neilson to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Washington and State of Mississippi, in place of Nannie S. Neilson. Incumbent's commission expires January 21, 1906.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn December 13, 1905.

Miles Cannon to be register of the land office at North Yakima, Wash.

Albert W. McIntire to be postmaster at Mendota, in the State of Illinois.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 13, 1905.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Henry W. Furniss, of Indiana, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Haiti.

CONSULS.

Maxwell K. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at St. Thomas, Ontario, Canada.

Benjamin F. Chase, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Catania, Italy.

PUBLIC PRINTER.

Charles A. Stillings, of Massachusetts, to be Public Printer.

NAVAL OFFICER OF CUSTOMS.

James O. Lyford, of New Hampshire, to be naval officer of customs in the district of Boston and Charlestown, in the State of Massachusetts.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

William G. Dearing, of Kentucky, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Louisville, in the State of Kentucky.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

James R. Hudson to be postmaster at De Queen, in the county of Sevier and State of Arkansas.

CALIFORNIA.

Richard J. Murphy to be postmaster at Folsom City, in the county of Sacramento and State of California.

GEORGIA.

Annie Ard to be postmaster at Lumpkin, in the county of Stewart and State of Georgia.

Walter I. Cooper to be postmaster at Sylvania, in the county of Screven and State of Georgia.

Rutledge A. Griffin to be postmaster at Quitman, in the county of Brooks and State of Georgia.

Thomas K. Heinsohn to be postmaster at Sylvester, in the county of Worth and State of Georgia.

INDIANA.

William F. Coats to be postmaster at Columbus, in the county of Bartholomew and State of Indiana.

Fred Kimbley to be postmaster at Orleans, in the county of Orange and State of Indiana.

Harry J. Martin to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Johnson and State of Indiana.

John McCartney to be postmaster at Scottsburg, in the county of Scott and State of Indiana.

Charles T. Miller to be postmaster at Cannelton, in the county of Perry and State of Indiana.

Herman Miller to be postmaster at Hope, in the county of Bartholomew and State of Indiana.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

William Strassberger to be postmaster at Purcell, in District Eighteen, Indian Territory.

IOWA.

Bert E. Bower to be postmaster at Traer, in the county of Tama and State of Iowa.

Albert S. Burnett to be postmaster at Valley Junction, in the county of Polk and State of Iowa.

Gordon W. Laflar to be postmaster at Manning, in the county of Carroll and State of Iowa.

Isaiah A. Mains to be postmaster at Charter Oak, in the county of Crawford and State of Iowa.

Stephen C. Maynard to be postmaster at Grand Junction, in the county of Greene and State of Iowa.

Esther M. McFarlan to be postmaster at Cumberland, in the county of Cass and State of Iowa.

Thomas W. Purcell to be postmaster at Hampton, in the county of Franklin and State of Iowa.

Belle Sherwood to be postmaster at Shellrock, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa.

KENTUCKY.

John M. Kennedy to be postmaster at Monticello, in the county of Wayne and State of Kentucky.

Thomas E. Myers to be postmaster at Greenup, in the county of Greenup and State of Kentucky.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Charles F. Bryant to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

William C. Hinman to be postmaster at Great Barrington, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts.

William I. Marble to be postmaster at Webster, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

J. Henry Norcross to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Orlando P. Robinson to be postmaster at Ayer, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Eugene S. Thatcher to be postmaster at Housatonic, in the county of Berkshire and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

Shelby C. Field to be postmaster at Sparta, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan.

Wallace J. Smith to be postmaster at Cadillac, in the county of Wexford and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

H. W. Severns to be postmaster at West Concord, in the county of Dodge and State of Minnesota.

NEBRASKA.

Robert R. Douglas to be postmaster at Clarks, in the county of Merrick and State of Nebraska.

Charles H. Hodges to be postmaster at Collegeview, in the county Lancaster and State of Nebraska.

Amanda Wille to be postmaster at Neligh, in the county of Antelope and State of Nebraska.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Charles L. Bemis to be postmaster at Marlboro, in the county of Cheshire and State of New Hampshire.

NEW YORK.

Burdette T. Burlingham to be postmaster at McGraw, in the county of Cortland and State of New York.

Theodore F. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Newark Valley, in the county of Tioga and State of New York.

William W. Gregory to be postmaster at Roscoe, in the county of Sullivan and State of New York.

Fred Greiner to be postmaster at Buffalo, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

Thomas Liddle to be postmaster at Amsterdam, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York.

David M. Pratt to be postmaster at Elmira, in the county of Chemung and State of New York.

George F. Rising to be postmaster at Hoosick Falls, in the county of Rensselaer and State of New York.

Horace Selleck to be postmaster at Holland, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

William A. Smyth to be postmaster at Owego, in the county of Tioga and State of New York.

OHIO

Grant Coats to be postmaster at Rockford, in the county of Mercer and State of Ohio.

John Finsterwald to be postmaster at Athens, in the county of Athens and State of Ohio.

Fred D. Pierce to be postmaster at Wakeman, in the county of Huron and State of Ohio.

PENNSYLVANIA.

David Dalton to be postmaster at Sharon Hill, in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania.

Malin Ewing to be postmaster at Sharon, in the county of Mercer and State of Pennsylvania.

William H. Fretz to be postmaster at Jenkintown, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

Solomon G. Krepps to be postmaster at Cadwallader, in the county of Fayette and State of Pennsylvania.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

William C. Brown to be postmaster at Belton, in the county of Anderson and State of South Carolina.

TEXAS.

James T. Ballard to be postmaster at Beeville, in the county of Bee and State of Texas.

Frank L. Bradley to be postmaster at Gilmer, in the county of Upshur and State of Texas.

John M. Clark to be postmaster at Yoakum, in the county of De Witt and State of Texas.

UTAH.

E. Harvey Belcher to be postmaster at Vernal, in the county of Uinta and State of Utah.

VIRGINIA.

Emmet W. Brittle to be postmaster at Wakefield, in the county of Sussex and State of Virginia.

Lula O. Hoge to be postmaster at Blacksburg, in the county of Montgomery and State of Virginia.

WASHINGTON.

J. P. Rosebaugh to be postmaster at Harrington, in the county of Lincoln and State of Washington.

WISCONSIN.

William S. Gilpin to be postmaster at Osseo, in the county of Trempealeau and State of Wisconsin.

Nathan D. Maxon to be postmaster at Walworth, in the county of Walworth and State of Wisconsin.

EXTRADITION WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

The injunction of secrecy was removed December 13, 1905, from a supplementary extradition treaty between the United States and Great Britain, signed at London on April 12, 1905.

BANCOS IN THE RIO GRANDE.

The injunction of secrecy was removed December 13, 1905, from a convention between the United States and Mexico, signed on March 20, 1905, for the elimination of the bancos in the Rio Grande from the effects of Articles II of the treaty of Novemebr 12, 1884.

SANITARY CONVENTION.

The injunction of secrecy was removed December 13, 1905, from the following message from the President of the United States, transmitting a sanitary convention signed ad referendum, on October 14, 1905, by the delegates of the United States, etc., and it was ordered to be printed as a document and also in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate:

I transmit, for the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a sanitary convention signed ad referendum on October 14, 1905, by the delegates of the United States, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, and Venezuela.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1905.*

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to its ratification, a sanitary convention signed ad referendum on October 14, 1905, by delegates of the United States and of Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, and Venezuela.

Respectfully submitted.

ELIHU ROOT.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 5, 1905.

SANITARY CONVENTION AD REFERENDUM CONCLUDED IN WASHINGTON ON OCTOBER 14, 1905.

The presidents of the Republics of Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, United States of America, and Venezuela:

Having found that it is useful and convenient to codify all the measures destined to guard the public health against the invasion and propagation of yellow fever, plague, and cholera, have designated as their delegates, to wit:

Republic of Chile, Sr. Dr. D. Eduardo Moore, professor of the medical faculty, hospital physician;

Republic of Costa Rica, Sr. Dr. D. Juan J. Ulloa, ex-vice-president, ex-minister of the interior of Costa Rica, ex-president of the medical faculty of Costa Rica;

Republic of Cuba, Sr. Dr. D. Juan Guiteras, member of the

superior board of health of Cuba, director of the "Las Animas" Hospital, professor of general pathology and tropical medicine of the University of Havana, and Sr. Dr. D. Enrique B. Barnet, executive chief of the health department of Havana, member and secretary of the superior board of health of Cuba;

Republic of Ecuador, Sr. Dr. D. Serafin S. Wither, chargé d'affaires and consul-general of Ecuador in New York, and Sr. Dr. D. Miguel H. Alcívar, member of the superior board of health of Guayaquil, professor of the medical faculty and surgeon of the general hospital of Guayaquil;

Republic of the United States of America, Dr. Walter Wyman, Surgeon-General of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States; Dr. H. D. Geddings, Assistant Surgeon-General of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States and representative of the United States at the sanitary convention of Paris; Dr. J. F. Kennedy, secretary of the board of health of the State of Iowa; Dr. John S. Fulton, secretary of the board of health of the State of Maryland; Dr. Walter D. McCaw, major, surgeon in the United States Army; Dr. J. D. Gatewood, surgeon in the United States Navy; Dr. H. L. E. Johnson, member of the American Medical Association (member of the board of trustees);

Republic of Guatemala, Sr. Dr. D. Joaquín Yela, consul-general of Guatemala in New York;

Republic of Mexico, Sr. Dr. D. Eduardo Licéaga, president of the superior council of health of Mexico, director and professor of the National School of Medicine, member of the Academy of Medicine;

Republic of Nicaragua, Sr. Dr. D. J. L. Medina, member of the second Pan-American Medical Congress of the city of Havana in 1901;

Republic of Peru, Sr. Dr. D. Daniel Eduardo Lavorería, professor of the medical faculty, member of the National Academy of Medicine, physician of the "Dos de Mayo" Hospital, chief of the division of hygiene of the ministry of fomento;

Dominican Republic, Sr. D. Emilio C. Joubert, minister resident in Washington;

Republic of Venezuela, Sr. D. Nicolás Veloz-Goiticoa, chargé d'affaires of Venezuela,

Who, having made an interchange of their powers and found them good, have agreed to adopt, *ad referendum*, the following propositions:

CHAPTER I.—*Regulations to be observed by the powers signatory to the convention as soon as plague, cholera, or yellow fever may appear in their territory.*

SECTION I.—NOTIFICATION AND SUBSEQUENT COMMUNICATIONS TO OTHER COUNTRIES.

ARTICLE I. Each government should immediately notify other governments of the first appearance in its territory of authentic cases of plague, cholera, or yellow fever.

ARTICLE II. This notification is to be accompanied, or very promptly followed, by the following additional information:

(1) The neighborhood where the disease has appeared.

(2) The date of its appearance, its origin, and its form.

(3) The number of established cases and the number of deaths.

(4) For plague: The existence among rats or mice of plague or of an unusual mortality. For yellow fever: The existence of *stegomyia fasciata* in the locality.

(5) The measures taken immediately after the first appearance.

ARTICLE III. The notification and the information prescribed in Articles I and II are to be addressed to diplomatic and consular agents in the capital of the infected country; but this is to be construed as not preventing direct communication between officials charged with the public health of the several countries.

For countries which are not thus represented, they are to be transmitted directly by telegraph to the governments of such countries.

ARTICLE IV. The notification and the information prescribed in Articles I and II are to be followed by further communications dispatched in a regular manner in order to keep the governments informed of the progress of the epidemic.

These communications, which are to be made at least once a week, and which are to be as complete as possible, should indicate in detail the precautions taken to prevent the extension of the disease.

They should set forth, first, the prophylactic measures taken relative to sanitary or medical inspection, to isolation, and disinfection; second, the measures taken relative to departing vessels to prevent the exportation of the disease, and, especially under the circumstances mentioned in paragraph 4 of Article II of this section, the measures taken against rats and mosquitoes.

ARTICLE V. The prompt and faithful execution of the preceding provisions is of the very first importance.

The notifications only have a real value if each government is warned in time in cases of plague, cholera, or yellow fever and of suspicious cases of those diseases supervening in its territory. It can not, then, be too strongly recommended to the various governments to make obligatory the declaration of cases of plague, cholera, or yellow fever, and of giving information of all unusual mortality of rats and mice, especially in ports.

ARTICLE VI. It is understood that neighboring countries reserve to themselves the right to make special arrangements with a view of organizing a service of direct information between the chiefs of administration upon the frontiers.

SECTION II.—CONDITIONS SHOWING A GIVEN TERRITORIAL AREA TO BE INFECTED OR TO HAVE BEEN FREED FROM INFECTION.

ARTICLE VII. Information of a first case of plague, cholera, or yellow fever does not justify against a territorial area where it may appear the application of the measures prescribed in Chapter II, as hereinafter indicated.

Upon the occurrence of several nonimported cases of plague or a nonimported case of yellow fever or when cases of cholera form a focus the area is to be declared infected.

ARTICLE VIII. To limit the measures to the affected regions alone, governments should only apply them to persons and articles proceeding from the contaminated or infected areas.

By the word "area" is understood a well-determined portion of territory described in the information which accompanies or follows notification—thus, a province, a state, "a government," a district, a department, a canton, an island, a commune, a city, a quarter of a city, a village, a port, a "polder," a hamlet, etc., whatever may be the extent and population of these portions of territory.

But this restriction, limited to the infected area, should only be accepted upon the formal condition that the government of the infected country shall take the necessary measures, 1, to prevent, unless previously disinfected, the exportation of articles named in 1 and 2 of Article XII, coming from the contaminated area, and 2, measures to prevent the extension of the epidemic; and provided further that there be no doubt that the sanitary authorities of the infected country have faithfully complied with Article I of this convention.

When an area is infected no restrictive measure is to be taken against departures from this area if these departures have occurred five days at least before the beginning of the epidemic.

ARTICLE IX. That an area should no longer be considered as infected, official proof must be furnished:

First. That there has been neither a death nor a new case of plague or cholera for five days after isolation,[a] death, or cure of the last plague or cholera case. In the case of yellow fever the period shall be eighteen adys, but each government may reserve the right to extend this period.

Second. That all the measures of disinfection have been applied; in the case of plague, that the precautions against rats have been observed, and in the case of yellow fever that the measures against mosquitoes have been executed.

CHAPTER II.—*Measures of defense by other countries against territories declared to be infected.*

SECTION I.—PUBLICATION OF PRESCRIBED MEASURES.

ARTICLE X. The government of each country is obliged to immediately publish the measures which it believes necessary to take against departures either from a country or from an infected territorial area.

The said government is to communicate at once this publication to the diplomatic or consular agent of the infected country residing in its capital as well as to the International Sanitary Bureau.

The government shall be equally obliged to make known through the same channels the revocation of these measures or modifications which may be made in them.

In default of a diplomatic or consular agency in the capital, communications are made directly to the government of the country interested.

SECTION II.—MERCHANDISE—DISINFECTION—IMPORTATION AND TRANSIT—BAGGAGE.

ARTICLE XI. There exists no merchandise which is of itself capable of transmitting plague, cholera, or yellow fever. It only becomes dangerous in case it is soiled by pestous or choleraic products, or, in the case of yellow fever, when such merchandise may harbor mosquitoes.

ARTICLE XII. No merchandise or objects shall be subjected to disinfection on account of yellow fever, but in cases covered by the previous article the vehicle of transportation may be subjected to fumigation to destroy mosquitoes. In the case of cholera and plague disinfection should only be applied to mer-

[a] The word "isolation" signifies isolation of the patient, of the persons who care for him, and the forbidding of visits of all other persons, the physician excepted. By isolation in the case of yellow fever is understood the isolation of the patient in an apartment so screened as to prevent the access of mosquitoes.

chandise and objects which the local sanitary authority considers as infected.

Nevertheless merchandise or objects enumerated hereafter may be subjected to disinfection or prohibited entry independently of all proof that they may or may not be infected:

1. Body linen, wearing apparel in use, clothing which has been worn, bedding already used.

When these objects are transported as baggage, or in the course of a change of residence (household furniture), they should not be prohibited, and are to be subjected to the regulations prescribed by Article XIX.

Baggage left by soldiers and sailors, and returned to their country after death, are considered as objects comprised in the first paragraph of No. 1 of this article.

2. Rags and rags for making paper, with the exception, as to cholera, of rags which are transported as merchandise in large quantities compressed in bales held together by hoops.

New clippings coming directly from spinning mills, weaving mills, manufactories or bleacheries, shoddy, and clippings of new paper should not be forbidden.

ARTICLE XIII. In the case of cholera and plague there is no reason to forbid the transit through an infected district of merchandise, and the objects specified in Nos. 1 and 2 of the preceding article, if they are so packed that they can not have been exposed to infection in transit.

In like manner, when merchandise or objects are so transported that in transit they can not come in contact with soiled objects, their transit across an infected territorial area should not be an obstacle to their entry into the country of destination.

ARTICLE XIV. The entry of merchandise and objects specified in Nos. 1 and 2 of Article XII should not be prohibited, if it can be shown to the authorities of the country of destination that they were shipped at least five days before the beginning of the epidemic.

ARTICLE XV. The method and place of disinfection, as well as the measures to be employed for the destruction of rats and mosquitoes, are to be fixed by authority of the country of destination upon arrival at said destination. These operations should be performed in such a manner as to cause the least possible injury to the merchandise.

It devolves upon each country to determine questions relative to the payment of damages resulting from disinfection or from the destruction of rats or mosquitoes.

If taxes are levied by a sanitary authority, either directly or through the agency of any company or agent, to insure measures for the destruction of rats and mosquitoes on board ships, the amount of these taxes ought to be fixed by a tariff published in advance, and the result of these measures should not be a source of profit for either state or sanitary authorities.

ARTICLE XVI. Letters and correspondence, printed matter, books, newspapers, business papers, etc. (postal parcels not included), are not to be submitted to any restriction or disinfection. In case of yellow fever, postal parcels are not to be subjected to any restrictions or disinfection.

ARTICLE XVII. Merchandise, arriving by land or by sea, should not be detained permanently at frontiers or in ports.

Measures which it is permissible to prescribe with respect to them are specified in Article XII.

Nevertheless, when merchandise, arriving by sea in bulk (vrac) or in defective packages, is contaminated by pest-stricken rats during the passage, and is incapable of being disinfected, the destruction of the germs may be assured by putting said merchandise in a warehouse for a period to be decided by the sanitary authorities of the port of arrival.

It is to be understood that the application of this last measure should not entail delay upon any vessel nor extraordinary expenses resulting from the want of warehouses in ports.

ARTICLE XVIII. When merchandise has been disinfected by the application of the measures prescribed in Article XII, or put temporarily in warehouses in accordance with the third paragraph of Article XVII, the owner, or his representative, has the right to demand from the sanitary authority which has ordered such disinfection or storage a certificate setting forth the measures taken.

ARTICLE XIX. Baggage. In the case of soiled linen, bed clothing, clothing and objects forming a part of baggage or furniture coming from a territorial area declared contaminated, disinfection is only to be practiced in cases where the sanitary authority considers them as contaminated. There shall be no disinfection of baggage on account of yellow fever.

SECTION III.—MEASURES IN PORTS AND AT MARITIME FRONTIERS.

ARTICLE XX. Classification of ships. A ship is considered as infected which has plague, cholera, or yellow fever on board, or which has presented one or more cases of plague or cholera within seven days, or a case of yellow fever at any time during the voyage.

A ship is considered as suspected on board of which there have been a case or cases of plague or cholera at the time of departure or during the voyage, but no new case within seven days; also such ships as have lain in such proximity to the infected shore as to render them liable to the access of mosquitoes.

The ship is considered *indemne* which, although coming from an infected port, has had neither death nor case of plague, cholera, or yellow fever on board, either before departure, during the voyage, or at the time of arrival, and which in the case of yellow fever has not lain in such proximity to the shore as to render it liable, in the opinion of the sanitary authorities, to the access of mosquitoes.

ARTICLE XXI. Ships infected with plague are to be subjected to the following regulations:

1. Medical visit (inspection).
2. The sick are to be immediately disembarked and isolated.
3. Other persons should also be disembarked, if possible, and subjected to an observation,[a] which should not exceed five days, dating from the day of arrival.
4. Soiled linen, personal effects in use, the belongings of crew [b] and passengers which, in the opinion of the sanitary authorities, are considered as infected should be disinfected.
5. The parts of the ship which have been inhabited by those stricken with plague and such others as, in the opinion of the sanitary authorities, are considered as infected should be disinfected.
6. The destruction of rats on shipboard should be effected before or after the discharge of cargo as rapidly as possible, and in all cases with a maximum delay of forty-eight hours, care being taken to avoid damage of merchandise, the vessel, and its machinery.

For ships in ballast this operation should be performed immediately before taking on cargo.

ARTICLE XXII. Ships suspected of plague are to be subjected to the measures which are indicated in Nos. 1, 4, and 5 of Article XXI.

Further, the crew and passengers may be subjected to observation, which should not exceed five days, dating from the arrival of the ship. During the same time the disembarkment of the crew may be forbidden except for reasons of duty.

The destruction of rats on shipboard is recommended. This destruction is to be effected, before or after the discharge of cargo, as quickly as possible, and in all cases with a maximum delay of forty-eight hours, taking care to avoid damage to merchandise, ships, and their machinery.

For ships in ballast this operation should be done, if done at all, as early as possible, and in all cases before taking on cargo.

ARTICLE XXIII. Ships *indemne* from plague are to be admitted to free pratique immediately, whatever may be the nature of their bill of health.

The only regulation which the sanitary authorities at a port of arrival may prescribe for them consists of the following measures:

1. Medical visit (inspection).
2. Disinfection of soiled linen, articles of wearing apparel, and the other personal effects of the crew and passengers, but only in exceptional cases when the sanitary authorities have special reason to believe them infected.
3. Without demanding it as a general rule, the sanitary authorities may subject ships coming from an infected port to a process for the destruction of the rats on board before or after the discharge of cargo. This operation should be done as soon as possible, and in all cases should not last more than twenty-four hours, care being taken to avoid damaging merchandise, ships, and their machinery, and without interfering with the passing of passengers and crew between the ship and the shore. For ships in ballast this procedure, if practiced, should be put in operation as soon as possible, and in all cases before taking on cargo.

When a ship coming from an infected port has been subjected to a process for the destruction of rats, this process should only be repeated if the ship has touched meanwhile at an infected port and has been alongside a quay in such port, or if the presence of sick or dead rats on board is proven.

The crew and passengers may be subjected to a surveillance, which should not exceed five days, to be computed from the date when the ship sailed from the infected port. The landing of the

[a] The word "observation" signifies isolation of the passengers, either on board ship or at a sanitary station, before being given free pratique.

[b] The term "crew" is applied to persons who may make, or who have made, a part of the personnel of the vessel and of the administration thereof, including stewards, waiters, "cafedji," etc. The word is to be construed in this sense wherever employed in the present convention.

crew may also, during the same time, be forbidden except for reasons of duty.

Competent authority at the port of arrival may always demand, under oath, a certificate of the ship's physician, or in default of a physician, of the captain, setting forth that there has not been a case of plague on board since departure and that no marked mortality among the rats has been observed.

ARTICLE XXIV. When upon an *indemne* ship rats have been recognized as pest-stricken as a result of bacteriological examination, or when a marked mortality has been established among these rodents, the following measures should be applied:

1. Ships with plague-stricken rats:

(*a*) Medical visit (inspection).

(*b*) Rats should be destroyed before or after the discharge of cargo as rapidly as possible, and in all cases with a delay not to exceed forty-eight hours, the deterioration of merchandise, vessels, and machinery to be avoided. Upon ships in ballast this operation should be performed as soon as possible, and in all cases before taking on cargo.

(*c*) Such parts of the ship and such articles as the local sanitary authority regards as infected shall be disinfected.

(*d*) Passengers and crew may be submitted to observation, the duration of which should not exceed five days, dating from the day of arrival, except in special cases, where the sanitary authority may prolong the observation to a maximum of ten days.

2. Ships where a marked mortality among rats is observed:

(*a*) Medical visit (inspection).

(*b*) An examination of rats, with a view to determining the existence of plague, should be made as quickly as possible.

(*c*) If the destruction of rats is judged necessary, it shall be accomplished under the conditions indicated above in the case of ships with plague-stricken rats.

(*a*) Until all suspicion may be eliminated the passengers and crew may be submitted to observation, the duration of which should not exceed five days, counting from the date of arrival, except in special cases, when the sanitary authority may prolong the observation to a maximum of ten days.

ARTICLE XXV. The sanitary authorities of the port must deliver to the captain, the owner, or his agent, whenever a demand for it is made, a certificate setting forth that the measures for the destruction of rats have been efficacious and indicating the reasons why these measures have been applied.

ARTICLE XXVI. Ships infected with cholera are to be subjected to the following regulations:

1. Medical visit (inspection).

2. The sick are to be immediately disembarked and isolated.

3. Other persons ought also to be disembarked, if possible, and subjected, dating from the arrival of the ship, to an observation the duration of which shall not exceed five days.

4. Soiled linen, wearing apparel, and personal effects of crew and passengers which, in the opinion of the sanitary authority of the port, are considered as infected are to be disinfected.

5. The parts of the ship which have been inhabited by persons sick with cholera, or which are considered by the sanitary authority as infected, are to be disinfected.

6. The bilge water is to be discharged after disinfection.

The sanitary authority may order the substitution of good potable water for that which is contained in the tanks on board.

The discharge or throwing overboard into the water of a port of dejecta shall be forbidden unless they have been previously disinfected.

ARTICLE XXVII. Ships suspected of cholera are to be subjected to measures prescribed under Nos. 1, 4, 5, and 6 of Article XXVI.

The crew and passengers may be subjected to an observation, which should not exceed five days, to date from the arrival of the ship. It is recommended during the same time to prevent the debarkation of the crew except for reasons of duty.

ARTICLE XXVIII. Ships *indemne* of cholera are to be admitted to free pratique immediately, whatever may be the nature of their bill of health.

The only regulations which the sanitary authorities of a port may prescribe in their case are the measures provided in Nos. 1, 4, and 6 of Article XXVI.

The crew and passengers may be submitted, in order to show their state of health, to an observation, which should not exceed five days, to be computed from the date when the ship sailed from the infected port.

It is recommended that during the same time the debarkation of the crew be forbidden except for reasons of duty.

Competent authority at the port of arrival may always demand, under oath, a certificate from the ship's surgeon, or, in the absence of a surgeon, from the captain, setting forth that there has not been a case of cholera upon the ship since sailing.

ARTICLE XXIX. Competent authority will take account, in order to apply the measures indicated in Articles XXI to XXVIII, of the presence of a physician on board and a disinfecting apparatus in ships of the three categories mentioned above.

In regard to plague, it will equally take account of the installation on board of apparatus for the destruction of rats.

Sanitary authorities of such countries, where it may be convenient to make such regulations, may dispense with the medical visit and other measures toward *indemne* ships which have on board a physician specially commissioned by their country.

ARTICLE XXX. Special measures may be prescribed in regard to crowded ships, notably emigrant ships, or any other ship presenting bad hygienic conditions.

ARTICLE XXXI. Any ship not desiring to be subjected to the obligations imposed by the authority of the port in virtue of the stipulations of the present convention is free to proceed to sea.

It may be authorized to disembark its cargo after the necessary precautions shall have been taken; namely, first, isolation of the ship, its crew and passengers; second, in regard to plague, demand for information relative to the existence of an unusual mortality among rats; third, in regard to cholera, the discharge of the bilge water after disinfection and the substitution of a good potable water for that which is provided on board the ship.

Authority may also be granted to disembark such passengers as may demand it, upon condition that these submit themselves to all measures prescribed by the local authorities.

ARTICLE XXXII. Ships coming from a contaminated port, which have been disinfected and which may have been subjected to sanitary measures applied in an efficient manner, shall not undergo a second time the same measures upon their arrival at a new port, provided that no new case shall have appeared since the disinfection was practiced, and that the ships have not touched in the meantime at an infected port.

When a ship only disembarks passengers and their baggage, or the mails, without having been in communication with *terra firma*, it is not to be considered as having touched at a port, provided that in the case of yellow fever it has not approached sufficiently near the shore to permit the access of mosquitoes.

ARTICLE XXXIII. Passengers arriving on an infected ship have the right to demand of the sanitary authority of the port a certificate showing the date of their arrival and the measures to which they and their baggage have been subjected.

ARTICLE XXXIV. Packet boats shall be subjected to special regulations, to be established by mutual agreement between the countries in interest.

ARTICLE XXXV. Without prejudice to the right which governments possess to agree upon the organization of common sanitary stations, each country should provide at least one port upon each of its seaboards, with an organization and equipment sufficient to receive a vessel, whatever may be its sanitary condition.

When an *indemne* vessel, coming from an infected port, arrives in a large mercantile port, it is recommended that she be not sent to another port for the execution of the prescribed sanitary measures.

In every country, ports liable to the arrival of vessels from ports infected with plague, cholera, or yellow fever, should be equipped in such a manner that *indemne* vessels may there undergo, immediately upon their arrival the prescribed measures, and not be sent for this purpose to another port.

Governments should make declaration of the ports which are open in their territories to arrivals from ports infected with plague, cholera, or yellow fever.

ARTICLE XXXVI. It is recommended that in large seaports there be established:

(*a*) A regular medical service and a permanent medical supervision of the sanitary conditions of crews and the inhabitants of the port.

(*b*) Places set apart for the isolation of the sick and the observation of suspected persons. In the *stegomyia* belt there must be a building or part of a building screened against mosquitoes, and a launch and ambulance similarly screened.

(*c*) The necessary installation for efficient disinfection and bacteriological laboratories.

(*d*) A supply of potable water above suspicion, for the use of the port, and the installation of a system of sewerage and drainage adequate for the removal of refuse.

SECTION IV.—MEASURES UPON LAND FRONTIERS—TRAVELERS—RAILROADS—FRONTIER ZONES—RIVER ROUTES.

ARTICLE XXXVII. Land quarantines should no longer be established, but the governments reserve the right to establish camps of observation if they should be thought necessary for the temporary detention of suspects.

This principle does not exclude the right for each country to close a part of its frontier in case of necessity.

ARTICLE XXXVIII. It is important that travelers should be submitted to a surveillance on the part of the personnel of railroads, to determine their condition of health.

ARTICLE XXXIX. Medical intervention is limited to a visit (inspection) with the taking of temperature of travelers and the succor to be given to those actually sick. If this visit is made, it should be combined as much as possible with the custom-house inspection to the end that travelers may be detained as short a time as possible. Only persons evidently sick should be subjected to a searching medical examination.

ARTICLE XL. As soon as travelers coming from an infected locality shall have arrived at their destination it would be of the greatest utility to submit them to a surveillance which should not exceed ten or five days, counting from the date of departure, the time depending upon whether it is a question of plague or cholera. In case of yellow fever the period should be six days.

ARTICLE XLI. Governments may reserve to themselves the right to take particular measures in regard to certain classes of persons, notably vagabonds, emigrants, and persons traveling or passing the frontier in bands.

ARTICLE XLII. Coaches intended for the transportation of passengers and mails should not be retained at frontiers.

In order to avoid this retention a system of relays ought to be established at frontiers, with transfer of passengers, baggage, and mails. If one of these carriages be infected or shall have been occupied by a person suffering from plague, cholera, or yellow fever, it shall be detached from the train for disinfection at the earliest possible moment.

ARTICLE XLIII. Measures concerning the passing of frontiers by the personnel of railroads and of the post-office are matters for agreement of the sanitary authorities concerned. These measures should be so arranged as not to hinder the service.

ARTICLE XLIV. The regulation of frontier traffic, as well as the adoption of exceptional measures of surveillance, should be left to special arrangement between contiguous countries.

ARTICLE XLV. The power rests with governments of countries bordering upon rivers to regulate by special arrangement the sanitary regime of river routes.

ARTICLES RELATING TO YELLOW FEVER.

ARTICLE XLVI. Ships infected with yellow fever are to be subjected to the following regulations:

1. Medical visit (inspection).

2. The sick are to be immediately disembarked, protected by netting against the access of mosquitoes, and transferred to the place of isolation in an ambulance or a litter similarly screened.

3. Other persons should also be disembarked, if possible, and subjected to an observation of six days, dating from the day of arrival.

4. In the place set apart for observation, there shall be screened apartments or cages where anyone presenting an elevation of temperature above 37.6 degrees Centigrade shall be screened until he may be carried in the manner indicated above to the place of isolation.

5. The ship shall be moored at least two hundred meters from the inhabited shore.

6. The ship shall be fumigated for the destruction of mosquitoes before the discharge of cargo, if possible. If a fumigation be not possible before the discharge of the cargo, the health authorities shall order, either

(*a*) The employment of immune persons for discharging the cargo, or

(*b*) If nonimmunes be employed they shall be kept under observation during the discharging of cargo and for six days, to date from the last day of exposure on board.

ARTICLE XLVII. Ships suspected of yellow fever are to be subjected to the measures which are indicated in Nos. 1, 3, and 5 of the preceding article; and, if not fumigated, the cargo shall be discharged as directed under subparagraph (a) or (b) of the same article.

ARTICLE XLVIII. Ships indemne from yellow fever coming from an infected port, after the medical visit (inspection), shall be admitted to free pratique, provided the duration of the trip has exceeded six days.

If the trip be shorter, the ship shall be considered as suspected until the completion of a period of six days, dating from the day of departure.

If a case of yellow fever develop during the period of observation, the ship shall be considered as infected.

ARTICLE XLIX. All persons who can prove their immunity to yellow fever, to the satisfaction of the health authorities, shall be permitted to land at once.

ARTICLE L. It is agreed that in the event of a difference of interpretation of the English and Spanish texts the interpretation of the English text shall prevail.

TRANSITORY DISPOSITION.

The governments which may not have signed the present Convention are to be admitted to adherence thereto upon demand; notice of this adherence to be given through diplomatic channels to the Government of the United States of America and by the latter to the other signatory Governments.

Made and signed in the city of Washington on the 14th day of the month of October, nineteen hundred and five, in two copies, in English and Spanish, respectively, which shall be deposited in the State Department of the Government of the United States of America, in order that certified copies thereof, in both English and Spanish, may be made to transmit them through diplomatic channels to each one of the signatory countries.

DR. EDUARDO MOORE.
JUAN J. ULLOA.
JUAN GUITERAS.
E. B. BARNET.
EMILIO C. JOUBERT.
M. H. ALCÍVAR.
WALTER WYMAN.
H. D. GEDDINGS.
JOHN S. FULTON.
WALTER D. MCCAW.
J. D. GATEWOOD.
H. L. E. JOHNSON, M. D.
JOAQUÍN YELA.
E. LICÉAGA.
J. L. MEDINA, M. D.
DANIEL EDO. LAVORERÍA.
N. VELOZ-GOITICOA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 13, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 11, 1905, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE CHANGES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say to the House that Representative MONDELL, who, in the arrangement of committees the other day, went off of the Public Lands, having been second on that committee in the last Congress, retained his place on Military Affairs. Representative MILLER of Kansas was appointed to the Committee on the Public Lands. These gentlemen desire to exchange committee places, and if there be no objection, Mr. MONDELL will go onto the Committee on the Public Lands and retire from Military Affairs, taking the place in the Committee on the Public Lands that he held in the last Congress, and Mr. MILLER, if there be no objection, will go off from the Committee on the Public Lands onto the Committee on Military Affairs. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

An act (S. 410) to authorize the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct bridges across Ouachita River and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota offers a resolution which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or such subcommittee as they may designate, shall have leave to sit during the sessions of the House during the Fifty-ninth Congress and during the recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection; and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, a further resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota offers a further resolution, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That authority be granted to print and bind, for use of the Committee on Appropriations, all documents deemed necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by said committee during the Fifty-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of two resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Territories be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by the said committee during the Fifty-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, also the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of another resolution, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Territories, or such subcommittee as they may designate, shall have leave to sit during the sessions of the House during the Fifty-ninth Congress and during the recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to introduce at this time a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the settlement of certain claims against the United States, and that it be read by the Clerk and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the following resolution be read and printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to hear some statement from the gentleman explanatory of the necessity of taking this rather irregular course, one that is not usual.

Mr. KEIFER. It used to be usual.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why can not it go into the basket?

Mr. KEIFER. It used to be usual to read such resolutions as this and print them in the RECORD. It is very brief; there is nothing political in it, and it would take considerable time to explain it, although I would be glad to do so if the House would give me that time. It does not affect the question of ordinary claims that are created by law, but is intended to take away from the Congress of the United States the power to make appropriations for claims not arising out of existing law, and provides that there shall be a court where they can go and have them adjudicated, a court that will be subject to the statute of limitations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman misunderstood me. I did not ask about the merits of the proposition. I asked what reason there was for its taking an unusual course.

Mr. KEIFER. The reason in my own mind is that there are so many things introduced here that we know nothing about that I thought the attention of the Members of the House would be attracted to it, probably some of them would examine it, and it would be ready for consideration in better shape than if it simply went through the basket.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the gentleman think that every Member of Congress would have that idea about some resolution that he wished to introduce?

Mr. KEIFER. That might be, but this is an extraordinary matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would be taking up the time of the House by Members introducing public resolutions under the rule that should go to the desk. I think, Mr. Speaker, the resolution had better pursue the usual course.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi objects.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the passage of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Public Lands be authorized to have printed and bound all documents for the use of said committee that it may deem necessary in connection with the subject under consideration or to be considered by said committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered, and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 1.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Elections No 1 be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House and have such printing and binding done as may be necessary in the transaction of its business.

The resolution was considered, and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Committee on Agriculture I present the following resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House, and to have such binding and printing done as may be necessary in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered, and agreed to.

ISTHMIAN CANAL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion on the canal appropriation bill I asked the gentleman from Iowa several questions about employees. I addressed communications to the chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission about it, and he has replied, and I ask unanimous consent that my letter and the reply from the chairman of the Commission be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from him to the chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission and reply of the chairman to the gentleman. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter and reply are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1905.

The Hon. THEODORE P. SHONTS,
Chairman Isthmian Canal Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please send me at your earliest convenience the following information:

(*a*) The name, date of appointment, and compensation of the present secretary of the Commission.

(*b*) What are the duties of the secretary of the Commission?

(*c*) What position did the present secretary have under the Commission prior to his appointment as its secretary, or what were his official relations to the Commission prior to such appointment?

(*d*) What duties were assigned to the present secretary in his former position under the Commission?

(*e*) What compensation was paid to the present secretary by the Commission, or from the funds at its command, previous to his appointment as secretary?

(*f*) Any other information that would be of value in connection with that asked for herein.

Respectfully, yours,

JOHN J. FITZGERALD.

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., December 8, 1905.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 6th instant asking for information concerning the secretary of this Commission is at hand. I beg to submit the following replies to your questions in the order in which they are asked:

(*a*) Mr. Joseph Bucklin Bishop was appointed secretary of the Commission on October 30, 1905.

(*b*) The duties of the secretary of the Commission are set forth in the following resolutions of the Commission, adopted on October 30, 1905:

"*Resolved*, That the office now held by Mr. Joseph B. Bishop, as executive secretary, be known and designated as "secretary of the Commission," and that it shall be the duty of the secretary of the Commission to keep the minutes of the Commission and have custody of the same; to attend to the giving and serving of all notices of meetings of the Commission; to collect, prepare, and maintain a general historical record and data of the history of the Panama Canal and the salient features of the history and progress of the isthmian canal, particularly from the time of its acquisition by the United States, and to prepare and submit to the Commission from time to time digests, indices, and summary of the same, and generally to perform such other duties as may be from time to time assigned to him by the Commission or its chairman.

"*Resolved*, That to facilitate the dispatch of current business at Washington office of the Commission the chairman be, and he hereby is, empowered to authorize and direct in writing the secretary of the Commission or other employee of the Commission to approve for payment, under the caption 'By direction of the chairman,' vouchers for any payments by the Commission, and to make requisition for supplies for the maintenance of said Washington office."

(*c*) Executive secretary of the Commission.

(*d*) Substantially the same he now performs as secretary, which are set forth in the resolutions cited above.

(*e*) For services in September, $666.67; in October, $833.33, the same being at the rate of $10,000 a year.

(*f*) In addition to the duties set forth in the resolution cited, Mr. Bishop has charge of the publicity and literary branches of the Commission's work. He prepares the various statements which the chairman or the Commission as a body may desire to make public.

In addition to all of these duties enumerated in the replies to your questions and also in the resolutions cited, the chairman assigns special work to Mr. Bishop from time to time as exigency requires.

Very respectfully,

T. P. SHONTS, *Chairman.*

Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs have authority to have such printing done as may be necessary in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered, and agreed to.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following report from the Clerk of the House, touching contested-election cases.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLERK'S OFFICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1905.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives a list of contests for seats in the House of Representatives for the Fifty-ninth Congress of the United States, notices of which have been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House, and also transmit therewith all original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto, as follows, to wit:

Territory of Hawaii.
State of Maryland, First district.
State of Missouri, Twelfth district.
State of South Carolina, First district.
State of South Carolina, First district.
State of South Carolina, Second district.
State of South Carolina, Seventh district.
State of Texas, Second district.

The Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in all of the above cases. In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1897, entitled "An act relating to contested elections," such portions of the testimony in the above cases as the parties in interest agreed upon or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed, together with the notices of contest and the answers thereto, and such portions of the testimony as were not printed with the original papers have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in each case have been mailed to the contestant and the same number to the contestee. The law in reference to the briefs of both the contestant and contestee in each case has been complied with as far as possible upon receipt by the Clerk of said briefs.

In the case of the contested election of John A. Noland *v.* George S. Legare, from the First Congressional district of South Carolina, there are no briefs. Nothing but notice of contest and answer were filed in the case.

So far as the briefs have been furnished to the Clerk they are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections upon the order of the House, together with a tabulated statement which has been prepared by the Clerk, showing the number of pages of testimony and the present status of each contested-election case and all papers in connection therewith.

Very respectfully,

A. MCDOWELL,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

District.	Contestant.	Contestee.	Testimony opened.	Testimony printed.	Printed pages of testimony and briefs.		
					Testimony.	Briefs.	Total.
Territory of Hawaii	Curtis P. Iaukea	Jonah K. Kalanianaole	July 11, 1905	Aug. 12, 1905	447	86	533
First Maryland	William H. Jackson	Thomas A. Smith	July 12, 1905	Sept. 5, 1905	687	141	828
Twelfth Missouri	Harry M. Coudrey	Ernest E. Wood	do	Aug. 12, 1905	1,409	282	1,691
First South Carolina	Aaron P. Prioleau	George S. Legare	July 11, 1905	do	182	35	217
Do	John A. Noland	do	do	do	8		8
Second South Carolina	Isaac Myers	James O. Patterson	do	do	83	59	142
Seventh South Carolina	Charles C. Jacobs	Asbury F. Lever	do	do	152	169	321
Second Texas	A. J. Houston	Moses L. Brooks	July 12, 1905	do	386	190	576
Total							4,316

District.	Contestant.	Contestee.	Contestant notified to file brief.	Contestant's brief filed.	Contestee notified to file brief.	Contestee's brief filed.	Contestee's brief sent to contestant.	Contestant's reply brief filed.
Territory of Hawaii	Curtis P. Iaukea	Jonah K. Kalanianaole	Aug. 12, 1905	Oct. 2, 1905	Oct. 2, 1905	Nov. 15, 1905	Nov. 15, 1905	
First Maryland	William H. Jackson	Thomas A. Smith	Sept. 5, 1905	Oct. 4, 1905	Oct. 4, 1905	Nov. 4, 1905	Nov. 4, 1905	Dec. 4, 1905
Twelfth Missouri	Harry M. Coudrey	Ernest E. Wood	Aug. 12, 1905	Oct. 10, 1905	Oct. 10, 1905	Nov. 29, 1905	Dec. 1, 1905	
First South Carolina	Aaron P. Prioleau	George S. Legare	do	Sept. 9, 1905	Sept. 11, 1905			
Do	John A. Noland	do	do					
Second South Carolina	Isaac Myers	James O. Patterson	do	Sept. 11, 1905	Sept. 11, 1905	Oct. 9, 1905	Oct. 9, 1905	
Seventh South Carolina	Charles C. Jacobs	Asbury F. Lever	do	Sept. 14, 1905	Sept. 14, 1905	do	do	
Second Texas	A. J. Houston	Moses L. Brooks	do	Oct. 7, 1905	Oct. 7, 1905	Nov. 2, 1905	Dec. 2, 1905	

The SPEAKER. The Chair makes the following assignment of the contested-election cases: To Elections No. 1, the four cases from South Carolina; to Elections No. 2, the cases from Maryland and Missouri; to Elections No. 3, the cases from Texas and the Territory of Hawaii; to Elections No. 1, the memorial relating to the qualifications of Mr. MICHALEK, of Illinois.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE COLUMBIA RIVER BY THE PORTLAND AND SEATTLE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I now send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill, the title of which the Clerk will read, after which the Chair will submit to the House the request for unanimous consent.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 299) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask whether this bill has been reported from the committee?

Mr. CUSHMAN. The bill was unanimously reported from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on yesterday. The House not being in session, though the report was made on yesterday morning, it was impossible to have the report printed. I will say that this bill has been recommended by the War Department and is the unanimous report of the entire committee.

The only reason I call the bill up at this early time is by reason of the fact that the railway company is waiting with some two hundred men and materials to begin the construction of this bridge.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill in its several provisions has met with the approval of the War Department?

Mr. CUSHMAN. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a unanimous report by the committee?

Mr. CUSHMAN. Unanimous.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read at length.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CUSHMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGES ACROSS THE OUACHITA RIVER AND OTHER NAVIGABLE RIVERS IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 410, and that the same may be now considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a Senate bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 410) authorizing the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct bridges across the Ouachita and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report bill.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if this bill is in the usual form and has been recommended by the Secretary of War?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, sir; and has passed the Senate.

Mr. PAYNE. Has a similar bill been reported in the House?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, sir; and I move to substitute this for the House bill.

Mr. PAYNE. And is identical in its terms.

Mr. CURTIS. The House bill is identical in terms with the Senate bill.

Mr. MANN. After the House had reported the Senate changed their bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. The corresponding House bill, without objection, will be laid upon the table. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, presented a report from the Committee on Ways and Means in regard to the distribution of the President's message; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the above report, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the resolution for the distribution of the President's message, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the report and resolution, as follows:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the House resolution (H. Res. 42) for the distribution of the President's message, report the same back with the following amendments, viz: Page 1, line 4, after the words "United States" insert the words "and insurance;" page 3, line 13, strike out the words "and to Cuba;" and recommend that the resolution as amended be adopted:

Resolved, That so much of the annual message of the President of the United States to the two Houses of Congress at the present session as relates to the revenue and the bonded debt of the United States be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

That so much as relates to the appropriations of the public revenue for support of the Government as herein provided, namely, for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for pensions; for the District of Columbia, and for all deficiencies, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

That so much as relates to the judiciary of the United States, to the administration of justice, to the punishment and prevention of crime, and the organization of courts be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

That so much as relates to banks and banking and the currency be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

That so much as relates to commerce, life-saving service, intercolonial railways and cables, and the isthmian canal be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

That so much as relates to the merchant marine and fisheries be referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

That so much as relates to agriculture, and appropriations therefor, and to forestry be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

That so much as relates to the foreign affairs, the consular and diplomatic service, including appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

That so much as relates to the military establishment, and appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

That so much as relates to the naval establishment and to the construction of additional vessels for the Navy, and appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

That so much as relates to the post-office and post-roads and to the carrying of the foreign mails, and appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

That so much as relates to the public domain be referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

That so much as relates to the relations of the United States to the Indian tribes, and appropriations therefor, be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

That so much as relates to the Territories, Alaska, and the Hawaiian Islands, and to the admission of States, be referred to the Committee on the Territories.

That so much as relates to the islands which came to the United States through the treaty of 1899 with Spain, and to Cuba (except so much as relates to the revenue and the appropriations), be referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

That so much as relates to labor be referred to the Committee on Labor.

That so much as relates to the levees of the Mississippi River be referred to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

That so much as relates to patents, copyrights, and trade-marks be referred to the Committee on Patents.

That so much as relates to the pensions of the civil war be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

That so much as relates to the pensions of all the wars of the United States, other than the civil war, be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

That so much as relates to the affairs of the District of Columbia (excepting appropriations) be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

That so much as relates to reform in the civil service be referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

That so much as relates to the election of the President, Vice-President, or Representatives in Congress be referred to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

That so much as relates to immigration or naturalization be referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

That so much as relates to printing be referred to the Joint Committee on Printing on the part of the House.

That so much as relates to the industrial arts and expositions, other than revenue and appropriations, be referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask that that part of the resolution stating what was referred to the Committee on the Election of the President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress be read again. I do this because I could not hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the paragraph referred to.

The Clerk again read the paragraph.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], that the resolution follows the rule.

Mr. COCKRAN. I would ask the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, if any reference has been made of that very weighty paragraph in the message concerning campaign contributions?

Mr. PAYNE. I have no doubt that this general subject includes that, because the regulation of campaign funds by Congress could only proceed under the clause of the Constitution which authorizes Congress to deal with the election of the President, the Vice-President, and Members of Congress. This refers all matters relating to the election of the President, the Vice-President, and Members of Congress to that committee, and I have no doubt that that includes it.

Mr. COCKRAN. That explanation is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask a question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. This resolution, as I understand it, in no way affects the jurisdiction of the several committees as fixed by the standing rules of the House?

Mr. PAYNE. It does not, with one or two exceptions, in the way of amendments, which I will explain to the House.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I had in mind the question of insurance.

Mr. PAYNE. I intend speaking about that later.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the colloquy between the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] is entirely inaudible to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no doubt that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] is right. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I had already yielded to the gentleman from Indiana, and he has asked his question.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are both through.

Mr. COCKRAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, will some one tell us what it was about?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must insist that the committee be in order before we proceed with business.

Mr. COCKRAN. I merely ask in behalf of the committee to know what the colloquy was about which transpired between the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], assuming, of course, that it was of importance.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would state to my colleague that I will speak of that when we get order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, this resolution as introduced follows the precedent in respect to resolutions which have gone before it distributing different subjects in the President's message and almost universally in the language of the rules of the House. There are one or two exceptions where other language has crept into this series of resolutions, and I will speak of one—for instance, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The rule gives that committee jurisdiction over matters relating to commerce and to lighthouses and the Life-Saving Service. Some years ago an amendment was introduced giving that committee in terms jurisdiction over the isthmian canal and also over interoceanic cables. That language is followed in this resolution.

The resolutions as before introduced and passed in terms did not cover the portion of the President's message relating to insurance, and I will say to my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] that this was the question that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] asked about. The resolution heretofore did not cover that question. Now, at the beginning of this session a number of bills were introduced regulating insurance and placing it under the control of the United States, or proposing to do so, in various ways. Most of those bills provided a tax upon insurance companies, the authors of them presumably believing that that was the only method by which Congress could deal with them under the Constitution of the United States. In this I think they were exactly right. I do not see what authority the Congress of the United States has over insurance companies, except under the clause of the Constitution giving the taxing power. I understand that the Supreme Court has decided that the United States can not get jurisdiction under the Constitution over insurance companies under the interstate-commerce clause in the Constitution, and it would seem that taxation was the only way in which the Constitution gave any jurisdiction whatever.

These bills were referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Ways and Means. It was done without any intimation from any member of that committee. The first I knew of it, at least, was that those bills had been so referred. Some of them did not involve the taxing power.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me to finish this statement, then I shall be glad to yield to him. Some of them, I repeat, do not involve the taxing power, although most of them do involve the question of taxation. Those bills are there now. The Committee on Ways and Means was not anxious to take up this subject, but, of course, coming to us as it did, these bills, under the rules of the House, plainly going to that committee and to no other, because they involved the question of taxation, and having been placed there by the direction of the Speaker, the committee thought unanimously that that was where they belonged, and directed me to offer the amendment in the resolution, which is proposed in language and in terms strictly sending those bills to the Committee on Ways and Means.

It has been a rule, I am informed by the Clerk at the Speaker's desk, that whenever a class of bills comes in and the main feature compels the reference of a portion of these bills to a certain committee, for uniformity it is the custom to send all of those bills to that committee, whether they involve the particular question or not. But if I am right in the proposition that the only way Congress can deal with insurance companies is under the taxing clause of the Constitution, then no other committee would have jurisdiction of this subject-matter and it would belong to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Now I will yield to a question from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] what became of the recommendation made by the President relative to extending the irrigation laws of the United States so as to include the State of Texas—to what committee that went? He made the recommendation in his recent message. I did not catch the information from the reading of the resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not remember now, but I think there is a reference of that to the Committee on Arid Lands.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman will find the recommendation in the latter part of the President's message, relating to the irrigation of arid lands.

Mr. MANN. Before the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] enters upon that question, will he yield for another question concerning the insurance matter?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] please suspend for a moment?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I do not find any clause in this resolution referring to the question of arid lands. I think that clause has gone out of the resolution, and I will state to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] that in drawing the resolution I overlooked the matter and did not know until the moment he referred to it that there was any recommendation in regard to arid lands. If there is such a recommendation, I will very cheerfully accept an amendment referring that question, in the usual terms, to the Committee on Arid Lands. That can be done later, and the gentleman and myself will have no difficulty about that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then I shall desire to obtain the floor for the purpose of making that amendment at the proper time.

Mr. LACEY. May I say a word upon that question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY]?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. I desire to say that the question of irrigation of arid lands would go to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, but the subject of arid lands alone would go to the Committee on Public Lands, as well as the question of grazing and matters of that kind that come up in connection with the arid lands. It is only the subject of irrigation that, under the rules of this House, would go to the Irrigation Committee, and the rule ought to draw that distinction.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say right there, in reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY], that the amendment, if it goes into the bill, will refer all matters in the President's message relating to the subject of irrigation of arid lands to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, so that there will be no question about that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands as to how the Committee on Arid Lands can control the situation under the present law, which gives them a right not only to water the arid lands, but carries with it the disposition of those arid lands, when the subject-matter goes to their committee?

Mr. LACEY. There is no Committee on Arid Lands.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yield to me for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee. However, I do not yield for debate until the amendment is before the committee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I see nothing in this reference relative to bills introduced on the subject of coinage, weights, and measures. It was omitted entirely, I think.

Mr. PAYNE. This refers the President's message, not a bill, and the President's message does not refer to that subject.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], but I will yield to the gentleman from Texas, however, for a moment.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state to the gentleman that I have a bill pending before the Committee on Irrigation providing for extending the irrigation laws of the United States under the reclamation act. I think, that this portion of the President's message should go to that committee.

Mr. PAYNE. If there is anything in the President's message referring to the subject of arid lands, it should go to that committee, and I will have an amendment inserted that will send it to that committee.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to bring this question before the attention of the House, and ask unanimous consent that that portion of the President's message be referred to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Mr. PAYNE. I will offer an amendment myself later. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the distinguished gentleman from New York to say on the insurance question that the reason they propose to refer the matter of insurance to the Committee on Ways and Means was because, in his judgment, or the judgment of the committee, that the only method of dealing with that subject was through the taxing power. Suppose Congress should desire to proceed upon the theory that it had power under the provisions of the Constitution relating to the control of interstate commerce, would not that matter go then properly to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, that is for the House to determine. If the House determines that Congress has the right under the interstate-commerce clause to regulate insurance companies, it will be open for the House to say so and to send the subject to that committee.

Mr. MANN. Well, I understand that no one has any disposition in the House to quarrel about where bills shall be referred if they receive consideration.

Mr. PAYNE. The Committee on Ways and Means have no desire to grasp business that does not belong to them.

Mr. MANN. I understand that perfectly well, and the Interstate Commerce Committee has no desire to grasp business that does not belong to it.

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly not.

Mr. MANN. In my own judgment on the subject, in the time I have had to consider it, and I have given consideration to the subject for several years following the creation of the Department of Commerce and Labor, I am convinced that Congress can regulate the insurance question under the provisions of the Constitution concerning interstate commerce. It is a new thing to me that you can do it under the taxing power. I fail to see myself how under the taxing power you have any control of the insurance business. Now, then, I have no desire to argue that question with the gentleman, but if I introduce bills on the subject—as I expect to do—I do not want them buried in your committee, which will not hear anything excepting under the taxing clause, because I do not propose to proceed on that line. I want it sent to the proper committee of the House. I would like to say to this House that when there is anything in bills which is referred to in the President's message, that carries the bill introduced on that subject to that committee.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not understand that where there is a reference to anything in the President's message that changes the rules; and if the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have jurisdiction of that subject under the rules, that reference of the subject in the President's message to a certain measure does not change the rule.

Mr. MANN. That is all I wished to say. That satisfies me.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not care for further debate. I understand the gentleman from Iowa——

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire to be heard in my own time.

Mr. PAYNE. I was about to reserve my time.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the resolution as it was introduced at the time of its reference. I do object to the amendment made in the fourth line, by inserting the words "and insurance." The effect of that is to carry all matters of legislation concerning the control of insurance to the Committee on Ways and Means; and the reason assigned for that is that in the opinion of the Chairman the only manner in which Congress can have jurisdiction over that subject is through the exercise of the taxing power.

Mr. Chairman, even if that were true, that would not indicate, necessarily, the direction which this class of business should take in assignment to committees. It is true that all matters of taxation, where taxation—the raising of revenue—is the object to be attained, should be considered by the Committee on Ways and Means; but where taxation is resorted to solely for the purpose of securing jurisdiction, solely for the purpose of the exercise of a power, I submit that it is not the rule of this House to send matters of that kind to that Committee—notably the legislation with reference to oleomargarine. A tax nominal was resorted to only to give power to the Congress, or justify it in the exercise of power. Yet you will remember that that matter was considered and reported by the Committee on Agriculture. They had jurisdiction of it, recognizing the fact that the assumption upon the part of the Committee on Ways and Means was a mere fiction. The object was not to secure revenue. The object was to secure the right to exercise a power. Therefore the taxing power was resorted to, or taxation was made the pretext. There are a number of instances that might be given where this rule has been observed and where jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means has been denied, notwithstanding the fact that a nominal tax was provided for in the legislation sought.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to concede that there is more than one decision of the Supreme Court in which it has been held, in a casual way, that insurance was not commerce; but I want to call attention to the fact that that was not the major proposition considered by the Supreme Court, that but little attention was paid to that question in the argument, that that was simply one of the incidents in the case; and it is the opinion of a great many men learned in the law that when the proposition is fairly made, when the attention of the Supreme Court is called to the fact of the immense interest there is in insurance, interwoven inextricably with trade, when it is remembered that the annihilation of insurance would well-nigh annihilate commerce, that thousands and tens of thousands of commercial enterprises would never for a moment be considered or undertaken but for the auxiliary of insurance; when it is shown how interwoven insurance is with all commercial transactions, with the millions of money invested in trade and commerce, that another view of that subject may be taken. And I want to call attention to the fact that I have in my possession a bill prepared by the secretary of the National Bar Association, and, as I understand, a bill that met with their approval, from which it is clear that, in their opinion—in the opinion of the National Bar Association of the United States—the regulation of insurance companies is a power given to Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution. The language of these gentlemen, as used in the bill, declares that the writing of policies and other business of that character is commerce, and therefore it is a power conferred by the commerce clause of the Constitution.

This is a matter of importance. I want to call attention to the fact that, so far as there is any precedent upon the part of the House, you will discover from that precedent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had jurisdiction over this subject. The only legislation that we have upon that subject emanated from that committee. That committee reported the bill creating the Department of Commerce and Labor, by which there is created a Bureau of Corporations, and in express terms, with the other conferments of power, is the one including insurance. So that, so far as precedent goes, I think the gentleman is wrong in his assumption that the committee he has referred to and over which he presides (the Committee on Ways and Means) is the sole committee that may take jurisdiction of this subject.

I reserve my time, but I will yield to any gentleman who desires me to do so.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HEPBURN. I will yield; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. How much time does the gentleman from Florida desire?

Mr. LAMAR. How much time can my friend spare?

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, fifteen minutes.

Mr. LAMAR. That is scarcely enough for my purposes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know what other gentlemen may want to discuss this matter. I will reserve the time and let the gentleman take the floor in his own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa reserves the balance of his time. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman, on Monday last I attempted to make an explanation to this House. The matter that I sent to the desk not being considered in the nature of privilege by the Speaker, I naturally desisted. In the colloquy which ensued between the leader of the minority on this side of the House and myself he suggested that in the interest of party harmony I should not pursue a discussion which he evidently saw I intended to pursue were the time allowed me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will accord to the gentleman that respect as a party leader which I have heretofore accorded to him personally, but which until he, as I conceive, relieves me of an unjust charge on his part I will always concede him as a party leader hereafter, but which under no circumstances could I concede to him personally.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not indulge in any personalities on this occasion, nor do I agree with the leader of the minority of this House that if I did so it would please any Republicans upon the other side. I do not believe that there is a man of any sense or sensibility in this House, be he Republican or Democrat, who would take any pleasure in a discussion in this

House of a highly personal character. In the heat of debate acrid colloquies and controversies will sometimes occur. But, sir, it is bad enough if those happen between political opponents; and even then when the time has passed that aroused the feeling it should subside. No man of generous instincts should cherish a revengeful feeling, and certainly I do not.

Therefore, I say, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the Republican side of this House would be amused at anything that I might say personally against the minority leader, and I will suggest to the leader of the minority that he would be in a much more fortunate position to suggest party harmony to me had he as the leader of this side of the House set the precedent.

I shall allude to a controversy on the floor of this House between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HEARST]. I had nothing to do with that controversy. I stated on the floor of this House that I would not be bound by the personal controversies in this House, and I will not be.

These are matters that gentlemen must settle for themselves. This House and the public will judge according to the merits, and not upon the rashness of speech of any one Member of the House. The leader of this House, because he is an elected leader, should have set a magnanimous example. Every man who heard the gentleman from Massachusetts arraign the gentleman from New York will concede that it was done—I will not say in a vicious manner, because I will not reflect upon the gentleman from Massachusetts—will testify that it was done in a terrific manner. Where was our distinguished leader on that occasion? It was Democrat to Democrat.

Why did not he stop that deliberated and prepared attack? The gentleman from Massachusetts made no concealment of his purpose. He gave notice of arising to a question of personal privilege days in advance. It was in the air here the morning he made his arraignment in the House of the gentleman from New York that he would do it, and, if I am not mistaken, the gentleman from Massachusetts arose and with typewritten manuscript in his hands made a deliberate and prepared attack. He did it openly; he gave a blow and received a blow. On this occasion I will do nothing to disturb the harmony of this side of the House. I shall certainly not contribute, if I can help it, to any amusement on the part of the Republicans. A distinguished Republican Representative in this House was standing near me on this side of the House when the gentleman from Massachusetts made that arraignment of the gentleman from New York. I did not see him amused; he did not smile; he did not say a word. I think, sir, he felt a sense of sorrow to see men divided who in the natural order of things would be united. Certainly it would not please me to see an acrimonious debate between two Republicans of this House.

I do not want to do anything here that my party colleagues will charge, or my people in Florida might think, contributed to Democratic discord in the face of political opponents. But, Mr. Chairman, I desire very briefly to allude to certain occurrences in this House upon public legislation and certain matters that do not appertain thereto, except in a collateral manner. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important questions—the one which the President lays down in his message as the great and almost supreme question—is the subject of national transportation. This House deals only with national transportation. This House has the power under the Federal Constitution to regulate all public highways of national character. I speak more particularly of the interstate railroads. A railroad charge is as directly a tax upon the products and business earnings of a community and country as though it were laid directly by legislative authority in the form of a governmental support tax. Therefore, any charge that is too high is unreasonable. Any device of extorting money or extracting money out of the individual that should not exist is against public policy, and these devices, according to the President's message and the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission, are many and varied. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this question is a very great question.

It is to be presumed that every Member of this House will furnish to this House and to the country every single particle of information he may possess upon this great question. His party is entitled to it, the country is entitled to it. I care not whose bill comes before this House, whether it is a bill of a Republican or a Democrat, it is entitled to receive consideration from each Member of this House regardless of party. It is not a mere personal measure; it is a public measure. It is not here that one particular man shall be shelved or put aside. In this House a measure of legislation proposed by each Member is to go to the proper committee, to be properly considered, and reported upon to this House to be properly debated. In no other way, shape, or form can a public measure of proposed legislation come before the House. The House and the country are entitled and ought to have an intelligent knowledge of that measure. Now, Mr. Chairman, at the last session of the Fifty-eighth Congress this House passed the bill known as the Esch-Townsend bill to regulate interstate railroad rates. A substitute measure was proposed on this side of the House, called the Davey bill. That substitute was voted down. Immediately or shortly thereafter the vote was had upon the main question, the the majority report from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Esch-Townsend bill as reported was passed. The Democrats voted with the Republicans in its favor, except possibly half a dozen. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a history behind the Davey bill, the Democratic caucus bill, which I propose to submit fairly and temperately to this House, and if I make an error I trust the distinguished leader of the minority on this side will correct me. I do not intend to do him the slightest injustice knowingly, and it will only be sufficient for him to point out my mistake for me to withdraw it. Mr. Chairman, the Republicans of this House, in reporting the Esch-Townsend bill to the House, proceeded in the ordinary regular course of legislation.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce dealt with that measure, the Republican majority of it formulated a bill, submitted that bill to their caucus, it was duly approved under caucus regulations, and then was formally introduced into this House and passed as a piece of Republican legislation. But, Mr. Chairman, was that the history of the Davey bill? It can not be held that in my alluding to these matters that I am transgressing any bounds of propriety that might restrict me to silence. What was done in that caucus went to the press and the country. Mr. Chairman, the caucus upon that occasion adopted what was known as the "Davey bill." It comprehended but two sections. The first gave to the Interstate Commerce Commission the mere power, upon complaint made, to revise an unreasonable rate and to substitute in lieu thereof a reasonable rate; that that rate go into effect until upon review it was reversed by the courts.

The second section of the bill provided merely the machinery for taking an appeal from the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the higher courts of the land. That was the sum total of the Davey bill. When that bill reached the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and after the Republican members of that committee had formulated the Esch-Townsend bill and had adjourned to give the Democrats on that committee a chance to formulate their bill and report it, what did the Democratic minority of that committee do? It added five sections to that Davey bill. What further happened? I voted for every one of those five sections added to that bill. I joined with the Democrats of that committee in formally reporting that bill to this House favorably. But, Mr. Chairman, I did something else besides that. I did that which I thought and knew that I had the liberty to do. I reported in a subsidiary manner, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] joining with me, what was known as the "Hearst bill," to this House, and that which I would have liked to substitute for the Davey bill, as practically my choice of bills, had I the power to enact it into law. Those were my views upon that bill then; they are my views now, and until I see some bill introduced by the leader of the minority, some Democrat on this side, or some Republican on the other side, which I believe to be a more comprehensive measure of legislative reform upon the present existing railway abuses, I shall continue to think was far and away the best bill introduced into this House upon the subject of railway-rate abuses and providing remedies for the same.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit it to the minority leader and to the House that whenever a caucus adopts a bill it can not be added to in the slightest particular. It would be a contradiction in terms, as we understand the caucus rules, to say that a caucus could adopt a bill and promulgate it, and bind the members of that caucus to it, and then that any committee or anybody else could add to it. Why, sir, the authority that made that caucus, the authority that limited the power of that committee or any Member of this House to touch this bill, was supreme and controlling, until the authority that made it had dissolved and annulled it. It needs no argument to establish that proposition. Now, what occurred when that bill, built up from two sections to seven, came before this House? The leader of the minority, upon the floor of this House, in the latter stages of the debate, was driven to the alternative of seeing that Democratic measure of proposed relief go out to the country patently imperfect, incomplete, unless he attempted to add to it and amend it; and on the floor of this House the minority leader asked, by grace of the Republicans, that which he might have placed in his bill in a Democratic caucus; that which the Republican President recommended in his message—that the

private car lines and terminal fees iniquities be corrected by legislation, and that he be allowed to amend the already enlarged Davey bill by adding amendments to that effect. His request was for unanimous consent to add these amendments, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] promptly turned him down by objecting.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I make this point, and I make it with the leader of the minority on this floor, before the Members of this House and in the eyes of the country, namely, if that caucus was binding, if the terms of that caucus limited every Democrat to that bill, and nothing else, then I challenge him as a lawyer, as a candid, frank debater, whether or not he could have asked for those amendments on the floor of the House, or whether on the committee we could have added to that caucus bill? I care not how men may argue or trim around that point; it is incontrovertible that in the matter of a caucus bill nobody could touch it until it was altered by another caucus. I submit it to the memory of my party colleagues as to whether or not I did not raise the question on the floor of the caucus, that that measure would not do for me, stating that I could not go back to my State upon so limited a series of remedies.

If I mistake not, the adequacy of the caucus bill was challenged by half a dozen members of that caucus, and it was the absolute understanding when the caucus adjourned that the provisions of the Davey bill were adopted to only signify to the country that the Democrats of this House were willing to put in a bill the great and important feature of rate revising and rate fixing, and that was all, and that any Democrat in this House or any member of that committee could contribute of his own knowledge and experience, whatever it might be, to the perfecting of a bill to come before this House eventually. If that is not correct, then I am the most mistaken man that ever attended a caucus. I state the matter correctly. I submit it to the memory of the Democrats of this House who attended the caucus. It came up for discussion. I rose in my place, with the few minutes of time allowed me, and stated to the caucus distinctly that with a Republican President pronouncing forcibly upon this great question it would not do for the Democrats to limit themselves to too brief a measure, and that so far as my State was concerned, it demanded far more extensive remedial legislation than was contained in the two-section Davey bill. I submit it to the memory of my colleagues.

Now, Mr. Chairman, so much for the public phase of this question. Now, sir, there is a personal phase to this matter which I will touch upon without any feeling. I do it in justice to myself. I do it in justice to my reputation. I do it in justice to my character. What Democrat can object to that? What Republican can object to that?

It is well known, Mr. Chairman, and is now a matter of record, that I am not and will not be in the future, a member of the Committee of Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am not challenging upon this occasion the power of the minority leader to make that change. I do not challenge his right. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I think he should have that power; I think he should have that right. If the Speaker would concede to him the power of appointing and would not concede also the power of removal, it would be dividing his power. As a leader of this House he ought to have the power of reorganizing those committees. I do not make any question of that; I make no challenge of that.

There are limitations, however, not binding upon the minority leader in themselves. There are moral limitations upon him, there is an honorable limitation upon him, as binding as if nominated in the bond. And what is that? That he must take the power and responsibility which the Speaker gives him and exercise it with wisdom, justice, and moderation upon his followers on the floor of this House, his brother Democrats, his peers in everything that constitutes manhood or anything else. I say it is as binding upon him as though the Speaker had written it in the power conferred upon him.

Now, sir, I submit it to this House that my removal from that committee has been done by a man whom I have held as my friend, a man for whom three years ago I voted for as party leader against my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. And I voted for him upon a sentiment and upon a ground that touched me very closely. When I explained this to my friend from Missouri he very kindly released me, and I voted for the gentleman from Mississippi.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing personal that I have against the minority leader. I have not the slightest feeling against him, with the exception that I feel a just sense of indignation, not of hate, anger, or revenge, at what I consider an injustice and indignity done against me upon the part of the minority leader. Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that I was honored when I first came here in a larger manner than I deserved, but not altogether by our party leader. I owed my appointment to the resignation from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of Hon. Robert W. Davis, of Florida, in my favor.

Mr. Chairman, had the minority leader given me that place of his own accord over men who had been here long years before me some one else would have suffered an injustice. I had some qualifications for a place upon that committee. I had been attorney-general of my State for fourteen years. I had been engaged in litigation against railroads in Florida, involving the fundamental question of just and reasonable rates. I had been associated for over ten years with special counsel of the Florida railroad commission. I will say without vanity or boast—for I do not think the House would credit me with that—that every suit instituted by me against the railroads on behalf of the people of Florida was won in the courts.

Mr. Chairman the minority leader has exercised the power which the Speaker [Mr. CANNON] conferred upon him, and removed me from that committee. He could have had it just for the asking if he had told me that it involved any principle. If he had told me that there was another man better qualified than I, I would have resigned it. I got it as a matter of grace from Mr. Davis, and through the courtesy of Mr. WILLIAMS, and he could have had it back for the asking. But, sir, the gentleman accompanied that removal with what I consider a statement of reasons harsh, unjust, and untrue. I hope yet that in our party caucus or in some formal manner the gentleman will recede from his position, because I say to him frankly, without the feeling against him that I had a few days ago—for I had it then, Mr. Chairman, I confess, and a very deep feeling—that perhaps he did me a service in checking my attempt to bring this matter to the attention of the House the other day, for in my feeling I might have said on the floor of this House, in my immediate indignation, things that possibly I might not have liked to read in the RECORD the next morning. It may be that the gentleman did me a service without intending it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did intend it.

Mr. LAMAR. Now, I do not hesitate to say, and I will say it in moderation, that the minority leader in removing me from that committee placed it upon a ground that I consider absolutely untenable, absolutely unjust, without a word of truth in it, and which I regard as an aspersion upon my character. I confess in the presence of my Democratic colleagues, in the presence of this House, that I am surprised at it. I have no hesitancy in saying in the most moderate way that the gentleman can not substantiate his statement and that it is false.

Mr. Chairman, more completely to make this matter plain, I will submit and ask the Clerk to read this letter from Mr. WILLIAMS to me, written a day or two before the appointment of these committees.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter handed up by the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., December 8, 1905.

Hon. W. B. LAMAR,
The Connecticut, City.

MY DEAR SIR: I had contemplated recommending the Speaker to remove you and Mr. SHACKLEFORD from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce because you were not in accord with the majority of the Democrats upon that committee, and I considered it very important that the report made by the minority members of that committee, whatever it might be, should be unanimous and without any dissenting report on the minority side. I had also contemplated transferring you from that committee to Foreign Affairs, one of higher dignity, so that you and others might know that what I was doing was not actuated by the desire to reduce you and had nothing personal in it.

It has been intimated to me, however, that perhaps you would refuse to accept the Committee on Foreign Affairs, if placed upon it. I wish you would let me know whether that is the case or not, as, of course, I do not desire to place you upon a committee which you would decline to take. I want to put you there, thinking it would be a pleasant committee for you, that you would be in accord with your colleagues on it, and that your service on it would be beneficial to the party and to the country. Please call me up over the phone, either at my house, where the phone number is Main 5722, or if I should not happen to be there when you call me, then at the minority room, or else drop me a note as soon as possible after receiving this. Must hand Speaker list to-morrow night.

Very truly, yours, JOHN S. WILLIAMS.

Mr. LAMAR. Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to submit this letter in reply and have it read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter handed up by the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, December 9, 1905.

Hon. JOHN S. WILLIAMS, *City.*

MY DEAR SIR: I received your letter rather late to-day. In it you offer me a place on Foreign Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives. My desire is to retain my position on the Committee on

Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I neither accept nor decline the position you offer me on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. You have the power. You can do as you please. But in view of your letter to me that I had defied the Democratic caucus on railroad rate legislation and your verbal statement to others in this city of a like character, I assure you I will consider my removal by you from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as an act of the highest personal indignity.

I will in such event be compelled in my own self-defense to properly repel that accusation. You can not find a Republican or Democrat in the House of Representatives, I think, who will indorse or justify your removal of me.

I was at perfect liberty at the last session to report the Hearst bill in the manner I did. I voted for the Davey bill in caucus. I voted for the amendments to the Davey bill in the committee. I voted for the Davey bill in the House of Representatives. And I joined in the report of the Davey bill, as amended, to the House of Representatives. How can you justly say I acted against the mandate of the Democratic caucus? Reporting the Hearst bill did not place it on the Calendar of the House. It gave it no official standing. I said on the floor of the House that I had no fight on the Davey bill. That I approved it as far as it went; but that I couldn't return to Florida without, at least, urging and advocating other legislation in that line and hope to sustain myself with my people.

The main features of the Hearst bill will, in part at least, be put in any bill to be returned by the Democrats or Republicans. I wrote you distinctly some weeks ago that if you or other Members had any better suggestions to offer I would drop this bill and advocate yours or any other Democrat's.

The people of Florida have been injured, in part, by the terminal matter, but very much so by the private car lines. These were two of the great features I desired to emphasize in reporting the Hearst bill, so far as it related to my people.

You have no just right to assume that I could not act either in harmony with you or my former associates in committee. You have not written to me in a proper spirit. I have borne your unjust accusation, because I wanted to see your real feelings toward me and to give you no cause to leave me off the committee on which I now serve, other than your alleged accusation—the want of party fealty. I assure you I will not let such a charge pass by if you put your determination to remove me into effect.

You wrote the most insulting letters to me about Mr. HEARST. Do you think this was right and just to me, when I had expressed on the floor of the House at least a personal regard for him, and had praised most of the features of his bill? Do you think it was just and right? I am sure it was not just and right.

Under no circumstances, Mr. WILLIAMS, would I make a threat against you; but if you do me this great wrong and personal indignity, I will feel at liberty to go over all this matter of our correspondence in whatever way I deem best for my defense. You are about to do an act which your party colleagues will condemn in you—if not to your face, at least in their hearts. And the country will condemn you.

I have nothing personal against you. I released myself from the support of Mr. CLARK, with his consent, to vote for you because you came from a State that had honored my uncle, Mr. Justice Lamar.

The matter is with you, and the consequences of a disruption of our personal friendship and association be with you if you so desire it. You can not maintain your charge against me. If there is want of harmony, if there is discord on our side, it will not be my fault. It is an unjust act you are about to do, and I rest it all there.

Very truly, yours,

W. B. LAMAR.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman, it has gone out to the country through the press—I have a clipping here before me which I need not burden the RECORD with—that the leader of the minority will not tolerate any followers of HEARST on the floor of this House; that he reduced Mr. SHACKLEFORD and Mr. LAMAR to the ranks because they were Hearst men.

Mr. Chairman, so far as that is concerned, I have but to answer this: I made myself plain, I think, to every man on the floor of this House who cared to listen, so far as the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HEARST] is concerned. I owe no more political allegiance to Mr. HEARST than I owe to Mr. WILLIAMS. They are both Democrats. They are both in the ranks. I will march shoulder to shoulder as quickly with the gentleman from New York as I will with the gentleman from Mississippi to accomplish Democratic victory. I feel perfectly free, if the gentleman from New York brings a bill in here, to champion that bill, to express myself in its behalf, to follow its wise provisions, to give him the credit for the masterly legal provisions shown in the bill. I feel at liberty to champion the Hearst bill on the floor of this House, as I would the Davey bill, or the Williams bill, or any other bill.

I will tell our minority leader, I will tell him in the presence of my Democratic colleagues, I will tell him in the presence of our Republican associates, that he has contributed more to Democratic inharmony in the brief space of one minute than I have in the long term of one year.

I do not hold this great power of naming the committees. To some extent I am a stranger in this House. The minority leader has served here, in many instances with much ability, for a long time. He is a party leader by the votes of my colleagues, together with my own. I voted for him three years ago, and had I been here at the first of this session I would have voted for him again. But I am free to say here that in the management of this great transportation question in the House of Representatives the minority leader blundered fearfully in one respect, if he called a Democratic caucus before the hearings were closed before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to bind the hands of the Democrats to that minority caucus bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I could state with more truth than he has to charge me with party unfealty that that caucus was not right; that it was party treachery and party perfidy. I do not make that charge. His charge is more than an injustice, and unless Mr. WILLIAMS places himself before a caucus of Democrats——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Florida to the fact that under the rules he should not mention by name any other Member of the House.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman, I shall limit my remarks to the proprieties of debate. If I have transgressed them, it was an unintentional act on my part.

Mr. Chairman, the minority leader of this House will have to, in some just and proper way, submit his accusation to those who authoritatively can declare upon it, or I say on the floor of this House, as I wrote to him, that our personal friendship is dissolved, that our personal associations are dissolved, much as I regret it; and I shall maintain always that his charge is not founded upon the history of that caucus and has not a particle of truth in it. I shall maintain in the face of my Democratic colleagues here that it is wrong, that it is unjust, and that it is untrue. These gentlemen here are his triers and are mine. The House will hear both sides. I am willing, so far as I am concerned, if the minority leader's charge is true, to bear the odium of having made an agreement and broken it, but I say to him—and I have brought this matter up in order to let it fall upon him—that if the charge is not true then the odium of having preferred a false accusation against a brother Democrat must rest upon him.

Mr. Chairman, I shall quote but one Member on this side of the House in favor of the provisions of that Hearst bill. What Member on the floor of this House occupies any higher position than Judge DE ARMOND, a man of high character, a man of fine abilities, a man of spotless purity of life, a leader in the highest and purest and best sense? I shall ask the Clerk to read the paragraph that I have marked, which gives Judge DE ARMOND'S opinion of what is called the "Hearst bill."

The Clerk read as follows:

I am not going far into the discussion of the merits of this bill or that bill, but I say frankly, simply because I believe it, that of all the bills introduced upon this subject the bill most comprehensive in its treatment of it; the bill which, if enacted into law, would be productive of the most good; the bill susceptible of the least misconstruction and least misapplication; the bill which guards most effectively against tendencies to minimize, weaken, and destroy corrective measures, is the bill introduced last spring and long pending in that committee—the bill of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HEARST]. It is the fruit of study and experience, developed while its author as a private citizen, at his own expense, contended in the courts for the rights of the people against the coal barons and other oppressive monopolists.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman, the people of my State, of the Third Congressional district—in fact, of the entire State of Florida—will want no better encomium upon a piece of proposed legislation in this House, although it was not upon the Calendar of the House, but which came informally before the House, than that pronounced by Judge DE ARMOND. There are a great series of remedies that should be carried into effect, and will eventually be carried into effect by the Congress, to restrain corporations in their pernicious activities. The Hearst bill, so far as I could judge—and I thought I had some qualifications to determine upon that matter—without being a perfect piece of legislation was far closer an approach to correcting the evils set out by the reports of the Industrial Commission, the evils set out by the recommendations of President Roosevelt, the evils set out by reports continued for ten or fifteen years by the Interstate Commerce Commissioners, than any measure then pending before this House. Under the limitations of that caucus, and within its limitations and with the latitude allowed me, I joined in the favorable report of the Davey bill to this House, two sections of it being the caucus bill plus the five sections added by the committee; and in a subsidiary manner reported that while I approved the Davey bill and joined in a favorable report upon it, it was done subject to the views that I also set upon the Hearst bill.

Now, there was not a word in the Esch-Townsend bill, the Republican bill—and it should have been there; there was not a word in the Davey bill, the Democratic caucus bill—and it should have been there—correcting the iniquities of terminal fees and private car lines. My State has suffered unjustly in the terminal-fees matter. The vegetable and melon and fruit industries of my State have been injured by the unjust exactions of the private cars. Mr. Chairman, from the little town in which I reside, Monticello, Fla., to Pittsburg, Pa., it has cost the large and extortionate price of $90 for icing charges on a car of cantaloupes, while according to the best testimony taken upon this subject, a charge of from $18 to $30 would be the maximum price these private car lines should justly charge—$60 taken at one fell swoop out of one small parcel of freight!

It has laid a crushing burden upon such industries and paralyzed them. Was it not my duty here to seek to bring before this House informally—and I did it only in an informal way under the committee rule—those features of legislation which I would gladly see enacted into law if I had absolute power to do it, and so I reported in that subsidiary manner the Hearst bill, in defense of the State of Florida and on behalf of public interests generally. I have arisen without that feeling of indignation which I had a day or two ago, with not that feeling of resentment toward the minority leader which I had a day or two ago. But I am amazed, and I confess it to my Democratic brethren, and I will express it to my Republican associates, at the charge made by the minority leader against a brother Democrat that is reckless and unjust and that is utterly untrue and not founded upon the facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am about to perform a very unpleasant duty, and one about the wisdom of the performance of which I have serious doubts, but as this speech of the gentleman from Florida has been preceded by interviews in the newspapers, it might perhaps be well that I should say a few words. First and foremost it is well that I should give reasons for the conduct which I have pursued in reference to the appointment, not the removal of anybody from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, because there was no removal, for the simple reason with each Congress every committee is tabula rasa. The gentleman takes himself too seriously.

Mr. LAMAR. That is what I wrote you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman takes himself too seriously. He takes his position too seriously. He thinks he can make of a committee appointment a national issue. He can not do it, Mr. Chairman. Now, I will give the reasons which prompted me. Here was the Fifty-ninth Congress about to meet. The first and foremost question presented for its consideration, and the one most immediately near the heart of the people for solution, was the question of the regulation of the rates of railroads engaged in interstate commerce. Six men had to be appointed on the Democratic side of that committee. I was titular Democratic leader. I had the power and the responsibility of naming those six men.

Now, I will leave it to anybody, I leave it to the Republicans, I leave it to school children, I will leave it to fools to answer this question: Would I not have been a fool, would I not have been unutterably assinine, would I not have been absolutely unworthy of the place which I held and void of all moral courage, too weak to hold it or any place of responsibility, if, knowing beforehand from my acquaintance with the personnel on the committee last Congress that four of them stood irrevocably one way and two of them stood irrevocably another way, I had reappointed every one of them again to present once more an absurd and ridiculous divided front upon this great question upon which the Democratic party is more nearly united than it ever has been upon any question since my service in the House [applause], except only the repeal of the Federal election laws in the Fifty-third Congress. Oh, I repeat, the gentleman takes himself too seriously. His illustrious uncle, L. Q. C. Lamar, a great statesman, a great orator, and a very good judge, possessed one trait which the gentleman possesses and another trait which he does not possess. The great L. Q. C. Lamar possessed a superb egotism, but it was justified, aye, it was consecrated, by his superb intellect. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I had one of two things to do, either to appoint two men in place of the two who could agree with the four or to leave out the four and appoint four men who could agree with the two. I did not believe that the four men were so much the inferiors, intellectually or as statesmen, of either of the two gentlemen as to lead me to believe that it was well to take a course involving the most friction by removing the four, though I might perhaps have found four who would agree with the two by searching with a microscope. I was led all the more to this conclusion by the fact the Democratic caucus, whose action was defied by the gentleman, had voted upon the two bills and overwhelmingly adopted the bill advocated by the four. Every member of that caucus except seven, I believe—it may have been nine—indorsed the bill which the four members indorsed, and only nine indorsed the bill which the two members of the committee indorsed. I was led all the more to it by the fact that during the summer the gentleman from Florida himself was interviewed in the Washington Post, reiterating his position and going so far as to say that the bill he advocated had not received "a fair consideration," which I regarded as a reflection on his Democratic colleagues.

By the way, in that interview he uttered high praise of myself, higher than I deserve, and I thank him for it. I am glad to have any man's praise and want to have every man's friendship, but my brother would have gone off that committee under those circumstances. The gentleman knows as well as he knows his name that if the Hearst bill had been reported by the majority of the Democrats on that committee to the Democratic caucus it would have received my support upon the floor of the caucus and upon the floor of this House as warmly as the bill that was reported. The gentleman knows, and his admission stands on the RECORD of the last Congress, that during all the numerous conferences between the Democratic members of that committee—some of them when I was present and some when I was not present—the Hearst bill was never once advocated or so much as mentioned by him or the gentleman from Missouri. Let him explain that, if he can, amongst his numerous interviews.

He knows that during that entire time, and in all of those conferences, neither he nor any other minority member of that committee so much as mentioned the Hearst bill, much less advocated it. He knows that not until after the last conference of the minority members of that committee was held in Judge RICHARDSON'S room at the Riggs House, and after they had apparently agreed, as I thought, he expressing no dissent and being present, and he voting, as I remember, for the motion that two lawyers upon the committee put into bill shape the principles on which he had agreed, did one of us, his colleagues on the committee, or I know that he advocated our adoption of the Hearst bill. Not until after that conference, and sometime between that and the meeting of the Democratic caucus, did he ever so much as suggest that the Hearst bill was the proper expression of Democratic opinion upon that great question. That bill was never mentioned in our minority committee conference but once, and it was mentioned then by me, and that was in that last conference, and for reenforcement of all of these statements I refer to the other Democratic members of that committee. I said in that last conference, "Gentlemen, if you are going into the question of private car abuses and other railroad abuses, besides this keystone question of the power to substitute a rate, there are some excellent provisions in the Hearst bill upon the private car line question, and it may be well for us to take it up as a skeleton and consider it." Somebody tabooed the suggestion. I will not repeat the language. I forget which member it was; but nobody else enforced the suggestion. And that was the only time that the Hearst bill was ever mentioned in our conferences seeking agreement.

Oh, the conversion to that bill, uninspired, was as sudden as the inspired conversion of Paul on his way to Damascus, with this difference, that God needed Paul to do work for him and it was necessary that Paul should be converted. [Laughter.]

The gentleman now says that I have "slapped him in the face." He ought to know better. The gentleman tells me that I must do without his personal regard hereafter. He ought not to have said it. But if he persists in it I shall manage somehow or other to exist. I hope he will not withdraw his recognition, but if he does I shall get along.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall ignore all of the personal things that were said about me in this connection here or in the newspaper interviews. It is, perhaps, unworthy of me personally not to ignore them, but I know it would be unworthy of me as the leader of a great and dignified party upon this floor. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There has been a studious attempt to make it appear that I was actuated somehow by personal antagonism and animosity toward the gentleman from New York [Mr. HEARST]. The gentleman, in his letter there, says—I have forgotten his exact language—personal abuse, I think——

Mr. LAMAR. Stronger than that.

Mr. WILLIAMS (continuing). That I said "most insulting things about Mr. HEARST" in a letter to him. I deny it. All I have ever said there was not of a personal character in the slightest degree; and I have copies of the letters.

Mr. LAMAR. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] object to an interruption?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will put the letter in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LAMAR]?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LAMAR] can not claim to me that there are no personal relations between us and then ask the courtesy of interrupting me at the same time.

Mr. LAMAR. I meant purely in a parliamentary way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will not yield. Mr. Chairman, whatever may be my opinion of the statesmanship of Mr. HEARST, it had nothing to do with the report by the majority of the Democrats upon that committee on the bill which they did report, and the

necessary consequent turning down, not only of the Hearst bill, but of thirteen or fourteen others that were pending before the committee. And nobody knows that better than the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LAMAR]. I pride myself, and I believe I have a right to pride myself, upon one thing, and all the more because I have so few things upon which to pride myself, and that one thing is that I never permit my personal likes or dislikes to interfere with me in the transaction of public business. I believe it is notorious that that is true. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have treated the gentleman from New York like any other Member of this House. Two years ago I put him upon the only committee that he asked to be put upon. I put him there after the committees had been filled up and the names of the men appointed had been published. I went to a gentleman on the committee and told him I wanted the place for him, and he gave it up so that the gentleman from New York might have it. This year he has been advanced to the senior Democratic place upon that committee, and will in due course of seniority be chairman, if the country goes Democratic and he remains in the House. Then the gentleman from New York, through his California papers, having shown great interest in the subject of irrigation, was put by me this Congress upon the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands as a former California man interested in that subject. It is true—perhaps I ought not to say it—I do not love the gentleman from New York. Why should I love a millionaire with a whole lot of papers that seem to be used solely for the purpose, so far as I am concerned, of breaking me down? I do not make the mistake of the gentleman from Florida; I do not regard myself as a national issue [laughter]; therefore, while I do not like the attitude of the gentleman from New York toward me, that does not control me in attending to my business upon this floor or my treatment of him as a legislator.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether I ought to say anything more or not. I did what I did because it was right. It was right; it is right; it was wise, and it is wise. I am justified by the almost unanimous opinion of this side of the House. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman asked me to call a caucus for the purpose of having myself rebuked. Why, the gentleman knows—no Member of this House knows better than he—that there is a prescribed method of calling a caucus. I am not vain or anything of that sort; but at the same time I have too much self-love to want to call a caucus to rebuke myself. If the gentleman thinks the Members of the party are willing to do it, he can call a caucus for that purpose if he can get a sufficient number of signatures; and if he can not get enough to call a caucus I suppose he would admit in advance that he could not get enough to justify his position of rebuking me for my action.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have done what I did "in malice to none and in charity to all." I promoted the gentleman who has just taken his seat—the gentleman from Florida—to Foreign Affairs, which is the fourth most important committee of this House. The Committee on Rules is first, Ways and Means, second; Appropriations, third, and Foreign Affairs, fourth, because it deals with all international questions and with the affairs of the State Department, whose Cabinet head is the American premier. Now, if the gentleman had gone along quietly it would have helped him in Florida; it would not have hurt him, and, if I may be excused for telling an anecdote on a grave and dignified occasion, I believe I will tell one. A man died in New York. His body was carried to the morgue. A description of the body was published in the papers. Finally two brothers out in Texas whose father had gone to New York at some time concluded it was their father. The corpse bore their father's name. They were ranchmen and wealthy; so they wired on and said "the body seems to be the body of so and so; if so, to have the undertaker dress the corpse in a proper manner and embalm it and they would be up there. They went on up and looked at the corpse, and it looked very much like what their father had been. Now, there was on it one of those undertaker's cloths to keep the lower jaw from dropping down. The cloth in some way became dislocated, and the jaw dropped down, and there fell out of the mouth of the corpse a set of false teeth. Then these boys who had come to New York said: "That is not our father. He never had false teeth; he did not have time to get false teeth, and we decline to pay the funeral expenses," nothing thus far having been done. Then the undertaker had a conversation with the corpse after the boys had left. Said he, "Oh, yes; if you had kept your blamed mouth shut you would have had a first-class funeral [great laughter], conducted in a first-class manner, with all sorts of plumes and feathers and four black horses and a great big metallic casket and a fine hearse and hired mourners, with all the latest embellishments so welcome to the feelings of corpses, but you could not keep it shut, and now you will be buried without any honors and nobody will attend the funeral. There will not even be any hired mourners."

Mr. Chairman, it is seldom, indeed, that intense national interest can be aroused in the exhibition of any man's sores, unless the sores are of a contagious character. Happily for mankind, the sores of injured vanity are never contagious.

I have not invited this. I have tried my best to prevent it. I have tried to save the gentleman from himself. Would to God that I could have done it! He belongs to a grand old southern family, who have contributed to the statesmanship and the prowess of this country not a little by their history in Georgia, in Mississippi, and in Florida.

I did all I could. The letter which the gentleman publishes there, from myself to him, shows how careful I was to try to spare his feelings, even after the first interview in the Star had appeared attacking me in a vicious manner, to say the least. I can not answer these personal attacks. I do not know how to answer them. I only remember this, Mr. Chairman, not to imitate them, and I am not going to imitate them. I am not going to imitate them because of my recollection of an incident in my own life.

My mother's father, while a self-made man and an uneducated one in a certain sense, but a broadly read one, was a man of magnificent sense of propriety as well as magnificent common sense. Soon after the time of the breaking out of the war, when I was a boy, some planters' sons were over at our house, on the long pavilion on the west side, and got to discussing the question of secession, which was then rife. Some ladies were present. One of the gentlemen, the son of a neighboring planter, became excited during the discussion and said things which he ought not to have said; nothing that could not have been said in the presence of ladies, but something that was rude. My old grandfather had a way of never mentioning any man's name angrily, and when he did not like anybody he would simply move out of the crowd. When this man had left, without mentioning his name at all, my grandfather put his hand on my head and said, "John, my boy, remember all your life never to insult anyone except when the insult can be immediately resented." I remembered that, and I have always tried to act in accordance with it. I am sorry, not even angry, though it may appear strange to the gentleman from Florida, that I could not prevent him from self-inflicted hurt; that I could not save him from himself. He has had his way finally, through the yielding of the floor manager of the Republican party, who, of course, wanted to see this linen washed.

The gentleman has had his way. He has not helped me, he has not helped himself, he has not helped the Democratic party, he has not helped the country; he has done but one thing that I can see, and that was to give me the opportunity to explain how it was that I had nothing under the sun to do with the fact that the Hearst bill was not the bill reported by that committee. I did not attend the meeting of the committee in order to mold legislation. I attended to harmonize differences, and I finally thought that I had harmonized them. The gentleman says if I do not withdraw a charge of some sort that personal relations will cease. We had better be frank now. I have made but one charge. That especial language in the newspaper I did not literally use. I have made but one charge. I used this language, and I repeat it now, that I had to have harmony and united action upon that committee in order to keep that committee from appearing ridiculously divided where the party was nearly united to a man. I removed the two rather than the four, for these reasons, and I repeat it for the further reason that the two had defied the action of a Democratic caucus, and that the two had totally failed to agree with their four Democratic colleagues, and that later on in the summer the gentleman from Florida had taken pains to be interviewed in order to tell the country that he would still not agree with the four. I could not expect the four to agree with the two. I cared not, and I stated it again and again and again last Congress, and I state now to the members of that committee, the House, and the country that I did not care what bill they brought out, provided only that these four things were in the bill, and they were in the Davey bill:

First. Give to the Commission the power to prescribe a substitute rate.

Second. Put that rate into operation immediately, or after reasonable notice.

Third. Allow it to go in the regular course by appeal or review to the courts, and not to be set aside except when set aside in that way by a final decision, the courts acting as an appellate court and not hearing the facts de novo.

Fourth. Not to be suspended in the course of litigation ex-

cept where the Constitution gives judicial power to suspend, namely, where the decision is in the opinion of the court unconstitutional, as taking private property without due process of law—that is, confiscatory in its character, or where, in the opinion of the court, the decision of the Commission is unlawful. That is, that it transcended the power conferred upon the Commission by the Congress of the United States.

Now, I said then, I say now, if you put those four things in the bill, that is all I want. I said if you put those four things in the bill that will be satisfactory to me. I do not care whose bill it is. I had a bill pending before the committee, and I might as well get angry because they did not report the bill and call it the "Williams bill," but they did not.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The gentleman from Mississippi has stated the requirements which he wanted to put into the bill. I would like to ask him if there was anything in the bill reported by the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Missouri that in any manner conflicted with those things that he wanted in the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not at all; both bills contained it. Now, Mr. Chairman, one other word and I am done. I was of the opinion at that time that the keystone of the necessary legislation proper to regulate railways lay in those four propositions. I was of the opinion that with them all railroad abuses could be tolerably well handled, and that without them no conceivable legislation could do any good. I am glad to say that the President of the United States, in his message this year, takes that position almost in those words.

Now, the committee never contemplated going any further than that in that bill. They were going to leave for another bill the private car lines, the terminal abuses, the switch abuses, and the balance of it. After the bill was brought into the caucus, after it was introduced, it was understood there that we could add to it provisions upon those subjects—many Democrats wanted it done—and we did add to it provisions upon those subjects as far as the House would permit us. It was not understood, of course, that any man could go out and vote for a substitute for the bill adopted by the caucus, as these two gentlemen did. The gentleman says, and says truly, that he signed the report introducing the Davey bill. Aye, he did. But he also did an unprecedented thing by signing on the same day and putting into the box on the same day a report recommending another bill as a substitute for the bill which he had reported in favor of. He signed for both bills. So the Democratic side of the committee did not stand four to two exactly, but it stood four and a half to one and a half, as you might say. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I started out by saying that I doubted the wisdom of saying anything. I believe I doubt it more after I am through than I did when I started, and I will now close. I thank the House for its attention. [Applause.]

(Mr. WILLIAMS here inserted in the RECORD, as supplementary to his remarks, the letter to Mr. LAMAR, to which the latter referred and which the former promised to insert, and submits that the perusal of it, while it will show political criticism, shows no personal abuse and nothing personally insulting toward Mr. HEARST or anybody else:

YAZOO CITY, MISS., *October 12, 1905.*

Hon. WILLIAM B. LAMAR,
Tallahassee, Fla.

MY DEAR SIR: I inclose you a squib which was cut out of a Washington paper and sent to me by some one. I have marked the part of it which attracted my attention. Of course you know that the Hearst bill was pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and therefore pending before the Democratic Members of it about a year, maybe more; I do not remember now just how long. I can not therefore understand how, as a member of that committee, you say that the bill "did not have a fair showing." You are, of course, cognizant of the fact that neither you nor any other Democratic member of the committee, at any of the very many general conferences of the Democratic members of the committee with the leader of the minority, ever at any time suggested the consideration or report of the Hearst bill as the Democratic policy on that question. If the Hearst bill had been proposed and agreed upon by the Democratic members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it would have been pushed and advocated by me, notwithstanding my judgment was against it, as warmly as the bill which was agreed upon as an expression of our policy.

You will also remember that in all the conferences which we held upon the subject we proceeded upon the assumption that we were meeting the expression of Republican policy upon the single question of rate making with an expression of Democratic policy upon the same question. You and I are friends personally and politically, and I hope, therefore, you will excuse me for saying that I do not see how any good can come out of a Democrat being interviewed and charging his party with not having been "fair" toward any bill pending before a commitee, especially if he himself was a member of that committee, and still more especially if he himself never demanded of his Democratic colleagues or floor leader at any Democratic conference the consideration of the bill in question. I do not know whether *you* gave the Hearst bill what you consider a fair showing or not. You are the best judge of that. I know that *I* gave it what *I considered* a fair showing, and I regarded it as prolix and complex, containing too much new machinery to be a practical measure. I know that it aroused my suspicion that it was in some places too drastic, with the set purpose of procuring the defeat of proposed legislation by dividing the conservative and radical friends of reform. You and I have had sufficient legislative experience to know that there are two ways of defeating any legislation which is offered with a view of killing existing abuses. One way is frankly to oppose it. The other way is to overdo it, to try to make the proposed remedial legislation so drastic in some particulars as to secure the defeat of all legislation. In other words, by attempting to throw the hounds off of the scent by running ahead of them.

Right or wrong—and I may have been wrong, because I am wrong about as frequently as I am right—that was my view of the Hearst bill. I may not have been altogether unbiased in arriving at that conclusion, may have been somewhat prejudiced against the source of the bill, because the man who offered it had been deliberately and consciously unfair to me, but more than that because I have a habit of distrusting plutocrats when playing the rôle of Democrat.

HEARST, in his paper, said that the bill had not had a fair showing, and charged that I was the cause of it, and then proceeded, in his usual yellow-journal style, to "eat up and spew out" the gentleman from Mississippi. I never noticed him; but as the only man who has been charged publicly with having deprived the Hearst bill of a fair showing is your humble servant, I desire to say to you, whose opinion *is* worth consideration, that if, in your assertion that it did not have a fair showing, you mean that I did not give it what I considered a fair showing, you are absolutely mistaken and altogether unjust.

I have my personal likes and dislikes, as all men have. I am human, like other men, and when a millionaire with a lot of newspapers goes into the business of trying to break me down by false insinuations and unjust and unfair methods I do not love him—would probably hate him if I ever took the trouble to hate anybody for any length of time. But, notwithstanding all that, I am never led in my legislative capacity by my personal feelings toward men, and nothing is more notorious concerning public men in America than that fact.

If you will permit me, I will call your attention to another thing in your interview, not of a personal character at all, and a thing very natural and very excusable, because it is so prevalent—that is, a division of the Democratic party into two classes—conservative and radical. A true Democrat is neither a conservative nor a radical. He is both. He is conservative when it comes to conserving, or preserving or saving, right and Democratic and American things. He is radical when it comes to tearing up by the roots radical abuses. He is simply Democratic always, and meets each question upon its own merits from a Democratic standpoint and solves it with plain common sense. Common sense frequently suggests that a cause can best be carried to success by going slow. Common sense frequently also suggests that a battle can best be won by an impetuous charge. Everything depends upon the condition of the ground, the situation of the enemy, and your own forces.

There is no such thing in my dictionary as a conservative Democrat. There is no such thing in my dictionary as a radical Democrat. There is just one thing—a Democrat. Too many men who call themselves conservative Democrats are really at heart Republicans. Too many men who call themselves radical Democrats are really at heart Populists or Socialists, as the case may be—the two things being, by the way, by no means the same thing.

A party can not win ultimate success by having its differences emphasized. There are always differences, of course. The way to win ultimate success is to minimize differences, as far as possible without sacrifice of fundamental principle, and to emphasize agreed purposes.

If "the only bill that at all met the evils and provided a remedy was the Hearst bill," as you say, how can any member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee explain the fact that he never discovered it until within three or four days before all the proposed legislation was brought before the House for consideration. If you yourself had brought up the Hearst bill at any time in conference, had proposed to have it read and considered, you know that I, for one, would have agreed readily and would have entered upon its consideration. It seems to me that your interview, between the lines at any rate, did injustice to me. I am not in the habit of rushing into print. My habit is when I think injustice has been done me to write a frank and friendly letter to the man who, in my opinion, has done it, if I am on friendly terms with him, and to ask him to correct it.

Please give my regards to Mrs. Lamar, and believe me,

Very truly, yours,

JOHN S. WILLIAMS.)

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has promised to recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD]. The gentleman from Florida has had his time; he had an hour, and he used forty-five minutes and did not reserve the balance of his time.

Mr. LAMAR. That is what I intended to do, Mr. Chairman. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield to me a few minutes without prejudicing his rights——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for fifteen minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to submit to the gentleman from Florida that if we go on getting unanimous consent to answer one another all day, does he think it is helping himself or me or the Democratic party or anybody? If he does, I shall not object.

Mr. LAMAR. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will not be so ungracious as to object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will not object if the gentleman thinks it will help either him or me.

Mr. LAMAR. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that he may have fifteen minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAMAR. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Mississippi, the minority leader, has furnished to Republicans certainly more amusement than I have attempted to contribute to them. If the truth could fall out of the mouth of the minority leader as the false teeth fell out of the mouth of the corpse in the story which he told, he would have more to pride himself upon than he now possesses. The minority leader institutes a comparison between the great abilities of Justice L. Q. C. Lamar and my own. I never did an act on the floor of this House, I never have attempted to pose in any way that would draw me into disastrous contrast with Justice Lamar.

Mr. Chairman, I have said repeatedly that the weightiest limitation upon me in this House is the overshadowing fame of that distinguished man. Permit me to draw a comparison. Mississippi has had for three of her Senators, George, Walthall, and L. Q. C. Lamar. The minority leader aspires to that proud position, I believe. Should he win it and take his seat in the Senate Chamber and a Mississippian who had never seen him should come to this great temple of legislation to visit and see his Senator, I predict that he will find seated in that chair what the visitor finds in some of those great Indian temples, with their lofty pillars, with their magnificent arcades and far-reaching perspective. Hoping to find a form like an Olympian Jove, he will come face to face with the image of a shriveled ape. The minority leader would like to have quietude over here, and would like to be followed. Here is how he would like to be followed by the Democracy:

MINORITY LEADER. Do you see yonder cloud that's almost in shape of a camel?

Some Democratic MEMBER. By the mass, and 'tis like a camel indeed.

WILLIAMS. Methinks——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida must obey the rules of the House.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman, I lapsed again. I shall proceed.

The MINORITY LEADER. Methinks it is like a weasel.

Some DEMOCRAT (if he should be so blind). It is backed like a weasel.

The MINORITY LEADER. Or like a whale.

Some GENTLEMAN (who does not care to differ with his leader). Very like a whale.

Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of peace the gentleman from Mississippi wants on this side of the House—that which reigned at Warsaw. "He made a desert and called it peace." I decline to accept his definition of Democratic harmony here. I shall follow him as a leader as long as he holds that position, but I repudiate, with all the contempt that I have for him, the idea that he is fit to lead anybody anywhere. Now, I shall ask him—I say it on the floor of this House——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I very much dislike to call attention to a rule of the House, but as it is apt by its enforcement to prevent unpleasant things from happening on the floor I do call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LAMAR] is not permitted by the rules of the House to use insulting language on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is correct, and the Chair thanks him for calling the attention of the Chair to the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not want to have to protect myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The language the gentleman from Florida used was not distinctly heard at the Speaker's desk.

Mr. LAMAR. What language was it?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will please proceed in order and not indulge in personalities.

Mr. LAMAR. Now, Mr. Chairman, but one moment. Before anything can be binding upon any man it must be founded in right, it must be founded in good faith, in bona fides. Fraud vitiates everything. It goes to the root of a contract, and annuls it, and I do not hesitate to say, if the information I have received about the calling of that caucus was true, that while it was not a fraud in intent, it was a fraud in effect, upon the national democracy—a caucus called for wounded vanity. He is talking about my wounded vanity. Because his own party turned him down upon the Miles amendment, under his own hand he called a caucus for one purpose and used it for another. He talks about Saul! I wish to Heaven he would imitate some of his virtues.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat it, and it is for the minority leader to deny this allegation if it be not true, and I assert that it is true that that caucus was called by the minority leader to tender his resignation as party leader. I said I would protest against his resignation, that he ought not to do it, that it would make him puerile, and make us all ridiculous. Between the time of the calling of the caucus and the meeting of it he converted it into a caucus to consult upon railroad-rate legislation, a great national question, and precipitated the national Democracy into a premature discussion of a great Federal question.

Why, sir, the Republican platform for the past fifty years has not a line in it about railroad-rate legislation. The platform of the Democracy for eight years has demanded it. It is a great public question, and because the minority leader does not understand it, because he has not the slightest conception of that great and far-reaching question which affects his party and the public so greatly, is no reason why he should get up here and indulge in some cheap-john wit.

I say that the caucus was called to salve over his wounded vanity. If the call was for that purpose, it should have been carried out; if it was called to consider the railroad question, it should have been stated in the call, which was not done. I stated on the floor of this House at the last session that a Republican President had gone further than the Democratic caucus bill, and it was true. I said a Republican President had gone beyond his own party action in this House, and it was true. I said I was sorry to see the one and delighted to see the other.

The President in his message to this Congress reviews his recommendations of last year, and reminds us of the need of regulation of private car lines, and terminal fee evils, and demands legislation. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] differed from me in my views at that time, and thought I had misread and misquoted the President. I did not seek to retort upon him. The gentleman from Iowa himself was embarrassed at that time with an assassinous backhanded blow upon his character and reputation in his own State, in which he had my sympathy, so that I did not use the time he gave me to attempt to retort upon him with vulgar witticism, and when I rose to speak I had consideration for his great ability and place in this House, and contented myself with stating my own position. I knew that in his great heart he did not intend to do me an injustice. His irritation was not against me. It was the anger in his heart at the outrageous and cowardly attack made upon him in the dark seeking to bring him into ridicule and contempt before his constituents.

The gentleman from Mississippi said he has but little to pride himself upon. Mr. Chairman, I will not indulge here in a vulgar controversy with the gentleman. He is more than a match for me when it comes to throwing mud. I confess my inability to match him. The minority leader amuses himself with a Heidelberg joke when he should be leading his party like Blaine led his party, like Crisp led his party, even like Lamar led his party; and I think I can say, without being egotistical, I could beat him at that business now. [Applause.] I would never call a caucus to resign a party leadership and then disingenuously divert it to a purpose which was not contemplated in the call.

Mr. Chairman, there is something higher in this body than mere anecdotes; there is something higher in this body than mere jokes. I repeat it, that the Democratic caucus was called for a personal purpose and diverted to a great national purpose. And while it was not a fraud in intent, it was a fraud in effect upon the interests of the country. And that very caucus to-day is made the medium for challenging my fealty to it. I say it was not a caucus; I say it was a "gold brick;" not a Democratic gold brick, but a gold brick of the minority leader. I say that the next time he calls a caucus upon this question, let him call us together, and let us debate the bill, not a bill that is a mere vermiform appendix to a Republican measure, but let it be a bill in response to the great Democratic national heart that will go to the very root of this great evil. I will give precedence, in that case, to the minority leader, and I will follow. I will do that.

It is not pleasant to me to say all of this to a man whom I once respected.

Mr. Chairman, I have not insulted the gentleman. He began a correspondence with me that was highly offensive. He went to the newspapers with his statement that I defied the Democratic caucus at the last session upon railroad-rate legislation. I have made my reply to him here, in the proper forum, that it may go upon the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LAMAR] has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to correct the last statement made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LAMAR]. I never in any letter arraigned Mr. HEARST as a "millionaire demagogue."

Mr. LAMAR. I will show the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] the letter. If I can not find the letter I will take it back. I report it on my recollection now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And I did not use any other abuse.

Mr. LAMAR. If I can not find the letter I will make amends.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] is recognized.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, into this House at the last session I had the honor in part to report a bill which provided for the regulation of railroad rates and transportation facilities. I came here with a charge from my people to ignore all bosses, set aside all dictation and demand legislation which should, not by implication, not by construction, but by express terms regulate railroads, warehouses, terminal facilities, private car lines, and everything used in connection with the transportation of the products of the people. I came here with that commission from the people. What should I have done with it? Should I have gone to the Speaker and said: "Mr. Speaker, what do you wish me to do?"

Why, Mr. Chairman, I bore a commission from my people, who told me what to do. What was it? Sir, it was that I should seek not partial but complete legislation upon this important subject. It was that I should seek to have private cars regulated along with the other evils of which the people complained.

Mr. Chairman, I shall raise no question of veracity here between me and another Member as to what happened in a caucus. What is a caucus? It is a conference. Its determination could not come between me and my oath to my God. It did not then and, as God helps me, it never shall come between me and the voice of the people.

Who sent me here? Whose servant am I? That of the people of Mississippi? No, sir; I am the servant of the sovereign people of the Eighth district of Missouri. Their commands I shall obey at all times. The man who would set up a barrier between me and the desire of my people I would refer to the happy hunting ground where George Cox, the Cincinnati boss, has gone, and where other bosses must eventually go.

No man can say that I violated that caucus without uttering an unmitigated falsehood. The caucus simply declared that it indorsed the provisions of the Davey bill. The bill I reported contained every provision of the Davey bill and not one word in conflict with it.

I am condemned because I reported the Hearst bill. Who is Mr. HEARST? A tall, stalwart man, who sits over here, from one of the New York districts; a handsome man, who possesses youth and modesty of demeanor. I have very little acquaintance with him. I am told he has large fortune and I know he has ample ability, and I commend him that, unlike most sons of wealth, he is devoting the golden fortunes which have come to him and the splendid talents with which God has endowed him to enlightening and making better the world in which he lives.

The Hearst bill arrested my attention because it provided in express terms for the regulation of private cars and private car lines; the classification of freights; for the regulation of warehouses, terminals, and terminal facilities. I found it was the kind of a bill my people desired me to support. I found, also, that there was not a line, not a letter of it, that was in conflict with what was done at the caucus. I reported the bill. But suppose a midnight caucus had declared for one thing and my people demanded another. What should I have done? Back in Missouri that question needs no answer.

The Esch-Townsend bill contained no express provision for regulating private car lines, neither did the Davey bill. The President, who assumes to be leading the fight for rate regulation, approved the Esch-Townsend bill. But time has passed, and I find by referring to the message sent to this session of Congress that he has seen light. Last session the bill which did not regulate private car lines met his approval, but now public opinion has driven him around to the provisions of the Hearst bill on this subject. I quote his message:

> All private car lines, industrial roads, refrigerator charges, and the like should be expressly put under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mark the word "expressly."

The President has come around to the Hearst bill. I want to say for the edification of the gentleman from Mississippi that he has not appointed on the committee any man who will have the hardihood to report out a bill which shall omit these provisions in express terms. I challenge the gentleman to stand upon this floor now and say that he is not in favor of putting into the bill in express terms the regulation of private car lines. Yet if we are to believe what we read I am to be condemned for doing that thing. For doing that I am to have written across my brow by him who assumes to be leader the words: "Thou are weighed and found wanting" and sent back to my people to apologize to them for having offended greatness.

Mr. Chairman, we talk of leaders. God Almighty makes leaders. A Democratic caucus never undertook to make one, and whoever adorns his brow with a coronet and gets astride a stick horse and struts into this Chamber shouting, "I am leader!" does that which no Democratic caucus has ever yet commissioned anybody to do. I will tell you who is a leader. He is a man whose doctrines are so sound, whose declarations are so clear, and whose heart is so bold that all must follow him—not under the lash of a boss, but because their hearts and their consciences constrain them.

We all sit in this Chamber coordinate leaders, bound by nothing but the oath we take to our Maker and the voice of the people who sent us here. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the voice of the Eighth district of Missouri is not to be stifled by the voice of the Eighth district of Mississippi. As long as I am a Member of this House I shall boldly assert the dignity and the sovereignty of the district which I represent.

They say I have been transferred from a committee. Why? Because I insisted on putting into express terms provision for the regulation of private car lines.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time I have seen the gentleman lead. At the St. Louis convention I saw him "lead through a slaughterhouse into an open grave."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have gotten away from what I intended to say. There is the Hearst bill, which I reported into this House at the last session. It was not voted upon, but nearly every Democrat who spoke expressed regret that it was not. Why was it not voted upon? Did not these stalwart Democrats desire to honestly represent their constituents? The voice of a leader—a boss—kept them from it. Is that the way business is to be transacted here? Am I to cringe before the man who has no other authority than that which he falsely assumes and ask favors at his hands? A leader!

> Our captain was as brave a lad as e'er commission bore;
> All brightly shone his new tin sword, a paper cap he wore.

He comes to ride me down for what? Because I refused to be dictated to by a boss and insisted on carrying out the will of the people who sent me here.

The gentleman will continue to come here from the Eighth district of Mississippi. Some other than I may come from the Eighth district of Missouri. The gentleman may sit in the cloakroom and boast of his conquests while I plow corn on some hillside farm back in Missouri. But the waters that leap from the top of the Ozarks into the Osage in my district are not freer now than I shall be free all the days of my public life from the dictation of any boss. Defy? I did not defy any caucus. Everything the caucus recommended was in absolute accord with my views, in absolute accord with the views of my people and with the terms of the bill I reported. But if you should hold a midnight caucus and pass a gag rule, get the recognition of the Chair, yield time to whom you will, stifle the voice of every man of your party except him whom you choose to hear, and in one short hour bring out of that midnight meeting that of which there is no report, no record, nothing but the veracity of gentlemen to be relied upon to state what there occurred, put that between me and my duty to my constituents and I will defy it. I will defy every boss who puts his will above the will of the people whose agent I am.

Mr. Chairman, why is it that we do not have legislation here? Why, sir, we all know how it is done. We report a bill and the Committee on Rules sees to it that we do not get a vote on it. [Laughter.]

They say to you Republicans: "Don't be scared. We will fix it so your record will be all right. So you can go back to your constituents and say you would have voted for the Hearst bill if you had had an opportunity." And our leader helps it along on the principles of:

> Tickle me, Joey, oh, tickle me—do;
> You tickle me and I'll tickle you.

Why is it that not a Member of this House is recorded as voting for or against the regulation of private car lines? Because the bosses would not permit it.

Mr. Chairman, what is there in the aspect of this young man HEARST that so excites the alarm of some here? I will tell you. He has advocated some things that the people are for, and there be those interests in this country which employ other than direct methods to prevent that which the people desire. One way to stifle rate legislation is to deflect it. The easiest method of doing it is for some leader to come in and say: "Gentlemen, it can not all be done at once, we must take one step at a time. We will leave private car lines for another bill."

The President now says that "all private car lines should be expressly put under the supervision of the Interstate Com-

merce Commission. That is what was said last session in the bill which Mr. LAMAR and I reported. A vote was not allowed upon it then. Everybody is for it now. The people have been heard from. And we shall find that the gentleman from Mississippi will not be bold enough to go back to his people and say that he opposed regulating private cars in express terms. [Applause.] The gentleman from Mississippi says he always was in favor of regulating private cars, but I am from Missouri and must be shown. It is not enough to tell me about it.

Leader! I will tell you of a leader. I saw him walk into the convention at Chicago in 1896 with his credentials questioned. I saw him come into that convention later with that platform into which was written the thoughts on rate regulation of that wise sage of Texas, Judge Reagan. That convention put into his hands the banner of Democracy, on which was inscribed the demand for rate regulation. Theodore Roosevelt opposed him; the bosses opposed him; the McCalls and the McCurdys opposed him; the corporations opposed him. But the people as one man arose and followed him, and William Jennings Bryan would have been carried into the Presidency if boodle had not controlled instead of ballots. [Applause.] That, sir, is a leader. Not one who goes down at midnight into the dark recesses of a chamber where the curtains are pulled down and reporters ejected, and evolves something which can be reported only from the memory of men and undertakes to use that to coerce others, but one who abides in the hearts of the people and is followed because they believe in him and love him.

Oh, the little triumphs that come to men! I submit to the gentleman from Mississippi two qualities which a leader should not possess—vanity and vindictiveness. Those are qualities which should inhabit the breast of no man who would lead his fellows.

Mr. Chairman, I would not inflict injury upon the railroads. The greatest instrument of advancement and civilization of the American people is its system of railroads. He who with reckless hand shall lay any improper burden upon the railroads will be placing that burden upon the shoulders of the people. The railroads can not be improperly subjected to the payment of a farthing that is not a tribute levied on the people themselves. They can not be harrassed with sinister legislation without injury to the country. All we ask is that the people shall have fair play. As the President puts it, give all an equal opportunity. I commend the President for the utterance of that sentiment, and all honor to him for drawing his inspiration from the utterances of the greatest living Democrat. In his speech accepting his first nomination Mr. Bryan said:

> Our campaign has not for its object the reconstruction of society. We can not insure to the vicious the fruits of a virtuous life. We would not invade the home of the provident to supply the wants of the spendthrift. We do not propose to transfer the rewards of industry to the lap of indolence. Property is and will remain the stimulus to endeavor and the compensation for toil. We believe, as asserted in the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal; but that does not mean that all men are or can be equal in possessions, in ability, or in merit. It simply means that all shall stand equal before the law. I assert that property rights are safe in the hands of the common people.

That is a fair statement of the principles upon which the people would act in the regulation of railroad rates. They would not destroy, but they will control.

Mr. Chairman, when we look back at the contests waged by Mr. Bryan for regulation of railroads, we find much to encourage us. There are those now leading the fight for regulation who opposed him in 1896, 1900, and 1904. Aye, Mr. Chairman, even the strenuous Roosevelt fought us and our policies in all of those campaigns. We on this side sometimes become despondent because we are in the minority. Let us take courage and be of good cheer; we may not get the post-offices, but by the grace of God we will get rate regulation. We have fought the Republicans on that issue for twelve years—or rather they have fought us. They have seemed to win and we to lose, but it is not so. The very declarations of our platforms in 1896, 1900, and 1904 will in this year of our Lord be written into a bill which shall pass this House. We shall win and the people get that for which we fought. We hear much of the leadership of Mr. Roosevelt in the matter of rate regulation. Yes, Mr. Chairman, he leads, but as a stag leads the hounds or as a ship leads the storm. He leads in flight for safety from the indignation of the people, aroused to a sense of their wrongs by the bold leadership of Mr. Bryan and his fellows. Let us take courage from the example of that great apostle of Democracy, that uncrowned king anointed with the benedictions of every man who loves human liberty. It is not necessary that we should be in the majority to triumph. Man is responsible only for effort; with God rests the responsibility for results. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the only boss that I know on this side of the Chamber is a Democratic caucus and the membership on the Democratic side of a committee dealing with any particular question. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] may call them bosses if he chooses. I care not what he calls them. He may defy their voices if he chooses. I care nothing about that. For myself——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. For myself I have never found the time when I thought I was wiser than the collected body of my colleagues. I have never found the time when I thought I was wiser than the committeemen who served with me dealing with a proposition from a Democratic standpoint. I would not myself surrender my judgment or conviction to a caucus or to the members of a committee upon any matter of material importance, certainly not any matter of difference about a constitutional question; but when things are nearly equal I think it is a different thing, because a man knows that the Government of this country is carried on by parties and that there is no other practicable way to carry it on. In a certain sense my party, therefore, is my boss, and I am not ashamed of it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, Mr. Chairman, I will answer the gentleman's question, but I do not want to talk. I desire to finish at once.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Two questions in view of the last thing the gentleman said. The gentleman speaks of his party. Does he consider that the man who is named for Speaker must be my party?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I did not yield for puerile questions.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I will give the gentleman another. I will give him one that is not puerile.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The gentleman from Mississippi was in a caucus here on the night of the 3d day of December, 1905. I should like to know, if he thought the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LAMAR] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] had dealt in such a way as to be unworthy of the confidence of the caucus, as to demand a castigation for having defied the caucus, why did he not in fairness submit that to the caucus instead of assuming to determine it himself? Why didn't he let these gentlemen say whether I should be punished or whether I should not, when he had the opportunity?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not yield for a speech, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That is a question; why didn't you do that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can yield no more. The gentleman can call a caucus if he wants to.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. No; I can not. These men would not sign it, because they would get thrown off the committees if they did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I arose to say this, and this only: I have had enough of this and, so far as I am concerned, to close the incident I do not want to reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] at all. He has so far overshot the mark of the facts in connection with all this business he has been discussing that I leave it safely and forever, as far as I am concerned, in the memories of those who were at the caucus, in the memories of those who were on the floor, and in the RECORD as it stands.

Now, I desire to say a few words not concerning that. Let the dead past go. It is gone anyway.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. He can not hinder it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Look to the future. Now, we shall have this year, I hope, six Democrats who can agree about something on some committee of the House, and when they do agree, as they are going to agree, the old Democratic party is going to march on out of seeming dark disaster into the bright sunshine of victory. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have not felt in a great long time so much as I do now that there is going to be a Democratic House of Representatives. I feel it now. I may be mistaken, of course. I have been more often mistaken in my life than I have been right, as far as that is concerned, and I am not one of those who pretend to the contrary. Let us then face the future—that is gone. I have assumed the responsibility for it. I thought I acted wisely; I think so yet. I was not called upon to question the gentleman's motives in answer to his last question. I have not questioned them and I do not now. I merely wanted a team that could and would pull together. I am tired of teams that pull in every direction in the world except together, and the Democratic party is tired of them, too. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Our party is represented in all the "funny papers" as a donkey. The truth is that the country is tired of you Republicans over there on

that side of the Chamber and afraid of us on this side. [Great laughter and applause.] Just the sort of thing you have just listened to from the gentleman from Missouri this morning is what makes them afraid of us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there will come before this House from the Committee on Interstate Commerce either a Democratic substitute containing all the provisions that I referred to this morning dealing with private car abuses that the gentleman himself did not suggest be dealt with last year until after the last conference between the minority members of the committee had been held, or if he did I do not remember it, and if he did I will correct that in the RECORD or withdraw it now——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Better withdraw it now, because I will show you by documentary evidence you are wrong.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He says he did—my memory does not bear him out—but at any rate it was thought wiser on the whole to meet the Republican proposed proposition upon the single question of conferring upon the Interstate Commerce Commission a substitute rate-making power with a Democratic proposition upon that same question, and it was urged by members of the committee that the hearings had not been finished upon other questions, and they were not ready to legislate upon other questions. There never was in any man's mind at any time, and the gentleman from Missouri knows it, any opposition to dealing with terminal abuses, with switch abuses, or private car line abuses. The only question was one of expediency, as to whether they should be dealt with in that bill which was proposed as a substitute to the Republican bill dealing only with the one particular question, of power to substitute a rate. There was also a parliamentary question, too, as to whether the substitute was germane when it partook of other matters.

Now, the future is before us. We are going to have a bill from the minority members of that committee, as I trust and hope and know almost, or else the Republicans upon that committee are going to correct the Esch-Townsend bill and make it complete and perfect and satisfactory, and if they do it then the Democratic party can well afford to stand for that bill. We do not care whence legislation comes. We do not care who claims the credit of it. If you will confer the power that I mentioned upon the Interstate Commerce Commission of naming a substitute rate, to remain in operation without being affected by injunction, except in so far as the Constitution grants the right of injunction, and then add to that any language you please that is satisfactory and sufficiently drastic in regard to private car line abuses and other things, the Democratic party will vote for it. Ah, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman so solicitously referred to by the gentleman from Missouri, as riding his—broomstick horse, was it?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Well, some kind of a stick.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Broomstick horse is rather an unusual name to call the position that was given by himself, I believe, amongst others, and which I am not so awfully fond of as the gentleman might imagine. But the gentleman to whom the gentleman referred, the gentleman from the Eighth district of Mississippi—in other words, I—last year took the position that the thing that would be the keystone of the arch to correct legislation to cure railway abuses—to prevent them in the future as well as to lop them off now—was this power of naming a substitute rate. I then predicted that the railroads of this country would consent to any other sort of legislation that you wanted, no matter what; that all the balance of it was subordinate to that—fulminations in the air without that—that with that you could get everything, and without that you could get nothing satisfactory. Since that time the railroads have virtually said, man after man of them, before the committee in the Senate: "Do what you please about private cars, do what you please about terminal facilities, do what you please about switches, but for God's sake do not confiscate our property (as they put it) by giving to the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to name a substitute rate when the rate complained of has been declared off because of its unreasonableness or because of its unjustness." I think I am justified by events, and I am justified by the President himself, who takes that same view in his last message, and I am still more justified by the fact that all the gentlemen upon the committee on the minority side seemed to take that view up to the last meeting held.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the incident is closed as far as I am concerned. I am sorry it has occurred. I hope it has left no rankling wounds or sores behind. These things must leave some, but I hope that hereafter we will go on, and when we come to fight we can fight the common enemy from now on all the time. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RODENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire whether it would be in order at this stage to move that the committee devote the balance of to-day's session to a consideration of the public business?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that public business was being attended to.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state it?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Would it be in order for me at this time to ask permission to revise and correct my remarks?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman has a right to revise his remarks, but not the right to extend them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] will understand that in revising his remarks he has not the right to extend them.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CUSHMAN. At this time, and at the close of this fearful scene of Democratic carnage on this floor, I would like to inquire if it would not now be in order "as a further mark of respect to the memory of all of the late deceased, that this House do now adjourn?" [Prolonged laughter and applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, we can reserve the consideration of this resolution. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] informs me that there are several Members of the House that desire to debate the real question at issue—that is, a question with reference to these insurance measures—and he thinks we can hardly conclude it at the usual time to-night. I am willing that the committee should now rise, and will make that motion in a moment, with the understanding with the gentleman from Iowa that we will agree in the House, if the House will concur, that all general debate shall be continued for one hour. I shall ask that in the House. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, a moment before the gentleman makes that motion.

Mr. PAYNE. I withdraw that motion.

Mr. HEPBURN. I said a little while ago in conversation with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that I thought that would be sufficient time. But since then two or three gentlemen have spoken to me, saying they wanted to discuss this question, and I think an enlargement of the time ought to be thought of, at least. Suppose we make it two hours.

Mr. PAYNE. Can not we get along with an hour and a half?

Mr. HEPBURN. I think not. I think there are a number of gentlemen here that want to discuss the matter, and I think there is an importance in it.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HEPBURN. Suppose we let the matter go over until to-morrow?

Mr. PAYNE. I think we had better fix the time in the House when we get there. We can not do it now. I want to suggest to the committee that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] tells me that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] has offered him five minutes of time. If he has not, I will yield to him five minutes now.

Mr. HEPBURN. Very well. If I may be recognized in my own time, I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER].

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I do not seek the floor for the purpose of in any way disturbing the harmony that has just been reached on the other side of the House through the great travail we have witnessed.

I understand that we are in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and that the special business is that of referring the various subjects of the President's message to appropriate committees. Some person who has taken time enough and has been patient enough to go through the President's message and digest it carefully has discovered that it deals with fifty-five distinct subjects, aside from the general introduction on the subject of prosperity and the congratulations that are extended to the people of this country on that account. But there is nothing in that great message, which is so erudite in learning, on the subject we have just heard discussed and debated here under the hearing of this resolution for the last three hours—nothing on the subject of Democratic harmony in the House of Representatives of the United States.

And there is one other subject that is not treated on, but it is as near in line with the fifty-five—if the gentleman was right—different subjects as the one we have just been considering. I note that the Committee on Ways and Means have undertaken to so segregate the different subjects that they are referred to twenty-five different committees only. That shows

the great ability of that committee. But now to this other subject that is not mentioned in the message. I will ask the Clerk to read the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of both Houses concurring), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall become a part of said Constitution, namely:

ARTICLE XVI.

SECTION 1. Congress shall have no power to appropriate money for the payment of any claim against the United States, unless preferred by a State thereof, not created in pursuance of or previously authorized by law, international treaty, or award, except in payment of a final judgment rendered thereon by a court or tribunal having competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. A court of claims shall be established at the seat of government with original jurisdiction in cases involving claims for money against the United States and with such other jurisdiction as may be provided by law; and Congress may confer on any other court of the United States inferior to the Supreme Court original jurisdiction in such cases, and Congress shall provide by law rules and principles and a code of procedure to govern in such cases, also for appeals and error proceedings therein, and it may prescribe a statute of limitations for such claims.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to give notice that at the proper time I shall offer the following amendment, and I ask to have it read in my time for the information of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 11, page 4, insert:
"That so much as relates to the irrigation of arid lands shall be referred to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House resolution 42, and had come to no resolution thereon.

REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. HITT, Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HOWARD as Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, reference of the bill (H. R. 380) to authorize the sale of a portion of the Lower Brule Indian Reservation in South Dakota, and for other purposes, was changed from the Committee on Public Lands to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of House bill No. 13233, second session Fifty-eighth Congress, for the relief of John V. Mason, no adverse report having been made on the same.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DRESSER, indefinitely, on account of important business.

PRINTING FOR RIVER AND HARBOR COMMITTEE.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rivers and Harbors be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business during the Fifty-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Also a second and third resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, or such subcommittee as may be designated by it, shall have leave to sit during the sessions of the House for the Fifty-ninth Congress and during the recess.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

PRINTING ENGRAVINGS AND DRAWINGS.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Also the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the Fifty-ninth Congress the order of the House to print executive documents shall be held to authorize with such printing the engraving of drawings and maps, unless the Speaker shall, in the case of any document, otherwise direct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman if this is usual, or ought it not to go to the Committee on Printing?

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. I really can not give definite information. Leave has been given, so far as the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is concerned, and it was thought best to make the resolution general. Numerous documents coming here have drawings and maps and would be incomplete unless they were engraved. It rests with the Speaker, however, to decide whether the maps or drawings shall be engraved or not.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to hear the resolution reported again.

Mr. PAYNE. So would I.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. PAYNE. That is a pretty far-reaching resolution. I think it ought to go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. I would like to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Printing, if he is present, what has been the previous course in reference to this matter?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will state that in the Fifty-seventh Congress we put in a provision, which I was opposed to at the time, that no engraving should be printed unless contained in the order for printing. In the Fifty-eighth Congress these reports containing matter which should be engraved—pictures of various kinds—came in and it was found so burdensome to put upon the Speaker the investigation of all of the public documents which came in to see whether every picture or illustration should be printed, that by unanimous consent it was agreed that the engraving should be put in unless objection was made by the Speaker.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. That is what this resolution accomplishes.

Mr. PAYNE. It is subject to the approval of the Speaker.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. The presumption being that it should be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I still think it better to have a committee consider this resolution before it is passed. My suggestion is that it go to the Committee on Printing, as the delay will do no harm.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. I have no objection to the withdrawal of the resolution for the present.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I desire unanimous consent for a change of reference of the bill H. R. 373, entitled "A bill for the erection of a public building in the Borough of the Bronx, New York." By some error this bill has been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I ask unanimous consent that that reference be changed, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the reference of the bill will be changed as indicated by the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Hans Peter Guttormsen against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Jackson County, Mo., against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for the military service—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the

report of the International Bureau of the American Republics—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect of the Treasury submitting an estimate of appropriation for the post-office and court-house building at Chicago—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, recommending legislation in reference to the requirement that a statement of expenditures be included in his annual report—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Lovely Lass*, William Moore, master—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the governor of Alaska, papers relating to a claim of Bishop P. T. Rowe—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a detailed report of expenditures from the fund for contingent expenses—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Kingston Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Bennetts River at and above Gatesville, N. C.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports of allowances made by the accounting officers of the Treasury in favor of the States of New York and Pennsylvania for advances made in the war of 1812–1815—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Blackwater Creek, or River, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Caloosahatchee River, Florida—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Mermentau River, Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of receipts and expenditures by the treasurer of Porto Rico from November, 1904, to October, 1905—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the auditor of Porto Rico of receipts and expenditures from November, 1904, to October, 1905—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Susan E. Joyner, Mary E. Roberson, Martha F. Luster, and Jane F. Crump, sole heirs of estate of Josiah Anthony, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3061) to authorize the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Ouachita River and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 2); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CUSHMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 299) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 7003) establishing an additional recording district in Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 7004) to amend section 6, chapter 501, of an act approved April 12, 1902, entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 7005) making an appropriation of $250,000 for the purpose of improving the Arkansas River from the head of navigation, at Muscogee, Ind. T., to Fort Smith, Ark.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 7006) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the endowment of schools or departments of mines and mining in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," and for similar purposes, being a further supplement to said act—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 7007) for the opening of a street in Mount Pleasant, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7008) for the erection of a public building at Pittsburg, Kans.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 7009) to build a lodge at in Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 7010) to create a new division in the western judicial district of Missouri, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7011) providing for the order of trial in criminal cases in the circuit and district courts of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7012) providing for public administrators in Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 7013) to confer jurisdiction upon the circuit court of the United States for the ninth circuit to determine in equity the rights of American citizens under the award of the Bering Sea arbitration of Paris, and to render judgment thereon—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 7014) to provide American registers for the steamers *Marie* and *Success*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 7015) providing for a site for a public building at Wymore, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7016) providing for a site for a public building at Fairbury, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 7017) providing for the transfer of certain national parks from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 7018) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 7019) for the protection of animals, birds, and fish in the forest reserves, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 7020) to acquire land for a park approach to Connecticut Avenue Bridge over Rock Creek, District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 7021) to extend Fifth street SE. from Congress Heights to Washington Highlands, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 7022) for the improvement of the harbor at Branford, Conn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7023) for a survey of the harbor of New Haven, Conn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7024) for the enlargement of the post-office building at Trenton, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7025) in regard to a monumental column to

commemorate the battle of Princeton, and appropriating $30,000 therefor—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 7026) providing for the erection of a public building at Trenton, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 7027) to provide for the government of the Canal Zone, the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 7028) for the relief of the Postal Telegraph Cable Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 7029) to authorize the extension and enlargement of the post-office and court-house building in the city of Rome, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 7030) providing for the erection of a keeper's dwelling at the Tibbetts Point light station, New York—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 7031) to regulate the salaries of letter carriers in towns or cities of less than 75,000 population—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7032) to provide for a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bloomsburg, in the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7033) to provide for thiry days' annual leave to clerks and employees of first and second class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 7034) fixing the rate of pension for persons eligible under the act of June 27, 1890, and acts amendatory thereof, who require the frequent and periodical or regular and constant aid and attendance of another person—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7035) for universal transfers over the street railway lines in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 7036) for a public building at the city of Johnstown, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 7037) for the erection of a public building at New Ulm, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 7038) for the retirement of Government employees who were soldiers in the war of the rebellion of 1861 to 1865 and are now in the classified civil service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 7039) to authorize the extension of Prospect street NW.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 7040) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Utah—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7041) to permit the State of Utah to select lands in the abandoned Fort Crittenden Military Reservation in Utah—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 7042) to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 7043) to restore the sale of fermented malt beverages and light wines to soldiers on Army transports and in post exchanges under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of War—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7044) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the militia and for other purposes," approved January —, 1903—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7045) to authorize the President to confer brevet rank on certain officers of the United States Army for gallant services in the war with Spain and subsequent insurrection in the Philippines—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7046) to provide for a national military park commission—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7047) to amend the pension laws relating to widows of deceased colored soldiers or sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7048) changing names of Pierce place, Blake street, Swann street, and Cedar street or place, and Orgeon avenue to Samson street—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7049) to provide for the removal of snow, ice, grass, weeds, and other impediments from the sidewalks and gutters of the streets, avenues, and highways in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 7050) for an additional judge in the fourth judicial circuit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7051) for the erection of a public building in the city of Middlesboro, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 7052) for the establishment of a naval volunteer force of seamen and for the government of the same—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 7053) to prevent robbing the mail, to provide a safer and easier method of sending money by mail, and to increase the postal revenues—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 7054) to establish a fish-hatchery and biological station in the Thirteenth Congressional district of the State of Indiana—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7055) to extend and regulate the liability of certain classes of employers to make compensation for personal injuries suffered by employees in their service—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 7056) for a public building at the city of Fayetteville, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COCKRAN: A bill (H. R. 7057) to provide additional revenue for the Government and to encourage the agricultural and manufacturing industries of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 7058) for the erection of a national sanitarium for disabled volunteer soldiers at Eureka Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7059) to aid States in prohibiting the sale of cigarettes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FIELD: A bill (H. R. 7060) to provide for the erection of a public building at Corsicana, Tex.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 7061) for the improvement of White Oak River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7062) to appropriate $25,000 to inclose and beautify the grounds and repair the monument on the Moores Creek battlefield, North Carolina—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 7063) providing for an additional appropriation for the public building at Owosso, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 7064) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hudson, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 7065) to amend section 858 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7066) to place hides on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 7067) to prohibit the use of Indian trust funds for the purpose of educating Indian children in sectarian schools—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7068) authorizing any legal trust company duly authorized to transact business in the Indian Territory to become bondsman in all probate matters in said Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 7069) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Capt. James Butler and others for heroism during the Revolutionary war—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 7070) to suppress bribery at Federal elections, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. McCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 7071) for the erection of a public building in the city of Columbus, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7072) for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building in the city of Wayne, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7073) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of West Point, State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 7074) to provide for the construction of an addition or extension to the post-office and

court-house at La Crosse, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 7075) for the construction of an able seagoing tug for the Revenue-Cutter Service for New Bedford, Mass.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7076) for a lighthouse and fog signal on Rock of Ages, Lake Superior—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 7077) to facilitate the shipments and furnishing of cars by railway companies for the shipment of carloads of live stock from points in one State or Territory of the United States into or through any other State or Territory of the United States, and to provide for such through shipments at reasonable rates of freight—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7078) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims in certain cases—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 7079) to permit the industrial uses of alcohol and to enlarge the domestic market for farm products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 7080) for the establishment of a subport of entry at Buffalo, N. Y.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee (by request): A bill (H. R. 7081) recognizing the military service of and giving pensionable status under all pension laws of the United States to persons serving under United States officers as home guards, militia, or other provisional troops during the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 7082) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Van Buren, Ark.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 7083) to repeal section 5, chapter 1482, act of March 3, 1905—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 7084) giving powers to national banks in addition to the powers contained in section 5136 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7085) authorizing the Pea River Power Company to erect a dam in Coffee County, Ala.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 7086) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Shelbyville, in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7087) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fayetteville, in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7088) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Tullahoma, in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 7089) to provide a site and erect a public building at Dothan, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7090) to provide a site and erect a public building at Eufaula, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7091) to provide a site and erect a public building at Opelika, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 7092) for the erection of a public building at Chester, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7093) relating to the removal of civil cases from the State courts to United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7094) providing for the erection of a monument at Kings Mountain battle ground commemorative of General Campbell, Colonel Shelby, and others who participated in said battle on October 7, A. D. 1780—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7095) providing for the erection of a monument at Cowpens battle ground, Cherokee County, S. C., commemorative of Gen. Daniel Morgan and those who participated in the battle of Cowpens on the 17th day of January, 1781—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7096) for the erection of a public building at Gaffney, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 7097) to amend the Code of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7098) to amend the Code of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 7099) to amend section 2871 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7100) for the erection of a public building in the city of London, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7101) for the erection of a public building in the city of Somerset, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7102) authorizing construction of a road from Mill Springs National Cemetery, in Pulaski County, Ky., to Somerset, in said county—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 7103) for the improvement of the St. Croix River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7104) to establish a subtreasury of the United States at St. Paul, Minn.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7105) to increase the limit of cost for the public building at St. Paul, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7106) to increase the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7107) to provide for the free transportation of official mail matter of officers of the organized militia of the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7108) to authorize the establishment of fish-cultural and biological stations in the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7109) to provide for a port of delivery at Stillwater, Minn.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7110) to provide for the distribution of the Federal Cases in the United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7111) to provide for the distribution of the reports of the United States circuit courts of appeals and of the circuit and district courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 7112) to amend sections 2959, 2960, 2962, and 2975 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7113) to amend an act entitled "An act to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenues," approved June 10, 1890, as amended by the act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7114) to provide for the consolidation and reorganization of customs collection districts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7115) providing for the licensing of custom-house brokers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 7116) for the erection of a public building at Ruston, La.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7117) reducing the import duty on certain articles of prime necessity—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7118) providing for the erection of a public building at St. Charles, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7119) appropriating money for the protection of property in Lincoln County, Mo.—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7120) to further provide for the Presidential succession—to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7121) declaring a certain portion of the Maramec River to be an unnavigable stream—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7122) making an appropriation to improve the harbor of Hermann, on the Missouri River, in Gasconade County, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7123) reducing the duty on agricultural implements—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7124) for the improvement of the Missouri River at or near the mouth of Smiths Creek, near Bernheimer, Warren County, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7125) to place binding twine and all materials used in making or manufacturing the same upon the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 7126) for a survey of the Homochitto River, in the State of Mississippi, from and including its mouth to the Yazoo and Mississippi Valley Railroad—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BYRD: A bill (H. R. 7127) to increase the pensions of the surviving widows of the soldiers of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 7128) to authorize the governor of the State of Mississippi to select certain lands in part satisfaction of its grant for university purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7129) for improvement of the Homochitto River, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COCKS: A bill (H. R. 7130) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service and to encourage the saving of life from shipwreck"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRD: A bill (H. R. 7131) for the relief of the farmers and planters of the United States by discontinuing the tariff duty on certain articles and placing the same upon the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 7132) to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 7133) to provide for the purchase of an additional site for the enlargement of the Federal building at Duluth, in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 7134) granting the right of way, with terminal facilities, over the military and lighthouse reservations on Gasparilla Island, Florida, to the Florida West Shore Railway Company—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 7135) concerning a public building in Selma, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 7136) to increase the efficiency of the militia and promote rifle practice—to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 7137) for the extension of Seventeenth street NW. from Florida avenue to Columbia road—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7138) to provide for the erection of a public building at Connellsville, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 7139) legalizing the removal of the county seat of Washita County, Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 7140) to amend an act approved February 28, 1903, entitled "An act to provide for a union station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 7141) to place lumber, coal, and wood pulp on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD of Missouri: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 46) providing for the creation of a joint committee to investigate the combination of corporate interests controlling the bridges across the Mississippi River in the vicinity of the city of St. Louis, in restraint of free traffic and trade—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEIFER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 47) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A resolution (H. Res. 71) authorizing the chairman of Committee on the Census to appoint a clerk to said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 72) amending Rule X of the standing rules of the House—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONDELL: A resolution (H. Res. 73) calling upon the Secretary of the Interior for the report on the investigation of black sands—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A resolution (H. Res. 74) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Railways and Canals to appoint a janitor—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SULZER: A resolution (H. Res. 75) requesting the Secretary of State to furnish all papers to the House in connection with the fine and imprisonment of Marcus Braun by the Hungarian Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 76) requesting the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to send to the House all reports concerning Marcus Braun—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 77) requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to send to the House information concerning the depositing of money in national banks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A resolution (H. Res. 78) to appoint an assistant clerk to the Committee on Indian Affairs for the present Congress—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BROWN: A resolution (H. Res. 79) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining to appoint a janitor to said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A resolution (H. Res. 80) providing for the appointment of an additional clerk to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A resolution (H. Res. 81) directing the Secretary of the Interior to make an examination of the financial and fiscal affairs of the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations of Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES: A resolution (H. Res. 82) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings to appoint a clerk to said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A resolution (H. Res. 83) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress to appoint a clerk to said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A resolution (H. Res. 84) providing for the appointment of a clerk to the Committee on Private Land Claims—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A resolution (H. Res. 85) authorizing the chairmen of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Exopsitions and the Committee on Militia to appoint a janitor—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A resolution (H. Res. 86) urging the return of moneys collected under the cotton-tax act of 1866—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A resolution (H. Res. 87) for the relief of Sarah A. Hickling—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WEEKS: A resolution (H. Res. 90) directing the Committee on Naval Affairs to investigate the present condition of the United States ship *Constitution*—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Utah, asking Congress to enact such legislation as will better protect the people against adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the State of Utah, urging Congress to recognize the faithful services of Indian war veterans in service from 1850 to 1872, etc.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to an amendment of the National Constitution, enabling Congress to enact laws regulating the hours of labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to rates of transportation on railroads—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the transfer of the Life-Saving Service to the Navy Department—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the removal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the establishment of freer trade relations between the United States and Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNT: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Missouri, favoring the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the State of Missouri, relative to the improvement of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the State of Missouri, relative to the permanent improvement of the upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the removal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the transfer of the Life-Saving Service to the Navy Department—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to rates of transportation on railroads—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the establishment of freer trade relations between the United States and Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to an amendment of the National Constitution enabling Congress to enact laws regulating the hours of labor—to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 7142) granting an increase of pension to George Castor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7143) to correct the military record of Christopher P. Rhodes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7144) for the relief of Aaron Everly—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 7145) to compensate P. K. Leathers for services rendered the United States in the prosecution of William T. Head and others in the circuit court for the northern district of Georgia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 7146) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of George W. Bone—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 7147) granting an increase of pension to Bronson Rothrock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7148) granting a pension to Charles Rippin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7149) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Bernhard Romacker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7150) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles Schmiederer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 7151) granting an increase of pension to Frank Z. Curry—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 7152) granting a pension to Ellen Donning—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 7153) for the relief of David McClelland for loss sustained at Chickamauga Park, Georgia, January 29, 1904—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7154) for the relief of Theodore F. Northrop—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7155) granting an increase of pension to William J. Fleming—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7156) for the relief of William H. Sloan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7157) for the relief of William H. Hugo, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7158) for the relief of James H. Reeder—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7159) for the relief of Jeremiah Cracraft—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7160) for the relief of Joseph Segraves—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7161) for the relief of Lewis Tacket—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7162) granting a pension to Elizabeth Cordial—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7163) granting a pension to Marion McKenzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7164) granting a pension to Lyman Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7165) granting a pension to Jacob R. Compton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7166) granting a pension to Patterson Moore, alias Andrew Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7167) granting a pension to Christian Lederer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7168) granting a pension to David T. Curnette—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7169) granting an increase of pension to Thomas K. Proctor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7170) granting an increase of pension to Henry Southgate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7171) granting an increase of pension to James W. Jarrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7172) granting an increase of pension to Harry Chaffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7173) granting an increase of pension to James H. Reeder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7174) granting an increase of pension to Christian Bothman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7175) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Lock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7176) granting an increase of pension to Ferguson Logan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7177) granting an increase of pension to Diana G. Halley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7178) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson S. Keeton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7179) granting an increase of pension to James H. Milstead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7180) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7181) granting an increase of pension to John A. Curry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7182) granting an increase of pension to J. J. Perry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7183) granting an increase of pension to William N. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7184) granting an increase of pension to James F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7185) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7186) granting an increase of pension to Israel T. Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7187) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Jacobs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7188) granting an increase of pension to Maggie H. Campbell, widow of Henry G. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 7189) granting a pension to Mary Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7190) granting a pension to Frank Gillespie—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7191) granting an increase of pension to George W. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7192) granting a pension to Mary A. Johns—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7193) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 7194) granting an increase of pension to William Conway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7195) granting an increase of pension to Moses A. Kellum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 7196) granting an increase of pension to Henry Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7197) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7198) granting an increase of pension to James Langdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7199) for the relief of David H. Moffat—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 7200) granting a pension to Kate M. Dawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7201) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus B. Dopp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 7202) for the relief of Jacob J. Shakelford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7203) granting a pension to Jacob Owens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7204) granting a pension to Absalom L. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7205) granting a pension to Green G. F. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7206) granting a pension to Nannie Frazier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 7207) for the relief of Laura J. Dills—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7208) granting a pension to Thomas G. Massey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7209) granting a pension to Philip H. Louks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7210) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin J. Matleson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7211) granting a pension to James C. Southerland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7212) granting an increase of pension to Romanti Hipp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7213) granting an increase of pension to Loucette E. Glavis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7214) for the relief of J. D. Golden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7215) removing the charge of desertion against the name of Joseph R. Moyer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7216) applying the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890, to the men of the Mississippi River Ram Fleet and Marine Brigade, their widows, and minor children—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 7217) for the relief of the Redemeyer-Hollister Commission Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7218) granting an increase of pension to Laura Kohlhase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 7219) for the relief of Samuel S. Weaver—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 7220) for the relief of Lieut. Jerome E. Morse, United States Navy, retired—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 7221) granting an increase of pension to Marcus D. Tenney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7222) granting an increase of pension to Levi J. Walton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7223) granting an increase of pension to George Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7224) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7225) granting an increase of pension to Mary O. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 7226) for the relief of Patrick Conlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7227) for the relief of John F. M. Todd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7228) for the relief of Benjamin Day—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7229) granting an increase of pension to Slater D. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 7230) granting a pension to John M. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7231) granting a pension to Samuel O'Toole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7232) granting a pension to Alba B. Bean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7233) granting an increase of pension to John H. McCain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7234) granting a pension to Ulysses G. Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7235) granting a pension to Abel W. Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7236) granting a pension to Richard Larrance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7237) granting a pension to Philip Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7238) granting a pension to William J. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7239) granting a pension to Horatio M. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7240) granting a pension to Glawvina A. Pinnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7241) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Allhands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7242) granting an increase of pension to Marcus Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7243) granting an increase of pension to Moses B. Page—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7244) granting an increase of pension to Christopher S. Guthrie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 7245) granting a pension to Thomas Alsop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7246) granting a pension to John H. Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7247) granting a pension to Lorenzo Sink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7248) granting a pension to Thomas Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7249) granting a pension to John S. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7250) granting a pension to Solomon C. Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7251) granting a pension to James J. Kirkland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7252) granting a pension to Maximilla Hazel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7253) granting a pension to Emily Cambron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7254) granting a pension to Isom Gwinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7255) granting a pension to Christopher Horn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7256) for the relief of Mary A. Coulson, executrix of Sewell Coulson, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 7257) granting a pension to Margaret Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7258) granting a pension to Philene Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7259) placing upon a pensionable status Fagg's Fifth Regiment of Pike County (Mo.) Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7260) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Ziegler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7261) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William E. Talbert—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7262) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7263) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Timothy O'Leary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7264) removing the charge of desertion from the name of David L. Draper, alias David D. Draper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7265) for the relief of Ralls Lodge, No. 33, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7266) for the relief of Elenor W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7267) for the relief of F. H. Hunicke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7268) for the relief of Mrs. Fannie Donnelly—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7269) for the relief of the heirs of the late William H. Finch—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7270) for the relief of Mrs. Catharine Bedell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7271) for the relief of the trustees of the Regular Baptist Church, at Mexico, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7272) for the relief of John Harper, Alexander Hammontree, and others, trustees of the Methodist Church at Warrenton, Mo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7273) for the relief of the heirs of William H. Finch—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7274) for the relief of Benjamin F. Massie—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7275) for the relief of C. L. Reid, Shap. G. Wright, and others, trustees of the Methodist Church at Warrenton, Mo.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7276) for the relief of the heirs of the late Joseph M. Carrico—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7277) for the relief of the heirs of William S. Bryant—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7278) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Mexico, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7279) for the relief of the heirs of Margaret P. Botts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7280) for the relief of James Rhodus—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7281) for the relief of David Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7282) for the relief of George Turner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7283) for the relief of John Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7284) for the relief of William Faller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7285) for the relief of Willis Arnaud—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7286) for the relief of John H. Frick—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7287) for the relief of Howard Munker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7288) for the relief of Annie T. Jones, widow of Jonathan L. Jones, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7289) for the relief of George W. Payne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7290) for the relief of the heirs of Capt. Henry L. Heckmann—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7291) for the relief of the estate of the late B. F. Richardson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7292) granting a pension to George W. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7293) granting a pension to John W. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7294) granting a pension to Alice Harrison—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7295) granting a pension to Lewis K. Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7296) granting a pension to Ignatz Bohnert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7297) granting a pension to Cicero Cluster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7298) granting a pension to James R. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7299) granting a pension to John A. Blackwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7300) granting a pension to John D. Reeds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7301) granting a pension to James Griffith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7302) granting a pension to James G. Head—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7303) granting a pension to James W. Conaway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7304) granting a pension to Orison Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7305) granting a pension to Martha A. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7306) granting a pension to Jeremiah Romans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7307) granting a pension to William Toedtmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7308) granting a pension to Prudence E. Wyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7309) granting a pension to Maj. Louis Dieckgraefe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7310) granting a pension to George N. Warfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7311) granting a pension to William H. Boulden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7312) granting a pension to William H. Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7313) granting a pension to James W. McCune—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7314) granting a pension to David Copenhaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7315) granting a pension to Charles B. Stough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7316) granting a pension to John Rohy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7317) granting a pension to James T. Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7318) granting a pension to Josephine B. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7319) granting a pension to Frank M. Hassler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7320) granting a pension to Conrad Klinge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7321) granting a pension to Emma A. Baxter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7322) granting a pension to Peter Berg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7323) granting a pension to William Dillon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7324) granting a pension to Joseph Turnbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7325) granting a pension to Edward W. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7326) granting a pension to James A. Terry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7327) granting a pension to Green H. Honeycutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7328) granting a pension to William Callaway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7329) granting a pension to Charles B. Stough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7330) granting a pension to James J. W. Clifton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7331) granting a pension to Henry Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7332) granting a pension to Spotwell E. Page—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7333) granting a pension to John W. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7334) granting a pension to Lizzie Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7335) granting a pension to Marion Skinner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7336) granting a pension to Cordelia S. Rodgers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7337) granting a pension to Milligan Ewing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7338) granting a pension to Amos Strauser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7339) granting a pension to Jeremiah Milroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7340) granting a pension to William W. Batterton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7341) granting a pension to Mary F. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7342) granting a pension to Mary Followill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7343) granting a pension to William Dixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7344) granting a pension to John T. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7345) granting a pension to Benjamin Haggard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7346) granting a pension to Louvina Mays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7347) granting a pension to John J. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7348) granting a pension to Samuel Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7349) granting a pension to John McCann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7350) granting a pension to Friedrich Schmied—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7351) granting a pension to Lydia Lollar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7352) granting a pension to Samuel S. Grimmett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7353) granting a pension to Silas A. Elkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7354) granting a pension to Jeptha Newman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7355) granting a pension to Mrs. S. M. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7356) granting a pension to John H. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7357) granting a pension to George H. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7358) granting a pension to Martha Caroline Hammack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7359) granting a pension to John B. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7360) granting a pension to Noah Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7361) granting a pension to Thomas A. Burks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7362) granting a pension to Cyrus Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7363) granting a pension to Elizabeth Seifert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7364) granting a pension to Susan L. Brimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7365) granting a pension to Absolom Howell Eggers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7366) granting a pension to Sophia A. Pollman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7367) granting a pension to Eliza Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7368) granting an increase of pension to Uriah H. Owings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7369) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7370) granting an increase of pension to Albertus Leovisin Paine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7371) granting an increase of pension to Garland Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7372) granting an increase of pension to James M. Cartmill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7373) granting an increase of pension to Archibald F. Bottoms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7374) granting an increase of pension to E. C. Aydelotte—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7375) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7376) granting an increase of pension to Peter M. McNelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7377) granting an increase of pension to George W. Simon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7378) granting an increase of pension to John L. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7379) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Glanden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7380) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Randolph—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7381) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hughlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7382) granting an increase of pension to Patrick McGarry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7383) granting an increase of pension to John M. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7384) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Blankenship—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7385) granting an increase of pension to William H. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7386) granting an increase of pension to George W. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7387) granting an increase of pension to James Leavy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7388) granting an increase of pension to Simon U. Branstetter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7389) granting an increase of pension to Christian P. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7390) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan W. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7391) granting an increase of pension to John M. C. Rentfro—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7392) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7393) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand David—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7394) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Hughlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7395) granting an increase of pension to James H. Rector—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7396) granting an increase of pension to John E. Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7397) granting an increase of pension to Ann Eliza Bradbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7398) granting an increase of pension to John Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7399) granting an increase of pension to George Whitehead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7400) granting an increase of pension to John Snay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7401) granting an increase of pension to William C. Shattuck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7402) granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Todd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7403) granting an increase of pension to John Alcorn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7404) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Gruenewald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7405) granting an increase of pension to George Ogden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7406) granting an increase of pension to Henry Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7407) granting an increase of pension to August Femmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7408) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7409) granting a pension to Ross R. Sanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7410) granting a pension to Elias Knupp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7411) granting an increase of pension to Tobias Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7412) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah L. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7413) granting an increase of pension to Bazel Lemley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7414) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7415) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brawner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7416) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Boger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7417) granting an increase of pension to Gibson Helms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7418) granting an increase of pension to Fritz Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7419) granting an increase of pension to James Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7420) granting an increase of pension to Michael Wren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 7421) granting an increase of pension to Caroline McGimsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 7422) granting an increase of pension to Elijah R. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7423) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Dailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7424) granting an increase of pension to George W. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7425) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Funk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7426) granting an increase of pension to William C. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7427) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Hoeffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7428) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7429) granting a pension to George W. Castor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7430) granting a pension to Eliza B. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7431) granting a pension to Emma Kessler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7432) granting a pension to Emily A. Cavender—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7433) granting a pension to Alfred Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7434) granting a pension to Georgia Tyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7435) granting a pension to John Hammond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7436) granting a pension to Prudence Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7437) granting a pension to Annie Coton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7438) granting a pension to Jacob Beckner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7439) granting a pension to Eliza J. Petty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7440) to remove charge of desertion against Harvey A. Hart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7441) to remove charge of desertion against Joseph McFarland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7442) to remove the charge of desertion against Nathen Mendenhall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 7443) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Ratchford—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7444) for the relief of William Hayes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7445) for the relief of John W. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7446) for the relief of J. W. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7447) for the relief of Catherine Greelish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7448) for the relief of Shadrick Sechrest—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7449) for the relief of Theophilus Fisk Mills—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7450) for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Ratchford—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7451) for the relief of W. L. Offutt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7452) granting a pension to Isaac C. Hogue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7453) granting a pension to Ashbell G. F. Janes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7454) granting a pension to Emily C. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7455) granting a pension to A. H. Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7456) granting a pension to George Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7457) granting a pension to Hannah Vandenburg—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7458) granting a pension to Mary A. Wampler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7459) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hathaway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7460) granting a pension to Charles W. Helvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7461) granting a pension to J. S. Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7462) granting a pension to Eliza P. Targert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7463) granting a pension to Edward Pape—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7464) granting a pension to John S. Mansfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7465) granting a pension to Martha A. Hand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7466) granting a pension to Elizabeth Crockett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7467) granting a pension to Catharine Shipley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7468) granting an increase of pension to John W. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7469) granting an increase of pension to Byron E. Sheffield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7470) granting an increase of pension to George W. Sheldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7471) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. Deneller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7472) granting an increase of pension to J. M. Whitehead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7473) granting an increase of pension to Jo Utt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7474) granting an increase of pension to James Burgess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7475) granting an increase of pension to Austin G. Jacobs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7476) granting an increase of pension to George C. Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7477) granting an increase of pension to Julius Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7478) granting an increase of pension to George W. Jackson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7479) granting an increase of pension to Wesley J. Ralston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7480) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. S. K. Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7481) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius E. Ostrander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7482) granting an increase of pension to George H. Morus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7483) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence V. Whitcraft—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7484) granting an increase of pension to Henry Mott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7485) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Linton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7486) granting an increase of pension to Parson W. Clifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7487) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7488) granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. Hatton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7489) granting an increase of pension to B. B. Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7490) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus W. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7491) to authorize the proper accounting officers of the Treasury Department to examine and audit, according to equity, the claim of Grubb & Robinson, a firm consisting of Alfred B. Grubb and William H. Robinson, and of Alfred B. Grubb, for building material sold and delivered to members of the Prairie Band of Pottawatomie Indians in Kansas—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7492) to authorize the accounting officers of the Treasury Department to readjust the accounts of transportation companies for transportation of troops, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 7493) granting an increase of pension to Paul Groff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7494) granting an increase of pension to Elijah L. Wade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 7495) granting a pension to Susie M. Gerth—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7496) granting a pension to Amelia Koinke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7497) granting a pension to Ellen Carpenter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7498) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hanson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7499) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence Miracle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7500) granting an increase of pension to John McCandless—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7501) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hercher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7502) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Lannen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7503) granting an increase of pension to Richard G. Cotton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7504) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Whitcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7505) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wilkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7506) granting an increase of pension to Edwin V. Graves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7507) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7508) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7509) granting an increase of pension to John N. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7510) to correct the military record of Claus Maxfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7511) to correct the military record of Clyde C. Fisher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7512) to correct the military record of Daniel Edminister, jr.—to the Commtitee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 7513) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Ogle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7514) for the relief of Frank Keller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 7515) granting an increase of pension to Firman F. Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7516) granting an increase of pension to Robert Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7517) granting an increase of pension to Peter B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7518) granting an increase of pension to George Richter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7519) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7520) granting an increase of pension to Theodore R. Stearns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7521) granting an increase of pension to George A. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7522) granting an increase of pension to Phillip Meyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7523) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. McCord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7524) granting an increase of pension to William Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7525) granting an increase of pension to William K. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7526) for the relief of Michael A. Dace—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7527) for the relief of Willard W. Howe, of Aurora, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7528) granting a pension to Martha J. Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7529) for the relief of A. W. Abbott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7530) granting a pension to James H. Sale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7531) granting an increase of pension to Nelson G. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7532) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7533) granting an increase of pension to William H. Buchanan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7534) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Korn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7535) granting an increase of pension to John S. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7536) granting an increase of pension to William Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7537) granting an increase of pension to Israel Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7538) granting an increase of pension to Thompson H. Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7539) granting an increase of pension to David H. Hair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7540) granting an increase of pension to William F. Griffith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7541) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7542) granting an increase of pension to Omer E. Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7543) granting an increase of pension to Prior M. Pavy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7544) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus E. F. Raschig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7545) granting an increase of pension to Lee De Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7546) granting a pension to Edna Buchanan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7547) granting an increase of pension to George W. Allison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 7548) for the relief of Mary V. Shaw—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7549) for the relief of J. M. Bloom—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7550) granting a pension to Samuel Dolby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7551) granting a pension to Daniel Robb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7552) granting a pension to George A. Crooker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7553) granting a pension to Susannah Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7554) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Cramer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7555) granting an increase of pension to John S. Roseberry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7556) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo English—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7557) granting an increase of pension to John W. Detwiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7558) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7559) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Pentz, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7560) granting an increase of pension to George Ulrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 7561) for the relief of Samuel E. St. Onge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7562) for the relief of Adelaide E. Grant and Alice Adelaide Grant—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7563) granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Sheldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7564) granting an increase of pension to Stephen N. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7565) granting an increase of pension to Orville Dickinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7566) granting an increase of pension to Ezra B. Spoor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7567) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7568) granting a pension to Eunice M. Stickle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7569) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan E. Havens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7570) to remove the charge of desertion against Nathaniel Howey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7571) granting an increase of pension to Robert Cannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7572) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert F. Capron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 7573) granting a pension to certain battalions of Kentucky State Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7574) granting an increase of pension to Jonas F. Fortney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7575) granting an increase of pension to Governor H. Hood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7576) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brummett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7577) granting an increase of pension to James K. P. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7578) granting an increase of pension to Levi Hoskins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7579) granting an increase of pension to Russel M. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7580) granting an increase of pension to James W. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7581) granting an increase of pension to Emile Cloe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7582) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah T. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7583) granting an increase of pension to Milton H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7584) granting an increase of pension to James H. Kemp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7585) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Girdler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 7586) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7587) granting an increase of pension to William J. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7588) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Dowling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7589) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7590) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Nolan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7591) granting an increase of pension to Electa E. Brooks—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7592) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry G. McDougall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7593) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Moore, alias George W. More—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 7594) granting an increase of pension to Ezra M. Northup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7595) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7596) to remove the charge of desertion against David T. Hayton, Company F, Fourteenth United States Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7597) granting an increase of pension to Horatio Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELD: A bill (H. R. 7598) granting an increase of pension to George Stip—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7599) granting an increase of pension to William Holland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7600) granting an increase of pension to John Welch—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 7601) granting a pension to Henry Langley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7602) for the relief of the estate of John G. Brice—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7603) for the relief of Edward P. M. Robinson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7604) for the relief of Howell H. Shute—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7605) for the relief of David H. Cork—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7606) for the relief of St. John's Episcopal Church, at Winnsboro, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 7607) granting an in-

crease of pension to Anna M. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7608) granting an increase of pension to John Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7609) granting an increase of pension to Charles Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7610) granting a pension to Emma M. Rea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7611) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Roswell W. Gould—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7612) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Richard Heys Taylor, alias Richard Heys—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7613) granting a pension to Anna F. Huber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 7614) for the relief of the estate of Peter Sheets, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 7615) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Tate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7616) granting a pension to Lee Allen—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7617) for the relief of A. M. Webb—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 7618) granting a pension to Seymour A. Judd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7619) granting a pension to Albert J. Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 7620) granting an increase of pension to Mary Virginia Taylor—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7621) granting an increase of pension to Samantha Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7622) granting an increase of pension to Herman Lieb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7623) granting an increase of pension to James J. Furlong—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7624) for the relief of Adolph Gichan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7625) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Prosser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7626) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. McKee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7627) granting an increase of pension to Peter Truckey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7628) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Stoker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7629) granting an increase of pension to William G. F. Schneider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 7630) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Higley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7631) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7632) granting a pension to Ella T. Hapeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7633) granting a pension to Martha A. Remington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7634) granting an increase of pension to Martha G. Matlack—to the Committeee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7635) granting a pension to Delia Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 7636) granting a pension to John J. Meeler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7637) for the relief of Floyd L. Frisbie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By. Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 7638) for the relief of Mathew Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7639) for the relief of Dilly Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7640) for the relief of the estate of Wiley B. Brigance, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7641) for the relief of James N. Richards—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7642) for the relief of Peter Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7643) for the relief of H. H. Belew—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7644) for the relief of the estate of C. H. Medlin, deceased, late of Crockett County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7645) for the relief of the estate of John Williams, deceased—to tne Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 7646) for the relief of the estate of Johnson Miller, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A bill (H. R. 7647) for the relief of the Black Brigade—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7648) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Pavy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7649) granting an increase of pension to William Leipnitz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7650) granting a pension to Laura B. Carson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 7651) removing the charge of desertion against the name of E. J. Kolb, alias Edward Kolb—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 7652) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Timms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 7653) granting an increase of pension to Henry McMahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7654) granting a pension to Sarah Duncan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7655) to pension the National Guards of East Tennessee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7656) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Main—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7657) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Malone—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7658) to remove the charge of desertion standing against J. Gilbert Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7659) granting a pension to Elihu Wilburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7660) to remove the charge of desertion against Sampson Carroll—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7661) for the relief of Calvin L. Childress—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 7662) granting an increase of pension to Barney Schultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 7663) granting an increase of pension to Ira N. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 7664) for the relief of Mrs. J. I. Cotney, widow of J. I. Cotney, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 7665) granting an increase of pension to Wesley J. Banks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7666) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Mahaffey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7667) granting an increase of pension to Mabrey B. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 7668) for the relief of the estate of James F. Phillips, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7669) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Lewis M. Maury, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7670) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Benjamin Lillard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7671) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Benjamin Lillard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7672) granting an increase of pension to Barzillar P. Irons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 7673) granting an increase of pension to Homer A. Barrows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7674) providing for reopening and adjustment of the accounts of Joseph A. Mower, deceased, late major-general of the United States Army, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 7675) for the relief of Samuel B. Horne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7676) authorizing the appointment of Allen V. Reed, now a captain on the retired list of the Navy, as a rear-admiral on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 7677) granting an increase of pension to Robert Marvel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7678) granting an increase of pension to John J. Stower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 7679) for the relief of J. B. Orbison—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 7680) granting an increase of pension to William Shannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7681) granting an increase of pension to James M. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7682) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Beare—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7683) granting an increase of pension to James Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7684) for the relief of Louis F. Brooks—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7685) for the relief of Kaenhappauch Thomas—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7686) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 7687) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hammond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7688) granting an increase of pension to William Hosea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7689) granting an increase of pension to John B. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7690) granting an increase of pension to August Hossenlopp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7691) granting a pension to Harriet E. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7692) for the relief of Charles W. Howard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7693) to correct the military record of Charles E. Fromman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7694) to correct the military record of Anthony W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7695) to correct the military record of James H. Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 7696) for the relief of Pope & Talbot, of San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 7697) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Mary D. Hoag, late of Poughkeepsie, Dutchess County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7698) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Oscar H. Speedling, late of Coldspring, Putnam County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7699) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Kate W. Doty, late of Poughkeepsie, Dutchess County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7700) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of James Roosevelt, late of Hydepark, Dutchess County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7701) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of James H. Brinkerhoff, late of Poughkeepsie, Dutchess County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7702) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Edward D. Ferris, late of Milan, Dutchess County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7703) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of James Stead, late of Catskill, Greene County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7704) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Ury Hicks, late of Pine Plains, Dutchess County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7705) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of William B. Lent, late of Poughkeepsie, Dutchess County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7706) granting an increase of pension to Berthold Fernow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7707) granting an increase of pension to George R. Thayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7708) granting an increase of pension to Alice S. Shepard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7709) for the relief of Joseph Crow—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7710) granting an increase of pension to Ransom B. Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7711) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Dunnan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7712) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7713) granting an increase of pension to John J. Woolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7714) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Todd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7715) granting an increase of pension to Rufus Betz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7716) granting an increase of pension to Hugh H. Poe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7717) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah J. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7718) granting an increase of pension to Jacob D. Peterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to George Fetterman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7720) granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Sexton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7721) granting an increase of pension to Daniel V. Lowrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7722) granting an increase of pension to Willis M. Hatch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7723) granting an increase of pension to George M. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7724) granting an increase of pension to John C. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7725) granting an increase of pension to T. W. Quine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7726) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Wickersham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7727) granting an increase of pension to Gideon Stanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7728) granting an increase of pension to William H. Owen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7729) granting a pension to William Cannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7730) granting a pension to Thomas Plunkett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7731) granting a pension to Charles Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7732) granting a pension to Henry Law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 7733) granting an increase of pension to Esther Krier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7734) granting an increase of pension to S. H. Osborne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 7735) granting an increase of pension to James Hartzel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7736) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Roth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7737) granting a pension to William H. Winters—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7738) granting an increase of pension to Franklin J. Keck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 7739) granting a pension to Carlotta E. Hooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7740) granting certain lands in Solano County, Cal., to the city of Vallejo for waterworks purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7741) waiving the age limit for admission to the Pay Corps of the United States Navy in the case of Pay Clerk Walter Delafield Bollard, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 7742) for the relief of J. G. White, of Dade County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7743) for the relief of the estate of Noah King, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7744) for the relief of the estate of J. W. W. Marshal, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEGARE: A bill (H. R. 7745) granting an increase of pension to Wheeler Lindenbower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 7746) for the relief of Columbia Hospital and Dr. A. E. Boozer—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7747) to correct the military record of James O'C. Cassidy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7748) for the relief of St. Stephen's Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 7749) granting a pension to Hezekiah Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 7750) granting an increase of pension to Anton Riedmuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7751) granting a pension to Albert Pearsall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 7752) granting an increase of pension to Jerome B. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 7753) for the relief of the estate of Eliza A. Fielder, deceased, and Benjamin L. Fielder—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 7754) granting an increase of pension to John L. St. Clair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7755) granting an increase of pension to Adam Wenzel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7756) to provide that the consent of the United States of America be given to the taxation for State, county, or municipal purposes, of the property constituting the former site of the United States mint, situated at the northwest corner of Juniper and Chestnut streets, in the city of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 7757) granting a pension to Thomas Corey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7758) granting an increase of pension to John L. Whitman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7759) granting an increase of pension to John Gemmill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7760) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7761) granting to the Colored Agricultural and Normal University of Oklahoma certain lands for the purposes of an experiment station and the teaching of agriculture to the negro race of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7762) granting a site for a public library building in the city of Perry, Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7763) granting a pension to J. Stebbins King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7764) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Dewald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7765) granting an increase of pension to George Gaylord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7766) granting a pension to Hannah Plummer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7767) to correct the military record of Wade H. Newman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7768) granting an increase of pension to William R. Rennels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 7769) granting an increase of pension to William B. Geoghegan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7770) granting an increase of pension to Burgess Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7771) for the relief of Judd O. Hartzell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 7772) for the relief of Milton S. Shirk—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7773) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Sarah A. Gayle, deceased, late of Amite County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7774) for the relief of James M. Newman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7775) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Sarah M. Dunbar, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7776) for the relief of Copiah County, Miss.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7777) for the relief of the estate of John Fleming, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7778) for the relief of Patrick J. Finley, of Adams County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7779) for the relief of the Protestant Orphan Asylum at Natchez, in the State of Mississippi—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7780) for the relief of the estates of Robert Bradley, deceased, and Mary C. Bradley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7781) for the relief of Mrs. M. J. Baynard, of Natchez, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7782) for the relief of the heirs of James W. Felder, of Amite County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7783) for the relief of the estate of Lemuel R. Hanks, deceased, late of Amite County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7784) for the relief of Mrs. M. L. Holt, Mrs. Jane E. Cannon, and Mrs. I. B. Shipp—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7785) for the relief of the estate of John T. Rawlings, deceased, late of Adams County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7786) for the relief of the estate of John O'Ferrall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7787) for the relief of the estate of John Rist, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7788) for the relief of Burks Fitzgerald—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7789) for the relief of Patrick Foley, of Adams County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7790) for the relief of Eliza L. Rivers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7791) for the relief of Mrs. Louisa M. Bennett, Miss Kate P. Bennett, Mrs. Mary Louisa Ogden, and Calvin S. Bennett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7792) for the relief of Victoria O. Giun, heir of J. B. Lewis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7793) for the relief of James M. Newman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7794) for the relief of James A. G. Winston—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7795) for the relief of U. Lunenberger, of Natchez, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7796) for the relief of James A. G. Winston, of Adams County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7797) for the relief of the estate of Landon L. Lea, of Amite County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7798) granting a pension to Hannah Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7799) granting a pension to C. F. A. Kellogg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7800) granting a pension to Henry McGlodry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7801) granting a pension to Bunyan H. Byrd—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7802) granting an increase of pension to John F. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7803) to correct the military record of Charles M. Gorden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 7804) granting an increase of pension to John Frett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7805) for the relief of the Seaboard Air Line Railway—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 7806) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Walquist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MINOR: A bill (H. R. 7807) granting an increase of pension to John D. Atwater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 7808) granting a pension to Annie R. Shamel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 7809) granting an increase of pension to E. F. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7810) granting an increase of pension to William M. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7811) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan W. Dix—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7812) granting an increase of pension to Seth Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7813) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7814) granting an increase of pension to James M. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7815) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Covell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7816) granting an increase of pension to William H. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 7817) for the relief of the heirs and representatives of Thomas J. Benson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7818) for the relief of the heirs of Washington Dorney, of Maryland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7819) for the relief of the heirs and representatives of William G. Burke, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7820) granting an increase of pension to John A. Orwig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7821) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7822) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Gill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7823) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Peters, widow of John A. Peters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7824) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Stacks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7825) granting an increase of pension to Haason Bottomstone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7826) granting an increase of pension to John T. Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7827) granting an increase of pension to William H. Uhler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 7828) granting a pension to Catherine Weiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7829) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James O'Brien—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7830) for the relief of Robert W. Caldwell, First Regiment Ohio Heavy Artillery Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7831) granting a pension to Samuel M. Griffith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7832) granting a pension to Horace Park—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7833) granting a pension to A. C. Pindell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7834) granting a pension to Joseph Amos—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7835) granting a pension to John S. Gill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7836 granting a pension to Alexander G. Patton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7837) granting a pension to Mary Jane McKim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7838) granting an increase of pension to S. Harriet Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7839) granting a pension to Ray E. Kline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7840) for the relief of George S. Curtis—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7841) granting a pension to Eli Conn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7842) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Ida Edgerton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7843) granting a pension to Mrs. T. E. Tait—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 7844) granting a pension to Phoebe Keith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 7845) for the relief of Eliza Percival—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBBER: A bill (H. R. 7846) granting an increase of pension to Electa Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7847) granting an increase of pension to Marcus D. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7848) granting an increase of pension to D. C. McMillen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7849) granting an increase of pension to W. N. Starr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7850) granting an increase of pension to Horace A. Durkee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7851) granting an increase of pension to Simon Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7852) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Swisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7853) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte W. Boalt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7854) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Munnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7855) granting an increase of pension to Clarence E. Duane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7856) granting an increase of pension to Norman C. Potter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7857) granting an increase of pension to George W. Culbertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7858) granting an increase of pension to James L. Wing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7859) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 7860) granting a pension to Joseph H. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 7861) granting an increase of pension to C. William Rehfeld—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7862) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wilkes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7863) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7864) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Pray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7865) granting an increase of pension to William G. Thorp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7866) granting an increase of pension to William Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7867) granting an increase of pension to Edward Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7868) granting an increase of pension to John Rohrver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7869) granting an increase of pension to George C. Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7870) granting an increase of pension to William E. McCready—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7871) granting an increase of pension to Jerome L. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7872) granting an increase of pension to Susan Burroughs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7873) granting an increase of pension to Winget Burgess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7874) granting a pension to George Gould—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7875) to remove the charge of desertion against Jacob Goll, late a private in Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7876) granting an increase of pension to Julius Beier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7877) granting an increase of pension to Leberecht Poetting—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7878) granting an increase of pension to Ann Betts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7879) granting an increase of pension to Marie Louise Michie—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON: A bill (H. R. 7880) granting an increase of pension to William W. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7881) for the relief of Anna M. Camp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7882) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Ann Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7883) for the relief of Daniel Dilts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 7884) granting a pension to John W. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7885) granting an increase of pension to R. B. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7886) for the relief of the heirs of J. McH. Kelley and Allie V. Kelley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 7887) to remove the sentence of court-martial from the military record of Morgan Everts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7888) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Sutherlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7889) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Noble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 7890) granting a pension to Mary G. Shaffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7891) granting a pension to Israel Heffner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7892) granting a pension to John Pearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7893) granting a pension to Harry L. Vance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7894) granting a pension to Thomas Cheek—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7895) granting an increase of pension to Lucas Hagar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7896) granting a pension to George Stace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7897) granting a pension to Albert Thibbadeau—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7898) granting a pension to John D. Acton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7899) granting a pension to Leonhart Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7900) granting a pension to Robert D. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7901) granting an increase of pension to James M. Dinwiddie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7902) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Orr, alias Charles Southard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7903) granting an increase of pension to Reuben H. Lynch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7904) granting an increase of pension to Andrew T. Bovard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7905) granting an increase of pension to Francis L. Strimple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7906) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7907) granting an increase of pension to George A. McSurely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7908) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Raymond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7909) granting an increase of pension to George W. Purcell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7910) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Karns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7911) granting an increase of pension to John W. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7912) granting an increase of pension to James M. Lawder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7913) granting an increase of pension to John Devening—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7914) granting an increase of pension to Henry Adler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7915) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Gibbons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7916) granting an increase of pension to David Peters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7917) granting an increase of pension to D. M. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7918) granting an increase of pension to John M. Buxton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7919) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bridgman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7920) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7921) granting an increase of pension to Patrick H. Bergen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7922) granting an increase of pension to John Gregan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7923) granting an increase of pension to Flavius K. Bowles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7924) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Weathers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7925) granting an increase of pension to Richard McMahon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7926) granting an increase of pension to Levy L. Dysert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7927) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7928) granting an increase of pension to Israel S. Dear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7929) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7930) granting an increase of pension to William Daily—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7931) granting an increase of pension to George H. Buehner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7932) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Backus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7933) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Cassity—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7934) granting an increase of pension to James W. Lawder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7935) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Stannah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7936) granting an increase of pension to William L. May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7937) granting an increase of pension to John Clifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7938) granting an increase of pension to George B. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 7939) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth T. Carpenter—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 7940) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Andrew Govan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 7941) granting an increase of pension to Carlon B. Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 7942) for the relief of Polly Jackson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7943) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Richard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7944) granting a pension to Ann S. Trushour—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7945) granting a pension to William W. Isaacs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7946) granting an increase of pension to John H. Ullrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7947) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Robinette—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7948) granting an increase of pension to James W. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7949) to remove the charge of mutiny from the record of David Boyd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 7950) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Heath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 7951) granting an increase of pension to William H. Pitchford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7952) granting an increase of pension to Detrick Nortrup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 7953) for the relief of Elanson Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7954) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan R. Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7955) granting an increase of pension to Newton E. Terrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7956) granting an increase of pension to Gottlob Schaubel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7957) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda A. Sellens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 7958) for the relief of William H. Roach, of Morrilton, Conway County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7959) for the relief of John C. Ray, assignee of John Gafford, of Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7960) for the relief of John C. Ray, assignee of John Gafford, of Arkansas—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 7961) for the relief of G. F. Tarbell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 7962) for the relief of the estate of Frederick Arbour, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7963) for the relief of the heirs of Charles and Palmyra Barre, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 7964) granting an increase of pension to Hardin R. Shanks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7965) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. S. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7966) granting an increase of pension to John Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 7967) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7968) granting an increase of pension to Palmetto Dodson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7969) granting an increase of pension to June Ada Ulmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7970) granting an increase of pension to Walter Lynn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7971) for the relief of Charles Mummey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7972) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Sebastian Delsite—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7973) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7974) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John W. Derrick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: A bill (H. R. 7975) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim N. R. Ohl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 7976) for the relief of Wilford Twyman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 7977) for the relief of Nicola Masino, of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7978) granting an increase of pension to David N. Kennedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7979) granting an increase of pension to John W. Purnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 7980) for the relief of Jacob A. Henry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 7981) to promote and retire Maj. John W. Dillenback, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 7982) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Kellogg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7983) granting an increase of pension to Antoinette A. Darnall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7984) granting a pension to Henry R. Hill—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 7985) for the relief of Charles H. Waterhouse—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPIGHT: A bill (H. R. 7986) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of A. M. Rayburn, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7987) for the relief of the estate of Alfred Swearingin, deceased, late of De Soto County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7988) for the relief of the estate of Joseph N. Moran, deceased, late of Benton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7989) for the relief of J. J. Miller, of De Soto County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7990) for the relief of the estate of Andrew B. Conley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7991) for the relief of Willis J. Moran—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7992) for the relief of Minor Saunders—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7993) for the relief of the heirs of W. T. Eason, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7994) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. E. J. Matlock, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7995) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Charity Clements, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7996) for the relief of the heirs of John Parham, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7997) for the relief of Margaret Raiford Loftin, administratrix of the estate of Robert Raiford, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7998) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Scott, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7999) for the relief of the heirs of William M. Kimmons, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8000) for the relief of Charles O. Spencer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8001) for the relief of the heirs of J. B. Fuller, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8002) for the relief of the heirs of Hardin P. Franklin, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8003) for the relief of the administratrix of John H. Record, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8004) for the relief of the heirs of Johnathan Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8005) for the relief of the heirs of John P. Caruthers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8006) for the relief of the heirs of W. E. Tomlinson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8007) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Louisa Ragsdale—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8008) for the relief of the estate of William A. Jeffries, deceased— to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8009) for the relief of the estate of Eben N. Davis, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8010) for the relief of W. D. Aston—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8011) for the relief of William Moyers, of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8012) for the relief of George L. McGehee and John C. McGehee, heirs of Mary McGehee, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8013) for the relief of James H. Knox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8014) for the relief of Mrs. A. T. Mason, of Benton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8015) for the relief of the estate of Maria A. Reinhardt, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8016) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. M. A. Allen—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R, 8017) for the relief of Mrs. G. W. Ross, Mrs. H. C. Cary, Mrs. Annie Brooks, L. C. Wilcoxon, and Willie Wilcoxon, heirs at law and representatives of Wiley Franks, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8018) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Hawes, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8019) for the relief of Mrs. Martha T. Davis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8020) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Hull Wellford, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8021) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. Susan L. Bailey, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8022) for the relief of the estate of David A. Hamilton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8023) for the relief of Henry C. McElroy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8024) for the relief of the estate of Isham G. Bailey, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8025) for the relief of the heirs of H. G. Spencer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8026) for the relief of Dr. J. N. McIntyre—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8027) for the relief of the heirs of John Carruth, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8028) for the relief of the estate of C. G. Boswell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8029) for the relief of the estate of William Parker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8030) for the relief of Martha A. Allen, administratrix of Wyatt M. Allen, deceased, late of De Soto County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8031) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Polly Callahan, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8032) for the relief of the heirs of Abraham Jones—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8033) for the relief of the Old School Presbyterian Church, at the town of Panola, in Panola County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8034) for the relief of D. W. Carpenter, of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8035) for the relief of the estate of A. M. Doak, deceased, late of Lafayette County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8036) for the relief of the heirs of John D. Martin, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8037) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Joiner, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8038) for the relief of the heirs of John C. McGehee, deceased, late of De Soto County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8039) for the relief of Jeremiah H. Morgan, of Benton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8040) for the relief of the estate of W. F. Gaines, deceased, late of Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEENERSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 8041) authorizing a patent to be issued to Stephen Teichner for certain lands therein described—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8042) granting an increase of pension to Bottol Larsen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8043) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Dodds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8044) granting an increase of pension to Angel Housker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8045) granting a pension to Wilmot Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8046) granting an increase of pension to James T. Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8047) granting a pension to C. A. Brighton, alias Thomas Aufinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8048) granting a pension to W. F. Bottoms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8049) for the relief of Calvin T. Hazelwood—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8050) granting a pension to Felix Linsay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8051) granting a pension to B. F. Draper—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8052) for the relief of John C. Lynch—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8053) to allot 160 acres of land to Herman Lehman and Bianco L. Bell, of Clay County, Tex., out of the Comanche, Kiowa, and Apache reservations, in Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 8054) granting an increase of pension to John Jewell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8055) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Bremer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8056) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel N. Winslow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8057) granting an increase of pension to Clara Eugenia Kramer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8058) granting an increase of pension to Stephen B. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8059) granting an increase of pension to Edwin E. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8060) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Fallihee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8061) granting an increase of pension to Hart Echard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8062) granting an increase of pension to John K. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8063) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Coburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8064) granting a pension to Sarah E. Tripp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8065) granting a pension to Patrick Dawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8066) granting a pension to Auguste Albrecht—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8067) granting a pension to Louis Demarais—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8068) granting a pension to Annie B. Mosbrugger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8069) granting a pension to Sarah E. Tripp—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8070) granting a pension to Adam Fritz—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8071) granting a pension to Mary Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8072) granting a pension to Fanny M. Lowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8073) granting a pension to Susan A. Harseim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8074) for the relief of Mrs. M. E. West—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8075) for the relief of Mrs. Pamelia J. Getty—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8076) for the relief of A. M. Darling and Frank C. Darling—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8077) for the relief of John H. Davern—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8078) for the relief of Miss Bernice Farrell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8079) for the relief of Harriet D. Newson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8080) for the relief of S. Kate Fisher—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8081) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Edward Simonton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8082) for the relief of Susanne P. Thorne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8083) for the relief of Dr. Rudolph Schiffman—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8084) to correct the military record of Hiram D. Gates—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8085) to correct the military record of Jacob M. Hames—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8086) to reimburse the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8087) to restore the name of Dominique Demars to the pension roll of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8088) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Reese Peoples—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8089) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry H. Martens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 8090) granting a pension to Emma H. Benham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 8091) granting an increase of pension to John Coughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8092) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Bedford, Pa., for legislation against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the St. Paul Board of Trade and the St. Paul Produce Exchange, to regulate railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the city council of Albuquerque, N. Mex., to admit Arizona and New Mexico as one State—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Grain Dealers' National Association, relative to railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Ohio Shippers' Association, relative to railway rates, indorsing the President's views—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, for regulation by the Government of railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Denver Teachers' Club, for establishment of Colorado Cliff Dwellers' national park, to be known as the "Mesa Verde National Park"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Emma Alexandria Defries, for adjudication of her claim to a portion of so-called Crown lands of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Minnesota Shippers and Receivers' Association, relative to railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the commissioners of the county of Santa Fe, N. Mex., for law to relieve them of certain indebtedness—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Liliuokalani, for settlement of damages suffered by action of United States minister and naval forces on January 7, 1893—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Walurba Council, No. 859, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pitcairn, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Illinois State Medical Society, for increased efficiency of Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Baptist Missionary Union, for a new treaty with China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Thomas W. Scott, adjutant-general of Illinois, for increasing efficiency of militia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Presbytery of Pittsburg, Pa., against use of intoxicants in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles Funkhouser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of S. A. Bone and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Joint Executive Commission on the Improvement of Philadelphia Harbor, favoring widening and deepening Delaware River—to the Committee on River and Harbors.

Also, petition of Roscoe Council, No. 711, of Roscoe, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for extending the provisions of the pension act of June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., for revision of tariff relative to certain European countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George Castor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Modesto Irrigation Association against San Francisco obtaining reservoir sites in Yosemite Reservation—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Hopewell Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, No. 504, of Claysville, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., relative to tariff revision—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of Newman Council, No. 22, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Georgia, favoring restriction of Immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of Smoky City Council, No. 119, of Pennsylvania, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of United Labor League of Western Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Andrew G. Curtin Council, No. 67; Iron City Council, No. 171; Welcom Council, No. 134, and Purity Council, No. 554, Junior Order United American Mechanics, all of Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BATES: Petitions of Waterford Lodge, No. 423, of Erie County, Pa., and Waterford Grange, No. 423, of Erie County, Pa., to strike word "knowingly" from oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Albion Lodge, No. 421, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, of Albion, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ellen Downing—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David McClellan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah Milvaney—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Theodore F. Northrop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Resolution of the senate and assembly of the State of California, for a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, for legislation relative to admission of Chinese—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petition to accompany bill H. R. 645—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, of Osawatomie, Kans., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Miami County, Kans., for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the United States Sugar and Land Company, against removal of tariff on sugar from Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRICK: Petition favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of J. W. Peters, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Clarence E. Ott, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James C. Southland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Romanti Hipp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of P. V. Thom and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Carpenters' Union No. 1231, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 4641—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the executive committee on improvement of harbor of Philadelphia and Delaware and Schuylkill rivers, for improvement of the harbor facilities of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the legislature of California, for legislation establishing a parcels post at rates not to exceed those accorded by American express companies to foreigners, viz, 24 cents for packages up to 11 pounds—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Local Council No. 175, Brotherhood of Carpenters, of New York, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Slater D. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Parris J. Latham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the board of managers of the Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, favoring passage of so-called Adams bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Conference (Pa.) Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ross R. Sanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Joint Executive Committee of Philadelphia, for appropriations to deepen the Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of the Connecticut Valley Conference and readopted by Local Union No. 108, Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, for free admission of domestic grain alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of citizens of Meriden, Kans., for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: Petition of W. L. Alexander Division, No. 426, against railway-rate legislation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEEMER: Petitions of Daniel L. Eitel and others, and H. R. Hill and others, of Williamsport; J. W. Richie and others, of Mill Hall; B. F. Doud and others, of Covington, and Washington Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, No. 626, of Covington, all in Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Sprout, Waldron & Co., of Muncy, Pa.; E. Keller & Co., Keystone Paint and Filler Company, Clinton File Company, Burnes Fire Brick Company, and National Foundry Manufacturing Company, for two classes of mail matter only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: Petition of Union No. 1023, Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers, of Helena, Mont., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of S. D. Griffin, relative to the Chicago Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the William Stillman Humane Society, against change of present law relative to live stock in transit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWIGHT: Petition of F. B. Phinney and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Indian Association of Cortland, N. Y., to purchase small land holdings for landess Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Robert H. Barton and others, of Owego, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the National Society of Colonial Dames of America, State of Wisconsin, asking legislation for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Dowling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William J. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry G. McDougall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: Petition of citizens of Wayne County, N. Y., against use of Niagara Falls for manufacturing purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FIELD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George Stip—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John Welch—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of the legislature of Cali-

fornia, for a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Nome Chamber of Commerce, asking that Alaska be given an elective Delegate in Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the board of trustees of the New York State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, for reestablishment of the canteen at the Home—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of J. E. Ewing—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of R. E. Allen and others, favoring a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petition of the Board of Trade of Elizabeth, N. J., for reform in the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of William H. Garrison and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of American Council, No. 25, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of the Woman's Columbia Club, of Boise, Idaho, for a law against adulterated foods and drugs—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Florsheim & Co., of Chicago, for removal of the tax on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Wells Briggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of James S. Kirk & Co., favoring revival of tax on tallow—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Martha A. Remington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph W. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of I. J. L. Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Petition of the Citizen Trades Association, for appropriation to improve Point Judith breakwater—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Westfield Baptist Church, urging favorable action on Senate memorial on Kongo Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Petitions of Queen City Council, No. 130; Harmony Council, No. 50; Fairmount Council, No. 155; Price Hill Council, No. 210; Cumminsville Council, No. 75, and Bethlehem Council, No. 79, Junior Order United American Mechanics, all in Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Cincinnati Retail Grocers' Association, for equitable food law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Leipnitz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of M. M. Presley and others, relative to Indian affairs in California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the joint committee on improvement of Philadelphia Harbor, favoring deepening and widening Delaware River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Harry T. Fulmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Decatur (Pa.) Council, No. 613, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the legislature of California, favoring a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HALE: Petitions of John B. Gordon Council, No. 82; Halton Council, No. 39; Emekul Council, No. 3; Uncleson Council, No. 36, and Chilhown Council, No. 68, Junior Order United American Mechanics, all in Tennessee, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of Passumpsic Division, No. 163, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Newport, Vt., against Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Petition of Minnehaha Tribe, No. 16, Improved Order Redmen, of Augusta, Ga., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Barney Schultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Resolution of the State of Connecticut, for legislation forbidding sale of liquor in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petitions of Sedgwick Council, No. 21, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Terryville, Conn., and H. E. Jayways, and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of G. M. Rhodes and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of citizens of Rochelle, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOGG: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William U. Van Ostern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David Wise—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of the legal heirs of Benjamin Lillard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Lewis Maney—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUNT: Petition of S. D. Griffin, clerk of the sanitary district of Chicago, for appropriations for the sanitary canal—to the Committee on River and Harbors.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of the Denver Teachers' Club, indorsing the Hogg bill for establishing Colorado Cliff Dwelling National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Resolution of the Massachusetts legislature, for transfer of the Life-Saving Service to the Navy Department—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Massachusetts legislature, for an equitable adjustment of railroad rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEVER: Petition of Junior Order United American Mechanics, of South Carolina, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Charles J. Kinter, of New York, protesting against condition of affairs now existing in the United States Pension Office—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance, favoring the Army canteen as it was—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the board of trustees of the New York State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, for the Army canteen as it was—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the State assembly of California, for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of William H. Wallace and others, for postal law for two classes of mail matter only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, for admission of Chinese visitors and travelers not of cooly class to America—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Petition of Division No. 99, Brotherhood of Railway Firemen and Brakemen, of Mechanicsville, N. Y., against railway rebate legislation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Stilloway Division, No. 418, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Mechanicsville, N. Y., against railway rate legislation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of importers and wholesale tea dealers of San Francisco, Cal., against a duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of importers and wholesale coffee dealers of San Francisco, Cal., against a duty on coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Transportation Club of San Francisco, against granting Interstate Commerce Commission power to fix railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Division No. 161, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, against granting Interstate Commerce Commission power to fix railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Francisco Division, No. 53, Order Railway Trainmen, against the Interstate Commerce Commission fixing railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Berthold Fernow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert Tillson and Maitland Boon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of Citizens' Trade Association of Cambridge, Mass., favoring appropriation to complete breakwater at Point Judith, R. I.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Citizens' Trade Association of Cambridge, Mass., favoring reciprocal trade treaties with European countries—to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MILLER: Petitions of Penfield Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, No. 274, of Olivet, Kans., and William R. Hottle and others, of Olivet, Kans., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers' Union No. 222, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry C. Canter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Washington Tribe, Improved Order of Red Men, No. 410, of Indianapolis, and J. C. McCain, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Phineas Hyde—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Eli Boynton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Albert Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of T. J. O'Bar—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Andrew L. Grimes—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of A. A. Ezell, heir of Caroline Ezell—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Carlton B. Osborne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Bridget Knott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of William Loughridge to refer claim to Court of Claims under Bowman Act—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POLLARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William J. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Raymond Bros. & Clarke Co., of Lincoln, Nebr.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Utterback Sargeant Rice Company, of Nebraska City, Nebr., against duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of I. C. France, of Fairfax, Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Gilbert M. Bastable, asking reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of John P. Wright, asking reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of William C. Edwards, asking reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of Robert D. Embrey, asking reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Thornton Pollard, asking reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Petition of Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress, for appropriations for continued improvement of harbors on Gulf of Mexico and Pacific coast—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the American Humane Association, against change in present law relative to live stock in transit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of board of trustees of the sanitary district of Chicago, for appropriations to enlarge the sanitary canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the senate and assembly of California, for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of the Humane Society, against amendment of present law regulating transit of live stock—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Berwick Council, No. 698, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Local Union No. 838, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, and Alexander E. James, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of John A. Wert, for removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Eastern Star Lodge, No. 143, Knights of Pythias, of Sunbury, Pa., and H. C. Smith and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the executive committee on improvements of harbor of Philadelphia, for deepening channel of Delaware River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Watertown Council, No. 514, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Goodrich Post, No. 22, Grand Army of the Republic, of Danville, Pa., relative to relief of Kate Lovett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: Petition of the Louisville Charity Organization Society, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of Dewitt W. Hall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of residents of Ridgway, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: Petition of the Territorial Baptist Convention, at Tucson, Ariz., against joint statehood of Arizona and New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Illinois, for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Illinois, relative to restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Illinois, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Liberty Bell Council, No. 3, of New Haven, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of New Haven Printing Pressmen's Union, for establishing the position of foreman of presswork in the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of P. H. Morrisey Lodge, No. 62, of Bloomington, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Illinois, against statue of any king on American soil—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of citizens of Pontiac, Ill., for removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Meredith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Albert J. Sprinkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Modesto Irrigation Association, against San Francisco obtaining reservoir sites in Yosemite Reservation—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James O'Brien—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Katherine Weiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of citizens of Coldwater, Bronson, and Quincy, Mich., for repeal of tax on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Petition of citizens of the Nineteenth Congressional district, for fair trial of President E. G. Lewis, of the People's United States Bank, at St. Louis, and for amendment to law relative to fraud orders relative to the mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. J. Craddock—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James W. Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Max Mayers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEISSE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Julius Beier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Lebaucht Poetting—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of citizens of Batavia, Genesee County, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Daniel Dilts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Lydia Ann Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 14, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the Nineteenth Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of John C. Spear *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Aitcheson Pollock, John G. Pollock, and Matthew B. Pollock, heirs at law of William Pollock, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR DEAF AND DUMB.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed Mr. PERKINS to fill a vacancy on the part of the Senate in the board of directors of the Columbia Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb, under the provisions of section 4863 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented the petition of E. Albertson, of Bridgeport, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. PENROSE presented petitions of the Cigar Makers' Union of Warren; Liberty Bell Lodge, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Philadelphia; Vanderbilt Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Vanderbilt; the United Labor League of Western Pennsylvania, of Pittsburg; York Typographical Union, of York; Labor Union No. 12, of Pittsburg; of Councils Nos. 116, 211, 926, 822, 292, 120, 635, 386, 1013, 201, 206, 54, 67, 310, 443, 465, 980, 992, 140, 29, 128, 317, 335, 367, 851, 243, 416, 20, 374, 1004, 346, 255, 18, 731, 136, 216, 618, 43, 161, 442, 107, 929, 287, 912, 150, 384, 282, 549, 171, 134, 1015, 249, 109, 906, 98, 472, 89, 72, 541, 78, 542, 406, 511, 235, 245, 962, 520, 157, 23, 732, 606, 570, 403, 514, 321, 605, 339, 108, 162, 973, 15, 698, 307, 153, 416, 441, 160, 954, 305, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Sharpsburg, New Stanton, Lewisburg, Scranton, Seven Valleys, Lancaster, Milroy, Conemaugh, Springgrove, Washington, Newcastle, Glenrock, McKees Rocks, Cokeville, Marion, Allegheny, Honesdale, Elizabethville, Royalton, Fayette, Pittsburg, Tower City, Elixir, Shenandoah, Mount Joy, Cherrysville, Wescosville, Philadelphia, Muir, Kutztown, Tyrone, Suterville, Philadelphia, Weissport, Monongahela, Blairsville, Pittsburg, Wilkesbarre, Pittsburg, Springtown, Allentown, Lancaster, Verona, Hoboken, Wilkesbarre, Wanamie, Pittsburg, Scranton, Pittsburg, McKeesport, Akron, Coal Valley, Altoona, Wrightsville, Johnstown, Washington, North Belle Vernon, Tidal Bethlehem, Berwyn, Hillsdale, Belle Vernon, Jonestown, Abington, Jermyn, Allegheny, Schuylkill Haven, Philipsburg, Tremont, Bolivar, Fogelsville, Watsontown, Connellsville, York, Marietta, Altoona, Steelton, Penns Park, Philadelphia, Berwick, Glenlyon, Mauch Chunk, Pottsville, Pricedale, Pittsburg, Annville, and Rices Landing, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PROCTOR presented a petition of sundry citizens of St. Johnsbury, Vt., praying for the adoption of an amendemnt to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Passumpsic Division, No. 163, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Newport, Vt., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the board of managers of the New Hampshire Society, Sons of the American Revolution, of Manchester, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the repair of the old ship *Constitution;* which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oklahoma Territory, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the new States to be formed; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Androscoggin Valley Council, No. 20, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Dexfield, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration and for the reformation of the naturalization laws; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the American Bar Association, the Commercial Law League of America, the Merchants' Association of New York, the National Board of Trade, and the National Association of Credit Men, praying for the enactment of a permanent bankruptcy law and remonstrating against the repeal of the present bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 951, Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Brainerd, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. TALIAFERRO presented a petition of Local Union, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of St. Augustine, Fla., and a petition of Local Union No. 1488, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Ormond, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DUBOIS presented a petition of the Columbian Club, of Boise, Idaho, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of the legislature of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation permitting the fencing of springs on certain unoccupied lands of the United States for the purpose of watering stock; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, as follows:

House joint memorial No. 1 (by Mr. Baer).

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the fifteenth general assembly of the State of Colorado, respectfully represent to your honorable body that:

Whereas the act approved January 13, 1897, relating to the construction of storage reservoirs for free stock water upon the unoccupied public lands of the United States and the withdrawal from entry of certain lands under the provision thereof, has been and will be in the future of great benefit in promoting the live-stock industry of the West; but we believe that the act should have provided for the privilege of allowing springs and water seeps to be cleaned out and fenced, and the waters conducted on the outside of said reservoirs or troughs, and in less quantities than now required by the regulation of Interior Department, and that the same be kept for the free use of range stock. This provision would lead to the preservation of much stock water, and in the opinion of your memorialists would in no way interfere with the disposal of agricultural areas, but would prevent in a great measure the utter destruction of many good springs and sources of water supply by preventing their being entirely destroyed by the tramping of range stock: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress be urged to pass an amendment permitting the fencing of springs for the above purpose.

And be it further resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent at once by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate of the United States, and one copy to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and one copy to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

WILLIAM H. DICKSON, *Speaker of the House.*
E. R. HARPER, *Chief Clerk of the House.*
ARTHUR CORNFORTH, *President of the Senate.*
M. Z. FARWELL, *Secretary of the Senate.*

Mr. MONEY presented petitions of sundry citizens of Jones County, Miss., praying that Capt. Newton Knight and his company be reimbursed for services rendered the United States Government during the war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented a petition of the legislature of Utah, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorializing Congress to enact such legislation as will better protect the people against adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines.

To the President and Congress of the United States:

Your memorialists, the governor and legislature of the State of Utah, represent that the legislature of the State of Utah, having heretofore

enacted laws for the protection of the people against adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines, realizing the necessity for adequate legislation by Congress to protect the States against interstate commerce, which is beyond the control of the State, in such prohibited articles, hereby memorializes Congress to speedily enact efficient legislation prohibiting interstate commerce in adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines, to the end that the laws of our State relative thereto may be more effective.

S. H. LOVE, *President of the Senate.*
THOMAS HULL, *Speaker of the House.*
JOHN C. CUTLER, *Governor.*

Attest:
[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

STATE OF UTAH,
Office of the Secretary of State, ss:

I, Charles S. Tingey, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 3, passed by the legislature of the State of Utah, and filed in my office March 9, 1905, as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 9th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented a petition of the legislature of Utah, praying that that part of the Uintah Indian Reservation known as Strawberry Valley be granted to the United States for the purpose of a national park; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A memorial to Congress praying for a grant of lands for a State park.

To the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the governor and legislature of the State of Utah, respectfully represent that the land included in the Uintah Indian Reservation is about to be opened to settlement; that that part of said reservation which is included in the Strawberry Valley, and is hereinafter more particularly described, is of such an altitude that it is valueless for agricultural purposes; that it is admirably situated for a public park and reservoir purposes; that this State has passed an act creating a board to manage and control any lands acquired for a State park and making an appropriation to carry the same into effect, contingent upon the granting of this petition.

Therefore, your memorialists pray that that part of the Uintah Indian Reservation known as the Strawberry Valley, and more particularly described as follows, to wit, townships 2 and 3 south and ranges 10 and 11 west, and fractional townships 4 south and ranges 10 and 11 west of the Uintah special meridian, be granted to the State of Utah to be used perpetually as a State park, the National Government reserving the right to construct a reservoir or reservoirs, with appropriate canals within the limits of the proposed grant, and your memorialists will ever pray.

THOMAS HULL, *Speaker of the House.*
S. H. LOVE, *President of the Senate.*
JOHN C. CUTLER, *Governor.*

Attest:
[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

STATE OF UTAH,
Office of the Secretary of State, ss:

I, Charles S. Tingey, secretary of state of the State of Utah, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a memorial to Congress praying for a grant of lands for a State park filed in my office March 6, 1905, as appears on file in my office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Utah this 7th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

MAINTENANCE OF COMMERCIAL CHANNELS.

Mr. MORGAN. The select committee appointed by the Senate under the resolution of March 2, 1905, to examine and report on the navigation of the Tennessee River and other matters, have discharged that duty, and I am directed by the select committee to submit the report; which I ask may be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report submitted by the Senator from Alabama will be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DEPEW, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 280) to provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STONE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1548) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the importation of impure and unwholesome tea," approved March 2, 1897, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HEYBURN. I am directed by the Committee on Manufactures, to whom was referred the bill (S. 88) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, or misbranded, or poisonous, or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report thereon.

I desire to state in reporting the bill that it contains substantially the provisions of the McCumber bill of the last session of Congress, with such additions as the present committee have thought proper to add to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 410) to authorize the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Ouachita River and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 299) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TONNAGE TAXES ON STEAMER BANES.

Mr. FRYE. I report back favorably from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment, the bill (S. 1169) for the refund of certain tonnage duties. It is a very short bill. It is to rectify a piece of injustice. A similar bill was reported to the Senate at the last session and passed the Senate. I should like to ask unanimous consent that it may now be considered.

The Secretary read the bill, and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to refund additional tonnage taxes at the rate of $1 per ton, amounting to $908, levied before May 15, 1905, on the steamer *Banes*, under the flag of Panama.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. FULTON. There has just been received from the House House bill 299, which is precisely similar to the bill that was passed yesterday morning by the Senate. It authorizes the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company. I wish consent at this time to call up the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 299) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Portland and Seattle Railway Company, a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Washington, its successors and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct and maintain a bridge across the Columbia River at a place suitable to commerce and not interfering with navigation, at a point at or near Vancouver, in the State of Washington, and to lay on or over said bridge a track or tracks for the more perfect connection of any railroad or railroads that are or shall be constructed to said river, on either or both sides thereof at or opposite said point, under the limitations and conditions hereinafter provided; that said bridge shall not interfere with the free navigation of said river, and in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of said river by reason of the construction of said bridge, the cause may be tried before the circuit court of the United States in and for any district in whose jurisdiction any portion of said obstruction or bridge may be. Said bridge shall be constructed to provide for the passage of railroad trains, and, at the option of the said company or corporation, its successors and assigns, for the safe and convenient passage of wagons and vehicles of all kinds, animals, and foot passengers for such reasonable rates of toll as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 2. That said bridge shall be provided with two or more draw openings, each having not less than 200 feet clear channel way, and in addition to said draw openings one or more fixed channel spans, each having not less than 350 feet clear channel way; and every part of the superstructure of said bridge shall give a clear headroom of not less than 6 feet above extreme known high-water mark: *Provided*, That all spans shall be so located as to afford the greatest possible accommodation to the river traffic, and a draw opening shall, if practicable, be located next or near shore: *Provided, also*, That if the physical characteristics of the locality so require, and the interests of navigation be not injured thereby, the lengths of the fixed spans or the number of draw openings may be reduced: *Provided also*, That for any two adjacent draw openings of 200 feet each one draw opening of 300 feet may be substituted if, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, the interests of navigation be not injured thereby.

SEC. 3. That all draw spans authorized by this act shall be operated by steam or other reliable mechanical power, and shall be opened promptly upon reasonable signal for the passage of boats, except when trains are passing over said span or spans; but in no case shall unnecessary delay occur in opening said draw after the passage of trains, and also that in case the opening of a draw is delayed by reason of the passing of a train after the signal has been given from a boat ready to pass through, the draw shall be opened for the passage of such boat before another train is allowed to pass over the said span or spans; nor shall there be any unnecessary delay in the passage of trains over the bridge.

SEC. 4. That all piers shall be built parallel with the current of the river at that stage of water which is most important for navigation, and the bridge itself shall be built as nearly as may be at right angles thereto; and that riprapping or other protection for imperfect foundations which will lessen the required waterway shall not be permitted; and also that piers which will produce cross currents or bars dangerous to navigation shall not be constructed; and if, after construction, any piers or accessory works are found to produce the above-mentioned effects, or if any riprapping or other protection prohibited by this section is found to exist, the nuisance shall be abated or corrected under the direction of the Secretary of War, at the expense of the company or persons owning, controlling, or operating said bridge.

SEC. 5. That the approaches to said bridge shall be so designed and constructed as not to interfere with the free discharge of said river in seasons of flood; and any encroachment on the high-water cross section by piers, solid embankments, or otherwise, which will result in unduly accelerating the high-water current at the site of the bridge shall not be allowed.

SEC. 6. That any corporation, company, or persons owning, controlling, or operating the bridge built under the authority of this act shall build and maintain at all times, as accessory works to such bridge, such booms, piers, dikes, guard fences, and similar devices as may be necessary to insure at all times a permanent channel for a sufficient distance above and below the bridge site and for the guiding of rafts, steamboats, and other water craft safely under or through said bridge; and if at any time after the construction of the bridge and its accessory works the approaches to draw openings, channel spans, or raft passages in said bridge are found to be dangerous or difficult of access by any important class of river traffic, the Secretary of War may, upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, order the corporation, company, or persons owning, controlling, or operating said bridge to construct, under his directions, and to maintain such additional sheer booms, dikes, and other devices as will obviate the difficulty mentioned, which additional sheer booms, dikes, and other devices shall be built and maintained at their own expense by said company or persons; and that said company or persons shall maintain, at their own expense, from sunset to sunrise throughout the season of navigation such lights and other signals on said bridge as may be required by the Light-House Board for the security of navigation.

SEC. 7. That the bridge authorized to be constructed by this act shall be located and built under and subject to such regulations for the security of navigation on said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and to secure that object said corporation shall submit for his examination a design and drawings of the bridge, piers, approaches, and accessory works, and a map of the location, giving for a space of at least 3 miles above and 1 mile below the proposed location the topography of the banks of the river and the shore lines at high and low water. This map shall be accompanied by others drawn on the scale of 1 inch to 200 feet, giving for a space of one-half mile above the line of the proposed bridge and one-fourth mile below an accurate representation of the bottom of the river, by contour lines 2 feet apart, determined by accurate soundings, and also showing over the whole width of this part of the river the force and directions of the currents at low water, at high water, and at least one intermediate stage by triangulated observations on suitable floats. The maps shall also show the location of other bridges in the vicinity, and shall give such information as the Secretary of War may require for a full and satisfactory understanding of the subject; and the construction of the proposed bridge shall not be commenced until the location and plans thereof are approved by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 8. That any bridge constructed under the authority of this act shall be built under the general supervision of the Secretary of War, and no changes or alterations in plans shall be made during construction of said bridge or after its completion unless said changes or alterations conform to the provisions of this act and are authorized by the Secretary of War; that such alterations and changes as may be required by the Secretary of War in said bridge so as to preserve free and convenient navigation shall be made under the direction of the Secretary of War, at their own expense, by the company or persons owning, controlling, or operating said bridge; that during original construction or in carrying out any authorized changes or repairs of said bridge a navigable channel shall be preserved at the site of the bridge at all times, and the waterway of the river shall not be obstructed to a greater extent than is absolutely necessary; and such lights and buoys shall be kept on all cofferdams, piles, etc., as may be necessary for the security of navigation.

SEC. 9. That all railroad companies desiring the use of the bridge authorized by this act shall have and be entitled to equal rights and privileges relative to the passage of railway trains or cars over the same and over the approaches thereto upon the payment of a reasonable compensation for such use; and in case the owner or owners of said bridge and the several railroad companies, or any one of them, desiring such use shall fail to agree upon the sum or sums to be paid, and upon rules and conditions to which each shall conform in using said bridge, all matters at issue between them shall be decided by the Secretary of War upon a hearing of the allegations and proofs of the parties; and equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph and telephone companies.

SEC. 10. That the bridge constructed, maintained, and operated under this act and according to its limitations shall be a lawful structure, and shall be recognized and known as a post route, upon which also no higher charge shall be made for the transportation over the same of the mails, the troops, and the munitions of war of the United States than the rate per mile paid for the transportation of said mails, troops, and munitions over the railroads and public highways leading to said bridge; and the United States shall have the right of way for postal telegraph and telephone purposes over said bridge.

SEC. 11. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date of approval thereof.

SEC. 12. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. FULTON. Is it proper for me to move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate bill was passed yesterday?

Mr. HALE. Let this bill be first passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. This bill can be passed, and after it is passed the Senator can ask for a reconsideration of the Senate bill. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill which has just been laid before the Senate?

Mr. FULTON. It is precisely the bill that passed the Senate with the amendments that were adopted by the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill (S. 260) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company, which passed the Senate yesterday. Without objection, the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed will be reconsidered and the bill will be postponed indefinitely.

PANAMA CANAL BONDS.

Mr. ALDRICH. From the Committee on Finance I report back with an amendment the bill (S. 1475) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes. The amendment is in the nature of a substitute, and I ask that it may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island asks that the bill be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let the substitute be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The substitute will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on Finance report to strike out all of the bill after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the 2 per cent bonds of the United States authorized by section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall have all the rights and privileges accorded by law to other 2 per cent bonds of the United States, and every national banking associataion having on deposit, as provided by law, such bonds issued under the provisions of said section 8 of said act approved June 28, 1902, to secure its circulating notes, shall pay to the Treasurer of the United States, in the months of January and July, a tax of one-fourth of 1 per cent each half year upon the average amount of such of its notes in circulation as are based upon the deposit of said 2 per cent bonds; and such taxes shall be in lieu of existing taxes on its notes in circulation imposed by section 5214 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. ALDRICH. This simply gives——

Mr. PETTUS rose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. PETTUS. I ask that the bill may go over.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask the Senator from Alabama to allow me to make a statement.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama object to a statement?

Mr. ALDRICH. I decline to yield unless the Senator permits me to make a statement.

Mr. PETTUS. I do not know that I shall object when the bill comes up, but I wish to read it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, this bill simply gives to the 2 per cent canal bonds the same rights and privileges which are accorded by the refunding act to other 2 per cent bonds of the United States. It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Finance, who have carefully considered it. It is important that it should be acted on at an early day, and I therefore ask that it be now considered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island asks that the bill just read be now considered. Is there objection?

Mr. PETTUS. I object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama objects. The bill will go to the Calendar.

Mr. ALDRICH. I give notice, then, that as soon as the canal appropriation bill, so called, is disposed of I shall move to proceed to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. PETTUS subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire simply to withdraw the objection I made to the passage of the bill reported by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama withdraws objection to present action upon the bill reported by the Senator from Rhode Island. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. CULBERSON. Let the bill be read again.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be again read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the substitute reported by the Committee on Finance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Th VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the bill and the subject-matter. Before I do that, as I have just come into the Chamber, I ask leave to present a memorial, and to have it read.

[The memorial presented by Mr. TELLER appears under its appropriate heading.]

Mr. TELLER. The present bill, as now reported by the committee is a pure appropriation. I suppose it is immaterial whether you call it a deficiency bill or an appropriation bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not sure that the Senator from Colorado is aware of the particular bill which is before the Senate. It is the bond bill, which was taken up by unanimous consent.

Mr. TELLER. I understood that it was the other bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. I thought the Senator was probably mistaken.

Mr. TELLER. I do not care about saying anything on this bill except that I gave my assent to the bill very heartily.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the vote be taken on it. Then the other bill can be taken up right away.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If no further amendment be proposed, the question is, Shall the bill be engrossed for a third reading?

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide that the 2 per cent bonds issued under section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans,' approved June 28, 1902, shall have the same rights and privileges that are accorded by law to other 2 per cent bonds of the United States."

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. LODGE on the 12th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such testimony as may be taken by the committee or its subcommittees in connection with matters before them, and have the same printed for its use, and such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that said Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1570) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Johnson; and

A bill (S. 1571) granting an increase of pension to Miles T. Skinner (with accompanying paper).

Mr. FRYE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1572) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Lapham;

A bill (S. 1573) granting an increase of pension to Patrick A. Galvin; and

A bill (S. 1574) granting an increase of pension to Wellington W. Whitney.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1575) to correct the military record of Josiah T. Postelthwait;

A bill (S. 1576) to correct the military record of David P. Morrison;

A bill (S. 1577) to correct the military record of Engleberth Benzinger;

A bill (S. 1578) to correct the military record of John Frederick;

A bill (S. 1579) to correct the military record of Jacob Metzinger (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1580) to correct the military record of Bernhard Steuber (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1581) to correct the military record of George I. Spangler;

A bill (S. 1582) for the relief of Charles Seiser;

A bill (S. 1583) to correct the military record of William H. Blyler;

A bill (S. 1584) to correct the military record of Alexander Everhart;

A bill (S. 1585) to correct the military record of Samuel Bailey;

A bill (S. 1586) to correct the military record of L. L. Bedell, alias Latero Degroat;

A bill (S. 1587) to correct the military record of Patrick O'Connor, alias Patrick Kennedy;

A bill (S. 1588) authorizing the Secretary of War to bestow a medal of honor upon Maj. J. O. Skinner, surgeon, United States Army, retired; and

A bill (S. 1589) to correct the military record of William Harlan (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1590) granting a pension to Jane E. Morris;

A bill (S. 1591) granting a pension to John S. Barr;

A bill (S. 1592) granting a pension to Isabella C. Swisher;

A bill (S. 1593) granting a pension to Mary J. Williams;

A bill (S. 1594) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Guthrie;

A bill (S. 1595) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Barr;

A bill (S. 1596) granting a pension to Fidelia C. Losch;

A bill (S. 1597) granting a pension to Ella B. Goy;

A bill (S. 1598) granting an increase of pension to David Keller;

A bill (S. 1599) granting a pension to Amos Caylor;

A bill (S. 1600) granting an increase of pension to William W. Fiscus;

A bill (S. 1601) granting a pension to Deborah E. Green-Childs;

A bill (S. 1602) granting an increase of pension to Albert Ivers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1603) granting a pension to Mary H. Sirwell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1604) to amend the act of March 2, 1903, increasing the pensions of those who have lost limbs or been totally disabled in them in the military or naval service of the United States;

A bill (S. 1605) granting an increase of pension to Richard H. Lee;

A bill (S. 1606) to amend "An act to amend the pension laws by increasing the pensions of soldiers and sailors who have lost an arm or leg in the service, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1883;

A bill (S. 1607) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Osborn;

A bill (S. 1608) granting a pension to Ira D. Coover;

A bill (S. 1609) granting an increase of pension to John Murray;

A bill (S. 1610) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Keller;

A bill (S. 1611) granting a pension to Andrew Comrey;

A bill (S. 1612) granting an increase of pension to Richard P. Nishuals;

A bill (S. 1613) granting a pension to Rebecca L. Price;

A bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Kate E. Young;

A bill (S. 1615) granting an increase of pension to John Armstrong (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1616) granting an increase of pension to Archibald K. Eddowes (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1617) granting an increase of pension to Charles Moyer;

A bill (S. 1618) granting a pension to Ely L. Jones;

A bill (S. 1619) granting an increase of pension to Vial A. Putnam;

A bill (S. 1620) granting an increase of pension to John P. Patterson;

A bill (S. 1621) granting a pension to Catherine Lenihan, now Hairsine;

A bill (S. 1622) granting a pension to Jane Agnew;

A bill (S. 1623) granting an increase of pension to Reid McFadden;

A bill (S. 1624) granting an increase of pension to Peter Betz;

A bill (S. 1625) granting an increase of pension to William Sherwood;

A bill (S. 1626) granting a pension to Simon Levi;

A bill (S. 1627) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Smith;

A bill (S. 1628) granting an increase of pension to Christian H. Goebel;

A bill (S. 1629) granting an increase of pension to William Stitzer;

A bill (S. 1630) granting an increase of pension to Nathan B. Fowler;

A bill (S. 1631) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shoup (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1632) granting an increase of pension to William Harrington;

A bill (S. 1633) granting a pension to Sarah E. Burns;

A bill (S. 1634) granting an increase of pension to Solomon R. Ruch;

A bill (S. 1635) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Sampson;

A bill (S. 1636) granting an increase of pension to Siotha Bennett;

A bill (S. 1637) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Gehr;

A bill (S. 1638) to restore to the pension roll the name of Henry M. Stiffler;

A bill (S. 1639) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim N. R. Ohl;

A bill (S. 1640) granting a pension to James A. Stine;

A bill (S. 1641) granting an increase of pension to John J. Gangwere;

A bill (S. 1642) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wertz;

A bill (S. 1643) granting a pension to Marion L. Wilson;

A bill (S. 1644) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Keniston (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1645) granting an increase of pension to Jacob G. Orth (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1646) granting an increase of pension to Sidney A. Asson (with accompanying paper).

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

A bill (S. 1647) to correct the naval record of Henry Borrowes;

A bill (S. 1648) for the relief of the Hoffman Engineering and Contracting Company;

A bill (S. 1649) providing for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the Navy;

A bill (S. 1650) to increase the efficiency of the United States Navy by building cruisers and torpedo boats after the design of Richard B. Painton; and

A bill (S. 1651) to correct the naval record of John Lindsay.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads:

A bill (S. 1652) to provide for thirty days' annual leave to clerks and employees of first and second class post-offices;

A bill (S. 1653) to prevent Sunday banking in post-offices in the handling of money orders and registered letters; and

A bill (S. 1654) to amend section 3893 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 1655) for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Newchwang;* which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1656) for the relief of Mary Von Kusserow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1657) relating to liability of common carriers by railroads in the District of Columbia and Territories and common carriers by railroads engaged in commerce between the States and between the States and foreign nations to their employees; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1658) to provide for a site and public building at South Bethlehem, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. ALGER introduced a bill (S. 1659) granting a pension to Hattie E. Houston; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1660) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Way; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HEYBURN. I introduce a bill to reimburse the States and Territories for sections 16 and 36 when taken for forest or other Government purposes, and ask that it be read at length and lie on the table.

The bill (S. 1661) to reimburse the States and Territories for sections 16 and 36 when taken for forest or other Government reserves, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any lands contained in sections 16 and 36 of the public lands of the United States which have been granted to a State or Territory for educational purposes shall be included in the withdrawal of public lands for the purpose of creating forest or other Government reserves, the said State or Territory shall be compensated by the payment out of the Treasury of the United States into the educational fund of the State or Territory in which said lands are situated a sum of money not less than the minimum price at which said lands are authorized to be sold by the State or Territory, whenever it is made to appear that there are not sufficient surveyed public lands of the United States subject to selection by the said State or Territory, in lieu of the lands so included within the reserve as aforesaid, of the cash value of at least the minimum price at which said lands so taken by the Government may be sold under the law.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1662) for the relief of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1663) for the relief of Catherine Grace; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LODGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1664) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth L. W. Bailey;

A bill (S. 1665) granting an increase of pension to John C. Estes (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1666) granting an increase of pension to George W. Beard (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1667) granting an increase of pension to John A. Stockwell (with an accompanying paper);

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 1668) for the relief of the estate of Gotlob Groezinger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 1669) for the establishment of an additional recording district in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1670) granting an increase of pension to William McNabb; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DICK introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1671) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Andrews;

A bill (S. 1672) for the relief of John W. Lewis;

A bill (S. 1673) for the relief of William H. W. Krebs;

A bill (S. 1674) for the relief of John A. Wanless;

A bill (S. 1675) for the relief of John F. Lewis;

A bill (S. 1676) for the relief of Harlow L. Street; and

A bill (S. 1677) for the relief of Edward Byrne.

Mr. DICK introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1678) granting an increase of pension to William A. Mullen;

A bill (S. 1679) granting an increase of pension to David Gough;

A bill (S. 1680) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Duff;

A bill (S. 1681) granting an increase of pension to William F. Davisson; and

A bill (S. 1682) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Forbriger.

Mr. MILLARD introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 1683) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Kearney, State of Nebraska;

A bill (S. 1684) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Wayne, State of Nebraska;

A bill (S. 1685) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of West Point, State of Nebraska;

A bill (S. 1686) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Columbus, State of Nebraska;

A bill (S. 1687) to provide for the erection of a public building at Grand Island, in the State of Nebraska; and

A bill (S. 1688) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of North Platte, State of Nebraska.

Mr. DEPEW introduced a bill (S. 1689) for the relief of Caleb W. Durham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1690) for the relief of Theodore F. Northrop; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1691) granting an increase of pension to Alice S. Shepard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1692) granting a pension to Ellen H. Swayne; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KITTREDGE introduced a bill (S. 1693) to establish a court of patent appeals, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. WARNER introduced a bill (S. 1694) for the erection of a public building at Carthage, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1695) legalizing the removal of the county seat of Washita County, Oklahoma Territory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1696) to authorize the location of a Branch Home for disabled volunteer soldiers, sailors, and marines in the State of Florida;

A bill (S. 1697) confirming to certain claimants thereto portions of lands known as Fort Clinch Reservation, in State of Florida;

A bill (S. 1698) to authorize the appointment of Archer B. Hayes to the grade of captain and quartermaster in the United States Army;

A bill (S. 1699) to correct the military record of George Gwynn; and

A bill (S. 1700) to remove the charge of desertion appearing against the military record of David W. Trumpeller.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1701) granting a pension to M. Frances Von Balsan;

A bill (S. 1702) granting a pension to Adolphus N. Pacetty;

A bill (S. 1703) granting an increase of pension to Robert Gamble, jr.;

A bill (S. 1704) granting a pension to John G. Patton;

A bill (S. 1705) granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. George;

A bill (S. 1706) granting a pension to Elizabeth Wester;

A bill (S. 1707) granting an increase of pension to Milton A. Smith;

A bill (S. 1708) granting a pension to Mary P. Docker; and

A bill (S. 1709) granting a pension to Florence Greeley De Veaux.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1710) for the relief of the heirs of Andrew E. Hodges, deceased;

A bill (S. 1711) for the relief of Salvador Costa;

A bill (S. 1712) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Ledwith;

A bill (S. 1713) for the relief of Louisa Avery;

A bill (S. 1714) for the relief of Mariah L. Trowell, administratrix of Benjamin F. Trowell, deceased;

A bill (S. 1715) for the relief of William Mickler;

A bill (S. 1716) for the relief of C. W. Moffatt;

A bill (S. 1717) for the relief of Rinaldo, Isadore, and Robert von Balsan, and the heirs of Caroline von Balsan, deceased;

A bill (S. 1718) for the relief of William S. Livingston;

A bill (S. 1719) for the relief of Thomas R. Webb;

A bill (S. 1720) for the relief of Emily Catherine Jones; and

A bill (S. 1721) for the relief of the estate of Cyprian T. Jenkins, deceased.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 1722) to construct and place a light-ship opposite the entrance of St. Johns River, Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1723) for the survey of the harbor of St. Augustine, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1724) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Fernandina, Fla., and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1725) granting certain land to the Missionary Baptist Church, of Rock Sink, Fla.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1726) making provision for conveying in fee the piece or strip of ground in St. Augustine, Fla., known as the "Lines," for school purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1727) granting a pension to I. N. De Long;

A bill (S. 1728) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Allen;

A bill (S. 1729) granting a pension to George W. Lewton;

A bill (S. 1730) granting an increase of pension to Orville E. Campbell;

A bill (S. 1731) granting an increase of pension to William O. Colson;

A bill (S. 1732) granting an increase of pension to John A. Packard;

A bill (S. 1733) granting an increase of pension to George W. Trice (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1734) granting an increase of pension to John H. Gardner (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1735) granting an increase of pension to Washington Hogans (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1736) granting a pension to Lena S. Fenn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1737) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Blanchard (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1738) granting a pension to Mary E. Connor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1739) granting a pension to Henry Sistrunk;

A bill (S. 1740) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Hazzard (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1741) granting an increase of pension to William M. Meacham;

A bill (S. 1742) granting an increase of pension to James F. P. Johnston;

A bill (S. 1743) granting a pension to Amon L. Charles;

A bill (S. 1744) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Papy; and

A bill (S. 1745) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Gill.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 1746) for the relief of C. B. McClenny; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 1747) to authorize the Mobile Railway and Dock Company to construct and maintain a bridge or viaduct across the water between the end of Cedar Point and Dauphin Island; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1748) granting a pension to Rupert S. Rives;

A bill (S. 1749) granting a pension to John Hedrick; and

He also introduced a bill (S. 1750) to reduce the tariff of the United States by amending "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 1751) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of captured and abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States, and acts amendatory thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MALLORY introduced a bill (S. 1752) granting the right of way, with terminal facilities, to the Florida West Shore Railway Company through the United States light-house and military reservations on Gasparilla Island, in the State of Florida; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1753) granting an increase of pension to Waldo W. Paine; and

A bill (S. 1754) granting a pension to Susan E. Potter.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1755) for the relief of Homer W. Styron;

A bill (S. 1756) for the relief of Sidney T. Dupuy and George R. Dupuy, the only surviving heirs of George R. Dupuy, deceased;

A bill (S. 1757) for the relief of John Wilson;

A bill (S. 1758) for the relief of the estate of Samuel T. Carrow, deceased;

A bill (S. 1759) for the relief of John I. Rowland;

A bill (S. 1760) for the relief of James W. Adams and of the estate of Solomon N. Adams;

A bill (S. 1761) for the relief of the widow of R. D. Hay;

A bill (S. 1762) for the relief of C. G. Perkins;
A bill (S. 1763) for the relief of the heirs of C. H. Foy;
A bill (S. 1764) for the relief of the heirs of Cicero M. Davis;
A bill (S. 1765) for the relief of the estate of Rayford Brewington, deceased;
A bill (S. 1766) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph H. Etheridge and William D. Etheridge;
A bill (S. 1767) for the relief of the trustees of the diocese of East Carolina;
A bill (S. 1768) for the relief of the Seamen's Friend Society of Wilmington, N. C.;
A bill (S. 1769) for the relief of L. T. Oglesby;
A bill (S. 1770) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Richardson, deceased;
A bill (S. 1771) for the relief of the estate of D. L. Pritchard, deceased;
A bill (S. 1772) for the relief of Sylvester Dibble;
A bill (S. 1773) for the relief of Thomas Monteith;
A bill (S. 1774) for the relief of Sidney Maxwell;
A bill (S. 1775) for the relief of Calvin J. Cowles;
A bill (S. 1776) for the relief of the estate of Esau Berry, deceased;
A bill (S. 1777) for the relief of Walter T. Dough;
A bill (S. 1778) for the relief of the estate of Thomas A. Dough, deceased;
A bill (S. 1779) for the relief of the widow and heirs at law of Charles Wilkes, deceased, late a rear-admiral in the United States Navy;
A bill (S. 1780) for the relief of John L. Brown and the estates of A. T. Redditt and William G. Judkins;
A bill (S. 1781) for the relief of K. H. Lewis and W. F. Lewis;
A bill (S. 1782) for the relief of the heirs of Nancy Burfield, deceased;
A bill (S. 1783) for the relief of the vestry and wardens of St. James Church, of Wilmington, N. C.;
A bill (S. 1784) for the relief of George A. Russell, administrator of Stephen Chadwick, deceased;
A bill (S. 1785) for the relief of the estate of H. D. Coley, deceased;
A bill (S. 1786) for the relief of Henry R. Bryan;
A bill (S. 1787) for the relief of Mary N. Bryan;
A bill (S. 1788) for the relief of Thomas D. Meares, administrator of Armand D. Young, deceased;
A bill (S. 1789) for the relief of the estate of James A. Suydam, deceased;
A bill (S. 1790) for the relief of William C. Staples; and
A bill (S. 1791) for the relief of T. H. B. Myers, surviving partner of John Myers & Son.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 1792) to provide for the erection of a public building at Baker City, in the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1793) to provide for building and completing the approaches to and improving the ground on which is erected the United States building at Salem, Oreg.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1794) to ratify an agreement with the Indians of the Klamath Indian Reservation, in Oregon, and making appropriations to carry same into effect; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 1795) for the relief of Louisa McCall, administratrix, and so forth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1796) granting an increase of pension to Edith Burt Trout; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SUTHERLAND introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1797) granting an increase of pension to John E. Henderson;
A bill (S. 1798) granting an increase of pension to Robert K. Smith; and
A bill (S. 1799) granting an increase of pension to Henry Logan.

Mr. KEAN introduced a bill (S. 1800) referring the claim of the legal representatives of William T. Duvall, deceased, against the United States to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 1801) regulating the creation of forest reserves; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 1802) to regulate the use by the public of reservoir sites located upon the public lands of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1803) granting a pension to Arthur Linn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HALE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles and, with the accompanying papers (which were ordered to be printed), were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

A bill (S. 1804) providing for the use of certified checks to secure compliance with proposals and contracts for naval supplies;
A bill (S. 1805) providing for the use by the United States of devices invented by its naval officers while engaged in its service and covered by letters patent; and
A bill (S. 1806) to provide for the deposit of the savings of enlisted men of the United States Marine Corps.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 1807) for the relief of Mary V. Shaw; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1808) providing that the Federal Government shall not grant liquor-tax receipts to persons residing in prohibition territory, State or local; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 1809) to amend section 3244 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CARTER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 9) to amend the Constitution of the United States to authorize uniform marriage and divorce laws and the enforcement thereof by adequate penalties; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 10) for the relief of P. J. McMahon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I ask permission out of order to make a verbal report from the Interstate Commerce Committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia asks permission to make a verbal report from the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, under the resolution adopted by the Senate March 2, 1905, authorizing the Committee on Interstate Commerce to hold sessions during the recess of the Senate, I am instructed to report that the committee proceeded, under the resolution, Monday, April 17, and continued its sessions until the early part of June. The committee gave hearings to all persons who manifested a desire to be heard on the subject. The result of the labors of the committee is contained in five volumes of testimony, which has been put in print, and I now place it, by direction of the committee, before the Senate for such disposition.

Under the terms of the resolution the committee was required to report in ten days after the beginning of the present session of the Senate by bill or otherwise. While the committee can not report a bill to-day, I am authorized to state to the Senate, on behalf of the committee, that it went into session on the 21st of November and has been holding meetings, not every day since, but as often as it suited the convenience of the members, to consider the various and difficult subjects raised in the resolution that was adopted by the Senate. The committee is giving careful consideration to the subject-matter of the questions which have been raised, and I am authorized to state that it is the belief of the members of the committee that later on it will be able to report a bill to the Senate for its consideration.

POSTAGE ON PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

Mr. STONE. I desire to offer a resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be directed to inform the Senate whether under the construction placed by his Department upon existing law prescribing the postage for periodical publications, and under the rules and practice of his Department, periodicals published by colleges and universities, or by alumni associations or students of colleges and universities, are admitted to the mails as second-class matter; and also to inform the Senate whether any discrimination has been

made or preference allowed any such publications over other similar publications in admitting them to the mails; and if so, to inform the Senate in detail, so far as practicable, to what extent and in what particular instances such discriminations have been made or preferences allowed, and how long the same have been continued, with the reasons therefor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLISON. I shall not object, if the resolution does not consume time.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Iowa that if he is especially anxious to go on with the bill in his charge, the resolution which I have offered may go over until to-morrow.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope that will be done. I am very anxious to have the Panama Canal bill taken up this morning.

Mr. STONE. I have no objection to letting the resolution go over until to-morrow.

Mr. ALLISON. Let it lie on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table, subject to the call of the Senator from Missouri.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the bill (S. 410) to authorize the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct bridges across the Ouachita River and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PANAMA CANAL APPROPRIATION.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent, if the morning business is concluded, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 480, being the deficiency appropriation bill for the Panama Canal.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no further morning business, that order is closed. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the bill referred to by him may be now taken up for consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The first amendment was to strike out section 1, as follows:

That the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall be subject to the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled "An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900, the same as though said bonds were issued under the provisions of said act of March 14, 1900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1 (2), page 2, line 8, before the word "act," to strike out "said;" so as to make the section read:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $11,000,000 to continue the construction of the isthmian canal, to be expended under the direction of the President in accordance with the act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, approved June 28, 1902, and for each and every purpose connected with the same, the said sum to continue available until expended: *Provided*, That all expenditures from the appropriation herein made shall be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds authorized in section 8 of the said act approved June 28, 1902.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3 (2), page 2, line 22, before the words "Canal Zone," to strike out "said" and insert "the;" in line 23, before the word "Canal," to strike out "said Panama" and insert "the isthmian;" in line 24, before the word "Panama," to strike out "said" and insert "the;" on page 3, line 2, after the word "Congress," to strike out "And any of the persons appointed or employed by the President in connection with the said government or the said work of construction or operation shall give to Congress or to either House of Congress such information as may at any time be required either by act of Congress or by the order of either House of Congress in relation to their respective actings and doings and the receipt and expenditure of money;" in line 20, after the word "purposes," to strike out "named in this act" and insert "of constructing and maintaining said isthmian canal;" and in line 22, after the word "Congress," to strike out "except that the moneys received, in the ordinary course of business, from the operation of the Panama Railroad and the property and rights appertaining thereto may be expended, so far as necessary, in defraying the expenses of such operation, including maintenance, without being covered into the Treasury of the United States, and such moneys are hereby appropriated for such purpose, and monthly reports of such receipts and expenditures shall be made to the President by the person or persons in charge;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the President shall annually, and at such other periods as may be provided, either by law or by his order, require full and complete reports to be made to him by the persons appointed or employed by him in charge of the government of the Canal Zone, the construction of the isthmian canal, and the operation of the Panama Railroad, including an itemized account of all moneys received and expended, which said reports shall be by the President transmitted to Congress. The President shall annually cause to be made, by the persons appointed and employed by him in charge of the government of said Canal Zone and the construction of said canal, estimates of expenditures and appropriations, in detail as far as practicable, which estimates shall be submitted to Congress in the manner provided in section 5 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes." And no money shall be expended for any of the purposes of constructing and maintaining said isthmian canal except in accordance with appropriations made by Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no further amendments, the bill will be reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, unless the chairman of the Committee an Appropriations desires to make some explanation of the bill, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to certain matters connected with it. I do not intend to discuss the canal question; that is to say, I am not going to discuss the question as to which is the best canal, neither do I care about discussing the question whether it is worth while or not to build the canal. We have settled that question. We have a law on the statute book to authorize the building of this canal. There may be some question as to how the canal is to be built and as to the character of the canal. Those, however, are matters which Congress must take up and must dispose of very soon.

I do not care to go into the history of the canal, nor do I care to go into the history of the efforts that have been made from time to time since the discovery of America to create a waterway across the Isthmus. From time to time commissions have presented information in reference to that subject to Congress and to the country, and such commissions on every occasion have discussed the same questions, and many of the members of the commissions have also presented their views as individuals.

I think it may be assumed that there has been a continued effort during the past two hundred years to get a canal. We perhaps approached closest and nearest to a systematic and organized effort to get a canal in 1850, when the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was made between the United States and Great Britain. Both Great Britain and the United States in that treaty declared that it was important the canal should be built, and should be built immediately. We know very well that no real effort was made in that direction for many years thereafter, and not until the French began to construct a canal along the present route of the so-called Panama Canal.

There have been a great number of surveys made, not only over the Isthmus of Panama, but over the Isthmus of Darien and over Nicaragua and also on some other routes, but it was generally understood that there were two lines which were preeminently adapted for canal purposes. Those were the Nicaragua and the Panama routes.

De Lesseps, who had charge of the construction of the Suez Canal, invited the engineers of the world to Paris to pass upon the question of a route for an isthmian canal. American engineers to some extent, at least, attended that conference. French engineers and European engineers generally attended in full force. It was claimed by the American engineers that there had been an effort made to forestall the opinion of that congress of engineers by the French engineers and to get an opinion in favor of a sea-level canal on the Panama route. I believe, with rare exceptions, the American engineers favored the Nicaraguan route for a canal with locks. Thereupon the French organized a canal company. I do not at this moment recall what was the amount of stock issued; but that is not a matter of any consequence to the world in this connection. It was the judgment of the European engineers that Panama was the best place to build the canal; that the best canal that could be built would be a sea-level canal, and that the entire work could be accomplished for about $130,000,000, or a little less.

Mr. President, it would be a reflection on the engineers of the world to say that they believed a canal could be constructed

across that line in Panama for $130,000,000. It is quite apparent now that the capital of the world would be withheld from a canal that cost three or four times that amount, and this they knew; but they made that low estimate hoping to acquire sufficient funds to put the canal in such position that the capitalists who had invested would be ultimately compelled to complete the canal.

I do not think in making that statement that I do any injustice to any person. I believe a careful examination of the history of that transaction will show that not only De Lesseps knew the canal could not be built for that amount of money, but the engineering talent of the world also knew it, and the American engineers declared with one universal voice that the canal could not be built for that sum.

Mr. President, I am going to stop just a moment to say that in this country, at that time at least, there was a very strong feeling that our engineers did not possess the learning and ability possessed by the engineers of Europe. De Lesseps at that time seemed to overshadow all the engineers of the world. He had made a successful adventure; he had connected the waters of the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. He had selected a sandy desert route, without any engineering difficulties whatever, and had built with the money of Europe a canal which turned out to be a very profitable investment for those who had put their money into it and had gained great reputation.

But more than two thousand five hundred years ago a canal had been built on almost identically the same route that De Lesseps built his canal. It was not as big as the canal constructed by De Lesseps; it did not, of course, begin to carry the amount of commerce that is carried over the canal which he constructed; yet I believe its construction was quite as great a feat as that accomplished by De Lesseps. It is said by the historian Herodotus that the Pharaoh who built that canal sacrificed 127,000 lives in its construction. If you reflect, Mr. President, that at that time all the earth that was removed from that canal was taken out and carried on the shoulders of men and dumped somewhere—for, of course, in that day the steam shovel had never been heard of—you will readily understand that very likely that statement may have been true when such work had to be done with forced labor and not paid labor. This canal was filled up by the drifting sands and opened again and again, if history can be relied upon, and even as late as the year 1000 it was doing service between those two seas. When De Lesseps took hold of the Panama Canal he took hold of a different enterprise, and if he had had a sufficient amount of money he would undoubtedly have made a success of it, as he made a success of the Suez Canal, but failed to finish the work. Of his failure I will speak later.

For twenty years we in the Senate and House of Representatives have been laboring with this question. We have given to it a great deal of attention. We have determined at last that the canal shall be built, and yet we are undetermined as to what shall be the character of the canal to be built.

It is not in good form to refer to personal affairs. Yet I am moved to make this speech to-day somewhat from personal relations to this subject. I have listened in the last few months to the complaints that are being made by the Canal Commission, by the friends of the canal, as to the opposition in this body and everywhere else to the canal. My attitude on the subject has been such as to justify those who have not carefully considered what has been done and said here to believe that I have been an opponent of the canal. I do not believe now, notwithstanding the enthusiasm of the Commission, notwithstanding the enthusiasm of the various friends of this movement, that the canal will be the success predicted and hoped for. I have said on this floor, I think at least fifteen years ago, that there was not any question but that there would ultimately be a canal across the Isthmus. The commerce of the world has demanded it. It has been a question what kind of a canal we wanted, what kind of a canal the business of the world demanded and required; and no other canal will be a paying canal. The canal must secure the business of the world. An immense business must go through the canal in order to make it a paying proposition. Even governments want returns on their investments.

I know it is said that we have a canal on our Great Lakes doing a tremendous business, and as that pays this will pay. But that is a canal through which the business originating back of it and west of it is compelled to pass. It must either seek that outlet or it must take the railroad outlet; and heavy articles, such things as come from the extreme West, like agricultural products, must go through the canal and through the lock.

But there is a difference when you come to the Panama Canal. There is a waterway, long it may be and tedious, around the end of South America, over which the commerce of the world has been going for some hundreds of years, and where the cheapest possible transportation on the face of the earth can be had. Commerce has the choice of taking the Panama Canal when completed, or of going around the cape and coming up the South American coast and then across to Asia. The commerce of the world also has the canal from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea, a canal which has been greatly increased in its capacity since it was bulit; and from a great portion of the United States, if you want to reach the larger part of Asia, you will take the Suez Canal as an economic question. If you want to leave New York with a ship to go to our Philippine possessions, you would take the Suez Canal, if the Panama Canal were open and free and the other route made a charge.

In that attitude, with that matter presented, is it illogical to say that the canal which is to be built at Panama must be a first-class canal, a canal which will meet the demands of commerce, and which will draw to it not only the business which naturally belongs to it, but even business from the sections of the world not naturally tributary to it?

In addition to that, I may mention the fact that four or five hundred miles north of the proposed canal there has been constructed recently a first-class railroad from the Gulf of Mexico across to the Pacific Ocean, across the southern part of the territory of Mexico, called the Tehuantepec Railroad. It is 143 miles of railroad. It is a railroad which I am told is now in first-class order. It cuts across the country where Engineer Eads for years proposed to build a ship railway. The highest elevation is 800 feet above sea level. There is a good harbor on the Gulf side, and the Government of Mexico is building a good harbor on the Pacific side. That route will be many hundred miles nearer to all the Gulf commerce than the Panama Canal when built.

I have not mentioned these facts for the purpose of detracting from the merit and the necessity of the Panama Canal, but I have mentioned them to the Senate of the United States in order that the members thereof may take into consideration what shall be the character of the canal—shall it be a sea-level canal, shall it be a lock canal, shall it be a canal with 90-foot elevation, or a canal with 60-foot elevation, or a canal with 30-foot elevation?

The President of the United States has appointed a board of engineers—I do not remember how many. They have considered questions as to the character of the canal, but they have not reported. It is said, whether truthfully or not I do not know, that all the foreign engineers will report in favor of a sea-level canal, and that the American engineers will report in favor of a lock canal. They will report in favor of a lock canal because they say it is cheaper and can be built with less delay.

I am one of those who voted for what is called the "Spooner amendment." I have never voted for a bill touching this canal, or favorable to the canal, except the vote for the Spooner amendment to take the place of the Hepburn bill, which was for a canal across the Nicaragua route. But if now you are to build a lock canal across the Isthmus I shall be compelled to confess that if a lock canal is to be built it would have been better to have built it across the Nicaragua route than to build it across Panama. I voted with the hope, and I expressed it on the passage of the Spooner amendment, that if we built a canal at all we should build one that would meet the demands not only of to-day but for the time to come.

Mr. President, there is no reason why the Government of the United States should build this canal any more than why other nations should build it. We felt many years ago, and so declared officially, that we could not afford to unite with any other nation in the building of the canal; that if it was built at all it must be built under the auspices and under the control of the United States. Up to a few years since nobody pretended that the Government of the United States ought to build the canal, and nobody thought the Government of the United States would. In 1889, when we chartered by an act of Congress the Maritime Canal Company, composed of citizens of New York, we put in the bill an absolute prohibition of the Government of the United States having anything to do with the building of the canal. For that bill I voted. That provision was put in the bill upon an amendment offered by the then Senator from Vermont, Mr. Edmunds.

Two or three years afterwards we were met by a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations asking the Government of the United States to guarantee the bonds of that company to the extent of $70,000,000 and to take as security for such guaranty an equal amount of the company's stock. We had before us then the report of the engineer of the canal company saying the canal could be built and put in full operation for the sum of about $65,000,000. When that question was submitted to the

engineers of this country they raised it to $87,000,000. Yet it was contended here and elsewhere that $65,000,000 was a fair estimate.

That canal scheme provided for locks 650 feet long and 28 feet deep, as I recollect. I wish to submit to the Senate for a moment, is there anybody here who will assert that that canal would to-day meet the requirements of the commerce of the world if it had been built? We now have ships being built that are more than 750 feet long, ships drawing 40 feet, and in a few years we will undoubtedly have ships that will require a lock at least a thousand feet long, if not longer.

Now, as I said, we were under no moral obligation to the world to build the canal. We are going to build the canal upon the assumption that it will be a benefit to us as a nation, and if we can not make that appear we have no right to build it. It will have some advantages to us when built. Whether they will be commercially such as will pay interest on the cost of the canal is another question. When the Spanish ships were threatening our coast, if they did threaten it—at least I know they created a spirit of terrorism in some sections—and the *Oregon* was longingly looked for on its way around South America from the Pacific coast, I suppose perhaps we then would have paid a good deal of money, without any reference to the income from it, if we had only had a canal across the Isthmus through which we could have brought that ship. But if the canal had been built on the theory which was advocated here for years, the *Oregon* would still have had to have gone around South America, because it could not have gone through the canal.

On the 28th of June, 1902, the President of the United States signed the bill which made the Panama Canal, I will not say a possibility, but a probability, because I believe the canal will be built. But the question I am anxious that the Senate should take hold of and consider is, What shall be its character? I would lose sight—because if you do not, I believe you will never build the canal—I would lose sight of the question whether there would be returns which, in a financial way, would remunerate the nation for the outlay. If you adhere to the view that the canal must be profitable, in my judgment it will never be built. We did not stop to inquire as to that. We said we wanted the canal, and the men who voted for it and the few who did not expressed the opinion on this floor, at least some of us did, that the die was cast; that the canal was to be built, and pledged ourselves to stand by the act of Congress and to vote on all occasions all the money necessary for its completion.

Why should we not? The whole world is looking at us. All mankind know that we have assumed the right to build the canal. We put $50,000,000 in it before we got possession of the route. We have put twenty-odd millions into it since we got possession of it. Seventy-odd millions of American money is in it. Nobody needs to predict that the canal is not going to be built; and, whether he be an engineer or whether he be a layman, the man who says it can not be built underrates the intelligence of this age as well as our financial ability.

But, Mr. President, notwithstanding all that, notwithstanding that we stand before the world in a way so that we can not afford to retire from the enterprise, it is still our duty to see that we do not put more money in the canal than is absolutely necessary, and that we do put enough in it to make it a commercial success, to the extent at least that it must meet the expectations and demands of the commercial world.

This is the greatest enterprise, in my judgment the most expensive enterprise, that any nation has ever undertaken. I suppose it might have been considered when the Egyptian, Pharaoh, undertook to and did build the canal across the Suez route that it was a great enterprise, and perhaps for the age of the world in which it was built it may have been considered even greater than this. It seems to me that the good name of the nation is involved in this question now. We willingly assumed the burden of this work. We must finish it.

I want to take but a few moments with respect to some details. I wish to ask whether we have approached this great subject as a nation of enterprising, intelligent, business people ought to have approached it. There came to the Senate a bill practically unanimous from the House to build the canal across the Nicaragua route. We changed it to the Panama route. I know it has been said again and again and repeated ad nauseam that we changed it here because we were opposed to the canal itself. That I deny. I have seen several bills pass the Senate for a canal. I have seen a bill pass the Senate for a canal of the lock system via the Nicaragua route with 5 dissenting votes. I have seen another bill passed here with 7 dissenting votes. I have seen another bill passed here with 3 dissenting votes. Every time I was one of that very small number, and on every occasion I have given as my reason for not voting for the bill that the proposed canal did not meet the requirements of the world.

I have often wondered, and some of these younger men will wonder, whether or not this is such a valuable enterprise as we thought it was when we undertook it. I think the very crux of the whole question is, Are you going to build a canal that will secure the commerce of the great sections—the Pacific coast and the Atlantic? Will the world's commerce go through it, leaving to the Suez Canal only such portions as logically belong to it? If you hope to make the canal a blessing to mankind, it must be a commercial way; it must take the commerce of the world, and it must take it at figures that will justify the shipper in sending his goods that way.

We have now several continental lines of railroads. We will have in the next ten years as many more, or at least I will put it in the next fifteen years. I venture to say that within fifteen years there will be as many new lines built as there are now old lines, and the old lines will be strengthened and improved. They are to be the competitors of the canal. They will take the goods from the interior of the country—the center of the country. Take the State which I in part represent here. What interest have we in the canal? The only interest we have in it is due to the fact that we have an interest in every single acre of American soil. The only interests we have in it are due to the fact that the interests of New England and New York and the Gulf States are our interests. We will never send any goods by that canal, nor will it, in my judgment, benefit us at all, except as it may benefit all mankind as well as all the people of certain sections of the United States.

We took possession of this canal route from the French. I was sorry to hear the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] say to-day that we had commenced the canal under conditions almost as disgraceful as those surrounding the French conduct of the proposed canal. I am not prepared myself to charge that there has been fraud or stealing in the operation of the canal since it came into our possession. I am prepared to say, and prepared to prove, I think, that no great enterprise ever was inaugurated or started with so little judgment and so little preparation and so little apprehension of what was to be done and what was necessary as this. There is not an engineer in the world who did not know this was the great enterprise, not of this age, but of all time. There was not an engineer who did not know that the French had made an absolute failure; that every step they had taken was marked by mismanagement or by fraud. The estimate was a hundred and thirty millions; two hundred and sixty millions were wasted, and they could only claim then that one-fifth of the canal excavation had taken place. No dams had been built. No harbors had been provided. There had not been one-twentieth of the canal built. Yet two hundred and sixty-two millions of French money had been spent—even more than that, it is said by some. It had been lost.

I know we paid forty millions. If we are to believe the many stories told, and I do believe them, one-half of that sum went into the hands of the men who exploited the enterprise and induced us to buy the canal. The men who put in the two hundred and sixty-two millions practically got nothing back. It was the scandal of the world. It sent that great French engineer to his grave in disgrace, a convicted felon. We may do the same thing and make the same mistakes, and not have any grafting or stealing, either.

What ought we to have done when we took possession of the canal route? There were upon the Isthmus, where the town of Colon is built, a great number of wooden houses full of disease of every kind and character, full of filth—the accumulation of years. What have we done with it? We have attempted the sanitation of the Zone. We have pulled down the houses in part and rebuilt them. In my judgment if we had torn down every building on the Isthmus built for the use of the canal and burned them and plowed the ground upon which they stood it would have been money in the pockets of the American people. You can not take those old polluted buildings and preserve the health of the employees of the canal who must inhabit them. We were supposed to have acquired twenty-five to twenty-nine million dollars of French supplies. I do not believe there is an engineer who has been down there who will not tell you to-day that it would have been better for us to have dumped them into the sea and bought good American supplies. For instance, we found there a shovel that would dump 25,000 yards of earth in a month, when an American shovel using the same power will dump 750,000 yards. The one means failure and the other means success. Every old shovel that we have rehabilitated has been an expense to the nation, and now we are perhaps growing wise enough to abandon them and buy new ones. But the knowledge of our mistake comes quite late.

Mr. President, I have repeatedly said on this floor that one difficulty we were to meet with the Panama business is the climate. On the Atlantic side it is comparatively healthy. On the Pacific side it is probably the most difficult and deadly climate of any part of the earth. It has been a passageway from California for some years. I have known personally of people crossing that passageway before the railroad was built. They came across there on the old Royal road, and in only two days on the Isthmus they found themselves sick with the Chagres fever. Why? The authorities will tell you, if they tell you the truth, that Panama is one of the most unhealthy places in the world, and it is unhealthy because of the fact that there are no proper breezes and winds to drive away the deadly poison arising from decaying vegetable matter.

We had the same difficult problem in Panama that we had in Colon. There is a lot of old polluted buildings there which we have been repairing.

Mr. President, it is not worth while to dwell upon mistakes that have already been made; but we have made some other mistakes besides attempting to make use of the old worn-out and antiquated tools of the French. We here, this body, and the American people at large have made a mistake. I do not intend to criticise the Commission. I do not know what they have done. I am not sufficiently familiar with their efforts. We were to blame. One of the most intelligent engineers of the age, now dead, a member of the Commission at one time, had declared publicly over and over again that it would take two years of preparation before we could properly go to work on the canal. The Secretary of War declared before the Committee on Appropriations the other day that that preparation is still going on—preparation of sanitation, preparation for housing and feeding the people, the 17,000 people down there, and with practically no work being done on the canal as canal work; doing, Mr. President, what ultimately must be done and should have been done before a single laborer except those engaged in the preparation were put to work upon the canal.

We have been told that unjust criticisms have been made of the Commission down there. That is possible, Mr. President, but not probable, in my opinion. There has been a condition there that, it seems to me, no business man would have had if he had had his way. They had a bureau here with a man in charge down there. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] smiles. I am not referring now to the press agent. That I will leave later to some one else perhaps. The officer in charge telegraphing here for supplies could not get the supplies in several weeks, and when he got them down there they were locked up and by some system of Army regulations I do not understand it would take, as Mr. Wallace says, three weeks to get the supplies from the storehouse that the engineers and other men were waiting there to use.

Mr. President, if this canal is built on an economic plan it is necessary that the people who have charge of it should go down to the Isthmus and stay there. It can not be done here.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator remarked a moment ago that by some Army regulations supplies which had been shipped were held somewhere by some instrumentality so that they could not be obtained by the engineers. I thought it was brought out in the testimony before the Appropriations Committee that the organization is designed to obviate all the red tape of Army officers and all that sort of thing. I expressly asked the Secretary of War whether the control and direction of affairs down there—inspection and so on—could not be systematized and economy promoted and stealing prevented by the use of the machinery of the War Department, and he said he did not think so.

I am surprised that the Senator speaks so emphatically. Of course I know he has foundation in fact for what he says, but I have not run on it. Simply from overwork in other lines I have not had time to examine all the documents, the testimony, reports, etc. I am astonished to have the Senator say that with this efficient administration, which has been brought about by the employment of the high-priced officials, the expert railroad builders, etc., it takes three weeks to get material.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I am not going into all the details. The President appointed a man by the name of Wallace as chief engineer. I think there are some Senators here, perhaps, who know Mr. Wallace. At all events he had a good reputation; and Mr. Wallace is the authority for the statement that I made. I call the attention of the Senator from South Carolina, if he chooses, to several articles Mr. Wallace has written which have been published in the Engineering Magazine. He will find an article in the magazine of September, another article in the magazine of October, another of November, and another of December. It makes very interesting reading, but I am not going to stop to read it. He states one case where an officer was waiting for mosquito nets. They were in the warehouse, yet he could not get them; and finally he went in and in some way, without authority from the others, he got them. Then he was brought to book for it and charged with stealing them from the Government. However, I believe they did not prosecute that very far.

Mr. TILLMAN. I thought Mr. Wallace had full control on the Isthmus.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Wallace was the engineer, but he did not control those regulations as to the delivery of supplies.

Mr. President, I am going to take just a moment to say a word about Mr. Wallace. I never met Mr. Wallace, and I have no predilections in his favor except those I have for a man who is recognized in circles that have knowledge of these things as a scientific, educated engineer—a class of men for whom I have always had great respect. I know a great many of them in this country and I have always been benefited by their acquaintance. Mr. Wallace complained of these regulations seriously. Mr. Wallace is under a cloud in the isthmian circles. He went down there and stayed some time. He was met then by one of the great enterprises of this northern country with an offer of $50,000 a year, and he was getting $25,000. He hesitated because he held this position. They raised it to $65,000, and then he appealed to the Secretary of War and asked that he might be allowed to take it. The Secretary objected. Mr. Wallace thought he ought to take it; he had taken his family down there and he thought he ought not to have them there. He came back and resigned his place on the Commission, and by invitation of the Secretary of War, who asked him to resign because Mr. Wallace said he could not, under the circumstances, afford to stay there and give his entire time to it, but he would remain on the Commission if desired and give such assistance as he could. Thereupon this man, who had been there, who had some knowledge of the subject he was sent there to investigate, who I believe has come nearest the solution of this difficulty than any engineer who has ever been there, French or American, went out and went into other employment and a new man was taken. I do not mean to say a word against the new man.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the Senator allow me a word just there?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Wallace, whom the Senator has mentioned, is a resident of Illinois, and has been a resident of that State for many years.

Mr. TELLER. That I knew.

Mr. HOPKINS. I think it is not doing him entire justice to say that he left the service because of a larger salary. He left the service in part because when he reached the Canal Zone he found he could not carry out what he believed was necessary in order to properly protect the interests of the Government and build the canal in accordance with the spirit of the law which was enacted by Congress, and his friends resent the idea that he left there simply because he was paid a larger salary.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for that suggestion. I did not seek to leave the impression that he left on account of the salary. He was restive under the conditions, and I have not the slightest doubt, from what I know of his character, that he would have left without any salary rather than to have stayed there under the conditions as they existed.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will read from the speech of William H. Taft, Secretary of War, at the St. Louis Commercial Club, St. Louis, November 18, 1905, the following:

> Under the regulations prescribed by the President the Commission organized and appointed an executive committee, consisting of Shonts, Wallace, and Magoon, and adopted regulations dividing the executive work between Mr. Shonts, who, as chairman, took charge of the Washington office, the making of contracts, and the purchase of material, and general executive control of the whole business of the Commission; Mr. Wallace, who was chief engineer, and had now become a member of the Commission and executive committeeman, who took immediate charge of the engineering and construction work upon the Isthmus.

Now, I do not understand what the Senator means when he says that Mr. Wallace, who, it appears from Mr. Taft's statement, had absolute control of the construction work, could not get mosquito nets and other material, and from what the Senator from Illinois says it appears that Mr. Wallace really left in disgust because of the obstruction to his work as an engineer. So it was something else which made him unwilling to be re-

sponsible for something he could not carry out because of these hampering conditions. I should like to have this matter ventilated somewhere, either on the floor here or by an investigation of the committee of which the Senator from Illinois is an honorable member. There is no doubt if we can produce the conditions (and I hope to show some additional reasons why such an investigation is imperative), Mr. Wallace can be vindicated, because we can have him come before that committee or some other committee and testify in his own behalf as to whether he was so avaricious that he accepted a few paltry thousand rather than to link his name for all time with the greatest engineering work of the century or of ages.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Wallace does not need any vindication at all. The Senator from Illinois has stated the fact that every man who has kept in touch with this work knows to be true—that he was restive under the conditions. He was not, as he said, allowed a free hand. Mr. Wallace was there at the bidding of the President, to stay just as long as the President wanted. He had no contract to stay there during the entire work of the canal. He had to put himself in harmony with the element that represented the Canal Commission and the influences here, and if he failed to do it he was at any time, under the notice he received from the President when he got his appointment, obliged to quit whenever the President thought someone else could do the work better than he could, or when any difficulties arose between him and the members of the Commission who stood closer to the President.

Mr. President, I do not think that anyone ought to complain of Mr. Wallace, and if Senators will read his articles in the Engineering Magazine, written with good temper, written as a scientific gentleman should write them, dealing with the difficulties with great moderation, he will accept the statement made by the Senator from Illinois, that he left because things were not as he thought in the interest of the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, it is a great thing for a man to connect his name with one of these great enterprises, but it must be a successful enterprise and not a failure. I believe there are many engineers in this country who could take hold of this work and make a success of it. I believe there are a good many engineers who for no sum whatever would attempt to connect themselves with it unless they felt sure that they would be allowed to make a success of it.

I have been careful not to criticise anyone. I do not wish to appear as the opponent of any man on the Commission. I do not wish to appear as criticising the Executive of this nation. In the bill that we passed on the 28th of June, 1902, we gave him full authority to appoint all the people he saw fit to build the canal, and to fix their compensation, and the only thing we did not do was to appropriate the money, and some of the people connected with the canal insist that we did do that. Mr. Taft, the Secretary of War, said before the committee on Tuesday last he did not think we did, but that the President did not need any help from us to determine of what type the canal should be. The position of the War Department—and I suppose, if I may say so without any disrespect to the Executive, it is probably the Executive position—is that the President can build a lock canal 90 feet above sea level, 60 feet above sea level, or 30 feet if Congress appropriates the necesssary money. It may be that we agreed to let him do that. We have done some very foolish things in the last thirty or forty years, but I do not think we have ever done anything quite as foolish as to abandon our right to determine what character of canal shall be built. I am sure we did not intend to do that.

But, Mr. President, we ought to have determined more fully and in detail when we passed the bill what should be done. We ought to have taken Mr. Morrison's opinion, that it would require two years with a proper force to make the conditions there safe for commencing the work of this great enterprise. It was our fault if we allowed the President of the United States to build the canal. Of course he had to use human agencies to build it. We did not give him any assistance. The demand made by the Commission we had formed, the demand made by the public press, the demand made by public speakers that the dirt must fly on this canal and that the canal must be immediately commenced would justify the President of the United States under those conditions in going to work when the conditions were not suitable. If anyone ought to be criticised, we ought to be criticised here. Congress was to blame.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to say another word or two about the expense of it. I think the expense has been entirely too great. It is largely from lack of proper organization. There are 17,000 men down there, practically none of them engaged in constructing the canal, all of them engaged in doing what we ought to have done two years ago and ought to have done with one-third of that force. But if they did not have 17,000 men the anxiety on the part of the American people that the canal shall be built and built at once would have raised a great commotion. The President would have been blamed. This enterprise is big enough to take time. I myself have seen some of the great public works built. I know something of the history of nearly every great canal that has ever been built in the whole history of the world. The Erie Canal, completed in 1825 by the State of New York, was years and years in building. There were, as I said about the Suez Canal, no great engineering problems to be solved. There was a climate that enabled men to maintain their health and vigor the year round in their outdoor labor. They were not met by the pestilential malaria of the Tropics. They were not met with a tropical sun that burned into their brains and prevented them from working and destroyed their vigor. Yet, Mr. President, it took longer to build that canal, which in the end cost only $9,000,000, than the average American is willing to give to this canal.

Mr. President, I think perhaps I have said about all I care to say, except that I want to say a little about what shall be the character of the canal. What I am going to say is my judgment. I believe every Senator here will agree that we ought to have the best type of canal which can be built. We ought to have it because it will compensate us to have that kind of a canal, if any canal will. We ought to have it because we assume the right to build the canal and keep all mankind except ourselves from its building. We will not do ourselves any credit nor secure any glory if we build an unsuitable canal. I have said here over and over again that the only canal, in my judgment, that would in these days of haste, these days of celerity, these days of great ships, meet the demands of commerce and the approval of mankind is a canal that shall imitate nature, where ships that enter the waters of the sea may go through from one great ocean to the other. I would be proud of that. Almost anybody could build a lock canal, and you could get one that would take a forty-ton ship or a hundred-ton ship through it. It is only a great people like ours, with great resources, with great staying powers, that can build this great canal and distress the people with great burdens of taxation.

We will not build it for $275,000,000. We will not build it for $300,000,000. We will not build it, in my judgment, for $500,000,000. But we will build it, and if I am not mistaken in the temper of the American people they will demand that it shall be the best canal that was ever built or could be built by any people.

Mr. President, why do I say it will cost this great sum? I say it because there is not the man living to-day who has the data to tell you what it will cost. I have the right to say it because I have sat down at my desk and attempted from all the data that could be gotten to determine whether the canal could be built for the money these people say it can or not. Difficulties unforeseen are continually arising. We do not want to repeat the experience of the French. We do not want to start out to build a canal with $250,000,000 or $300,000,000 if it is going cost $500,000,000. We do not want so stop because it is going to cost $500,000,000. We want to face the question and prepare for it, and build the canal, now we have commenced, regardless of cost.

Mr. President, I do not know whether we should issue bonds for it or not. I should like the glory of building it with the money we collect, and give it to the commerce of the world and to the generations which are to come after us. But if we are not rich enough for that, let us issue the bonds. We can put out $500,000,000 or $800,000,000 if necessary, and the people will take them up, and we can pay them. We have expended since Dewey went into the harbor of Manila not less than $800,000,000 on the Philippine Islands. We have not gotten in return $800 worth of value, unless it be the glory he conferred upon the American flag and American shipping when he won that battle in that harbor. But, Mr. President, in the language of the West, at least, which we use sometimes, we have not "gone broke." We are as able to spend $800,000,000 on this work as if we had not already spent that amount at all.

Mr. President, I grow restive sometimes when I think of that great expense for nothing. This expense will not be for nothing. There is something that will come from it. If it is nothing in the way of finance, it will be some glory that shall solve the problem of the ages, and that we shall cut the waterway across the Isthmus that shall save 10,000 miles of seafaring from one American port to another.

The Committee on Interoceanic Canals will find themselves charged with great difficulties. There is criticism of the payment being made to individuals; there is criticism of the payment being made for supplies. All of these things must be put upon a business basis, and it is that committee's prerogative

and function to arrange for those things and not the committee to which I belong, the Committee on Appropriations, which reports this bill.

I do not know, Mr. President, how long I shall remain a member of the Senate. If I live until the 4th of March, 1909, and have my seat here in the Senate, I wish to repeat the pledge I made when the Spooner bill was passed, that whether I thought it wise to build the canal now or wait, that is the law of the land. By my education and by my principles it is my duty as a member of the Senate to vote these supplies, even if I do not approve of what may have been done. Even if the plan of the canal shall not meet my approval, if the party that has the right to determine what shall be the character of the canal determines it against my judgment, that will not justify me in obstructing, hindering, or delaying the execution of the work.

I have here a very large amount of data on canals, but I am not going to present them to the Senate now. I have a great many statements here to show, I think, that we are overrating the income which will be derived from this canal. I wish to say, however, that the income will be much greater if it is made a sea-level canal. While the expense of maintaining a sea-level canal will be millions of dollars, it will be less than the amount required for the maintenance of a lock canal, whether such a canal be constructed on a high elevation, a medium elevation, or on the lowest elevation.

I think this canal should be wider than is proposed by this Commission. It should be more than 150 feet wide, and it should be more than 35 feet deep. There are ships to-day drawing 40 feet of water. It should be deep enough to take a ship drawing 40 feet of water. It should be in some places 300 feet wide; in the great cuts where we are removing this earth it ought to be at least 300 feet wide as the only safety for the canal in the future.

If, however, you build a lock canal, that will be the end of it. While that lock canal is in operation you can not enlarge it; you must do what the State of New York is now doing with her Erie Canal—practically build a new canal. You can not build a new line across that Isthmus, for there is no place for it. When you have built this canal as a lock canal it will remain a lock canal for all time. If it is once found to be an inefficient and valueless canal, it will always remain an inefficient and valueless canal.

A majority of the engineers—I had perhaps better refer to that subject for a moment—to whom the President submitted the question, I think, are likely to report in favor of a sea-level canal; and the American engineers, some of them at least, will report in favor of a lock canal. I want the Senate to understand that, so far as I am acquainted with the American engineers, I know some of them who have expressed themselves on this subject are in favor of a lock canal, and every one of them who has done so has done it upon the ground that we ought not to spend the money which would be required to build a sea-level canal.

I want to repeat what I have said again and again, what I want to keep before your attention—and I want to have the attention, not simply of the Senate, but I want the American people to understand it—that this enterprise is one in which they have more than a financial interest. If it is to be a success, it must be a canal, I again repeat, that will meet the demands of the world. We are not building it for ourselves alone; we are building it for the commerce of the world. Unless we shall increase our commerce, unless we shall gather up in some way more of the business of exporting and importing, we shall do a beggarly business through that canal. Of all the exports and imports of the United States, on an average about 10½ per cent is being carried in American vessels, and the remainder is carried under foreign flags.

The commerce we shall carry through that canal does not now address itself to us. It might have done so when we were considering whether or not to build the canal; but it does not to-day, after we have pledged ourselves before the world that we would build it and after we have already spent $70,000,000 in trying to build it.

Mr. President, the greatest obstruction to the building of this canal is a river. I am going to touch on that briefly, and then I shall relieve the Senate from further discussion. There are a great many other things I should like to say, but there will be opportunity to say them at some other time.

The Chagres River is the most important and difficult problem of all. The French, when they considered the plan of a sea-level canal, and at the time when they planned to build a lock canal, proposed to build a dam across the river at Bohio. I believe now that it has been demonstrated to be impracticable, and that a dam can not be built there. Mr. Wallace, however, has made an examination higher up the river and has found a place where I do not think there can be any question but what the canal can be built.

Mr. Ernst, one of the engineers who for a long time was connected with the investigations down there, has gone higher up the river and selected two tunnel sites, one to run a portion of the water into the Pacific Ocean and another to run a portion of it into the Atlantic Ocean. The dam proposed is at Gamboa. This dam and these tunnels will solve that problem, and the entire expense will be less, I think, than the engineers had heretofore expected. Whether that will be done or not I do not know, but I think, as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] said the day before yesterday, there can be no dam built at Bohio, and there is no use talking about it. They have gone down a hundred and seventy feet, we know, in making the examination, and have found no rock yet. It is impossible, in my judgment, to maintain a dam of the character which the French company had planned and which for the time being we had accepted without much examination on the strength of their action.

These questions are all before the Commission; they will all come before us here; and I think it is the duty of every Senator to investigate them and be prepared to vote on them.

Now, I am going to leave this subject for the present. I have no doubt this appropriation bill will pass, and I suppose the chairman of the committee will repeat what was stated to the committee, that the amount it contains is sufficient to carry the work on without any hindrance until at least the 1st of April next.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from West Virginia allow me to offer an amendment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 21, section (3) 2, after the word "Canal," it is proposed to insert "or for any expenses incident thereto."

Mr. ALDRICH. I think that is self-explanatory, and I think perhaps the committee will have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the committee regard the language already in the bill as covering everything relating to the construction of the canal and the expenses incident thereto are of course a part of it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not sure as to that.

Mr. ALLISON. I am quite willing personally that the amendment shall be inserted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULBERSON. What is the amendment, Mr. President? Let the amendment be again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island will be again read for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 21, section (3) 2, after the word "Canal," insert "or for any expenses incident thereto;" so that as amended it reads:

> And no money shall be expended for any of the purposes of constructing and maintaining said isthmian canal or for any expenses incident thereto except in accordance with appropriations made by Congress.

Mr. MORGAN. That means, I take it, the salaries of officers?

Mr. ALDRICH. Anything. I understand there may be steamboat lines established.

Mr. MORGAN. I had hoped that the committee had purposely cut out the provision for salaries of officers, so that the money could be applied to the construction of the canal only, and not to the payment of such salaries.

Mr. SCOTT. I believe I have the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think there is no objection to making it perfectly clear that no money can be expended for the canal, or any expenditures incident thereto, without an appropriation by Congress; and I suppose that is what we are all after.

Mr. MORGAN. That is your purpose?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. CULBERSON. I desire to ask a question with reference to the amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. If it does not lead to debate I shall not object, but if it is to cause a running debate I shall object.

Mr. CULBERSON. What I desire to ask the chairman of the committee is whether or not it is intended by the provision,

which has just been made, to limit the operation of section 5 of what is known as the "Spooner Act?" There is some question as to whether the general provision against deficiencies applies to the Spooner Act. Now, this provision here seems to squint, at least, at a modification of section 5 of the Spooner law. I desire to know if that is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know what the precise purpose of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] may be; but, as I understand it, the amendment does not in the slightest degree affect section 5 of the Spooner law.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of a canal across the Isthmus of Panama. So the remarks I am now going to make should not, and can not, be taken as an evidence of opposition to such a project on my part. It is in no spirit of opposition to the proposed appropriation that I desire to address the Senate. I will not, by my vote, in any way delay action on this measure to give to the Panama Canal Commission a sufficient amount of funds with which to proceed in its work. But I do desire to call the attention of the Senate and the country to the fact that I feel more certain than ever that a mistake has been made in selecting the Panama route for this canal.

In the Fifty-seventh Congress I took occasion, by the courtesy of the Senate, to address this honorable body on the merits of the San Blas, or Mandingo Bay, route across the Isthmus. At that time I had given the subject as careful study as it was possible for me to give; had examined the reports of engineers, the equals of any connected with the present Commission, and felt satisfied that this route was the best proposed to connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. My plea was made at that time for an appropriation of only $15,000 to meet the expenses of a board of engineers in thoroughly examining and reporting on this route. In its wisdom the Senate saw fit to take no action on this resolution of mine.

We are now confronted with a situation which only proves, to my mind at least, what I have always held concerning the Panama route. Millions of dollars have been expended, and the canal itself is no nearer completion than it was when the United States took charge of its construction. A difference of opinion among engineers exists, some favoring a sea-level and others a lock canal. Ten years was set as the limit for the work. Two years have passed, and, as I said before, the canal itself is no nearer completion than it was at the beginning. I do not think that this canal, as projected, can be completed within ten years from the present time. If the plans are changed to make it a sea-level canal, our children may live to see the day when ships can pass through it from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The cost was estimated at nearly $200,000,000, and to the uninitiated it now looks as if it would take a half billion dollars at least to complete this stupendous work. Two years of experience seem to bear out the prediction made concerning the almost impossible conditions of completing this canal. The time of completion will be indefinitely extended, and the amount of money necessary has indefinitely increased. I have faith enough in American genius and American grit to believe that even this canal will be completed some day, but the cost will be beyond our most extravagant estimates.

It is because of these facts that I desire again to direct attention to the San Blas route across the Isthmus of Panama. As a business man I have studied this route as a business proposition, and in my previous address I gave the reasons in detail for the conclusions drawn. Let me state the conclusions again, comparing them with the Panama Canal.

The San Blas line is less than 30 miles long; the Panama line is 49 miles long.

The San Blas line has excellent and capacious harbors at each end not subject to calms or cyclones. The Panama line has very good harbors, but the harbor of Panama is subject to calms and Colon is visited by northers.

The San Blas line is at sea level, without locks, gates, or dams, excepting a tide lock; the Panama line—no one knows what it will be.

The San Blas route, after construction is commenced, could be completed within three, or at the most, five years. No one knows how long it will take to complete the Panama line.

The San Blas line will have no curve; the Panama Canal has several.

The San Blas Canal could pass a ship from sea to sea in five or six hours; the Panama would require fifteen.

The San Blas line would be located in a most healthful district. The expenditure of millions of dollars for sanitary purposes has already shown in what sort of a district the Panama Canal lies.

The San Blas Canal could be constructed all the way, with the exception of a short distance, through solid rock; the Panama Canal is to be constructed for a large part of the way through mud, sand, slippery clay, and shale rock.

Finally, the entrance to the San Blas line would be several miles nearer to New York than Panama.

It would seem, Mr. President, that a route that is the shortest, least expensive to complete, easiest to build and maintain, capable of construction within from three to five years, with a capacity for business ten times larger than any other route, would have appealed to the Isthmian Canal Commission, to the Senate, and to the people of the country. But, Mr. President, a tunnel was necessary on the San Blas route, and this proved to be the great "bugaboo" in the way. It made no difference that eminent engineers as early as 1864 surveyed this San Blas, or Darien, route and reported on its feasibility. It made no difference that eminent foreign engineers unhesitatingly gave their favorable consideration to this San Blas route. It made no difference that even eminent American naval officers and engineers gave it their sanction. The Ishmian Canal Commission simply ignored it. Naturally the Senate and the people also ignored it.

But why did the Isthmian Canal Commission ignore this project? Some one with knowledge greater than I possess must answer; I can not. A large sum of money was appropriated by Congress for the purpose of examining and reporting on the most practicable route across the Isthmus of Panama. It would seem reasonable that such a commission would examine into all the proposed routes. And this Commission did, in a way, at least so far as the San Blas route is concerned. On their ship, several miles out at sea, with the instruments at their command, they gazed upon the mountain range under which the canal must be dug, and at once unhesitatingly gave it as their opinion that such a proposition was an impossibility! The mountains, so their instruments told them, were of volcanic origin; the inside was composed of soft and decaying material, through which it would be impossible to bore. Having seen, and having satisfied their eyes, they sailed away and ignored this route! The Commission landed no parties, no borings were made in the mountains, and no route from ocean to ocean was followed. Satisfied with their distant telescopic view, they refused afterwards to place any importance upon the actual borings made by eminent engineers and the tests of the rock so found made by most eminent scientists. They paid no attention to the testimony of distinguished engineers as to the possibilities of the construction of such a canal. And yet one engineer of high standing and long experience, believing in the possibility of this canal, has since been called into the counsels of the Commission.

Mr. MORGAN. Who was that engineer?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Randolph.

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. SCOTT. In addition, a company composed of reputable business men proposed to dig this canal, tunnel and all, within six years. All these gentlemen asked was the indorsement of the United States on one hundred and fifty millions of the company's bonds. Such indorsement was guarded in the most careful manner. In return, the United States was to have the use of this canal free for one hundred years. But such an offer was not deemed worthy of consideration, nor did it even cause a suspicion in the minds of the Commission that perhaps the San Blas Canal was a feasible route.

As I said at the outset, Mr. President, I do not intend to delay for a moment, if I could, the building of the Panama Canal. I shall vote for the money needed to complete this great project. I do not offer these remarks as a harsh criticism on the Commission or on the judgment of Congress. But I do desire to state, in my opinion, that if the appropriation for which I asked three years ago had been made, the Government to-day would not be standing sponsor for the Panama Canal and its ramifications of toil and expense. I believe it would have chosen the shorter, cheaper, and more easily constructed route.

Mr. MORGAN obtained the floor.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me to say just a word in relation to the amendment I offered a moment ago?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. In answer to the question of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], I would say that my purpose is to make it certain that no money shall be expended for the construction and maintenance of the canal, or any expenses incident thereto, unless the money shall be appropriated by Congress for that purpose. If the last clause of the fifth section of the Spooner Act, so called, should be construed to authorize expenditures without definite appropriations, then the amendment certainly does modify and change the fifth section of the Spooner Act.

Mr. BACON. I understand the reason for offering the amendment by the Senator is that it is contended by some persons that under the fifth section, as it now stands in the existing law, an appropriation is not necessary.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have heard that contention made.

Mr. BACON. And the purpose of the Senator is to set that question at rest?

Mr. ALDRICH. To make it perfectly clear that no money can be expended unless it is appropriated.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, in frankness I ought to say that, in my judgment, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] does not state the case on the part of the Administration correctly. As I understand it, the idea of the Administration, as expressed by the Secretary of War, is that, under the Spooner Act, the President is authorized to enter into contracts; but that there must be appropriations to pay those contracts from time to time by the Congress. If it is the purpose of the Senator from Rhode Island by his amendment to cut off the payment of money except by a specific appropriation, whether the payment is made on the spot in cash or by contract, then his amendment ought to go further and use the term "contract," so that the language employed will unquestionably cover it.

Mr. ALDRICH. My amendment and the amendment of the committee were not intended to stop the power of contract, which is given by the fifth section of the Spooner Act. That question is not dealt with at all. The amendment is intended to provide that expenditures must cease whenever the amount of money appropriated by Congress is expended.

Mr. CULBERSON. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] has been agreed to.

Mr. BACON. In order that I may not be misunderstood, I will say that I did not undertake, as is suggested by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], to state the contention of the Administration. I would have no right to do that. I simply stated that it was a proposition contended for by some that, under the fifth section of the Spooner Act, expenditures could be made without specific appropriation, and that in recognition of the existence of that contention the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], as I understood him, had introduced his amendment for the purpose of setting that question at rest by providing that expenditures can not hereafter be made, if this amendment shall be incorporated in the law, without a specific appropriation. That is as far as I intended to go.

Mr. ALLISON. The amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] only affects incidental expenditures, or expenditures incident to construction. The amendment proposed by the committee, which has been agreed to by the Senate, settles the question as respects the expenditure of money in advance of appropriation. Contracts can be made just as contracts are made in other branches of the Government service. For rivers and harbors, for instance, a contract is made that a certain work shall be undertaken and that the cost shall not exceed so many million dollars. A contract is made, but that contract must be made within whatever the limit may be. The fifth section of the Spooner Act authorizes the President to contract within the limit of $135,000,000, but I do not understand, though others may, that a contract can be made that will bind the Government for expenditures in the future without appropriations by Congress. If a contrary construction can be made of the Spooner Act, the amendment proposed by the committee and by the Senator from Rhode Island ought to be agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, does the Senator construe this law to limit the power of the President to contract?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not. We expressly allow him to contract, but certainly he is not to contract and expend money——

Mr. SPOONER. Ah!

Mr. ALLISON. That has not been appropriated by Congress.

Mr. SPOONER. Not to contract and expend?

Mr. ALLISON. Contract and expend. He can contract, if he chooses, for certain expenditures. If there is an appropriation for such expenditures they can be made, but if there is not, they can not be made and ought not to be made.

Mr. SPOONER. All the Senator means is that the President can not expend under contract money that has not theretofore been appropriated?

Mr. ALLISON. That is exactly true. In all river and harbor appropriation bills contracts are authorized by law, but expenditures under the contracts are estimated for and appropriated by Congress in advance of their being made.

Mr. SPOONER. My understanding of the law is in harmony with that of the Senator. The only limitation upon the President's power to contract was this:

> And the President is hereby authorized to cause to be entered into such contract or contracts as may be deemed necessary for the proper excavation, construction, completion, and defense of said canal, harbors, and defenses, by the route finally determined upon under the provisions of this act. Appropriations therefor shall from time to time be hereafter made, not to exceed in the aggregate the additional sum of $135,000,000 should the Panama route be adopted, or $180,000,000 should the Nicaragua route be adopted.

It was clearly contemplated that appropriations should be made from time to time to meet the expenditures.

Mr. ALLISON. That is my understanding, and this amendment does not change it. It only provides that the expenditure shall be appropriated for.

Mr. SPOONER. Let me ask the Senator——

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator from Texas will permit me for one moment. At the last session of Congress section 3679 was enacted:

> No Department of the Government shall expend, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law.

The last clause of that section would apply to section 5, as I understand it.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator think the prohibition of last winter—I mean against deficits—would apply to the Panama Canal?

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator asks me for my view of that, I will say that I think it does not apply to the Panama Canal. That is a contract authorized by law.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; but in addition to that, do you construe the prohibition of a deficit as applying to this matter?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not.

Mr. SPOONER. As I understand, the Senator from Rhode Island secured the adoption of an amendment to this clause.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; by the insertion of the words "or for any expenses incident thereto."

Mr. SPOONER. "Or for any expenses incident thereto." Was that adopted?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. It is the purpose to bring the construction of the canal and the expenditures therefor within the purview of that prohibition?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator from Iowa, he takes the position that notwithstanding the general language of section 5 of the Spooner Act, authorizing the President to contract within the limit of a hundred and thirty-five million dollars, yet he can not contract beyond the limit of the specific appropriation that may be made from year to year. That is not the position of the Administration; it is not the construction placed upon that law by the Secretary of War. I call attention to his language at page 15 of the hearing:

> Secretary TAFT. No, sir. In other words, I do not think that the section, to which reference was made, in the last appropriation act——
> The CHAIRMAN. Applies?
> Secretary TAFT. Applies at all to this, because that applies to cases where there is no express authority to make contracts beyond appropriations, and the Spooner Act contains the express authority to make contracts for the construction of the canal.
> The CHAIRMAN. In other words, if you choose to do so you can contract now for the whole canal?
> Secretary TAFT. Yes, sir.
> The CHAIRMAN. If it does not exceed $130,000,000?
> Secretary TAFT. Yes, sir.

Mr. President, in view of this opposing opinion, it seems to me that those in charge of the bill making this appropriation should clear up the situation by explicit language that there may be no misunderstanding hereafter.

Mr. SPOONER. Who holds the opposite opinion to that of Secretary Taft on this question?

Mr. CULBERSON. I understood the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations did.

Mr. SPOONER. Not at all.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt that under that clause a contract could be made for the construction of the canal within the limit stated, but that contract surely must be subject to appropriations made by Congress, because in connection with it there is the clause to which attention has been called.

But the intention of the committee in proposing these amendments was that in making these contracts there shall be provision that they shall be conducted in accordance with the appropriations made from time to time by Congress and subject to that limitation. It is just what we do with respect to our public buildings and as to rivers and harbors, etc., and it seems to me that this provision as respects the construction of the canal should be put exactly upon that basis and no other.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to ask him a question in order to secure an illustration of his view? In the case of a continuing contract for the improvement of a

harbor, I understand that under the law a continuing contract can be made, contemplating a succession of appropriations thereafter each year as the work may develop; but is it not true that while those contracts are thus authorized under the law, no work can be done to the extent that a liability therefor shall be incurred for the payment of the money until the money is appropriated for the work?

Mr. ALLISON. That is true, and the contract so provides.

Mr. BACON. In other words, while the contract can be made, the work on account of which the money is to be paid is not to be done until the money is appropriated therefor. Am I correct in that respect?

Mr. ALLISON. The method as respects rivers and harbors and public improvements of every kind is that a contract can be made for the completion of the work. That enables the contractor, of course, to acquire sufficient plant, etc., to go on with the whole work. He knows he has that contract, but as to the rapidity with which the work is to be done or paid for it depends upon appropriations made by Congress. Now, it certainly would not be the part of wisdom for us to have a contract here covering many millions of dollars without knowing from time to time the appropriations that will be made for that purpose. That is all that is provided for here.

Mr. TILLMAN. It occurs to me to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in view of what has been said about making contracts and the power of the President, as claimed by the Secretary of War, to make a contract, whether or not any evidence has been brought to our attention that it is proposed to build this canal as one whole thing by some one contractor. Is not the work going on now, where there is any contract at all, by piecemeal, individual contracts being given out, without anyone knowing whether the aggregate of all the small contracts, when they come to be footed up, will far exceed $135,000,000?

Therefore if the contention which the Senator from Wisconsin has presented, rather than the Senator from Iowa, that the President is permitted to make contracts within the limit of $135,000,000 holds good, without the limitation which this amendment proposes, I want to know how we are to be sure that contracts will not be let which will absorb the whole $135,000,000 and yet the canal be not half completed? The necessity for the amendment limiting all expenditures to the specific amounts appropriated for specific purposes is more obvious by reason of the contention I have put out. Otherwise this project will cost us four or five or three times—I do not know how much, but an immense amount—more by reason of the fact that we will not know whether the contracts will carry the work along to the percentage of completion which the amount paid under them would require.

Mr. ALLISON. It is true, as the Senator says, that there is no general contract now.

Mr. TILLMAN. None is contemplated, either, that I have heard of.

Mr. ALLISON. It may possibly be. They have the right to contract.

Mr. TILLMAN. I say I have not heard of it.

Mr. ALLISON. The limitation is the total cost of the work when completed, as provided by statute, according to the plans of the engineers of the Government.

Mr. TILLMAN. But unless there is a contract covering the entire construction, so that when the contract is completed the canal will be completed, where are we at, except in the clouds or in the mud, and I do not know which?

Mr. ALLISON. We will be in the clouds or the air somewhere.

Mr. TILLMAN. We will be stuck in the mud, because there is a lot of rain down there.

Mr. ALLISON. There is a provision that the cost of the canal shall not exceed $135,000,000.

Mr. TILLMAN. Who is to be the judge as to whether a given contract will cover a percentage of the total cost equal relatively to the total amount stated—$135,000,000?

Mr. ALLISON. The President of the United States, of course.

Mr. TILLMAN. Suppose he makes a mistake, as even a President may sometimes do?

Mr. ALLISON. If that mistake shall be made in the great future, I think there will be some way of relieving ourselves.

Mr. TILLMAN. We will have to pay the expense.

Mr. ALLISON. Very likely we shall.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I yielded the floor a while ago in order to have other gentlemen make some inquiries about the form in which this legislation should be perfected. Having gotten through that and an agreement, I believe, having been reached about it, I wish to make some suggestions of rather a general character about this business, which I think I ought to make, considering my relation to the subject heretofore.

As to the practicability or feasibility of the construction of a canal at Panama, and as to the conditions under which we have taken over the property from the French company, and as to the suspicious surroundings that belong to those conditions, and as to my personal opinion as a member of the Senate with reference to the possibility or impossibility of making a canal, either a lock canal or a sea-level canal, at Panama, I have already gone on record as far and as fully as I desire to do.

I am very much gratified to find that the statements which I laid before the country at that time—all statements of fact, not mere opinions—are being quoted with approval by Senators on this floor, and that they are resorting to those facts now as a basis of argument as to what we are about to try to do, instead of having appealed to them as a basis of action against any attempt to build a canal at Panama. I need not put quotation marks around those statements for identification. That question has all passed. Congress has decided that the canal is to be built at Panama, and in the recent message of the President we have an admonitory statement made by him, which shows, if it shows anything, that he would feel compelled to veto any bill the Congress might pass to take the canal to San Blas or to Nicaragua, in the following words:

> Active work in canal construction, mainly preparatory, has been in progress for less than a year and a half. During that period two points about the canal have ceased to be open to debate. First, the question of route; the canal will be built on the Isthmus of Panama. Second, the question of feasibility; there are no physical obstacles on this route that American engineering skill will not be able to overcome without serious difficulty, or that will prevent the completion of the canal within a reasonable time and at a reasonable cost. This is virtually the unanimous testimony of the engineers who have investigated the matter for the Government.

There we have a statement by the President, which he will be prepared to execute against any vote of the Congress of the United States, that he will veto any measure proposed at any time to change the route from Panama either to Nicaragua or San Blas. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] has correctly stated that the Committee on Interoceanic Canals of the Senate gave no attention practically to the San Blas route for the reason that the Isthmian Canal Commission, under the circumstances and in the manner which he has properly stated, made their observations in regard to that route and reported against its practicability, reporting at the same time in favor of the Panama route, having three times before that, and once under oath, reported in favor of the Nicaragua route. Their change of front on the subject, which some gentleman has ventured to call a flop, was brought about by conditions which I do not find it necessary at this moment of time to inquire into, nor do I know that it would be of any interest to the country that they should ever be inquired into. The gentlemen who made that proposition and certified it in the manner I have stated have gone out of business, and most of them have gone out of observation, and I am disposed to let them stay right where they have planted themselves in public estimation.

The proposition brought forward this morning in the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia is a reasonable one, considering the fact that the Panama route and any other route that Congress has yet decided upon is exclusively for the benefit of steamships. A tunnel would have to be dug at San Blas, but it need not be of the altitude in its grand arch to admit sailing vessels to go through. Perhaps a height of 50 or 75 feet in the apex of the arch would be quite sufficient to admit the passage of the largest steamers which would ever attempt to pass through. It would depend mainly upon the length of their funnels.

As to its feasibility, the question is exactly the same that has been demonstrated completely in the railway tunnels through the Alps; that is to say, it is quite as feasible in the present state of the art of tunneling to make a tunnel large enough to admit the largest steamer in the world, as it is to construct the tunnel in Washington for the accommodation of railway trains, which is to pass almost under the Capitol. As to the cheapness, when we consider the question of its durability and the absence of the necessity for continued repairs, the tunnel is the cheapest, it is the most permanent, the least liable to difficulty.

The Senator referred to the objection that was made that the interior of the mountain between San Blas and the Gulf of Panama was said to be of soft material. If that is so, it is all the better for boring, because no constructor of any tunnel for a canal through that region of country or any region of country would think of letting the tunnel rest without a lining from bottom to top to make it absolutely secure. So if the material is really soft it is cheaper and better for boring.

That, Mr. President, is an ideal situation for a canal for many reasons; for one great reason that it has no Spanish and

free negro population in towns and cities at each end of it. It passes through an uninhabited region. It passes under it. It gets rid, just as far as human skill can make plans to that end, of the interference which we are bound to expect—and it will come, often times in forms and with a rapidity that we little dream of—from the miserable population that happens to have congregated on the surface of the earth between Colon and Panama. We will be rid of all that. I believe to-day, in view of the situation now presented of a divided judgment between the American and foreign engineers, that it would be wise for the Congress of the United States to direct an immediate survey of the San Blas route, which could readily be made within the period of time that the present Congress will be in its first session.

No man could mention to me or give to me an assurance that would be more grateful to my mind than that of the practicability or the feasibility of building any kind of a canal at Panama. I would welcome it as a solution of the difficulties that very able and learned men have encountered and that the common sense of the people of the United States upon the facts which are perfectly known finds call for hesitation and doubt. We ought not really, if we can avoid it, to spend a dollar in building a canal anywhere across the Isthmus unless we are first satisfied that when the canal is built it will be a perfect and unfailing channel for the conveyance of the commerce of the world. We have not reached that conclusion by any means. We are as far away from it as we were three years ago—quite as far away—and there is a greater labyrinth of doubt than existed at the time of the dissension between the former commission d'étude of the Panama Canal and the American engineers who reported upon the De Lesseps project of a sea-level canal. I would very cheerfully vote any money that might be necessary to have an expedition sent at once to San Blas to see whether or not a canal could be made practicable at that point.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] is a practical man, a man of business knowledge, who works out propositions of the kind with which we are dealing with as much certainty as anyone is able to do upon the facts that are furnished to him, and I have great respect for his judgment. I do not know that it is worth while for him or anyone else to offer such a bill and have this report made—and it can be made at least by May—for the reason that the President has determined, as he says in his message, that the canal shall be built at Panama, and shall not be built anywhere else. It seems to me, Mr. President, that is really taking time by the forelock and in a very strenuous way. However the balance of the Senate may feel under such circumstances, I do not feel comfortable when I am informed by the President of the United States that the canal shall be built at a certain location, and shall not be changed from that location, and that it shall be built. We have acquired by the payment of $40,000,000 certain canal franchises which did not belong to the company that sold them to us. They belonged to Colombia at the time we bought them from the Panama Canal Company. But we have bought them, and along with them we have taken over a railroad which is of very great value. It is indeed the very best piece of railroad property in the world. We have no accounts from it. We are not likely to get any very soon, because it is the interest of the men who are concerned most prominently in the management of that railroad that the Government and the country should know very little about it at the present time. It has a queer board of directors, some of them civilians and some of them officers of the Isthmian Canal Commission. It seems to be an independent affair there. It regulates itself according to its own will—buys ships, buys material, makes contracts and what not, and makes no accounting to the Government of the United States, but to the Commission in authority at Panama, for its income and I suppose for its expenses.

I did not say, as has been attempted to be quoted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] in his speech this morning, that graft had found its way into the Government operations in Panama. I made no such accusation. I shall be very sorry if the occasion ever arises when it ought to be made, and it must be made if it is true. What I said was this:

> Already, Mr. President, the history of the Panama Canal is fully as bad as the first three years of the history of the old De Lesseps Panama Canal—not perhaps so deeply stained with fraud and graft, as it is called, but as to reckless expenditure, as to the wasteful use of the money of the people, as to the carelessness as to what the results are going to be, as to insufficiency and incompleteness of knowledge of what we are doing, and what we can do, we are as far in the woods to-day as the De Lesseps canal was three years after it was projected; and we have gone on with this job for three dreadful years.
>
> If any graft has occurred—I do not know the precise definition of that word; it has a very latitudinous meaning in the estimation of the people—if any graft has occurred it will be found most notably in the management of that railroad; and that is the point to which I hope the committee which took charge of this subject on Monday will address their attention particularly. I have not had time to read the report, and I do not know that the subject was then called up in the examination of Mr. Shonts and Secretary Taft, who appeared before the committee.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. I did not mean to misquote the Senator at all; and if I find that I did, I simply ask permission to correct my speech to conform to what the Senator did say.

Mr. MORGAN. I knew the Senator had no idea of misquoting me. I knew that very well.

Mr. TELLER. I spoke only from recollection, having heard what the Senator said, and I may not have remembered it accurately.

Mr. MORGAN. I am merely trying to exonerate myself from all unnecessary suspicion as to my attitude on this subject. When I was in an extremely low state of health I marshaled these facts before the Senate of the United States, frequently when only two or three Senators were present and there were no occupants of the galleries to listen, and when the newspapers got so tired of my statements about it that they would not report what was said.

Now, what I have said is of record, and I would not change one word of it for my right hand; and I have stated the facts, and it is all the truth.

In respect to my future relations to this subject, standing in an attitude where I am really suspected of a positive hostility to any canal at all because I opposed the transfer of the canal from Nicaragua to Panama, I want to be very careful about what I say and to say very little. I am going to have very little to say about this canal from this on, because I have said what I believe to be true, and it is being revealed as the truth every day wherever the subject is considered and by every Senator who considers it.

I wish to say just a word about the Spooner bill. The distinguished author of that bill never did his country a greater service than he did in the formulation of that measure. If its purposes had been executed this country would to-day have been in a degree of prosperity in canal construction that we would call glorious. It has been thwarted. It has been thwarted by the command and the determined resistance of the President of the United States. The records show the truth of what I say. When I speak of the record I mean his own messages. Recently, at Mobile, Ala., the President said that he had been in favor of the Nicaragua canal. Would anyone say that the Congress of the United States had compelled him to go to Panama? I leave the record to answer.

Now, realizing, perhaps because the subject was somewhat referred to in public prints, that he had overstepped the boundaries of discretion in that statement at Mobile, he comes out and he says in his message to the Congress of the United States, "The canal will be built at Panama; that is a settled question; it will not be built anywhere else." I yield to the preliminary veto and I say, "Yea and amen!" Build it at Panama if you can, but I do not think you can." And I have yet a right to say that much.

The bill before the Senate, as I understood it all the time, was to provide for a deficit. I notice here that the deficit is put by Mr. Pepperman at $16,500,000, and the House for some reason has cut that deficit down to $11,000,000, the sum appropriated in the bill on the report of the Committee on Appropriations. As to what becomes of the $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 that was stricken out here I have no knowledge. I have no knowledge as to what particular part of the list of estimates furnished by Mr. Pepperman the sum that is stricken out of the bill will be made applicable. But if it could be shown to me or stated by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that the sum which was reduced below the estimates of the Government was necessary and proper to be expended to make up the salaries or other contracts that have been entered into by the Canal Commissioners, I would cheerfully vote to put the amount back to $16,500,000.

Mr. ALLISON. Does the Senator ask the question?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the estimate of $16,500,000, called a deficiency estimate, is one which is intended to carry on the work as it is now being carried on, increasing perhaps the work from month to month. That would require $16,500,000;

but the Secretary of War in his statement before the committee stated that with $11,000,000, the amount found in the bill as passed by the House, all the work could be prosecuted as proposed until the 1st of April, and that between the 1st of April and the 30th of June the Commission would require the additional sum of $5,500,000.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, I suppose——

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow me to make just one further remark——

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. The Secretary of War stated to us in explanation that within the next two or three months he hoped the question of the character of the canal would be definitely settled—that is to say, whether it would be a sea-level canal or a lock canal, as contemplated in the act called the Spooner Act, and that he was content with $11,000,000 as proposed, because it might be that the decision as respects the character of the canal would require a greater sum, I think he stated, than the additional $5,500,000 estimated for in the original estimate sent to the House of Representatives. So the deficiency appropriation found in this bill as it came to us from the House will provide for all that is necessary up to the 1st day of April, and another deficiency bill will be required about that time.

Mr. MORGAN. Then we are expected to be in session here the 1st day of April, when another deficiency is to be voted; otherwise the canal must stop.

Mr. ALLISON. That would seem to be the expectation; and I think very likely we may be in session the 1st of April.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, by the 1st day of April, or at least by the 1st day of May, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] could have his survey made at San Blas. We have got to be here, and I shall insist, whenever he calls up the measure, that he is entitled to be heard by the Senate very seriously and very effectively in solving and putting forever at rest the question whether the San Blas route is practicable, because if it is practicable, Mr. President, it is the best route that anybody has ever designed for a sea-level canal. There is no question of that. It is perfectly straight and very short, and terminates at each end in bays that need very little dredging or very little preparatory work to accommodate the largest vessels of commerce that are afloat to-day.

Now, as to the work that is to go on with the appropriation of $11,000,000, it will carry the canal forward according to the plan that they are working on now until the 1st of April. That includes, I suppose, the payment of all these so-called "extravagant salaries." The House and the Senate will not have been able, by the small reduction of the appropriation from sixteen and one-half million dollars to $11,000,000, to control in any wise, as I understand it, what these salaries are to be. There is more money spent upon salaries in Panama in proportion to the amount of work that is done than there is in any other part of that whole undertaking; and that is where the rub of extravagance comes in. That is where the Congress of the United States ought at once to prescribe to the President some limit upon his generosity in lavishing out the money of the people upon his favorites and his pets. That is where we ought to begin. But the committee has very handsomely glided around that proposition, and they have merely cut down the appropriation from sixteen and one-half million dollars to $11,000,000, without designating the particular objects to which this appropriation is to be applied in the future. As to the contracts for material, I can see very well that they ought to be provided for. As to the employment of a sufficient amount of labor to carry on the digging operations, the excavations in the Culebra heights, I can see that it ought to be provided for. As to the payment for the great shovels described by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], I can see that that ought to go. But I can not see, Mr. President, that these very extravagant salaries ought to go on when we are cutting the President off from the full supply of money that he has said was necessary to enable him to complete the work.

I am not using the word offensively, but we are pretending to reduce the expenditures at the canal by cutting down salaries when in fact we are letting them run along. They will be paid just at the figures that have been prescribed by the liberality and generosity and extravagance of the President of the United States.

I had some other observations that I desired to make about this canal, and I think it would not be out of place if I should make them now.

Suppose that the canal at Panama is a success. Suppose that it is built within fifteen or twenty-five years, and that when built it will be permanent; that it will defy the earthquakes that have occurred and reoccurred there in a period of twenty years and mashed things to pieces in a terrific way. Suppose that that canal is built of such proportions that the largest steamship now in the world or the largest to be projected can pass through. Still no American sailing ship can go through it, and the men who are carrying on the great bulk of the coastwise trade, about which we are accused of being so remarkably selfish by the European powers, can be cut out of any possible opportunity of conducting that trade between the Pacific and the Atlantic coasts of the United States. They have got to double the Horn before they can get to San Francisco or anywhere near it. They can not go through the canal. It is from 400 to 600 miles of perfectly dead water, dead air, out in what is called the "doldrums" beyond the bay of Panama, through which a sailing ship can not pass except with the assistance of a steamer. You might take the finest packet ship in the United States and give it all the sailing power you could possibly put upon it and carry it out 200 miles into that dead sea and the ship would rot and the men would die and the provisions would give out. They would die of starvation, if they did not die otherwise, before that ship could ever get out of it. It could never get out unless through the agency of some accidental storm. So the sailing ships of the United States are absolutely cut off from any canal at Panama—sea-level or lock canal.

I can very well see, Mr. President, that the control which men have—labor unions and mine owners in railway transportation—over the supply of coal in the United States may put the commerce of the world at a terrible disadvantage in supplying coal to do all the work that a canal can possibly do on the plan that is projected at Panama, or either of the plans. Then we will be raising our hands and crying out for assistance from the winds to carry our commerce as it has been carried from the foundation of civilization, and the natural reply will be the same that we are making to-day—that we are barricaded and cut off from any such opportunity by an act of folly and national injustice.

I, therefore, irrespective even of the proper accommodation of the sailing fleets of the world, can very well understand, I think, without any stretch of imagination, basing my calculation exactly upon ascertained facts, that by the time you get your canal built at Panama and in full operation, with every prospect of permanence, to the delight of the country, there will be a demand for commercial transit through that canal that it can not possibly supply.

The Suez Canal, which was projected at the time of first construction for the largest ships—sailing ships or steamers—that were then in vogue, has proved to be quite insufficient for the accommodation of commerce, and they have enlarged it one time. They have added about 100 per cent to its carrying capacity and increased the expenditure upon the Suez Canal, which is 99 miles long, from $100,000,000 to about $200,000,000. They have done that, Mr. President, not for the accommodation of sailing craft, because no sailing ship ever goes through the Suez Canal—not even a fisherman passes through—but for the accommodation of steamers and only steamers. So to meet the increased demand of commerce carried by steam through the Suez Canal it has already been necessary to increase the capacity of that canal double and to increase the expenditures double. It now stands them at a cost of $200,000,000, whereas when it was completed the cost of construction was $100,000,000.

The Suez Canal on that basis—$200,000,000—if my information is entirely correct, for about fifteen years has been declaring an annual dividend of 15 per cent net upon the $200,000,000 invested, or thereabouts, and so valuable is the stock of the Suez Canal that you can not buy it on the Bourse or on the London Exchange to-day for less than 900 per cent.

Looking to the future of any canal across the isthmian country of America, I can well believe that when it presents a shorter and safer route between the Pacific Ocean and the Atlantic Ocean, without having to navigate the Red Sea at one end and the Mediterranean at the other, the increase of traffic through that canal will mount up so rapidly that by the time you get the canal completed you will be obliged to have another.

My contemplation of the American situation and the American policy in respect to the canalization of any part of the isthmian region of America is this: No canal can be dug through the isthmian part of America by any nation or any company or any power whatever that is not under the exclusive control of the United States of America. It makes no difference when it comes or who may undertake it or who may furnish the money, the American doctrine is a mere false pretense if it does not extend to the proposition that the control of that canal shall be exclusively American. If any other power, even the powers that own the land bordering upon both oceans—such as Nicaragua and Costa Rica—should undertake to build a canal through their own country, the American Government would

be derelict if it did not take that matter in charge and control the canal. The great commercial, military, and political interests of the United States require that we should exercise that amount of authority over an isthmian canal, and that is, in truth, the whole meaning and merit of the American plea on that subject.

Now, looking to one of our own examples here, in about thirty-five years, I think it is, during which the canal at Sault Ste. Marie has been in operation, we commenced with a tonnage upon that canal of 600,000 tons a year, and it is now more than 36,000,000 tons a year. Just opposite to it, on the same water course and in sight, is a British canal, built by the Government of Great Britain, possibly by Canada, which is carrying on as heavy a trade as we conduct on our side of that river. So the annual transportation of commerce through these two canals is not less than 60,000,000 tons a year. And that canal is blocked for nearly half of the year with ice so that it can not be used. There are also two or three great trunk lines of railroad parallel to the lake connecting the great cities of the West with those of the East, and they have all the work they can do conveying the commerce of the country back and forth. Where does this commerce come from? From a comparatively small area of country, not taking into consideration, however, the transcontinental traffic that comes upon the great railways, but the local commerce which belongs to a comparatively small area, I might say even an insignificant area of country. Therefore the commerce that will pass through whatever canal or canals may be constructed in Central America or the isthmian country of America will have for its source of supply every open port in the world, and when that canal is completed the nearest way between any two ports that lie on opposite portions of the globe is through the canal.

So, as a matter of course, it is going to attract the commerce of the earth, and the increase of the world's commerce is progressing at a rate that we have no comprehension of. We have not even figures in which to state the commerce of the world. I therefore assert on the basis of these facts that by the time we get the Panama Canal built, if it shall be built, on the day of its opening a demand will exist for two canals. Hence it has been my purpose, Mr. President, all the time to endeavor to maintain our rights already acquired by Mr. McKinley in compact agreement with Costa Rica and Nicaragua, whereby we have the exclusive right to build a canal on that line.

It will not be settled in my lifetime. No more than a mere beginning of the Panama Canal will be settled in my lifetime, and I shall not be here to realize the happiness and the glory of this great consummation. But irrespective of that, I have felt it to be my duty on every occasion, and under all circumstances, and it has cost me nights and days of painful watchfulness in this Chamber and elsewhere, to preserve the principle and the vital legislation contained in the Spooner law, which will stand for the construction of the isthmian canal when some President wiser than the present incumbent and less determined to thwart the will of Congress shall rise who will be willing to hear the will of the people executed in the achievement of the proudest of all the works that they have in contemplation.

That is my attitude about this matter, and I believe firmly that the project of the canal at Nicaragua will never be willingly surrendered by the people and the Government of the United States whenever it is within our reach to build it, even if we had no other motive for it than to accommodate the sailing fleets of the United States.

I am very glad to observe also that in a recent edition of the Treaties of the United States, compiled at the instance of the Committee on Foreign Relations and reported to Congress, there have been printed these great compacts that Mr. McKinley arranged with those two Governments. That man's monument in the memory of mankind the world around will grow and grow, predicated upon the basis of those compacts, until they see revealed the full splendor of his great character. I am glad the Senate has already put those compacts amongst the existing treaties of the country by resolution, so that so far as the Senate at least is concerned—and I suppose the House of Representatives participated in it—those compacts have been classed amongst the published treaties of the United States, there to stand until we choose to give up our privileges under them, because under compacts, Mr. President, it takes two parties to make them, and it takes the consent of both parties to revoke them. You can not annul them as you can a treaty. They stand good between the parties so long as they exist, with the first consent that created them.

I am not trying, Mr. President, to make a prophecy; I would be foolish to attempt it, and I would forbear, so far as it is possible, to make an evil prophecy against the Panama Canal. I hope that it will be constructed. It will be needed, for, if it can not be built, we shall still have in Panama a property that is well worth all the $50,000,000 that we have paid for it to the Panama Canal Company and to the State of Panama—it is well worth it. It will pay an interest of 3 per cent net profit on $130,000,000. It is the best piece of railroad property in the world. But the least of its advantages is the revenue it will yield to the Government of the United States if it continues in our ownership. The greatest of those advantages is that it belongs, like the great water courses, to the people, and that every dollar that we put upon it opens up a highway that is free to all the people to carry their commerce; and that, after all, it is the most powerful lever that any human being can conceive of for the regulation and settlement of this vexed, furnace-like question that we are now confronted with, in regard to the regulation of railroad rates. There is no one instrumentality in the United States to-day, political or physical, that is of such advantage to the people of the United States as that 45 miles of railroad across the Isthmus of Panama, because by that means the people of the United States will have power, through the action of Congress, about which there will be no dispute at all, to compel the transcontinental railroads that exist—and the fifteen of them which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] has been prophesying about—to compel all of them to come to reasonable rates for the transportation of the goods and commerce of the people. So if there was never a dollar of profit to be gained by the Government of the United States, if there was no return of revenue above the expense of maintaining the railroad at Panama, double track it to furnish proper facilities for commerce to pass through there, and it will continue to be the best-paying railroad property in the world.

For many years—I can not recall the number of years just now—information has been kept back in respect to that railroad, so that every man who speaks of it or thinks of it still goes in the dark, as has been the case heretofore—everything has been hidden; but during several consecutive years, I think as many as seven or eight, the net revenue from that railroad was 31 per cent on the $18,000,000 that it cost the Panama Canal Company.

Now, if there are two establishments there—one a railroad and the other a canal in process of being dug—one under the control directly of Congress, and the other under the control of Congress only through electing a board of directors, but controlled and regulated entirely according to the rights acquired by a law of New York, an independent corporation, although we own it—if under such conditions the Government of the United States can make it pay expenses and not set aside the 31 per cent per annum of net profits that company has realized out of it since they have had it in charge, we will have in that railroad the best bargain that was ever obtained in the purchase of a piece of property. I sponge from my memory all the circumstances of its acquisition, because the Senate has compelled me to do so. It is no longer an open and debatable question, and perhaps it is improper even to refer to the circumstances under which we acquired that property; but leaving them out of view entirely, measuring the value of the property according to its cost, and estimating that at $50,000,000 as covering the whole sum we expended in the purchase of the canal rights and the Canal Zone, there was never any agreement made by the United States, and never will be, equal to that in actual value to the country.

I expect, Mr. President, when the time comes that the failure of the isthmian canal shall unfortunately be demonstrated we shall find our satisfaction in the fact that we have instituted a vast commerce through that canal which will indemnify the United States and remunerate it for all the expenditures that we have made upon that entire effort to dig a canal in that region, including all the wild extravagance that is now alarming the country.

Mr. FRYE. You mean upon that railroad.

Mr. MORGAN. Upon that railroad and the canal administration.

Having thus stated my view upon this general topic, I will not proceed further, Mr. President, in discussing this bill, but will vote for it, regretting that the Committee on Appropriations and the House of Representatives have found it necessary, in justice to the country, to cut down the estimate of $16,500,000 to $11,000,000. I know they have done that for reasons which are unavoidable.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I would not say anything but for the fact that the debate seems to be about coming to an end. I confess that I had hoped to hear something from the members of the Committee on Appropriations on the matter of the expenditure for salaries and of the scale of expenditure; but

in view of the fact that the debate seems about to close with nothing said about that subject, I should like to know of the committee whether the failure on its part to report any amendment to this bill in reference to certain expenditures which have been brought to the attention of Congress touching salaries, and particularly to know whether the failure of the committee to report any amendment is due to the fact that it approves of these salaries or whether it was due to the fact that the committee deems it outside of the jurisdiction of Congress to correct the salaries if they are deemed to be upon an improper scale.

I can not question, Mr. President, that the committee has grave reasons for the attitude which it occupies. I can not myself see any other solution of the matter except in the suggestion of the two alternatives I have mentioned. One is that the committee, after looking into the question, thinks that these salaries are upon a proper scale; and the other is that, perhaps, while the committee does not think the salaries proper, it nevertheless comes to the conclusion that, the matter having been turned over to the executive department, the Congress no longer has any jurisdiction of it. I am very frank to confess for myself that I would not agree with the committee in either suggestion. I have no doubt in the world that these salaries have been fixed in good faith, and that whatever differences there are in regard to their propriety are differences in judgment. I do not myself think they are proper salaries. I think they are exorbitant; I think they are out of all proportion to the salaries for corresponding services rendered by others who serve the Government. I think they can only be compared to the expenditures by certain employees of corporations where very large—and there is no other word I can use without being offensive—and extravagant salaries are paid to employees. These exorbitant salaries paid by some corporations are, we have every reason to believe, largely matters of favoritism, and should be no guide in fixing the salaries of the officers on the canal work. There is certainly no precedent for it, no parallel for it, in any expenditure by the Government.

I do not desire to particularize, nor do I desire to go into any general discussion of the question. I only venture to call the attention of the committee to it and to make inquiry concerning it because it seems about to go by default.

When the matter was before the Senate in a preliminary discussion two days ago upon the question of reference, there was a suggestion made that these salaries should be scrutinized; that the committee in charge of the matter should scrutinize the question of whether or not these salaries were proper salaries; and I had expected either that the committee would give us some explanation or statement which would show the propriety of these expenditures or else that some effort would be made to correct them by amendments to the bill.

I suggested when that preliminary discussion was had a few days ago, that it was only upon appropriation bills, or upon the occasion of making appropriations, that these corrections could be made, from the fact that as to all, except as to the Commissioners, there are no officers specified in the law; and in the absence of officers specified in the law, there could be no general legislation regulating and controlling expenditures for salaries; and that in consequence the only legislation which could be had, the only corrective which could be applied, would be by Congress when it came to make appropriations for the payment of the salaries, recognizing, of course, that salaries which had already been earned, even though they had been put on an improper basis, must be paid; but when our attention should be called in the estimates submitted to the fact that extravagant salaries are provided for, it would be competent for Congress, when we came to appropriate money, to say that, while we pay these salaries already earned, in the future only such amounts as those specified shall be paid for such and such service.

Therefore, it occurs to me, Mr. President, that an appropriation bill is not only the proper place but the only place where Congress can deal with the subject. If we fail to deal with the subject, it must be either upon the grounds—at least these are the only grounds which suggest themselves to me—that the salaries are proper salaries, or that we do not recognize our right to supervise and direct the amount of salaries which shall be paid.

As I have said, Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the question at length; but I think it is due to the Senate, and I think the country expects that there should be statements made which shall put this matter right before the public, and in which it shall be shown whether these are salaries which are approved by the Senate, or whether it be true that in the passage of what is known as the "Spooner law" we have abdicated the function of determining what expenditures shall be made and have remitted it exclusively to the determination of the executive department.

Mr. ALLISON. I think the inquiry made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] is a very pertinent one in view of the discussion a few days ago and in view of the general situation of the subject of the compensation that is allowed for services rendered by the various employees of the Canal Commission.

By the original statute of 1902, the fixing of the compensation of all employees, including the Commissioners, was placed in the power of the President. That was done, I have no doubt, for excellent reasons at that time. It would have been impossible under the situation then existing and because of the consideration of time to properly adjust the matter by provision of law. Hence it was that the President was authorized to fix the compensation of the various employees, including the Commissioners.

There was another difficulty then, which I think prevails now, and that is that it is almost impossible for any committee within a brief period of time to carefully investigate the situation of these employees, in view of the place where their services are rendered, in order to fix a just and fair compensation. I would not know, and I do not believe any Senator would know, what ought to be a fair compensation for employees on the Isthmus of Panama at this time, having regard to the services that are rendered there.

Mr. MORGAN. May I interrupt the Senator?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. MORGAN. I suggest to the Senator that a fair basis of estimating the salaries would be to take those paid for services of a like character in the United States, that are fixed by law now, and add a life risk on each of, say, 20 per cent, for the purpose of saving the men from the dangers and horrors of going to Panama to do the work required.

Mr. ALLISON. One Senator, and a very wise Senator, has made a wise suggestion as respects a general provision that should apply to the persons employed on the Isthmus. A few years ago, I believe, when we began to send troops to the Philippine Islands we did allow the officers serving in those islands an increase of 20 per cent over the compensation allowed them for service in the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. The life-insurance companies have considered that question.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. In connection with what the Senator was saying in regard to an increase of 20 per cent in salary allowed for services performed in the Philippine Islands, I should be glad to call the Senator's attention to a little statement which I have here and which I understand to be correct. I see that a United States naval officer who was drawing a salary of $2,400 a year as an officer of the Navy is now drawing a salary, while working on the Isthmus, of $6,000 a year—more than double. Going on down the list, I see a United States Army officer is drawing a salary of $10,000 a year as an employee of the Canal Commission, while as an army officer he was drawing $4,950. I see, also, that the director of hospitals, who was an officer of the Marine-Hospital Service was drawing $3,500 a year, is now drawing a salary of $8,000 a year. It will be seen, therefore, from this statement that instead of there being an increase of 20 per cent the increase in the case of several officers of the Army and Navy is more than 100 per cent.

Is it not true that if an officer's salary ought to be increased by 20 per cent for service in the Philippine Islands a like increase for officers serving on the Isthmus of Panama would be a sufficient amount to compensate for the difference in climate and extra expenses connected with that service?

I say to the Senator that I have not been able to get an accurate statement of account—a detailed statement of account would probably be the proper term—of the expenditures made under the appropriation of $10,000,000 that was granted at the last session of Congress—I believe we appropriated $10,000,000 at the last session, of which amount about $9,000,000 has been expended. The statement from which I have read simply applies to salaries ranging above $2,000 a year. If these increases be proper, we ought to be furnished with some reason why a salary is increased from $2,400 to $8,000.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator is quite correct; we ought to have some reason for such increases. I suppose the statement from which he has read is the statement made in the House of Representatives, and found in the RECORD, which I have no doubt is accurate.

It must be borne in mind, however, as respects the increase in the salaries of officers of the Army, that the officers of the

Army of the United States are ordered to service wherever the general in command chooses to order them. Service on the Isthmus of Panama, I take it, is much more hazardous than is service in the Philippines, which, we are told in various ways and by various authors, have a reasonably healthful climate, and we are trying very hard, as I understand, to improve the situation at Panama as well. So that the question of salaries of persons employed on the Isthmus is not one that is very easily disposed of by fixing a range of salaries except in a very few cases.

I myself think that some of the salaries, as set out in the statement from which the Senator from Georgia has read, are higher than they ought to be. That is the way it looks to a casual observer, and yet I do not know but if I had all the facts, understood all the situations, and knew that these men were rendering a voluntary service, different from the service rendered in the Army, where an officer is obliged to go where he is sent—I do not know but that after a prudent and careful examination I might be willing to give some of these employees more than I now think they ought to have; but I probably would not be willing to give them as much compensation as has been provided for in the arrangements that have been made by the Commission or by the President.

I will say to the Senator from Georgia and to other Senators that I did not know it was expected of us on the Committee on Appropriations that we should enter upon the consideration of legislating for and regulating by law all the things that ought to be done and that are now omitted to be done on the Isthmus of Panama.

Here is an emergency appropriation, and not only an emergency appropriation, but a deficiency appropriation. It is an appropriation that the Senate in its discretion and under the necessities of the situation ought to pass before the Christmas holidays. I mention that incidentally, as I suppose we shall have Christmas holidays. [Laughter.] We usually have, but I have heard no suggestion as to the time fixed for the holidays. However, this appropriation bill ought to be passed, as we are told by the President, by the Secretary of War, and by all the people who are interested in this business, whether they be Jamaica negroes or whether they be hospital supervisors receiving $10,000 a year.

These expenditures are going on now, and ought to go on, if we intend to build this canal. The men employed on the Isthmus are engaged, in my judgment, in the most important work in connection with the preparations necessary for the construction of this canal. That being true, Mr. President, it does not seem to me that the Committee on Appropriations were required to enter at large upon this subject of the detailed compensation which should be paid to the various employees under the Canal Commission.

Mr. MORGAN. I will say, if the Senator will allow me, that if the bill had gone to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals we should have tried to enter upon the subject.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt the Senator is correct in his statement that he would have tried it, as we are trying now to build the Panama Canal, which the Senator says we can not do. With due deference to the Senator from Alabama, allow me to say that no committee can arrange these salaries in four or five days in its committee room and do it as Senators ought to do it after investigation and examination. Of course, we can guess at it, as a certain distinguished railroad president says we are guessing at railroad rates. We can guess at those things very easily, and we can reduce the salaries to a minimum; but the question is, What is a reasonable compensation for the people who are performing service on the Isthmus of Panama?

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. ALLISON. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. HALE. Granting that the committee should not take up this subject and fix these salaries now, I think no one will dispute that if any Senator wants them fixed or reduced, it would be entirely in order for him to move as an amendment to this bill that hereafter all salaries under the Isthmian Canal Commission shall be estimated for in detail, as in all other Departments, and shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury as a part of his annual estimates. Then we should get what Senators desire—a knowledge of what we are to pay these employees, what we ought to pay them, and what we shall only pay by law in the future. Is not that a practical way of getting at it?

Mr. ALLISON. That would seem to be practical. But I was about to say, in connection with this question of salaries, that in my opinion the compensation paid to officers or employees on the Isthmus requires a different treatment from what is required as respects salaries and compensation of people who are engaged in service here in Washington; and there are quite a number of people in the public service here connected with the Commission. I think the Senate and the other House of Congress ought to take up the question of salaries and compensation to employees who reside in Washington or in the United States, and who are not subject, as a rule, to the vicissitudes and the situations of people who are serving the Government on the Isthmus, and there should be brought in a bill which would provide for whatever administrative bureau is needed in the city of Washington and fix the number of employees and the compensation of each. That is what I think ought to be done; and manifestly the Committee on Appropriations could not do this during the few days that it had to look into the subject.

So, Mr. President, I would prefer that the whole question of salaries should be relegated to the proper committee of this body, which will have necessarily under consideration all the legislation that is needed respecting the canal subject; and much legislation is needed. There is practically no legislation now, as I understand, except that found in the Spooner Act, which is not legislation controlling the Canal Zone. Senators on the Interoceanic Canals Committee can correct me if I am mistaken. I understand there is no law or body of laws or system of laws that governs our possessions there. So this whole question must be taken up, and it must be considered by the proper committee; and while considering all these subjects, of course, they can take up the whole question of compensation.

I must say that I believe some of those salaries are large, although there may be reasons for them that are not known to the Senate or to myself. So the committee omitted any consideration of salaries on this bill. As I explained earlier in the day, another appropriation bill will of necessity come in April, or before that time, and some committee in the meantime will have full opportunity to investigate this subject and correct whatever may be wrong as respects the compensation of any of the persons connected with the work.

There is another difficulty that we found in the consideration of this bill—one that was alluded to a moment ago by the Senator from Alabama—and that is the situation as respects the Panama Railroad. There ought to be legislation on the subject, as I think after a cursory examination of the matter, but I might think differently if I had an opportunity to study the subject in the proper committee. The Panama Railroad is owned by the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Not all of it.

Mr. ALLISON. All of it.

Mr. MORGAN. There are some private stockholders.

Mr. ALLISON. Am I mistaken?

Mr. GALLINGER. It was testified that the United States owns every share at the present time.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; I recollect the Secretary of War stated that now the United States owns every share of this corporation.

Mr. MORGAN. Is not Mr. Cromwell, of New York, a director in the Panama Railroad Company?

Mr. ALLISON. He may be.

Mr. MORGAN. How did he get there if he does not own any stock? He is a private citizen.

Mr. ALLISON. He probably got there as some other people get into railroad directorships—by holding one share, which is loaned to him in order that he may have the honor of being a director.

Mr. KITTREDGE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. KITTREDGE. I think I can advise the Senator in regard to the proposition concerning which he was just questioned.

The United States Government owns in its own name all the shares of stock in the Panama Railroad except thirteen. Thirteen shares are outstanding in the name—one each—of the directors of that company, and the United States has an ironclad contract of purchase with each one of those directors.

Mr. ALLISON. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. TILLMAN. Tell us at what rate. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, I want to know whether it is at the rate of a million dollars or five. If there is an ironclad contract to buy, how did the stock get into the hands of the directors?

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator from South Carolina mean one million or five million?

Mr. TILLMAN. No. I want to find out at what price we are to purchase the one share from each director.

Mr. KITTREDGE. It has simply been transferred to them.

Mr. TILLMAN. In other words, they are holding it merely as an excuse to be directors.

Mr. KITTREDGE. They are holding it to act as directors under the law of New York, under which the corporation exists.

Mr. TILLMAN. I say to act as a director under the charter.

Mr. ALLISON. I think that is an unhappy situation as respects the Panama Railroad. It is so interlaced in its business and in its operations with the Panama Canal that it ought to be owned and controlled and managed by the Government. The road is now about to be reconstructed. They are building now a double-track railway. They are running spurs hither and thither and everywhere for the purpose of the construction of the canal; and the canal is the largest, or probably will be the largest, customer of the railroad. Therefore it is essential and proper that the Government of the United States should own it, and it does own the railroad in fact, although thirteen shares may be in the names of thirteen people.

The Secretary of War states that the Government of the United States owns every share, and controls every share, in fact, but the railroad company keeps up a separate and independent system. They have a president of the railroad company; they have a secretary of the railroad company; they have a large office, or a considerable office, in the city of New York, and officers, and so forth, at Panama and in various other places for commercial business.

Mr. BACON. Are the officers paid salaries out of the railroad's fund?

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator know the character of those salaries, as to amount?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not. We did not go into that matter, and there was no reason why we should, because nothing appears here——

Mr. BACON. The Senator did not understand me as making any criticism on that point.

Mr. ALLISON. I think there should be a statutory regulation as respects the relations of the railroad company to the Canal Commission and to the canal construction. We have here in the testimony a statement by the Secretary of War showing that the Government has now a contract with the Panama Railroad Company, whereby the Commission agree to build an additional track for almost the whole length of the railway, and whereby also the Government is to be reimbursed from time to time by means of the receipts of the railway. In other words, they are making contracts with each other.

Mr. HALE. I call the Senator's attention also to another thing directly in the line of this sort of dual management. Not only has the Commission entered into contracts for the increase of the facilities of the road, doubling the track, but it has bought ships and leased them to this company, and the jurisdiction and business of the company to-day, instead of being confined to a railroad across the Isthmus, embraces a continuous line of transportation from New York to the Isthmus and across it.

I agree with the Senator from Iowa that there ought to be statutory provisions that will put an end to this needless arrangement of contracts between different organizations all of which are owned by the Government and are finally maintained by appropriations made by the Government. Some committee ought to take that up separately and arrange it.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator from Maine allow me to ask him a question? I notice in this report that the estimates call for $700,000 to pay the Panama Railroad Company for services, and so forth, and I noticed in the partial report which I have read that the past expenditures consist partly of money paid to the Panama Railroad Company for carrying freight across the Isthmus. Do I understand that we own the Panama Railroad Company, that it is our property, and that we are paying the company for performing services? If we do, what becomes of the money that the road earns? Does it come to the United States? I see we pay large items, and those items are set forth in the report which I read. They amount to six or eight hundred thousand dollars out of the $10,000,000 spent last year. I noticed that these estimates call for $700,000 for the purpose of paying for services to be performed by the road.

Mr. HALE. Some of us, it seemed to me, got considerable education by the long hearing we had about this matter, and a good deal of the development was new and strange, not involving corruption and fraud, but the exercise of very large powers. I should think it was needless to have this double arrangement. Regular books are kept. There are accounts of all transportation. Every item of freight is paid for to the railroad; every account is complete, just as if it were an outside foreign corporation, when it is really owned by the Government. It seems to me that that is needless.

Mr. CLAY. Do the profits come to the Government?

Mr. HALE. There are no profits.

Mr. KITTREDGE. Yes; there are.

Mr. CLAY. Is it all on one side?

Mr. HALE. It is one hand washing the other; that is all it is. It looks to me like it is needless, and so with the double bookkeeping.

Mr. TILLMAN. I was not present in the Committee on Appropriations yesterday morning when this investigation first began, and I have not had an opportunity to digest all of the testimony brought out at the hearing, but I have nowhere yet heard any allusion made to—and I confess I would be very glad to know whether there is any such document in existence anywhere—a report of the Panama Railroad Company.

Mr. ALLISON. There is.

Mr. TILLMAN. For instance, I have understood from an intelligent gentleman to-day that that road owes $6,000,000 debt; that their bonds are outstanding, and, of course, if we bought the road subject to the bonds issued by way of mortgage, the United States has to pay them or make provision for the interest on them; and it does seem to me that we ought to have somewhere in evidence very soon, if we can not get it, on this bill, a report of the transactions, the fiscal work, of the Panama Railway, so that those of us who are inquisitive in regard to fiscal matters upon the Isthmus and the construction of the canal may get some light as to whether this is really a swabbing betweeen hands or not, or whether some one else's hand is slyly slipping in and committing some legerdemain business by which a few odd dollars drop into a private hand. Is there anywhere a report of the Panama Railway Company?

Mr. ALLISON. I have it here.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is buried, then, in those things that it was not thought worthy to submit to us, except in a way that we could not get at them.

Mr. ALLISON. The committee yesterday—the Senator from South Carolina did not happen to be present at the moment——

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator knows why I was not.

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. It was not any neglect of duty, but because of another matter I could not very well do otherwise.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator had a very good reason for not being there at the moment, although he was there most of the time. But the committee was in possession—I thought I had it here, but I believe I have not; I have it in the committee room—of a very full report. In fact, a set of reports of the receipts and expenditures of, and all the data respecting, the Panama Railroad, and that data is fully found also, I think, in one of the reports made some years ago by the Senator from Alabama or in some report of the Isthmian Canal Committee. So that there is no concealment about it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not accusing anybody——

Mr. ALLISON. No; I understand.

Mr. TILLMAN. And least of all the Senator from Iowa, because I can assure the Senate, if it needs any assurance, that he is about the only pane of glass through which we get any light at all. The House gave us absolutely none. It sent over here a bill dealing with bonds and also with deficiencies, mixing the things up so that as a matter of self-respect the Appropriations Committee turned over to the Committee on Finance the question of bonds, and now we are trying to deal with the deficiency, which is a legitimate function of the Appropriations Committee. I am not trying to charge anybody with an effort at concealment—the Secretary of War or anybody else—but I say it is an unfortunate condition that oriental methods of dealing with a great public question have been imported into the United States and are being practiced right here upon the Congress.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it is due to the Secretary of War to state here that he proffered every document and every paper and all the details of the transactions of the Commission. We called for a large number of documents relating to various matters, which I have before me and which can be seen by any Senator.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY] seems to think it is strange that there is a debt due to the Panama Railroad Company under the circumstances. The truth is that the Panama Canal Commission undertook the construction of this second track and found themselves short of means in respect to that work, and they borrowed some money from the Panama Railroad Company, which company raised the money to loan to the Panama Canal Commission temporarily, as I understand the testimony, there being in its vaults a certain number of bonds issued by the Panama Railroad Company. That accounts for part——

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. I should like to ask the Senator if this debt of the railroad company, to which he has just alluded, is in addition to the $7,000,000 mortgage to which this testimony refers?

Mr. ALLISON. I understand it is not. I understand it is part of it. The Panama Railroad Company and the steamship company in connection with it do charge the Canal Commission for transportation not only on the Isthmus, but also for the transportation of supplies, materials, passengers, and so forth, from New York to the Isthmus.

Mr. MORGAN. The steamships belong to the railroad.

Mr. ALLISON. The steamships belong to the Government, and are leased to the railroad.

Mr. TILLMAN. They were bought with Government money. They are owned by the Government, but leased by the railway.

Mr. ALLISON. A certain number of those steamships were purchased when the transaction was made with the French company.

Mr. GALLINGER. Three of them.

Mr. ALLISON. Three of them. Those three are transport ships—that is, they carry passengers and freight. But the Canal Commission was so pressed for the transportation of material that it would have been required to go outside and lease ships. Instead of doing that, in their discretion, wisely, I suppose—we did not have time to look into it, although I have no doubt they thought they were doing the wise thing for the Government, and I presume they were—they bought two ships, at $650,000 each, to carry on their work; and then they leased those ships to the Panama Railway Company on the basis of 4 per cent—rent, insurance, and repairs added.

Mr. PERKINS. With 4 per cent written off annually.

Mr. GALLINGER. Four per cent deducted annually for depreciation.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; 4 per cent for depreciation. In other words, they made with the Panama Railroad Company probably a fair and just contract as respects the matter of running these ships.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I will read precisely what Secretary Taft said on that point.

Mr. FORAKER. What page?

Mr. GALLINGER. Page 26. He said:

> We leased the ships to the railroad company for 4 per cent on the thirteen hundred thousand dollars and charged them 4 per cent in addition for depreciation, and required them to keep the policies of insurance for the full value of the ships in favor of the Canal Commission; and that is the way they are being run now.

Mr. ALLISON. They are now being run in that way. So the railroad company and the Canal Commission have an account with each other as though they were under two separate ownerships. It seemed to the committee that this was a matter with which we could not very well deal, and yet we had to deal with it in the sense of knowing, as near as we could ascertain, how the ten millions had been expended.

If the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY] will give me his attention for a moment, I will state that Secretary Taft delivered a lecture or address in Cincinnati, Ohio——

Mr. FORAKER. St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. ALLISON. He also delivered one in Ohio. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. That was before and after taking.

Mr. ALLISON. In that speech he distinctly stated the amount and the details of the expenditure of the $10,000,000, which I think perhaps is the best statement that has been made on the subject. It includes the $1,300,000 that was paid for the transports.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator put those figures in the RECORD for us? I am frank to say I have not been able to find a detailed statement of how the $10,000,000 was expended which we appropriated at the last session of Congress.

Mr. ALLISON. Allow me to suggest to the Senator from Georgia that in the House of Representatives this entire address was ordered printed in the RECORD, and, I think, it was printed on Thursday. It contains most valuable and useful information, because it is wholly upon the subject of the isthmian canal. It was printed in the RECORD by unanimous consent and will be found there.

Mr. TILLMAN. On what day?

Mr. ALLISON. The RECORD of last Thursday.

Mr. CULBERSON. I desire, with the permission of the Senator from Iowa, to recur to the question I asked him a moment ago, whether or not this new indebtedness against the railroad company was included in the six or seven million-dollar bonded indebtedness? I understood the Senator to say it was not.

Mr. ALLISON. I meant to state that I understand it is a part of the seven million. It is a part of an old issue of bonds that was found in the treasury.

Mr. CULBERSON. Very well. It seems that the Government of the United States paid $6,800,000 for the shares of this stock which it purchased last year, that being the par value of a certain number of shares. Since then the Government has bought a hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars' worth of these shares. Notwithstanding we gave par value for the stock, I notice, on page 25 of the hearing, the statement introduced by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] that the total liabilities of the railroad are $2,490,918, not including the sinking fund subsidy bonds. On page 95 of the hearing we find that the sinking fund 6 per cent subsidy bonds amount to $3,000,000. That makes in the neighborhood of at least $6,000,000 outstanding against the railroad at the time we paid $6,800,000 par value for the stock, plus a hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. ALLISON. Where does the Senator get his information that we paid $6,800,000 for the stock?

Mr. CULBERSON. That is in the report of the Panama Canal Commission, and is included in the $40,000,000.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, certainly. I understand now. I supposed the Senator had found that we had bought Panama Railroad shares and paid that sum for them. We bought the property of the Panama Company, as I understand, including their material, whatever it was, locomotives, etc., and their machinery for excavating on the canal route, and so on, and their railroad shares, except whatever was embraced in what cost us afterwards a hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars.

Now, it is said, and there may be great truth in it—we could not examine into it; some other committee, of course, will have to take up that question and deal with it—that there is an impediment in the way of the unification of the government of the Commission and the railroad, and that that impediment will remain as long as the bonds remain disposed of. It may be there is such an impediment, but if so, I think it might be removed, perhaps, by proper legislation if that were attempted, and for one I believe it ought to be.

So, going into this question as far as we could with the time we had, and unfolding it as far as we could, we found that the question of salaries and compensation was one in which, if we undertook to fix it, we might do very great injustice to very good people. We also discovered that if we undertook more in detail than is found here to analyze these expenditures we would occupy more time than we had at our disposal. Therefore we have undertaken in the hearing to elicit, and in the document we have presented to give, the best information we could upon the subject, and I hope it will turn out to be satisfactory to the Senate.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

Mr. MORGAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a question before he takes his seat.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. ALLISON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. On the same subject (and I am simply endeavoring to get this matter straight, apologizing to the Senator for interrupting him so much) he stated a while ago that the $6,886,300 which we paid for the Panama Canal Railroad was what we paid for the stock of that company.

Mr. ALLISON. That I understand.

Mr. CULBERSON. Now, I understand the Senator to disagree with that statement to the extent of saying that it was for the physical property of the company. I desire in this connection to read from Senate Document No. 123, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, one paragraph only.

Mr. FORAKER. What is the document?

Mr. CULBERSON. It is the report of the Isthmian Canal Commission, with the President's message on the subject, Senate Document No. 123, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, page 5:

> Of the existing 70,000 shares of the Panama Railroad the canal company will transfer to the United States all but about 1,100 shares. These latter are held by a few individuals residing in various parts of the United States and in Europe. As it will not be the policy of the United States to so manage the railroad as to secure a large revenue, it is probable that the holders of these shares will in time find it to their interest to dispose of them at the price fixed by the Commission for the other shares, viz, their par value. At par, the value of the 68,863 shares to be transferred to the United States by the canal company is $6,886,300.

Showing that we have paid (and it is included in the $40,000,000) $6,886,300 for the stock of this company, and in addition $150,000 for the 1,100 shares purchased subsequently, when there was a mortgage of between $6,000,000 and $7,000,000 on the property.

Mr. ALLISON. I so understood. If I stated otherwise I did not intend it.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa whether or not in the list of directors of the Panama Railroad Company Mr. William Nelson Cromwell appears as one of the directors?

Mr. ALLISON. I must confess we did not ask for the names of the gentlemen who are directors of the railroad company.

Mr. MORGAN. I am informed that he is a director while he is also attorney of the Panama Railroad Company.

Mr. ALLISON. Possibly he is. I think he signs some of these documents as attorney of the Panama Railroad Company.

Mr. MORGAN. Has the Senator any knowledge of the amount of money he gets in this double-barrel capacity of attorney and director?

Mr. ALLISON. I have not. I think that is something well worthy of inquiry, and I hope it will be entered upon. I think it ought to be inquired into. I have no doubt he gets an adequate salary.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. On page 27 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations occurs this statement by Secretary Taft:

> The railroad had a most inadequate equipment even for the work which was to be done as a common carrier. It was agreed—I say it was agreed, but as it was the same person making the arrangement it could hardly be called an agreement except formally—it was decided to be fair that the Commission should double track the railroad, etc.

That indicates, as I understand it, that the organizations were practically the same; I mean the organization of the Commission and the organization of the railroad. Was not that the case?

Mr. ALLISON. In point of fact I take it the Commission is in control of this railroad, but it is also a fact that they have a separate organization and a president who performs service either in New York or Panama, a superintendent, etc., and I have no doubt a salary list is carried by the railroad separate and distinct from the canal. That is in the nature of things so, because the railroad company transports passengers and freight across the Isthmus. As the Senator from Maine said a few moments ago, the railroad company contracts for through freight from New York to San Francisco and to other parts of our own country, and to Chile and the Asiatic countries.

Mr. FORAKER. The point I wished to call attention to was that the properties, although separately organized, are really under one and the same management.

Mr. ALLISON. They are really under the same management.

Mr. FORAKER. And all managed in the interest of the United States Government.

Mr. ALLISON. I am sure they are. Besides, it is absolutely essential that this railroad should be owned by the Government of the United States if we are to construct the canal, as we would be obliged to build another railroad, if there was room for another on the Isthmus, if we did not control this line of road.

Mr. STONE rose.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall be glad to explain any other matter.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. ALLISON. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. STONE. The Senator adverted a short time ago to the fact that there had been purchased by the Canal Commission two transports to run between New York and the Isthmus, for which, I understand, $1,300,000 was paid. I saw not long since in reports made by the Secretary of War and the Canal Commission—the chairman of the Commission—that it was the determined policy of those having charge of the construction of the canal to purchase ships and supplies wherever they could be bought cheapest. That was stated by them in their reports to be considered as a part of their duty; that they were under a public obligation to observe and enforce that policy. There was a great deal said about it in the press during the past summer.

I have also seen where it was said, in a semiofficial way at least, that two ships of 6,000 tons each, suitable for this work had been offered to the Canal Commission for $750,000; that negotiations had been entered upon for that purpose. I desire to ask the Senator if, while the Secretary of War and the other executive officials were before the Appropriations Committee, anything was said relating to that subject, explaining why there was a change of this policy, and why they paid $1,300,000 for ships substantially of the same kind which were offered to them for $750,000 when officially they had declared that they considered it their duty under the law to buy where they could buy cheapest. Was anything said before the committee on that subject?

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, there was nothing said upon that subject, except the inquiry was made as to what proportion of the supplies and materials for the use of the canal construction was purchased in our country and what proportion was purchased abroad, and the answer was that about 2 per cent of the amount was purchased at Panama and at points elsewhere than in this country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will permit me, I will state that in reference to the purchase of two ships the Senator from Missouri is right in saying there was some discussion in the public prints when the Secretary of War announced last year that he was going into the open market to buy supplies for the Panama Canal, including ships. The Secretary of War did attempt to buy ships abroad, but I think if the Senator from Missouri will make careful inquiry of the Department he will find that the Secretary failed to find any foreign ships that met the requirements of the Department. After exploiting that matter abroad, in England particularly, he turned his attention to the United States, and he found the Ward Line had two ships that exactly suited the purposes, and he purchased them for $650,000 apiece, which, it has been stated by experts, was a very reasonable amount. There are now being built, I will say to the Senator, in the United States shipyards two ships to take the place of those the Ward Line sold to the Department.

Mr. STONE. What was the tonnage of the ships?

Mr. GALLINGER. Six thousand tons each.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator know whether two foreign ships, English ships I believe they were, of 6,000 tons were offered to the Commission for $750,000?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator I have no knowledge of that. I can apprehend that there might be two ships somewhere of 6,000 tons which would be sold for that amount that might be practically worthless after they had been bought. The fact remains that foreign ships did not meet the requirements of the Department and they purchased these American ships.

Mr. ALLISON. I think the Secretary of War said incidentally that they could find no ships abroad which covered the kind of transportation that they had.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a well-known fact.

Mr. ALLISON. It must cover locomotives and other material that they were sending from our country to the Isthmus.

Mr. STONE. Do I understand the Senator to say that no ships could be had in all Europe that would suit this purpose?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have understood that no proper ships, ships such as the Department wanted, could be purchased. Of course the Senator knows that there are a great many good ships, doubtless, in the service of foreign governments which can not be bought because they are earning more money, at least earning good money, and they would not sell them. I think if the Senator will investigate the matter carefully he will see that the Secretary of War acted very wisely in the purchase of those American ships.

Mr. ALLISON. I think I have made all the explanation that is needed now.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I have but a word or two to say adverting to the matter of salaries. The Senator from Iowa responded to the inquiry which I made relative to that branch of the subject and then continued as to another branch, and for that reason I revert to it.

If nothing had been said on the subject, it might have been concluded that the Senate in passing by the matter of the salaries without offering an amendment, and without any suggestion of the reason why none had been offered, had in so doing practically indicated their approval of these salaries. The explanation which has been made and the discussion which has been had in response to the inquiry made by myself negatives any such conclusion, and while it may not be said that anything has been determined by the Senate adversely to the correctness and propriety of these salaries, certainly it can not be claimed that the Senate has approved of them. For that reason, Mr. President, I am glad that the matter has been brought up and that we have had the discussion on it which has taken place this afternoon. None of us desires to hinder or delay the construction of the canal. On the contrary we all desire to expedite it. But nevertheless it is our duty to see to it that the money for its construction shall be expended with reasonable economy and that extravagant and exorbitant salaries should not be paid.

I think the suggestion of the Senator from Maine is decidedly the most practical one which has been made, and I very much hope that the Senate will act upon it. If no other Senator

does so I will myself to-morrow—as I understand this matter will go over until then—offer an amendment which will require that there shall be estimates of these salaries submitted to Congress for each period for which appropriations are to be made, so that in making appropriations for the money with which they are to be paid the question may be determined as to what is the will of Congress in regard to the amounts properly to be paid as salaries not only in the aggregate, but in detail, specifying each officer, or at least each class of officers, and the salaries for the same.

I desire to repeat, Mr. President, that in calling the attention of the Senate to this matter and in making the inquiry I have, I have not designed or intended any reflection upon any officer who has been instrumental or had any agency in the fixing of these salaries. It is a matter about which there may naturally be very great differences of judgment, and I accord to the officers who have thus fixed the salaries the utmost good faith, although I differ from them very radically as to the correctness of the conclusions which they have reached. I wish to say further that personally I do not object to the officers of the Army and of the Navy who are detailed on this work receiving as much compensation as civilians who are employed for similar work. This, I think, is clearly contemplated by the seventh section of the Spooner Act. But whether civilian or military, the compensation, while it should be liberal, ought not to be exorbitant.

I desire to say further in this connection that I think this debate illustrates another fact. That is, that the committee which has charge of the appropriations must necessarily have charge of the question of the consideration of the propriety of the amounts to be appropriated in these salaries. While I think that the rule at present gives the consideration of this bill to the general Appropriations Committee, I repeat that one of two things must be done, in my opinion. Either the general Appropriations Committee must make up its mind that it must go through with this detail work and scrutinize all the expenditures to be made in the construction of the canal or the appropriation bill for the canal must be turned over to a committee which will have the time thus to do.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I wish to inquire, after getting the floor, if the Senator from Iowa is willing to have an adjournment now? It is evident that this bill can not be completed to-night, and I want to submit a few remarks on it. I should like to have an adjournment so that I can begin in the morning, when Senators are fresh.

Mr. ALLISON. I hoped we would be able to finish the bill to-night. It is manifest that it can not be done; and therefore I will give way or myself make a motion to go into executive session or to adjourn, whichever is most agreeable to Senators.

Several SENATORS. Let us adjourn.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 15, 1905, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 14, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DECEMBER SALARIES OF CAPITOL EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CASSELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the joint resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a resolution and asks unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The Clerk will report the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1905, on the 20th day of said month.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized and instructed to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1905, on the 20th day of said month.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of resolution No. 42, relating to the distribution of the President's message.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania in the chair.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, to return to the subject of this resolution and the amendment offered to it referring this message, so far as it relates to matters of insurance, to the Committee on Ways and Means, I wish to discuss that question briefly.

There can be no doubt but that all bills raising a tax go to the Committee on Ways and Means, no matter what may be their nature. They go there under the rule.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] yesterday, in speaking of the matter, announced a rather novel and strange doctrine. He said:

Therefore the taxing power was resorted to. The taxation was made the pretext—

And from reading the context it would seem from the tenor of his remarks that in various laws passed by Congress taxation was made the pretext to give Congress the jurisdiction of the subject-matter. Now, of course, it is patent to every lawyer in the House that if the House should enact a law and put into the law itself the statement that the taxation was simply a pretext to get jurisdiction over the matter the Supreme Court would promptly declare the law unconstitutional; and where any of these laws which the gentleman characterizes in this manner have gone to the Supreme Court on their constitutionality the Supreme Court has examined the law, and when it found that the law imposed a tax they have promptly said that under the Constitution Congress had jurisdiction, but if the tax was a mere pretense Congress would have no jurisdiction. No committee would have any jurisdiction. Congress has no jurisdiction over the subject of insurance unless it can get it under the taxing power of the Government, as I shall proceed to show later on in numerous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States where that subject was involved in the decision of the case.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I put a question to the gentleman?

Mr. PAYNE. I would rather the gentleman would not interrupt me now. If he will wait until I finish, then he can put his question.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Very well.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] yesterday cited what he said was a precedent for this action, and that was the bill imposing a tax on oleomargarine. I have quite a vivid recollection of what occurred at that time, because it occurred during my early service in Congress, and I was curious to see how the House would get at a subject when it was bent on doing so, rule or no rule.

The bill came here first in 1882. That was before I broke into Congress, and it was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means under the rules. It was a bill to tax oleomargarine. There was a suspicion in the House, as well as in the country, that the object of that law was to tax oleomargarine out of existence. Nevertheless, the bill went to the Committee on Ways and Means. Why? Because it raised revenue; because by its terms it imposed a tax. No one doubted then but that that was the proper reference.

In 1886 the same bill was introduced in the House and the same bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. I think it was referred there in the first instance properly under the rules of the House. Mr. Hatch, of Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, had very pronounced views on the subject of the suppression of oleomargarine. I do not remember whether the bill was introduced by him or not, but he had a suspicion that the bill would go to sleep in the Committee on Ways and Means. They had not reported it. It was rumored that that committee was opposed to the bill and opposed to the proposed legislation, and in order to get the bill out of the Committee on Ways and Means and get it into more friendly atmosphere Mr. Hatch made the motion in the House to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from the further consideration of that bill and to refer it to the Committee on Agriculture, of which he was chairman.

After some debate, from which it appeared that the House was overwhelmingly for the bill, a very large majority representing their farmer constituents here on the floor of the House having gotten the idea that this law if enacted was going to greatly improve the condition of agriculture, and especially the dairy farming in the United States, anxious as they were to have an immediate action upon this bill and get it before a committee that would report it to the House, by a vote of 67 to

40, as I am informed, the bill was taken from the Committee on Ways and Means and referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and the bill was reported and afterwards became a law. That is the origin of the oleomargarine law.

Since that time in various Congresses, since my friend from Iowa has become chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, various bills of like character—a bill taxing filled cheese, the bill taxing impure flour, and bills of that nature—have been introduced in the House and referred invariably to the Committee on Ways and Means and reported by that committee, and have become a part of the law of the country from such reference and reports.

No one ever doubted that the proper place for these bills was with the Committee on Ways and Means. I do not know whether the gentleman from Iowa claims that his committee has jurisdiction over the subject of insurance or not, but it seems to me that if any legislation is proposed on this subject the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has no more pretense to a right of jurisdiction than has the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. PAYNE. What is it?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How can the committee have jurisdiction over insurance when the Supreme Court has time and again said that insurance is not commerce?

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman from Tennessee will allow me to make my speech, then he can make his.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman's speech could be improved upon if he puts that proposition into it.

Mr. PAYNE. Possibly some of these things have occurred to the rest of the Members as well as to my astute and learned friend from Tennessee. The gentleman from Tennessee saw, I suppose, that I was coming directly to this subject.

Now, the Supreme Court has made repeated decisions on this question. The first case arose in 1868, the case of Paul against Virginia, reported in 75 United States, page 183. Justice Field delivered the unanimous opinion of the court. That case arose in this way: An insurance corporation in the city of New York had issued a policy of insurance upon some property in the State of Virginia. It was fire insurance. Virginia had a law regulating the subject of insurance and making it a penal offense for a person to issue or deliver such a policy in the State of Virginia when the company had not complied with certain terms of the State law. Mr. Paul was indicted for this offense, and his defense was that the United States had jurisdiction of this question, that it was a question of interstate and foreign commerce, and that the State had not jurisdiction of the question. Upon that question alone the case turned.

The Virginia courts affirmed the conviction of Paul, and the case went up to the Supreme Court of the United States, and in deciding that question, which, I say, was by the unanimous opinion of the court, the following language appears in the opinion of the court:

> Issuing a policy of insurance is not a transaction of commerce. The policies are simple contracts of indemnity against loss by fire, entered into between the corporations and the assured, for a consideration paid by the latter. These contracts are not articles of commerce in any proper meaning of the word. They are not subjects of trade and barter offered in the market as something having an existence and value independent of the parties to them. They are not commodities to be shipped or forwarded from one State to another, and then put for sale. They are like other personal contracts between parties which are completed by their signature and the transfer of the consideration. Such contracts are not interstate transactions, though the parties may be domiciled in different States. The policies do not take effect—are not executed contracts—until delivered by the agent in Virginia. They are, then, local transactions, and are governed by the local law. They do not constitute a part of the commerce between the States any more than a contract for the purpose and sale of goods in Virginia by a citizen of New York whilst in Virginia would constitute a portion of such commerce.

The same question next came up in the case of Hooper *v.* California, reported in 155 United States, 653.

It came up in a similar manner, Mr. Chairman. In delivering the opinion of the court the court said:

> The business of insurance is not commerce. The contract of insurance is not an instrumentality of commerce. The making of such a contract is a mere incident of commercial intercourse, and in this respect there is no difference whatever between insurance against fire and insurance against "the perils of the sea."

This latter case was a marine insurance case and the first case was a fire insurance case.

In a more recent case, the case of the New York Life Insurance Company *v.* Cravens, 178 U. S., 401, Mr. Justice McKenna, in delivering the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court, said:

> That the business of fire insurance is not interstate commerce is decided in Paul *v.* Virginia, 8 Wallace, 168; Liverpool Insurance Company *v.* Massachusetts, 10 Wallace, 566; Philadelphia Fire Association *v.* New York, 119 U. S, 110. That the business of marine insurance is not is decided in Hooper *v.* California, 155 U. S. 648. In the latter case it is said that the contention that it is "involves an erroneous conception of what constitutes interstate commerce."

I do not thing that the justice meant to be personal in respect to my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] when he made that statement. He continues:

> We omit the reasoning by which that is demonstrated, and will only repeat, "The business of insurance is not commerce. The contract of insurance is not an instrumentality of commerce; the making of such contract is a mere incident of commercial intercourse, and in this respect there is no difference whatever between insurance against fire and insurance against 'the perils of the sea.'" And we add, or against the uncertainty of man's mortality.

There are other cases, Mr. Chairman, which I do not care to cite. The decisions of the Supreme Court seem to be uniform and unanimous, notwithstanding the opinion which my friend said he had from a noted lawyer, and in which he states that he still thinks that these contracts of insurance or the subject of insurance is a matter of interstate commerce. I prefer to stand on the decisions of the Supreme Court; I prefer to stand on the rules of this House. I do not believe there is any jurisdiction possible in this body of any matter relating to insurance unless it is through the taxing power given by the Constitution to the Congress. Most of the bills introduced are introduced by men who seem to agree with that view of the Constitution, because they tax the business of insurance. That seems to be the object of the bill. These bills have been referred by the Speaker, taking the same view of the subject, after examining the question, to the Committee on Ways and Means. The other bills which some gentlemen have introduced, without examining this question apparently, and which omit any reference to taxation, have also been referred to that committee for two reasons. One is that it has been the rule of the Speakers, whenever the committee had the jurisdiction of the general matter, to refer all bills relating to that matter, although there was nothing technically in the bill sending it to that committee, to the same committee, and for the further reason that Congress has no jurisdiction of this subject unless it is under the taxing power, and no matter what the form of the bill it can not have life and vitality. It would not be passed by this House, having proper regard for the constitutional limitations upon our powers, unless it involved the question of taxation. Therefore this amendment is put into this resolution referring this part of the message to the Committee on Ways and Means, the only committee which has jurisdiction in taxation.

It is important to preserve the jurisdiction of committees. We are not looking for business in the Committee on Ways and Means. We have enough of that, but we do not shirk our business. When it comes to us naturally under the rules of the House we do not propose to give up our prerogatives, unless the House amends the rules, and we propose to get jurisdiction of such matters as belong to us whenever they do belong to us. This is plainly such a matter, and I hope when the House comes to vote upon it it will not seek to overrule the line of decisions of the Supreme Court, unanimously given, in favor of the proposition that interstate and foreign commerce has no jurisdiction of this subject-matter. Congress can get no jurisdiction of it under the interstate and foreign commerce act, but Congress can get jurisdiction of the subject of taxing insurance companies. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Several MEMBERS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield, and to whom?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman say whether there is anything in the President's message respecting insurance in reference to regulating insurance companies by taxing them?

Mr. PAYNE. I did not observe anything of that kind.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman give us some idea very briefly of how it is possible through the taxing power to regulate insurance companies?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to formulate a bill on this subject now extemporaneously. All I contend is that the only jurisdiction we can have in regard to insurance companies must come under the taxing power, and if there is not sufficient of that to regulate these companies, then Congress will not be able to carry out the suggestions of the President's message in relation to insurance.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will understand that I am asking only for information.

Mr. PAYNE. But I can not inform the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman can give me information upon any subject.

Mr. PAYNE. I can not undertake to say now. I can not formulate a bill regulating insurance on the question of taxation on the spur of the moment, if I ever can.

Mr. MANN. What I was trying to get at was to find out

whether it was on the spur of the moment the gentleman proposed to turn this over to the Committee on Ways and Means under the taxation theory. I say to the gentleman frankly this is the first time, although the gentleman spoke yesterday, that I ever heard suggested the idea that through the taxing powers you can regulate insurance companies; and for that reason, because the gentleman has evidently given some study to the subject or he would not make the motion, I asked the gentleman in what manner is it possible, not in detail, to regulate insurance companies through the taxing power.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, the gentleman will remember in his recollection here in Congress that Congress has regulated the business of filled cheese through the taxing power, and also regulating the matter of mixed flour—impure flour—through the taxing power.

Mr. MANN. I remember Congress has prohibited mixed flour except upon paying a certain tax.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, they went further than that and provided rules and regulations under which taxes could be collected, and if the gentleman will read those provisions he will have a suspicion at least that it may be a stretch of the constitutional provision in regard to taxation that enables them to regulate the business as these acts regulate the business. It was done under the assumption that it is necessary to do that in order to levy and collect the tax. Whether that is an honest assumption or not I am not now discussing. I am only discussing the possibilities of the case——

Mr. MANN. Well, I think the gentleman, when he discusses it, if he ever gets to the point of discussing it, will very readily see it is not possible to regulate any national insurance company with the taxing power on the mere theory that they regulate the question of mixed flour, filled cheese, or oleomargarine, because they are entirely different propositions.

Mr. PAYNE. It is possible, when I come to study the subject, I will come to some conclusion other than what I arrive at now, but what I contended was that this is the only jurisdiction we have on the subject.

Mr. MANN. I do not care where the message goes to particularly, but if we can endeavor to regulate insurance through the interstate-commerce provision of the Constitution, as I believe we can, and I have studied the decisions to which the gentleman referred and others to which the gentleman has not referred, why should not the proper committee dealing with that subject have jurisdiction on that question?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I have studied other decisions of the court, but these seemed to be so closely in point I did not think it necessary to multiply others from the same court, as they seemed to be in the same general direction.

Mr. CRUMPACKER and Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Just a question, please. I understand the position you take is that the Congress has no jurisdiction whatever over the subject of insurance unless it is through the taxing power of the Constitution?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I take that position, and especially that it has no jurisdiction under the interstate-commerce clause.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Well, I would like to ask the gentleman, in that connection, if the Congress has no jurisdiction except by means of taxation, would it be proper for the Congress by act or otherwise to prescribe certain rules and regulations which insurance companies must comply with or be debarred from mail facilities? I ask him if the Congress has not that power?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I want to say to the gentleman, so far as I am advised now, I have failed to find any authority under the Constitution to do that thing. I may be enlightened on that subject, but I am only speaking now——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I wish I was able to enlighten the gentleman on the subject, but it has occurred to me that the power of Congress over all matters that pass through the mails is unlimited, and any act or regulation prescribed by the Congress in this regard must be obeyed.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know any decision of the Supreme Court that has gone so far as to decide that legitimate business communications can not go through the mails. Of course, I am aware of the lottery cases, where they have regulated the carrying of lottery tickets, and as a matter of course that is a subject of excise, and they have sustained the idea that Congress may interfere with that, and properly interfere, but this is another matter.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]?

Mr. PAYNE. I do.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I desire to ask a question in relation to the necessity for this amendment of the resolution. It occurred to me that the gentleman had already argued himself entirely out of court when he stated, or his resolution states, that all matters pertaining to taxation should go to the Committee on Ways and Means and that the only way to handle insurance questions is through the taxing power, and that under the rules as they now stand all of these questions will go to the Committee on Ways and Means. I would like to know what is the necessity for this amendment of the resolution?

Mr. PAYNE. I will state it very frankly to the gentleman, and I do not think I am violating any committee secrets in making the statement. I drew the original resolution, as he will observe, without these words in it, but simply referring all matters relating to taxation to the Committee on Ways and Means, in general language. When the resolution came up before the committee some of my colleagues thought we ought to put the words "and insurance" in, in order that the matter might be met frankly and fully in the House; and so those words were put in there by way of amendment by direction of my colleagues in the committee. I think myself it is a new subject, a novel subject, one never having been presented to the Congress of the United States before, and in that my colleagues were right in suggesting that those words ought to go in. But in connection with that they referred me to the particular clause that gives jurisdiction to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in terms "of the isthmian canal" and in terms "of the interoceanic cables," and so forth. It goes beyond the language of the rule in that respect.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Would it not be better to leave the whole subject upon the standing rules of the House, so that if a bill proposing to regulate insurance by taxation were introduced it would under the standing rules be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means? If an insurance bill were introduced in the House providing for regulation through the mails, or as a subject of interstate commerce, without involving the taxing power, I think the gentleman would concede if Congress had jurisdiction, it ought to go to some other committee. His committee is directed in its jurisdiction by the original rules of the House.

Mr. PAYNE. I am afraid my friend was not paying attention to the argument I tried to make. It has been the custom of the Speaker wherever a class of bills was referable to one committee, and that because of some particular feature of the bills, and those bills were so referred, to refer other bills upon the same general subject to that committee, so that there should be but one jurisdiction in the House. Now, I am informed that that is the custom of the Speaker. But I am also informed by the Speaker, and that is what I attempted to say to the committee a few moments ago, that, so far as he can see, the House has no jurisdiction of this subject unless the question of taxation is in every bill. So that a bill seeking to regulate this can have no life and vitality, even if enacted by the Congress of the United States, unless there is taxation in it, and the question of taxation appears. So I say that all those bills, whether taxation is in them or not, should be referred to the only committee that can report a bill involving taxation and bring it before the House.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Another question.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]?

Mr. PAYNE. I will first yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. One more question. My colleague from Indiana, Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS, has a bill pending providing for the regulation of insurance in the District of Columbia and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States involving in no respect the question of taxation. The gentleman must admit that Congress has the power to enact that kind of legislation. Does he think his committee ought to have jurisdiction of that bill?

Mr. PAYNE. I will state to the gentleman frankly that if that bill does not involve taxation I do not think it will go to the Committee on Ways and Means, but it will go to another committee of the House.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will it not, if this amendment is not adopted?

Mr. PAYNE. No; it is the President's message that goes to the committee on this subject.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. If you only want the message, I think you can have it all.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] permit another question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]?

Mr. PAYNE. I certainly will.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman stated it was the custom to refer all bills of the same character or relating to the same subject-matter to the same committee. Does not the gentleman remember when the oleomargarine question was before the House a bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means on the ground that it involved the taxing power; a bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the ground that it involved interstate commerce, and a bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture on the ground that it involved agricultural interests, all introduced in the same session of Congress?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, the gentleman may be right.

Mr. MANN. Is not "the gentleman" right? Does not the gentleman himself know that was the case?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not recollect.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that the bill acted upon came out of the Committee on Agriculture and that his committee did not act upon the bill referred to it.

Mr. PAYNE. I can not confirm the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. You can take my assurance of the facts.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, certainly. I know a member of the Committee on Ways and Means introduced bills on the subject, and was probably the father of the legislation upon that subject.

Mr. MANN. And not being able to get action by his own committee, a bill was introduced and sent to another committee, and still another bill introduced and sent to another committee.

Mr. PAYNE. My recollection does not extend so far as the recollection of the gentleman from Illinois. I had not the interest in the bill that he had.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York knew what was being done by the three committees.

Mr. PAYNE. My constituents did not have the same interest as those of the gentleman. I reserve the balance of my time, if I may. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will answer the gentleman as soon as he ascertains.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I think that this is a much more important question than the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] seems to think it is. I think it is important because I believe that the action of this committee to-day will be taken as a guide to be followed by the officer of the House who makes reference of bills on various subjects to committees in the future; and I think that these references will cover within the near future a great many bills on subjects involving much of legislation. The annual message that is referred to in this resolution devotes much of time to the discussion of corporations, corporations that the writer of that message says are engaged in interstate commerce, and among these corporations is included the business of insurance.

Perhaps I was unfortunate in using the word "pretext." Of course, I did not mean to be disrespectful to the Committee on Ways and Means, that might report a bill looking to legislation for revenue when that was only the minor and inconsequential part of the bill and was simply used for the purpose of giving jurisdiction of the larger, major subject that really was important in the bill. I used that word because it happened to come at the moment, without thinking at the time that it might be a subject of criticism upon the part of the gentleman from New York. He will remember, the committee will remember, that at the outstart of my remarks the other day I did not hesitate to say that the Supreme Court had taken a different view on this subject from the one that I entertain and a great many other gentlemen in this House take; but I said at the same time that that opinion of the Supreme Court was not indorsed, as I understand, by the American Bar Association, and that the gentlemen composing that eminent body of men took a different view on the subject from that which has been quoted here by the gentleman. There is no question——

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman? I have the report of the committee of the American Bar Association in my hand on that subject, both the majority and the minority reports, and the American Bar Association adopted at its last meeting the majority report. Will the gentleman permit me to say just what that was?

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARTLETT. The American Bar Association committee is composed of five gentlemen, four of whom signed the majority report, one of whom made the minority report on this subject, and this is what they recommend:

Legislation by Congress providing for the supervision of insurance.

That recommendation was adopted by the American Bar Association. Will the gentleman permit me to say that in furnishing this I do not mean to say that I agree altogether with the views of that committee or the majority report of the committee of the American Bar Association? I have my own views, which, at the proper time, I may express.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman tell the House how many members of the American Bar Association voted on that resolution?

Mr. BARTLETT. I have not the minutes of the American Bar Association.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is it not a fact that only a very small minority voted on it at all?

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know. I know of a committee of five appointed by the American Bar Association to investigate and report to it. Four reported in favor of regulation and one against.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I may say further that at least certain members of that committee and of the bar association have determined the form which this control that they recommend should take, and have furnished me with a bill that I shall have the honor in a day or two to introduce.

But I know, Mr. Chairman, that the decisions of the Supreme Court, respectable as they are, and entitled to our respect at all times as they are, are not infallible, and that they do not always remain the same. Every man who is familiar with the reports has been struck with the great number of overruled, doubted, and discredited cases that are contained as a list in every digest in this country. I remember, a little less than fifty years ago, when one of the most important decisions that ever was pronounced by the Supreme Court was rendered. More men, perhaps, were discussing that decision, were affected by it in their emotions and their convictions, than any other one decision that has ever been announced. I remember that as great a character as Mr. Lincoln said that "while that exposition of the law will be obeyed, yet we will never cease our efforts to secure a reversal of that decision." One decision does not fix for all time the law. It takes a long period, after full discussion and after the subject is thoroughly understood, to fix permanently the law as we have it in construction.

I remember when Congress first began the discussion of its right to control the great railway corporations that they all relied upon the Dartmouth College case. It was said that their rights were fixed by that decision and the series of decisions affirming the doctrines of that case. Their vested rights were recognized in the law as there interpreted. And yet I remember that when the cases were presented that was not regarded as a controlling precedent, and that the other view became the rule through construction.

I have no doubt that in cases of minor importance, where argument was not extended, where but little attention was given to the subject-matter, the Supreme Court has taken a particular view; but that was in the absence of legislation, in the absence of effort, and when those cases were first decided the conditions were infinitely different from those of to-day; and I am hopeful that when the case of to-day may be presented, as it will be presented, that a different view will be taken. At least I do not want, by our action here to-day, to abandon the position and the claim that under the commerce clause of the Constitution the Congress has the right to control these great corporations that are engaged in commerce. I do not want to abandon it, and after what has been said by the gentleman from the Committee on Ways and Means, if we adopt this resolution as he has amended it, we do abandon this ground; we surrender everything. We say that we have no power of control save that which comes from the taxing power, and I do not want to say that. That is what this resolution does say in effect, after the declaration of the gentleman from New York.

Besides, Mr. Chairman, I understand from the gentleman, and perhaps I may be justified in saying that I have been informed from other sources, that the majority of that committee agree with him, and therefore I do not want this legislation to go to a committee where it is condemned in advance.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman that what I meant to say was, and what I think I did say, that the committee, I think unanimously, were for the amendment. Whether they all agree with me on the taxing power or not I can not say. I know some of them do.

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, I assume that they must, for this reason, that that is the only way, and it is because that view does obtain that the gentleman could claim jurisdiction at all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the rule under which the gentleman says this should go to his committee. And yet let me suggest that this resolution is an abandonment of all claim that there is a rule that would take this matter before that committee.

Why is this resolution here if, under the rules of this House, the subject should go to the Committee on Ways and Means? The very fact that there is no rule that determines this matter, that there is no claim of a precedent or rule, is the reason they introduced this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, the rule provides that all proposed legislation shall go to the various committees; there is no doubt about that. All bills or resolutions introduced on that subject go to the various committees, and this resolution is brought in here to send the President's message to the various committees because the rules do not send it there.

Mr. HEPBURN. "All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committees named in the preceding rule, as follows, namely: Subjects relating to the revenue and the bonded debt of the United States." Is there a word in the President's message referring to the revenue? Is there any pretense that this portion of the President's message that is assigned to this committee proposes revenue, or can be considered as proposing legislation relating to revenue? I think that a strict construction of this rule perhaps would not justify the gentleman in his contention. "All proposed legislation." We legislate through bills, and while I am not clear that so limited a definition should be given, yet I suggest it to the gentleman for his consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the attention of the House longer, but I do think that this is an important matter. I do believe that this subject of the control of the great corporations is one that the people of the United States demand this Congress shall take hold of and shall consider, and that they shall exercise all of the powers, if necessary, conferred by the Constitution on the Congress in order to secure proper control over them, and that our constituents will not be content if, at the very beginning of this great contest, we abandon all our claim to authority except that we may have under the taxing power. I am not willing to surrender the power that we have through the control of the postal system. This does it. I am not willing to surrender the control that I believe we have through the commerce clause of the Constitution. This does it. Therefore I think the amendment to the resolution as proposed by the gentleman ought not to prevail, and, if this amendment is not sustained, I will, at the proper time, propose an amendment in the third line, on page 2, after the word "commerce," to insert "including Federal control over corporations;" so that it will read: "That so much as relates to commerce, including Federal control over corporations, shall be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce." Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LACEY rose.

Mr. HEPBURN. How much time does the gentleman from Iowa want?

Mr. LACEY. Ten minutes.

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the committee and the Chair to the form of the President's message, and will here insert it in my remarks:

INSURANCE.

Recent events have emphasized the importance of an early and exhaustive consideration of this question, to see whether it is not possible to furnish better safeguards than the several States have been able to furnish against corruption of the flagrant kind which has been exposed. It has been only too clearly shown that certain of the men at the head of these large corporations take but small note of the ethical distinction between honesty and dishonesty; they draw the line only this side of what may be called "law honesty," the kind of honesty necessary in order to avoid falling into the clutches of the law. Of course the only complete remedy for this condition must be found in an aroused public conscience, a higher sense of ethical conduct in the community at large, and especially among business men and in the great profession of the law, and in the growth of a spirit which condemns all dishonesty, whether in rich man or in poor man, whether it takes the shape of bribery or of blackmail. But much can be done by legislation which is not only drastic but practical. There is need of a far stricter and more uniform regulation of the vast insurance interests of this country. The United States should in this respect follow the policy of other nations by providing adequate national supervision of commercial interests which are clearly national in character. My predecessors have repeatedly recognized that the foreign business of these companies is an important part of our foreign commercial relations. During the Administrations of Presidents Cleveland, Harrison, and McKinley the State Department exercised its influence, through diplomatic channels, to prevent unjust discrimination by foreign countries against American insurance companies. These negotiations illustrated the propriety of the Congress recognizing the national character of insurance, for in the absence of Federal legislation the State Department could only give expression to the wishes of the authorities of the several States, whose policy was ineffective through want of uniformity.

I repeat my previous recommendation that the Congress should also consider whether the Federal Government has any power or owes any duty with respect to domestic transactions in insurance of an interstate character. That State supervision has proved inadequate is generally conceded. The burden upon insurance companies, and therefore their policy holders, of conflicting regulations of many States, is unquestioned, while but little effective check is imposed upon any able and unscrupulous man who desires to exploit the company in his own interest at the expense of the policy holders and of the public. The inability of a State to regulate effectively insurance corporations created under the laws of other States and transacting the larger part of their business elsewhere is also clear. As a remedy for this evil of conflicting, ineffective, and yet burdensome regulations there has been for many years a widespread demand for Federal supervision. The Congress has already recognized that interstate insurance may be a proper subject for Federal legislation, for in creating the Bureau of Corporations it authorized it to publish and supply useful information concerning interstate corporations, "including corporations engaged in insurance." It is obvious that if the compilation of statistics be the limit of the Federal power, it is wholly ineffective to regulate this form of commercial intercourse between the States, and as the insurance business has outgrown in magnitude the possibility of adequate State supervision, the Congress should carefully consider whether further legislation can be had. What is said above applies with equal force to fraternal and benevolent organizations which contract for life insurance.

The matters discussed before the House and the committee this morning have involved entirely a different proposition from that proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. He has discussed the question as to where certain bills should be referred. The proposition before the House is as to where the message should go. If the President is mistaken in his message, that is another thing. He proposed in his message to Congress to amend the laws in relation to the Bureau of Corporations so that Bureau may have control over interstate insurance in the United States. He discusses that matter, and that subject is not suggested in any other form. He does say that there is a question as to the constitutionality of such legislation, and he submits the subject to Congress. If nothing but the constitutional question comes to Congress, it would go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD rose.

Mr. LACEY. I will yield to the gentleman in a minute. If the other question, which is the real question presented in his message, as to whether the law in relation to the Bureau of Corporations should be amended so as to enlarge its jurisdiction, if it is a proper subject for consideration by this House, it goes to the committee having charge of the laws on that subject, and it is not for us to say in advance that we can not handle this question in any way except by the taxing power. That would be saying to the President of the United States that he is entirely mistaken in suggesting any amendment to the law in the Bureau of Corporations, and in advance saying that the law can not be constitutionally amended except through the taxing power. That ought not to be decided in this broad way in the Committee of the Whole. When the bills are prepared and when they are introduced they will go to the appropriate committees—to the Judiciary Committee, perhaps, if the bill involves only a constitutional question; to the Postal Committee if it is only a question of controlling the mails; or, if it is to enlarge the power of the Bureau of Corporations, to the committee that has control of that subject.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Do I get in with this inquiry at any time?

Mr. LACEY. Yes; right at this particular moment. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What I would like to inquire about is this: I understand the gentleman to say that if a constitutional question is raised by the message it should go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LACEY. If he submits to Congress the question of whether there is constitutional power, as he says here, then that portion of the message merely involving the question of constitutional power alone would naturally go to that eminent committee of lawyers whose duty it is to pass on questions of constitutionality, and it might be proper to refer that part of the proposition to that committee.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Does not the gentleman appreciate the fact that at the very foundation of this suggestion, this recommendation, and any legislation that may take place, is this important constitutional proposition? Is not that true?

Mr. LACEY. Not necessarily. It will be true when any bill is presented. If I should prepare a bill amending the corporation laws as to the Bureau of Corporations, that bill would go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Now, there is still another proposition in this part of the message, that as to whether or not there should not be some arrangement with foreign powers. Possibly that might go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There is no suggestion of revenue in this part of the message.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. But I did not ask anything about revenue.

Mr. LACEY. That is what I am discussing.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. And the gentleman was apparently answering the question that I asked him, as I understand it. Does not the gentleman concede that at the foundation of all these suggestions in relation to the control of insurance companies by Congress lies the great constitutional question as to whether we have the constitutional power to control life-insurance companies? Is not that true?

Mr. LACEY. That is no more true than it is with any bill. The question of the constitutional power to enact a bill comes up with every bill that comes before this House. That is one of the questions, and every committee can deal with that.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Would not that be fundamental there?

Mr. LACEY. Not at all. We have already dealt with the Bureau of Corporations, and the President in his message asks us to enlarge the powers of that Bureau. Now, the question as to whether those powers should be enlarged or not goes to the committee having charge of the legislation that seeks to enlarge that power.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. And he suggests in his message that his own recommendation is of doubtful constitutionality, and raises the question of constitutionality.

Mr. LACEY. No, he does not suggest it in that way.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I understood the gentleman to so intimate.

Mr. LACEY. No. The question of constitutional power is of course a matter to which he calls the attention of Congress: "That Congress carefully consider whether the power of the Bureau of Corporations can not be constitutionally extended to cover interstate transactions in insurance."

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. "Can not constitutionally be extended"——

Mr. LACEY. Certainly, but the question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and which I was endeavoring to answer, is this, that this House in advance should determine that there is no way to act upon the insurance question except by taxation, and therefore every question connected with it must go to the Committee on Ways and Means. Now, that is not involved here. The President's message does not suggest taxation; consequently respecting his message on that subject, if he has made a mistake in asking a kind of relief, it is not for us to correct it, but to send the message to where it appropriately belongs.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman.

Mr. LACEY. So that the question that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has been presenting here is not involved at all, and it evidently did not occur to him or to the Committee on Ways and Means at the start that this subject belonged to that committee, but now comes in the form of an amendment. If some one wants to reach the insurance question by taxation and a bill is introduced, then it would go to the Committee on Ways and Means. If some one wants to regulate this question through the Bureau of Corporations, the bill would go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. So that, Mr. Chairman, the whole question is one not of the appropriate reference of bills when they come to be introduced, but the reference of the message as it is written, as it stands, and that clearly refers to commerce, because that is the question that the President submits to this House.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman's opinion as to what effect the reference of subjects in the President's message has upon the jurisdiction of the committees, as defined in the rules?

Mr. LACEY. None whatever. The rules state the question of jurisdiction and the reference of the President's message has no more to do with that subject than a reference of a bill to a wrong committee would have upon the reference of a similar bill to the right committee, so that this question does not bind the House as to future reference of bills which do not involve the question of raising revenue.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Now, Mr. Chairman, do I get the impression correctly from the gentleman that as a matter of fact it is immaterial as to what is done with this resolution if it does not bind anybody hereafter, that it is largely an immaterial proposition?

Mr. LACEY. No, I think not. I think it is very material in the form in which it is presented. It is presented with the statement of the leader of this side of the House that he presents this as a precedent, and this precedent will control the action of the Chair in future reference of bills, so that it becomes more material and important than ordinarily it would be.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. LACEY. I yield.

Mr. DALZELL. I would like to ask the gentleman what, in his judgment, is the significance of referring so much of the President's message as relates to insurance to any particular committee? What does it carry to the committee?

Mr. LACEY. It carries the consideration of the message, that is all. It does not carry the whole subject under the rules. That would not disturb the functions of the Committee on Rules, which I think still would have power upon the question, notwithstanding the fact the Committee of the Whole should have seen fit to refer this particular subject in the manner in which it is presented by the Committee on Ways and Means. But it seems to me there ought to be as many different methods devised as possible, so that this question could be presented to different committees in different ways in all of its lights, and we should not prejudge that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I will ask unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields five minutes of time to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DALZELL. No committee of this House can originate any legislation. It must be founded upon a bill or resolution introduced in the House here or upon a message from the Executive Departments through the House, as, for instance, to the Committee on Appropriations. Now, is not the purpose of sending so much of the President's message as relates to taxation to the Committee on Ways and Means to give that committee jurisdiction to report to this House a bill without the introduction of any bill in the House? Is not that so?

Mr. LACEY. Possibly it may be. Then all the greater reason why we should not make a mistake now and give exclusive jurisdiction to the Ways and Means Committee of this subject.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. This does not give it. Does the gentleman claim that it does?

Mr. LACEY. I understand the gentleman claims it does.

Mr. DALZELL. If what the gentleman conceded is true, this resolution, or so much as relates to this subject, does give jurisdiction to the committee to legislate on the subject.

Mr. LACEY. If the Committee on Interstate Commerce should conclude that the only remedy in this matter is by taxation, I presume they would scarcely report a bill upon that question for fear of trespassing upon the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. That is a question we will worry about when we get to it; but here is the President's message that only points out one way through commerce, and that would go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, not the Committee on Ways and Means. There is not a single suggestion anywhere in the message that there is any thought in the mind of the Executive that the question can be handled through the taxing power. Possibly it could be legislated upon in that way, but the message does not consider anything of that kind or suggest anything of the kind to the Congress, and therefore it seems to me clear we ought not to adopt this amendment, but to leave revenue measures to go to the Committee on Ways and Means, and matters connected with commerce in the message go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, does the gentleman from Iowa desire to reserve the balance of his time?

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire to reserve the balance of my time, and if I can be recognized I would desire to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. This subject is an important one, but the proposition to be immediately settled is not novel. It seems to me that similar subjects which should be precedents and a basis for our action here have been settled by the House in previous Congresses with the assent of the Committee on Ways and Means, and especially of its distinguished chairman. Now, he did relate somewhat the history of the oleomargarine legislation, but he omitted especially the significant course of legislation in the Fifty-sixth and Fifty-seventh Congresses, which is of the greatest interest and bearing now. The history of that legislation in those two particular Congresses is that which is appropriate to the present settlement of this proposition. There were several bills introduced in the Fifty-sixth Congress to regulate and control the sale of oleomargarine by means of the taxing power. I have here the index to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress. From it there appears to have been six bills introduced in the House, three of which were referred to the Committee on Ways and Means—H. R. 6, introduced by Mr. TAWNEY, of Minnesota; H. R. 43, introduced by Mr. DAVIDSON, of Wisconsin; H. R. 11140, introduced by Mr. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama—two to the Committee on Agriculture—H. R. 3717, introduced by

Mr. Grout, of Vermont, which was the only bill reported from any committee and upon which the House took any definite action, and H. R. 11542, by Mr. WADSWORTH, of New York—and one to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—H. R. ——, introduced by Mr. Glynn, of New York. The RECORD shows that the Committee on Ways and Means took no action with the bills referred to them. The RECORD also shows that the Committee on Agriculture did take action on one of the bills—H. R. 3717—referred to it, and that the House received the report without objection by anybody as to jurisdiction, but no bill passed. The RECORD of the Fifty-seventh Congress shows that there were eight bills introduced in the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress. Seven of them were referred to the Committee on Agriculture—H. R. 1, introduced by Mr. MCCLEARY, of Minnesota; H. R. 4, introduced by Mr. TAWNEY, of Minnesota; H. R. 10, introduced by Mr. DAVIDSON, of Wisconsin; H. R. 1948, introduced by Mr. HENRY, of Connecticut; H. R. 4613, introduced by Mr. Cooper, of Texas; H. R. 9206, introduced by Mr. HENRY, of Connecticut; H. R. 10060, introduced by Mr. WADSWORTH, of New York—and one, containing other provisions, was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means—H. R. 6534, by Mr. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, which by its terms amended the revenue act of October 1, 1890. The especially noticeable fact which the House should know is this: There were two of the bills introduced in the Fifty-sixth Congress providing for the control and regulation of the subject of oleomargarine by means of the taxing power, one introduced by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] and one by my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIDSON], which were referred to the Committee on Ways and Means in the Fifty-sixth Congress. In the Fifty-seventh Congress those almost identical bills, introduced by those same gentlemen, were referred to the Committee on Agriculture by the officials of the House without any objection from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means or from the Committee on Ways and Means itself. And the bill which was considered in the Fifty-seventh Congress, the bill which actually passed, was a bill introduced by Mr. HENRY, of Connecticut—H. R. 9206—which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, reported by that Committee to the House and considered on the floor from that reference, and no objection was made by the Committee on Ways and Means or by anyone else to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture, although the taxing power of the Government was invoked by the measure. So that the history of that legislation which bears the closest analogy to this proposition before this committee shows, although it contained provisions for the taxing powers, which were even the basis for its action and existence, yet the Committee on Ways and Means, although at first it assumed or received jurisdiction of the bills, afterwards yielded the control of them, for the very good reason that the main subject of those bills and the main purpose of that legislation was not the exercise of the taxing power, but the power to regulate and control a certain subject-matter which should be considered by another committee. Now, the House has considered and settled just this sort of matter. The Committee on Ways and Means has already considered them and yielded jurisdiction on a similar subject when the same question was involved, and that seems to me——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] yields three minutes of time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the analysis of what was or was not legislation. Now, what I would like to inquire is why these bills that went before the Committee on Agriculture and which are so parallel to this proposition did not go before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the committee that now wants to get possession of this subject?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. That is just the point I wanted to make. The House evidently considered—and the Committee on Ways and Means evidently considered, and it should be considered now—that the reference of any bill as to any subject should be to the committee which has general charge of the subject-matter which is the general main purpose of the bill. If the general purpose of the bill, if the general scope of the legislation, if the primary object for its enactment, is to raise revenue, even if it taxes insurance companies and insurance policies, or whatever it may do, and because of that regulate them in certain ways—if the main purpose of that legislation is to raise revenue, then it unquestionably should go to the Committee on Ways and Means. But if the main purpose of the legislation is to benefit the general or any particular agricultural interests of the country—is to vitally affect the agricultural interests of the country—and its incidental purpose is to use the taxing power, this House has decided that bill should go to the committee which had general charge of the agricultural interests of the country.

Now, if the main purpose of this bill be to regulate commerce, is to regulate the business which is incidental to or may be an integral part of commerce, regulate the general object which concerns commerce, it should go to the committee which has general charge of the subject of commerce, even though one of its incidental features concerns the subject of taxation, just exactly as did the question of control of oleomargarine in the Fifty-seventh Congress go to the committee which had charge of the interests which were most and vitally affected.

That has been the rule in the past. It seems to me to be a safe and salutary rule now and in the future, one that ought to be adopted in this House on all sorts of subjects. That kind of a rule is always safe and fair to all interests and all committees; and under that rule this subject should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Now let me suggest to the gentleman, if he pleases.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That very reason you have given why this bill should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce applies with equal force to the oleomargarine proposition, as to which we could not legislate at all except under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. Now, why did not your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at that time assert the jurisdiction that they are now undertaking to assert, when there were just exactly the same reasons for it. You had one bill referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and that committee quietly let that bill die in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The gentleman from Iowa has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Minnesota have five minutes in his own right. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. It seems to me that the very reason you have given why this bill should go to the Interstate Commerce Committee, and all the reason you have given why it should go to that committee, is that it is interstate commerce; all the reason why you say the oleomargarine proposition went to the Committee on Agriculture was because it related to agriculture. Now, this proposition relates not to interstate commerce, but to insurance. There was a Committee on Agriculture, and the oleomargarine proposition was one that related to agriculture, and it went to the Committee on Agriculture, and the only provision under which that committee could get jurisdiction of legislation of that kind was that it was interstate commerce, and that is exactly the same jurisdiction over that subject that you have over this. Why did you not assert that jurisdiction then?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. I do not think the gentleman from Maine quite apprehends the point I make. It seems to me that the true rule should be that the main purpose of the bill should be primarily considered in its reference. The object which is mainly and primarily sought to be accomplished by the measure should be the principal consideration which should determine the reference of the bill. Now, in the oleomargarine bill the main purpose of the bill was to assist the agricultural interests of the country. It was subsidiary and an incident that it related to the question of interstate commerce. The main purpose of that legislation was to assist the agricultural interests; but for that it would not have been passed or enacted. This House did exactly right in considering the main purpose and object of that legislation in making the reference to the committee which had charge of the principal subject-matter of agriculture. Now, in this case, insurance is incidental at least to commerce; it is part, an integral part, of a business which is concerned with the subject of commerce; if it exists at all it must be as a part of the great business interests of the country and of the great commercial interests of the country, and that subject-matter goes, by our rules, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. I understood the gentleman to say that the Committee on Ways and Means yielded jurisdiction in the Fifty-sixth or Fifty-seventh Congress in those bills.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. The RECORD shows that your committee obtained jurisdiction on the introduction of several bills and then did not exercise it, and that no protest was made by your committee.

Mr. PAYNE. Then all that the gentleman means is that the Speaker referred some of the bills to that committee, on which there was no report, and in a subsequent Congress he referred the same bills to another committee, and that it did report.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. He referred various bills introduced in the Fifty-sixth Congress by several gentlemen to the Committee on Ways and Means. In the Fifty-seventh Congress those identical gentlemen introduced the identical bills, and these bills went to the Committee on Agriculture without any protest by the gentlemen on the Committee on Ways and Means, and that subject was then acted upon by the Committee on Agriculture without protest on the part of the Commitee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman means to say that the bills were referred to another committee. Now, who was that by; the Speaker?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. In the usual course of business.

Mr. PAYNE. Then how did the committee yield?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. That is yielding.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CAPRON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

An act (H. R. 299) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company.

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, the vote upon this question will be far-reaching, so far as this session of Congress is concerned. The adoption of the amendment proposed by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means would be equivalent to approval of his argument and his judgment, that this House has no power to legislate upon the subject of insurance except so far as concerns the taxing power. That is the proposition, and the question now is as to whether we want it to go out to the country that this House is of the opinion that we have no power over the subject of insurance or the regulating of insurance companies except to tax them under the Constitution. There is nothing in the message of the President referring to taxation of insurance companies. There is no demand on the part of the people from any part of this great country asking that we tax insurance companies, because the people know that that would be simply levying a tax upon themselves, and the policy holders, who have been robbed almost enough, are not asking for an additional tax upon themselves, making the cost of insurance higher. But recent developments, Mr. Chairman, have settled the question that the people of the country are asking Congress to give them some relief from the extortion of the great insurance companies of this country, especially those engaged in life insurance.

The question of life insurance is one that comes home to and interests more people than any other subject with which Congress has, or can have, to do. I am not one of those who believe that Congress is powerless in the face of a great demand such as comes to us now for legislation in regard to insurance companies, and for some kind of control over the great life insurance companies of the country. I do not think that we are limited to the taxing power under the Constitution. I do not believe that anybody is asking for such a tax, but I believe that, under the Constitution, Congress has power to legislate in certain respects, at least as to the transaction of the business of life insurance in the United States.

There can be no doubt, for instance, that we might pass bills regulating these companies in the District of Columbia and in the Territories. There is no doubt that we have the power to establish a bureau of insurance under the Department of Commerce and Labor, or in the Department of the Interior, or under some other Department. There is no doubt that we may give to that bureau of insurance the power of investigation, and of acquiring such information as it may be able to acquire, giving such publicity as it can to the transactions of these great companies. Then, Mr. Chairman, we might provide by a bill that any life insurance company doing business in more than one State could submit to the jurisdiction of the bureau of insurance of the United States Government, could submit to examination by officers sent out from that bureau, and could have the benefit of a showing made under the supervision of the Federal Government if their business was honestly and fairly conducted. What company, under such circumstances, would undertake to go before the people and ask for business unless it was willing to submit to the jurisdiction of the department of insurance organized by the Federal Government? There is no taxation about that. That would not need to go to the Committee on Ways and Means. It would not need to go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, even. I am not sure what committee it might go to.

Mr. DUNWELL. The Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FULLER. Perhaps the Committee on the Judiciary would be the appropriate committee under the rules as they now are. But, Mr. Chairman, there is an easy way out of that. I have this morning introduced a resolution providing for an amendment to the rules by adding a standing committee to be known as the "committee on insurance," and if the Committee on Rules will report out that resolution and give us such a committee then we will all know where these bills should go.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. FULLER. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I understand the gentleman to suggest that he thinks perhaps the proper place might be the Judiciary Committee. I know the gentleman is an extremely good lawyer, and whatever views any of us may entertain upon the question as to whether insurance per se is or is not interstate commerce, we all concede, I suppose, that it is certainly a grave question. Now, why, under the circumstances, would it not be wise to refer this provision of the message to the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. FULLER. I think it would.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Then I suppose the gentleman will support us on that proposition, and I will submit an amendment a little bit later that the matter be referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FULLER. That would not commit us to any policy whatever as to where other bills should go.

Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. One moment. In the message the President himself does not seem to understand fully what jurisdiction Congress may have. If that part of the message were referred to the Judiciary Committee, they could tell the House as lawyers how far we might go in legislating upon this question. They might report under that provision of the message, by bill or otherwise, to this House, and that committee being composed of the greatest lawyers in the House we would then perhaps find out what our rights were and just how far we could go.

But, Mr. Chairman, I protest against its going out to the country here to-day that we believe Congress has no power over this great question except the power of taxation. I do not want to accede to that proposition. I do not believe it. I will suggest one other power under the Constitution of the United States by which we may control every great insurance company in the land, and that is under the provisions for the transmission of the United States mails. Congress has full power over the subject, and now when some little fraudulent concern undertakes to use the United States mails, when some of these get-rich-quick concerns or confidence games become known to the Post-Office Department, a fraud order is issued, and the company is forbidden the use of the United States mails for the transaction of its business. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that some of the developments that have become known in the last few months in regard to the transaction of the life-insurance business by some of the great companies of this country would justify the Post-Office Department, under existing law even, in the issuance of fraud orders, to prohibit their having the use of the United States mails.

Under that provision of the Constitution we may legislate as to any kind of a corporation in this broad land that does not do an honest and fair and safe business, and no insurance company and no other great corporation can do business for a single day in the different States without the use of the United States mails. Tell me that there is no power except the taxing power whereby we can control these corporations! There is more than one provision of the Constitution which allows this Congress to legislate upon that subject.

Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS rose.

Mr. FULLER. I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS. The gentleman states that he favors a reference of this to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to hear the colloquy that is going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of the gentleman from New York is well taken.

Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS. The gentleman states that he favors a reference of this matter to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. FULLER. Of this part of the message.

Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS. The gentleman favors reference to the Committee on the Judiciary of this part of the message. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would favor the reference to the Committee on the Judiciary of a bill which I introduced the other day, which involves no interstate proposition, but merely gives to Congress the power to impose restrictions on corporations doing business in the District of Columbia and Territories and insular possessions. That bill amends the law creating the Department of Commerce and Labor, the bill creating which Department was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In that event would the gentleman favor a reference to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. FULLER. I hardly think that bill should go to the Committee on the Judiciary. I should say it would go to the Committee on the District of Columbia or the Committee on the Territories, or possibly to the Interstate Commerce Committee, which had jurisdiction of the subject originally. But that is a matter purely for the Speaker of the House to decide.

Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS. Does the gentleman think under any possible construction it should go to the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. FULLER. Not by any possible construction. I do not believe that where the question of revenue is not at stake the bill should go to the Ways and Means Committee. Any bill the purpose of which is to raise revenue, of course, should go to that committee. But I object more particularly to the adoption of this amendment to-day because under the discussion that has taken place it would commit us to the argument made by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, that we were willing to tell the country that in this great demand for legislation concerning life-insurance companies we believe the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States to be practically powerless; that our hands are tied, and that no matter how great the fraud, no matter how great the swindle perpetrated by these companies is, we can do nothing unless it is to tax them, which would be putting an additional tax on the policy holders of these companies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no bill on this subject. I have introduced no bill and I do not know that I will; but unless some one else does so, unless some one else introduces a bill that meets my views, I perhaps shall introduce one, because I believe that in this session of Congress, and in the coming sessions of Congress, the question of control of insurance companies will be one of the great questions before the country. It towers up to-day as great as any other question, in my judgment, which we have to meet, and we must meet it. We must meet it fairly under the Constitution, and under the Constitution I believe we have the power. I do not care where this part of the message is referred, except that I would not like to have a precedent established that the Ways and Means Committee, under the taxing power, was the committee, and the only committee, to have jurisdiction of this subject. I do not believe it. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of my remarks I ask permission to extend them in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks permission to extend remarks which he proposes to make in the RECORD.

Mr. COCKRAN. What is that request, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas proposes to make some remarks upon the resolution, and requests in advance that he may have the opportunity to extend them in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, the question of the reference of that part of the President's message relating to insurance seems to be in such doubt in the minds of the Members of the House as to the constitutional power of Congress in the premises that I am inclined to think that that part of the President's message referring to the supervision or control of insurance companies should be referred to the Judiciary Committee, with instruction to investigate and report to the House upon the constitutional question involved.

But, Mr. Chairman, there has been much said, and much more will be said, in regard to the regulation of insurance companies by Congressional action, and I will only take this occasion to say that I believe and hope that the great State in which the recent crimes, embezzlements, and frauds have been developed will prove sufficient in its power in the execution of its laws to put stripes upon the thieves who have plundered their policy holders with a recklessness that has startled the country.

These great moneyed corporations have for the last dozen years contributed freely of the money they had gathered from the people to the Republican campaign fund.

The conduct of these companies demonstrates the evil that naturally flows from the participation in political contests by the great corporations of the country, and should warn the country that immediate action ought to be taken to forever prohibit all corporations from contributing or otherwise participating in national elections.

Mr. Chairman, during the last session of Congress, and in the month of January, I had the honor to introduce a resolution in this House, which was passed, directing an investigation into the conduct and course of business of the United States Steel Corporation. That resolution has been in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor for practically twelve months, and yet no information has reached this House or the country as to what has been done respecting it. On the 6th day of this month I submitted an inquiry to that officer and I received a brief reply which I desire to give to the House. The inquiry I thought was in proper place, as I was the author of the resolution, and I desired to know what steps had been taken looking toward its execution. I received the following reply from Mr. Metcalf, the Secretary:

SIR: I have your letter of the 6th instant. House resolution 448, relating to the steel industry, was referred to the Commissioner of Corporations, under whom a thorough investigation is being conducted.

I do not know when he began it; I do not know when he intends to conclude it, and do not know what has been done. For twelve months this criminal, heartless, and defenseless monopoly has fed not only upon the industries of the country, but upon the people themselves, and yet when an investigation has been ordered we find that a thorough one is being conducted now twelve months after the passage of that resolution. Mr. Chairman, if the insurance companies are to undergo such an investigation through the Department of Commerce and Labor I am of the opinion that before it is concluded the officers of the great companies in New York will have ample opportunity to put all the money in their pockets and can continue their contributions to the Republican campaign fund.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to refer to another subject which will engage the early attention of this House, and as I may not have an opportunity of participating in that debate I desire to say in regard to the bill proposing to extend and enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission that I favor giving to the Commission the power, when a rate has been found upon complaint to be unreasonable, to declare what is a reasonable rate and enforce it. I believe also that that rate ought to stand as soon as notice can be had of the judgment of the Commission until reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction. I desire to say, further, that I hope the measure that will be given to the country by this Congress will not only control the general questions, but will give the Commission control over the private car service of the country. In my State and in the South and Southwest the great fruit industry, which is calling to its service the best efforts of the people in that section of the country, is suffering because of the blighting hand of the private car abuses, and if we can secure by legislation relief that will give our people fair treatment in the shipment of their fruits and berries we can feed the people of this Republic on the best fruits and berries the world ever saw or ever knew. But unless the outrageously high and almost prohibitory charges can be reduced to a just basis this great industry must be abandoned.

Mr. Chairman, the question of regulation of freight traffic upon railroads, in my opinion, will affect directly and largely the pampered existence of many of the trusts and monopolies of this country. Sir, it would have been impossible for the Standard Oil Company, the beef trust, the Steel Corporation, and many other monopolies that now infest and curse the country to have reached their mammoth proportions and their great power over the commerce of the country had it not been for securing the benefit of special rates, special rebates, and special privileges from the railroads. If in this country the independent shipper, the small shipper, and all competitors can have and secure the same rates and the same privileges from the railroad companies it will be a strong restraint upon the power of monopoly. Not only that, but another question arises. I refer to the tariff rates. As we all know, or ought to know, it has

fed and fostered and built up many of these monopolies, and but for these twin trust breeders, and the great advantages secured through their instrumentality, their present existence would have been impossible. The Steel Corporation, selling by far cheaper in foreign countries than it does to its own home or domestic customers, has grown into great power.

One of the purposes of the resolution which I referred to a moment ago was directing the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to investigate the question of how it was and why it was that this corporation could and did sell the products of its factories more cheaply in foreign countries than it would to its own domestic customers. This corporation, with a capital of one and a half billion dollars, holding within its greedy grasp the control of the major part of the raw material and the finished products of iron and steel in the United States, defies the law, challenges Congress, stifles investigation, and continues to levy its lawless exactions upon every industry and upon every industrious hand in the country—pampered and fed by a tariff that is in many instances prohibitive, favored by railroad discrimination and rebates that give it mastery over its competitors; and yet the party in absolute control of this Congress, and which has been in control of the country for years, does not raise its hand or its voice in protest against this predatory combination. Not only this, Mr. Chairman, but I find that the greed of the day, the commercialism of the day, affects not only the insurance companies and the various business enterprises of the land; but it has gone further, and there has been organized a trust upon the schoolbooks of the country.

The American Book Company, capitalized at $5,000,000, it is authentically stated, controls to-day three-fourths of the schoolbook trade in the United States. It was organized under the laws of New Jersey, and absorbed the schoolbook business of five large competing compaines, and by trade agreements it controls the schoolbook trade of a large number of other concerns. So it may safely be said that it can dictate to a large degree the prices of all the schoolbooks used in the common schools of the country. It and its confederates control seven-eighths of the book sales in the primary and grammar grades of schoolbooks in the country. Not satisfied with the levying of tribute upon the industries of the country and the homes of the people, this monopoly seeks to levy tribute upon the hopes and the promises of the school children of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I rejoice at the exposure not only of the post-office frauds, but also that the land frauds and the insurance frauds are being called to the attention of the people. We find that there is an alarming condition of commercial graft and official graft sweeping over the country from sea to sea. We need an aroused public conscience that will inspire the bold and honest citizenship of State and nation to demand and compel the enactment in State and nation of effective legislation that will secure to the country official integrity and official honesty as well as business integrity and business honesty when enforced by brave and honest men. [Applause.] While, Mr. Chairman, it is true that there are insurance companies in the State of New York which have fed and fattened and feasted upon the money of the people as it has been paid into their coffers, but this was a voluntary payment, this is but a voluntary assumption of the payment of money, yet we find that the great Steel Corporation under tariff laws collects its thousands where these insurance companies steal their pennies from the American people, and yet we find a struggle in this Congress as to which of the great committees in this House shall have jurisdiction of the subject of insurance. Important as that subject is, I think if the Ways and Means Committee would take hold of the glaring dishonesties, the glaring outrages of the present tariff system that protect this mammoth monopoly it will serve the country and do its duty.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe there ought to be something done to correct the evils of life insurance. But this can only be done by the sovereign States. Mr. Chairman, you may trace the history of these institutions from their beginning until this time and you will find behind them, championing them and misleading and putting to sleep the public, a subsidized press. Mr. Chairman, one thing needed in this country is not only publicity with reference to the dealings of these great corporations and companies, but there is need of a bold, aggressive, and honest press to expose their abuses and frauds. Mr. Chairman, a few such newspapers exist in this country, but you may go not only to the national press, you may go to your own States and find that the infamous transactions of your State governments, as well as the trusts and insurance companies, are often championed by the State press, which is owned or subsidized by those who would feast upon the spoils of crimes against the people. Why was it that you heard the shouts of victory the other day as it rolled from the throats of the reform forces in the city of Philadelphia? Why was it you heard the shouts of Democratic victory in the great State of Ohio? They tell me in one instance it was a protest against the liquor traffic. They tell me in another it was a protest against bossism. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, it was a protest of the honest people that means more than that. They realize and they know that in these days of prosperity and of our greatness that we are sowing the seeds that promise the overthrow of our institutions unless we destroy them.

You may run the threads of history from the earliest periods of free government down to this time and you will find that the evils that overthrew the great governments of the world have developed and grown up in the hours of greatest power and wealth in those nations. [Applause.] And to-day in this nation, boasting of our wealth and power, if we will but draw back the curtain, we will see the bloodhounds of corruption and greed gnawing at the very vitals of free government. As long as we can secure to the people honest public service by honest men there will still be security of our rights and our institutions, but when the public domain is swept away from the people by thieves, when the Post-Office Department is plundered, and when the insurance companies insuring the lives of the people openly, defiantly, and boldly plunder their policy holders and rob the widows and orphans whose funds they hold, it is time to remedy it by an enforcement of the criminal laws. I say to you that in the State of New York by her own power she has exposed these frauds, and I believe and hope that that great State will bring the officers of these insurance companies to justice and give to the country legislation correcting and controlling these evils that will secure the rights of the policy holders. I shall not enter upon a discussion of the power of Congress to control these insurance companies. I don't think that power exists, but I want to say we should control those corporations over which we have unquestioned jurisdiction. I can see, I think, in the immediate future a general movement to put all corporations under the power and under the control of the General Government, and when we do we will wipe away the jurisdiction and power of the States. Then the corporations will be bulwarked behind a Cabinet officer's department, and resolutions of inquiry into their conduct and into their crimes will not only sleep a year, but sleep the sleep that knows no awakening. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the great question that confronts the country is how to restrain the greed and power of the great moneyed corporations of the country.

Take the three great insurance companies in New York, controlling a capital of $1,225,000,000—a sum sufficient to menace the State and challenge the virtue and power of local self-government in dealing with their abuses. If the State of New York will not correct the abuses of these companies, the other States can preclude them from doing business therein until such abuses have been corrected and honest administration of their affairs secured.

These great companies have been fed and enriched by the people of the South since their organization; and now grown to such power that they revel in the luxuriance of their crimes and embezzlements and lordly salaries taken and withdrawn from the funds belonging to the policy holders and their beneficiaries. Let the several States take the matter in hand and compel honest business methods and the preservation of the funds of said companies for the benefit of the beneficiaries or compel them to get out of the States in which they are carrying on their business under the present disreputable methods.

The Standard Oil trust, the steel trust, the trust on farming implements and machinery, and, in fact, all of the trusts that prey upon agriculture are located in the North and East. These institutions have managed for years and years to gather the earnings of our people into their coffers. They have held our people in their grasp with a power as inexorable as it was pitiless. Every year the rich earnings of our people take its journey East to add to the colossal holdings of these companies. This condition must be overthrown. This mortgage of greed must be canceled before the progress of the great and rich Southland can be established upon a firm and enduring basis.

It is time that the farmers and laboring people be recognized in national legislation. For forty years legislation has been enacted in the interest of the manufacturers and the money lenders—the shylocks, the usurers, and the protected plutocrats have prospered under the benefits of special legislation until their wealth and power is a menace to popular government, an embargo upon the healthful progress of the country, and an invasion of every just principle of trade and commerce. The time has come for a change. It must come and it will come. The farmers, the fruit growers, the laborers, the people are demanding that the yoke of greed and cunning be

taken off their necks, and that the great Government which they have established, defended, and maintained shall, if it does nothing else, take the felonious hands of the beneficiaries of special legislation out of their pockets.

The railroads of the country have received from the Government enough donations of the public land to make five States as big as Pennsylvania—enough upon which to build an empire. And now the people are only demanding legislation that will secure to them fair and reasonable rates in the shipment of their products to the markets. Equal rates; fair treatment. The fruit growers demand that they shall no longer be the victims of the extortions of the private-car companies, not only in the freight charges, but in the iceing and other incidental charges. These interests are not asking for special privileges, only for simple justice—in the language of the President, a "square deal." Shall they have it full and complete or shall they be turned away empty-handed or with a makeshift—the railroad employees, the men who work, the men who move the commerce of the world, the men who stake their lives in a most dangerous occupation, men not only as faithful to their employers, but as faithful to the public as any band of patriots who ever marched under freedom's banner? [Applause.]

They only ask for legislation that will reduce their risks to the minimum, and that will give them protection against the barbarous fellow-servant doctrine.

I have had a fellow-servant bill pending in this Congress for six years, giving to the railroad boys and their families a right of action against the company when killed or injured by the negligence of the company or of its employees. I have also introduced and had pending in Congress for six years an eight-hour-day bill, which applies to all Government work, and also an anti-injunction bill to prevent the Federal courts from arresting and imprisoning laboring men without trial by jury.

These measures, only involving matters of plain, simple justice, have up to this time been denied them, and I see no promise of their passage in the near future. How much longer shall these brave, industrious, faithful men be denied these plain and simple rights? They have waited, waited and endured, until the time has come when their plain rights should be respected by the law-making power in this country.

The long denial of these just measures by Congress is arousing the vigilance and determination of the people. The laboring men are organized and organizing all over the country. The farmers of the South are aroused as they never were before, and the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union and the Society of Equity of America are purely farmers' organizations, not for political purposes, but for the purpose of demanding and securing fair prices for the products of their sweat and toil. They are numbered not by thousands, but by hundreds of thousands, and they are moved to this action by as lofty and sacred a patriotism as ever inspired our fathers in their struggle for liberty and free government. They are determined that they, themselves, shall enjoy the profits of their own labor. They are determined that the stock gamblers shall cease to manipulate the prices of their cotton, corn, and wheat. They are tired of being pack horses for every trust and corporate interest that enjoys the privileges of special legislation. They are tired of having their profits eaten up by extortionate freight charges.

They are bringing the battle on between the industrious, honest people and the selfish and predatory classes. I rejoice to see them moving. They have my sympathy and my help and should have the help and encouragement of all patriotic people everywhere.

Our farmers and laboring people have the power to save the Government from an impending oligarchy of wealth. They can at the ballot box, with the weapons of freedom and peace, compel legislation that will put the commercial pirates and trust freebooters out of business or in the penitentiary. The cotton growers and farmers of the South have borne their burdens with courage and hope. Looking back over the blackened monuments of social, political, and material ruin which rose up all over their fair land; struggling and working, paying tribute to the protected factories of the East, who but they would not have lost hope and courage and given up the battle? Not so with them. They struggled on until now, and to-day, looking forward, they see the dawn that will dispel the darkness of the long night of industrial and commercial injustice and wrong which has enveloped them in its despairing gloom for so long.

No one can rejoice more than I do at the approaching sunrise, when the farmers and laboring people of this country will enjoy fair play and justice at the hands of the lawmakers of this country. I am linked to them by the ties of a common lineage, by the memories of their struggles in the past. Their fate shall be my fate. No voice or power shall lure me from my duty and devotion to them. The honor of no position shall tempt me to betray or abandon them. In representing them upon this floor I need only plead for justice, for right, for they are the fairest, the best, and bravest people in the world, giving justice to others and demanding justice for themselves. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] did not reserve the balance of his time.

Mr. LITTLE. No, sir.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss this question of insurance a few moments for the purpose of helping so far as I can the leaders on the other side to find exactly where, in right and justice to the people and this House, the question of insurance should be referred. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] I believe in last Congress reported a bill establishing a bureau of corporations and labor, and included in that law an insurance provision; and he now wants this insurance proposition referred to his committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] desires that the mater be referred to the Ways and Means Committee, for the purpose, I presume, of regulating insurance by taxation, an unheard-of proposition as to insurance, in view of the fact that we have a very continuous and increasing deficit in the Treasury.

He is now looking out for something to tax. He would tax, Mr. Chairman, the insurance policies that belong to the poor widows and orphans of the United States, and yet for years and years he and his great party have stood here and defeated Democratic efforts to place an income-tax amendment in our Constitution, whereby we could make the thieves that have been robbing the widows and orphans of this country help to contribute toward running the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Again, Mr. Chairman, when the question of Federal regulation of insurance came before the last Congress, I stood in this House opposing it, and cited and read in this House the authorities of the Supreme Court of the United States that as far back as 1868 down to 1894 declared that "the insurance business is not commerce." Here is my speech, reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1903, at page 868, and in the course of that speech, Mr. Chairman, I read not only from the Paul *v.* Virginia case, to which the gentleman alluded and quoted from this morning, but I quoted from the Hooper case and cited the Philadelphia and Waters Pierce oil cases. I quoted the identical language from the Virginia case which the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] quoted this morning.

I approached to-day the distinguished gentleman, so learned in economics, in tariff making, in the laws of his country, and adjudications of the Supreme Court, and asked the gentleman to yield, which he did, and I asked him this question:

How can the committee have jurisdiction over insurance when the Supreme Court has time and again said that insurance is not commerce?

He replied:

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] will allow me to make my speech, then he can make his.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman's speech could be improved upon if he puts that proposition into it.

Mr. PAYNE. Possibly some of these things have occurred to the rest of the Members as well as to my astute and learned friend from Tennessee.

Now here comes the remarkable statement of the distinguished gentleman:

The gentleman from Tennessee saw, I suppose, that I was coming directly to this subject.

Mr. Chairman, here is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in which I quote the identical language which the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] quoted, and from the cases to which he referred, in my speech of January 15, 1903. Evidently the gentleman was inspired to think of the proposition of law as I approached him, rather than myself being inspired to think of it when I approached and looked at him.

Mr. Chairman, in reference to the question, where this bill should be referred, it is a serious matter. As to what Congress should do, and what Congress can do, is more serious.

Here are the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, that not only say that "the business of insurance is not commerce," but that it is not "interstate" commerce, even when insurance is taken out between parties of different States, and a contract is made that the laws of one State—New York, for example—shall control the insured living in another State—Missouri.

I will read, now, for the edification of my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE], a part of the officially reported statement of a case reported in 178 United States Reports, page 392, New York Life Insurance Company *v.* Cravens,

which statement contains this so-called "interstate insurance contract," as follows:

That the contract contained in such policy and in this application shall be construed according to the laws of the State of New York, the place of said contract being agreed to be the home of the said company in the city of New York.

The agent of the company signed the application, sent it to the company in New York, whereupon the policy was issued and returned to the insured in Missouri.

In this suit they raised several questions. I will now read the main defense of the insurance company in a suit on this policy, from page 394 of this case, decided in 1900, as follows:

It is urged as error against the judgment of the supreme court of the State that it makes the law of Missouri and not the law of New York the law of the contract, as provided in the application for the policy, thereby denying to the plaintiff in error a contractual liberty without due process of law, in violation of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Now, then, listen, gentlemen:

And that the statute of Missouri is an attempted regulation of interstate commerce.

What does the whole court at the conclusion of the opinion say upon this subject? On page 401, United States Reports, 178, I will read from this same Craven's case, Mr. Justice McKenna speaking for the court:

Is the statute an attempted regulation of commerce between the States? In other words, is mutual life insurance commerce between the States?

That the business of fire insurance is not interstate commerce is decided in Paul *v.* Virginia, 8 Wall., 168; Liverpool Insurance Company *v.* Massachusetts, 10 Wall., 566; Philadelphia Fire Association *v.* New York, 119 U. S., 110. That the business of marine insurance is not is decided in Hooper *v.* California, 155 U. S., 648. In the latter case it is said that the contention that it is "involves an erroneous conception of what constitutes interstate commerce."

We omit the reasoning by which that is demonstrated and will only repeat the business of insurance is not commerce. The contract of insurance is not an instrumentality of commerce. The making of such a contract is a mere incident of commercial intercourse, and in this respect there is no difference whatever between insurance against fire and insurance against the "perils of the sea." And, we add, or against the uncertainty of man's mortality. Judgment affirmed.

Thus giving judgment for the deceased of $8,000 or $10,000, the judgment of the supreme court of Missouri being affirmed.

So, gentlemen, we have now the naked question decided that "insurance," coupled with interstate contracts of that sort, though set out in the body of the insurance policy, the contract being signed in part in Missouri and partly in New York, is not "interstate" commerce.

Now, then, we have two distinct propositions settled. First, that "the business of insurance is not commerce," local or State commerce; second, we have it distinctly decided by this great court—in a Republican court, I may add, by a Republican judge, speaking for his Republican associates and three Democrats on that great bench—"the business of insurance is not interstate commerce," that there is no such thing as interstate insurance, and upholding the opinion of the supreme court of the great State of Missouri, from which my distinguished friend [Mr. CLARK] hails.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman if that was a unanimous opinion?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes, sir. The opinion concludes, "judgment affirmed," page 401.

Now, then, I will take up the Hooper case. That suit was about marine insurance and therefore interstate. The opinion was written by Mr. Justice White. In the Hooper case there was a dissenting opinion, but not on the question, "Is insurance interstate commerce?"

Now, then, on this point. It is a question of law. That is the point I am arguing; and being a question of law, this question should not be sent to the Committee on Ways and Means nor the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but should be sent to the great law committee of this House—the Judiciary Committee. The men who are put on that committee are not put there because they know how to make a tariff or are learned in economics, but because they are distinguished and able, and supposed to be of the ablest lawyers in the House, and are trained in questions of law. When that committee holds and reports to the House, in the face of these decisions, that insurance is commerce; that there is such a thing as "interstate" insurance; that Congress may regulate under the commerce clause, then let the question of insurance go to that committee, if then desirable.

I am not speaking of the "wild-cat" insurance companies. I am the pioneer in trying to choke off those thieves and the railroad combinations, the industrial combinations, insurance combinations, and others, by excluding them from the mails. I introduced a bill several years ago and have one on my desk. I also introduced one excluding wild-cat insurance companies from the mails, but a Republican House buried it; and yet we hear something from the Republican side to-day about regulating insurance by excluding them from the mails, as though that was something new. Why, there is nothing new politically that is good that has not emanated from this side of the House at one time or another. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The commerce law of 1887, which we have, emanated from a distinguished son of Tennessee, Judge Reagan, of Texas, who so long adorned a place in this House, and the people of the great State of Texas elevated him to the United States Senate, where he blazed the way for the making of our antitrust law of 1890, and he was the first man to introduce a bill in that body basing the law upon the commerce clause of the Constitution, where it rests to-day, and was the author of the criminal section of that act.

Now, gentlemen, if this great Judiciary Committee of the House comes back here and reports that insurance is commerce and that there is "interstate" commerce insurance, why then the distinguished gentleman, in whose ability I have great confidence and whose learning in affairs concerning that committee commands my respect, the chairman of the committee, Mr. HEPBURN, can then take charge of this question. You might send it to the Committee on Ways and Means; but the first question I make is, you must first find your power to act.

My distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] says the Supreme Court wabbles on questions, that the Supreme Court criticises its own decisions and reverses itself sometimes, and he quoted Abraham Lincoln as saying that he would reverse a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. My God! that decision has never been reversed, and it never will be reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States. The effect of it was reversed as the result of four years of bloody war. That was the only way it was reversed. As far as I am concerned, I do not want to talk about slavery. I am glad we have no more black slaves, and I am opposed to the making of any more white slaves, either men or women, widows or orphans, and hence I speak here to-day.

Now, suppose that the committee report that this insurance is commerce. It looks to me as though it is saying, practically, indirectly, to the Supreme Court of the United States, "Won't you please reverse yourselves? We have so many thieves in this country that they are about to run over us, and the Congress of the United States is the only power that is capable of legislating on this subject. Therefore, will you please reverse yourselves just as a matter of accommodation? You would favor us very much if you would." Now, I say, with all due respect to the gentleman who proposed to reach this question by Federal legislation based on the commerce clause, that is the way it looks to me. I have great respect for that court, and I have absolute respect for every member on the other side of the House and on this, but when the Supreme Court of the United States since 1868 has held, and the State courts from time immemorial have passed on this question and have held, that "the business of insurance is not commerce," how can we come along here and say it is commerce? Can we say black is white and make it so? How can we say that when we know it is not so? That would be a legislative falsehood. I submit it is nothing in the world but an indirect request to the Supreme Court to reverse its own holdings on this question.

But what is the effect of it? Suppose they pass a law and the Supreme Court should not reverse itself, but refuses absolutely to aid or abet, directly or indirectly, the proposition to regulate insurance by the commerce clause. We will then be in a worse fix than ever before. These corporations will say, "It stands confessed that the States can not grapple with this question; the Congress of the United States is bigger than the States, and the Supreme Court of the United States has decided, as Congress might have known at first, that it will not swallow its own decisions which it has been delivering for the last thirty-seven years." Then they would say, "We are unbridled. The States can not control us, the Federal Congress can not control us, and now we have everybody at our mercy," and instead of obeying the divine injunction, "Feed my lambs," their motto will be "Skin the lambs," whether they are widows or orphans.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Shear them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They do worse than that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, where are the reforms coming from in this country now? I ask the distinguished gentleman who has charge of this matter, Where are the reforms coming from? Are they coming from Congressional investigations or are they coming from investigations by State legislatures and local authorities? When has Pennsylvania ever undertaken to have a "laundry day?" We had one yesterday. The Democrats have laundry days, but the Republicans never do.

I know Mayor Weaver, and I am glad that the good people of the city of Philadelphia have awakened from their anæsthetic condi-

tion that immense wealth has caused. I talked with one of the splendid citizens of the glorious old historic city of Philadelphia and asked him why it was there was so much moral decay there. I will get to other cities in a moment, and if I omit any, just tell me. He replied, "Mr. GAINES, the thieves and the rascals have got charge of all the machinery, and we all have secure our corner lots and our money is locked up in vaults, and as long as they will not steal our vaults and our corner lots we are willing to let them have the balance, and we just go to sleep and wake up and live along in that way."

But, gentlemen, the people of Philadelphia awoke. I do not know exactly who started it. I hope, as a matter of party pride, that some good Republican started it. They awoke and turned the wretches out. Conditions were so decayed there that I am sorry as a lawyer to say that Mayor Weaver, that gallant little man, could not hire a lawyer in Philadelphia who had sense enough to conduct the investigation and had to cross over to the city of New York to get a lawyer to help him to turn those rascals out. The best lawyers, for a living, permitted themselves to be employed by unrighteous clients, professional grafters, who wrought this moral decay in that city. Honest lawyers, if you please, permitted themselves to be retained against pure government, pure governmental policies, to such an extent the mayor had to leave Philadelphia to get proper legal assistance. Shame upon the lawyers of Philadelphia, or any other place under the broad canopy of heaven, that would permit themselves, for the love of money, to sell their birthright, to hire out to defend the professional robbers of those people, or to fight gainst their own ideas of a righteous governmental policy.

But, gentlemen, the people of Philadelphia have cleaned out Philadelphia.

How did the State of Missouri stop her frauds and moral decay? Did they come and ask the Congress to do it? Why, not by a great long shot. It started from a little humble fellow, and he was born in the State of Tennessee [laughter]—little Joe Folk. And I want you to distinctly understand, gentlemen, you may not know it, but all the great men have not left Tennessee yet. [Laughter.] I will tell you, gentlemen, that I can pick out 200 lawyers in the city of Nasvhille that can put the thieves and robbers and plunderers of Philadelphia or any other city of this country in the penitentiary, if they will give them the sinews of war.

A MEMBER. And a jury. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, it may be that you couldn't easily get a jury, but I would keep on trying until I did do it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me get back to the proposition on which I was dwelling. Reforms begin down among the plain people, and not a thousand miles away from the evils in issue. That is where they start. You know we have been trying to clean out some of the Bureaus in this Government for years. Have we done it? We have cleaned them out all around Washington and left her a magnificent oasis. [Laughter.] Gentlemen, the Democrats will have the biggest "laundry" when we get in in a year or two from now that you ever heard about. And I tell you, gentlemen, we will show you then where the rascals are, and we will use lye soap. Oh, I have come in contact with some of them, and I have been after them with a pitchfork. I am not done with them. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, if Congress can, let us outlaw insurance thieves, but do so within the limits of the Constitution, for God's sake and for the sake of the country let us at least take care of its dismembered parts. If Congress can help out, legally, the States who are trying to help themselves in this great struggle, let us not turn our backs upon the effort. Surely the people of this country are asking for it.

But, Mr. Chairman, what distresses me is the fact that because the President, a straightforward, honest, courageous man, has found a lot of frauds and rascals in the Departments and turned them out and is trying to punish the guilty, and because he is trying to enforce the law the people are reflecting upon themselves and upon us by saying that "it seems as if the President is the only honest man in office in the country." To tell the truth, they are sending to him and asking his advice, asking him to help clean out the Augean stables, as if he was the only officer in the whole country who is honest. Shame upon the morals of the people in the States! The law can make no man an honest man. It may prevent him from being a desperado, but God Almighty makes the honest man. [Applause.] The law helps the honest man to put the dishonest one where he ought to go. It is a sad commentary that the people are looking at this one man in the White House to lead them out of this horrible and terrible abyss of corruption, fraud, and oppression of all sorts done by Democrats and Republicans.

The President has his faults. I have told him of some of them to his face and on the floor of this House. [Laughter.] I have extolled his virtues on the floor of this House and on a hundred "stumps" this summer, on the ground, and in the train, and on horseback. [Laughter.] I hope and believe he will stand firm. I have done what I could to put that infernal outlaw—the head of Duke's Tobacco Company—in the penitentiary, where I believe he belongs and will at a near day go there. So long as the great God gives me a voice, so long as he gives me the little gray matter that is left in my head, the little spark of love I have for my mother and my country, I shall never let up on that vampire until I see him behind the bars. He has been robbing my people under the forms of law. He has been at the head of an international and Federal trust, and the tobacco farmers have been stirred up in Tennessee and Kentucky, in decency and in order, and within the limits of the law, thirty thousand strong, blacks and whites, old and young, rich and poor, have banded together to defend their homes and firesides, waiting until the Attorney-General can give them relief, by injunction, and indictments against this vampire.

Now, as I say, the people were stirred up, and when they were what did they do?

They said, "You have got to give us a living price for our tobacco; it cost us 6 cents to raise it, and you have been paying us 'a cent, a cussing, and nothing,'" as my friend John B. Allen says—in fact, paid them last year an average of 4 cents. And what did they have to do when they got our tobacco this year? They paid us about 8.89 cents for every pound they bought. That was not the result of my efforts nor the efforts of any other one man. Not at all. There was John B. Allen, of Clarksville, Tenn.; there was STANLEY, of Kentucky, and OLLIE JAMES, of Kentucky; Joel B. Fort, of Springfield, Tenn., and Felix G. Ewing, of the farmers' hearts, a plain, little, red-headed farmer down at Glenraven, Tenn., the chairman of the executive committee, and his five or six associates.

It was the stirring up of people's sensibilities to hate a law-breaker, that really did the work. It was arousing the people and telling them what their rights are. It was going home and stirring up the old-fashioned, genuine Americanism, which has brought this righteous result about.

Gentlemen, before we get rid of the insurance frauds in New York or in Philadelphia or in Missouri or in Ohio, or dear old Tennessee—where, so far as I know, there are none—we must stir the people up at home and make them enforce the laws at home, just as Mayor Weaver is enforcing the laws in the great city of Philadelphia, and Joe Folk enforced them in the State of Missouri; as they are fixing to do in Ohio.

Now, suppose you pass your insurance law based on this commerce clause, where are you going to get your juries to convict, if the people are too rotten at home to punish under their home laws? As somebody said here a while ago, where will you get honest juries to convict under the Federal law? The President has said a wise thing, which some of the gentlemen on the other side have unwisely overlooked, in his message on this subject. He says:

> Of course the only complete remedy for this condition must be found in an aroused public conscience, a higher sense of ethical conduct in the community at large, and especially among business men and in the great profession of the law—

I am glad to find that—"*in the great profession of the law*"—that is something he said I had overlooked. He continues:

> And in the great profession of the law, and in the growth of the spirit which condemns all dishonesty, whether in rich man or in poor man, in the shape of bribery or of blackmail.

The President says you may pass the law, and he does not say we can base it on the commerce clause either, and make it constitutional. He puts it, "if," He says the only way to exterminate fraud and blackmail and stealth is to stir up the morals of the people; stir up the people at home, in the States. Now, I have said a great deal more on this subject than I intended. I did not intend to speak when I came here to-day.

I just recall a point which I will discuss and then conclude.

Mr. Justice White, in the Hooper case, in 1894, and Mr. Justice McKenna, in 1900, in the Missouri case that I cited a while ago, reported in 178 United States, at page—let me get the page correctly, because I want my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to read down to date; I do not want him to depend on himself exclusively in getting down to the kernel of the proposition which he did not discuss this morning—at page 389, New York Life Insurance Company *v.* Craven. Here Mr. Justice McKenna reviews the whole proposition, to wit, that a State can create and limit a corporation; that it can create and limit the rights of its own corporation, and that it can admit to

or exclude from its borders a foreign corporation. Let us read what Mr. Justice White says:

The principle that the right of a foreign corporation to engage in business within a State other than that of its creation depends solely upon the will of such other State has been long settled, and many phases of its application have been illustrated by the decisions of this court. (Bank of Augusta *v.* Earle, 13 Pet., 519; Lafayette Ins. Co. *v.* French, 18 How., 404; Society for Savings *v.* Coite, 6 Wall., 594; Provident Institution *v.* Massachusetts, 6 Wall., 611; Hamilton Co. *v.* Massachusetts, 6 Wall., 632; Paul *v.* Virginia, 8 Wall., 168; Ducat *v.* Chicago, 10 Wall., 410; State Tax on Railway Gross Receipts, 15 Wall., 284; Railroad Co. *v.* Peniston, 18 Wall., 5; Delaware Railroad Tax Case, 18 Wall., 206; State Railroad Tax Cases, 92 U. S., 575; Philadelphia and Southern Steamship Co. *v.* Pennsylvania, 122 U. S., 326; California *v.* Central Pacific Railroad Co., 127 U. S., 1; Home Insurance Co. *v.* New York, 134 U. S., 594; Maine *v.* Grand Trunk Railway, 142 U. S., 217; Ashley *v.* Ryan, 153 U. S., 436, 445.)

Then the opinion goes on to state that if the corporation is engaged in interstate commerce the State can not stop it from operating in that State, and it is so held in the Crutcher case and in the Pierce Waters oil case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to interrupt the gentleman to make a suggestion in an interrogative way. Does he not think it healthy, does he not think it a good thing, that insurance is not interstate commerce?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because if it were interstate commerce they could protect themselves under the shield of the Constitution and prevent the people of the States escaping this evil.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is true. The distinguished gentleman has interrupted me on a matter I was coming to—at least I thought I was coming to—with the light that he always sheds on every question, which even Republicans must acknowledge. Well, now, the next proposition that Judge White discussed and Judge McKenna discussed is the vital one here, gentlemen. It seems to me to be the crux of the legal proposition as decided by Mr. Justice Field in the Pensacola Telegraph case, that when the Government creates a corporation to engage and it engages in interstate business the State can not interfere with it. Justice White in the Hooper case also said:

While there are exceptions to this rule, they embrace only cases where a corporation created by one State rests its right to enter another and engage in business therein upon the Federal nature of its business, as, for instance, where it has derived its being from an act of Congress, and has become a lawful agency for the performance of governmental or quasigovernmental functions or where it is necessarily an instrumentality of interstate commerce, or its business constitutes such commerce, and is therefore solely within the paramount authority of Congress. In these cases the exceptional business is protected against interference by State authority. The reasons upon which the exceptions to the general rule are based have been often explained. (Western Union Tel. Co. *v.* Texas, 105 U. S. R., 460; Gloucester *v.* Penn., 114 U. S. R., 122, U. S., 196, 205; 1 Interstate Com. Rep., 308; McCall *v.* California, 104, 110; 3 Interstate Com. Rep., 178; Pickard *v.* Pullman Southern Car Co., 117 U. S., 34; Robbins *v.* Shelby Co., 120 U. S., 489; 1 Interstate Com. Rep., 45; Leloup *v.* Mobile, 127 U. S., 640; 2 Interstate Com. Rep., 134; Asher *v.* Texas, 128 U. S., 129.)

In the case first cited the precedents were fully reviewed and the governing reasons of the law upon this subject were clearly elucidated.

The contention here is that, inasmuch as the contract was one for marine insurance, it was a matter of interstate commerce, and as such beyond the reach of State authority and included among the exceptions to the general rule. This proposition involves an erroneous conception of what constitutes interstate commerce. That the business of insurance does not generally appertain to such commerce has been settled since the case of Paul *v.* Virginia, supra. (See also Philadelphia Fire Asso. *v.* New York, 119 U. S., 110 (30:342), and authorities there cited.)

Whilst it is true that in Paul *v.* Virginia and in most of the cases in which it has been followed the particular contract under consideration was for insurance against fire, the principle upon which these cases were decided involved the question of whether a contract of insurance of any kind constituted interstate commerce. The court in reaching its conclusion upon this question was not concerned with any matter of distinction between marine and fire insurance, but proceeded upon a broad analysis of the nature of interstate commerce and of the relation which insurance contracts generally (654) bear thereto. Thus in Paul *v.* Virginia, the court, speaking through Mr. Justice Field, said:

"Issuing a policy of insurance is not a transaction of commerce. The policies are simply contracts of indemnity against loss by fire, entered into between the corporations and the assured, for a consideration paid by the latter. These contracts are not articles of commerce in any proper meaning of the word. They are not subjects of trade and barter, offered in the market as something having an existence and value independent of the parties to them. They are not commodities to be shipped or forwarded from one State to another and then put up for sale. They are like other personal contracts between parties which are completed by their signature and the transfer of the consideration. Such contracts are not interstate transactions, though the parties may be domiciled in different States. The policies do not take effect—are not executed contracts—until delivered by the agent in Virginia. They are, then, local transactions, and are governed by the local law. They do not constitute a part of the commerce between the States any more than a contract for the purchase and sale of goods in Virginia by a citizen of New York whilst in Virginia would constitute a portion of such commerce."

This language was reiterated in the case of Philadelphia Fire Association *v.* New York, supra. In Crutcher *v.* Kentucky, supra, the court, in applying the exception to the general rule, held that the State of Kentucky was without power to prevent a corporation engaged in interstate commerce from entering that State and carrying on its business therein, and also pointed out the distinction between the making of contracts of insurance and interstate commerce, or the necessary instrumentalities thereof, as follows:

"The case is entirely different from that of foreign corporations seeking to do a business which does not belong to the regulating power of Congress. The insurance business, for example, can not be carried on in a State by a foreign corporation without complying with all the conditions imposed by the legislation of that State. So with regard to manufacturing corporations, and all other corporations whose business is of a local and domestic nature, which would include express companies whose business is confined to points and places wholly within the State. The cases to this effect are numerous."

It is evident, then, as we have said above, that the attempt to so distinguish between policies of marine insurance and policies of fire insurance as to reach the deduction that there is a constitutional difference between the business of a corporation issuing policies of one kind and that of a corporation dealing in policies of the other kind, which affects the question of a State's authority to control the business of either, is based upon a fundamental misconception of the nature of the constitutional provision relied upon. It ignores the real distinction upon which the general rule and its exceptions are based and which consists in the difference between interstate commerce or an instrumentality thereof on the one side and the mere incidents which may attend the carrying on of such commerce on the other. This distinction has always been carefully observed and is clearly defined by the authorities cited. If the power to regulate interstate commerce applied to all the incidents to which such commerce might give rise and to all contracts which might be made in the course of its transaction that power would embrace the entire sphere of mercantile activity in any way connected with trade between the States, and would exclude State control over many contracts purely domestic in their nature.

The business of insurance is not commerce. The contract of insurance is not an instrumentality of commerce. The making of such a contract is a mere incident of commercial intercourse, and in this respect there is no difference whatever between insurance against fire and insurance against "the perils of the sea."

The State of California has the power to exclude foreign insurance companies altogether from her territory, whether they were formed for the purpose of doing a fire or a marine business. She has the power, if she allows any such companies to enter her confines, to determine the conditions on which the entry shall be made. And as a necessary consequence of her possession of these powers she has the right to enforce any conditions imposed by her laws as preliminary to the transaction of business within her confines by a foreign corporation, whether the business is to be carried on through officers or through ordinary agents of the company; and she has also the further right to prohibit a citizen from contracting, within her jurisdiction, with any foreign company which has not acquired the privilege of engaging in business therein, either in his own behalf or through an agent empowered to that end. The power to exclude embraces the power to regulate—to enact and enforce all legislation in regard to things done within the territory of the State which may be directly or incidentally requisite in order to render the enforcement of the conceded power efficacious to the fullest extent, subject always, of course, to the paramount authority of the Constitution of the United States.

In the argument at bar it was admitted that if the contract is to be considered as made in California, then this case is governed by the foregoing principles, unless the business of a foreign company writing marine insurance is protected by the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution, which, as we have seen, is not the case.

Now, then, gentlemen, let us reason together. What I have said is without any ill feeling to anybody in this House. If anything is my strong suit it is love for my fellow-man, and the next is hate toward those who are rotten and evil doers. I despise rottenness; I despise oppression; I despise anything that oppresses my neighbor or the people. I may not be very religious, but I love my neighbor very nearly as much as I do myself—not quite as much, I will be fair to say, as myself—although I do not really know how much I do love myself—and I will tell you who my nearest neighbor is. He is a small independent tobacco manufacturer, I buy my cigars of him. Now, gentlemen, if the public morals of my State or the State of Missouri or any other State of this country become so corrupt that you can not enforce your State insurance laws, will you please tell me how you are going to get the Federal officers, who are always incorruptible enough, to enforce them?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to interrupt my friend long enough to suggest to him that the Hon. William D. Vandiver, long time a Member of this House, now insurance commissioner of the State of Missouri, is after these insurance companies hotfooted.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Exactly, as he was after every species of injustice when he was a Member of Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And they have appealed to the Federal courts to try to choke him off.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Exactly, and if he gets a good chance before the Federal court he will do the choking, and I hope he will choke off every rotten insurance company in his State. He found out they had been invading the rights of widows and orphans. He found it out by their own admission, and he said to them, "You must come up here and show me clean hands or I will withdraw your licenses," and that "If you fail you shall not operate in this State."

We are no better than our people. Appointees are no better

than the appointing power, and vice versa. If we represent a corrupt people, we are sure to be moral cowards. Then if we are so corrupt in the States that they can not enforce the laws, will you please tell me where are we to find angels to enforce the law? After all, we must get back to the very mud sills of society, to the homes and firesides of the country that are removed from the contaminating influences of city life. From there you will find most of our illustrious soldiers have come; from there you will find the most of our best citizens have come, according to population. There you will find people have not become corrupt or debased by hunting for filthy lucre and have not turned their fingers into tongs of graft and greed: their hearts are not ulcerated with commercialism. It is in the sweet little homes of dear old Tennessee, where the gourd vine hangs, that you will find true happiness; it is in the humble home that you will find deep, honest convictiosn, true virtue; there you will find the old man, with his wife, his daughter, his son, talking of "the good old days"—gone forever—deploring public and private depravity of these days, that his son may avoid riches if it costs his good name. [Applause.]

It is from the highways and byways of the country, in a large measure, that cities that become corrupt, receive new examples of strong, rugged manhood. Cities are revived and renewed by the country girl who comes to the town and makes a good mother, by the country boy who comes in and grows to be a great and good citizen. There, gentlemen, is the final hope of our country if present conditions continue.

You may make all the laws you please to correct all the evils you please; but after all, with diminishing exceptions, to enforce them you will have to go back to the place where you find men who hate graft and greed, who have shed their lifeblood, who have shouldered the musket in the past, and if necessary will do so again, to defend our liberty, to maintain the Constitution, to uphold the law, to refine home and protect wife and children. God save the country home, bless the city mansion, and save us all! [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SHERLEY rose.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] how much time he desires?

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to be recognized in my own right.

Mr. PAYNE. How much time?

Mr. SHERLEY. Probably ten or fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to go on now or to-morrow?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is immaterial.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House resolution No. 42, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 410. An act to authorize the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Ouachita River and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCDERMOTT on account of illness.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Western Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for transportation of the Army and its supplies—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for encampment of militia, construction of cable ship and wharf at Fort Revere, Mass.—to the Committees on Appropriations and Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the commissioner of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company, submitting the annual report for December 1, 1905—to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for relief of persons who sustained damage by reason of accident at Rock Island Arsenal—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, except the document of the Fifty-eighth Congress.

A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of survey of Anacostia River Flats, with opinion of the Attorney-General as to the ownership thereof—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with maps.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Cape Porpoise Harbor, Maine—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with maps.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Deckers Creek, West Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of harbor at Caseville, Mich.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Occoquan Creek, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with maps.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of resurvey of Savannah Harbor, Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an additional estimate for the maintenance of the assistant custodianship and janitor service during the present fiscal year—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5301) setting aside a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands in the Philippine Islands for school purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 8093) to extend the provisions of the pension act of June 27, 1890, to each and every company and organization organized for the defense of the Union in Missouri during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPPERT: A bill (H. R. 8094) to amend an act entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions upon certain harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States"—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 8095) to provide for the erection of a public building at Columbia, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 8096) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers'

Home located at Washington, D. C., and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8097) to provide an additional district judge for the district of Alaska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8098) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to construct a bridge across the Spokane River, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8099) to provide for the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at or near Council Bluffs, Iowa—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8100) authorizing the examination as a witness of the husband or wife of the defendant in criminal cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 8101) making an appropriation for the improvement and repair of the national cemetery near Fort Scott, Kans., and the improvement of the Government road leading thereto—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8102) to amend sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8103) authorizing the construction of a bridge between Fort Snelling Reservation and St. Paul, Minn.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8104) to require internal-revenue collectors to furnish clerks of State courts with lists of all persons, firms, and corporations within their respective districts who have paid special taxes as wholesale or retail dealers in spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8105) to prohibit internal-revenue officers from receiving special taxes from any person, firm, or corporation for the carrying on of the business of a brewer, manufacturer of stills, rectifier of distilled spirits, wholesale or retail dealer in spirituous, vinous, or malt liquors in communities where the carrying on of such business is prohibited by local laws, and to prescribe punishment for its violation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 8106) to provide for the erection of a public building at Charleroi, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 8107) extending the public-land laws to certain lands in Wyoming—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8108) to extend the homestead laws to certain lands in the Yellowstone Forest Reserve—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDRUS: A bill (H. R. 8109) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Yonkers, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 8110) to provide for enlarging and improving the United States building at Aurora, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 8111) authorizing the erection of a post-office building at Gainesville, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 8112) providing for rank and pay for certain retired officers of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 8113) to increase the limit of the appropriation for a public building at Deadwood, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8114) to set apart certain lands in the State of South Dakota as a public park, to be known as the Battle Mountain Sanitarium Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8115) to establish mining experiment stations, to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 8116) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the port of Lewes, in the State of Delaware—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 8117) to promote public education by giving free transmission through the mails to certain educational publications—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 8118) to grant grazing privileges to homestead settlers and holders of small farms in the arid and semiarid land region, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 8119) providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8120) to provide for the erection of a monument at the battlefield of Gettysburg to commemorate the services of the Signal Corps of the United States Army during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8121) to amend an act to increase the pension of Mexican war survivors to $12, approved March 3, 1903—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 8122) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sumter, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 8123) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Americus, Ga., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8124) to amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, permitting national banking associations to make loans on real estate as security, and limiting the amount of such loans—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8125) to construct and build a road from Andersonville Station, on the Central Railroad of Georgia, to the Prison Park and national cemetery, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8126) to provide for the payment of interest on all money now deposited, or hereafter deposited, in national banks of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8127) for the erection of a public building at the city of Hawkinsville, Ga., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8128) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Cordele, in the State of Georgia, and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8129) to improve road from Andersonville railroad station to Prison Park, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 8130) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 8131) to prohibit the wearing of the uniform of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or revenue service of the United States, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 8132) to amend an act entitled "An act making an apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Twelfth Census"—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8133) to provide for the infliction of corporal punishment upon all male persons convicted of willfully beating their wives, and the manner and place of inflicting the said punishment, and the officers by whom the same is to be inflicted—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SULZER: A resolution (H. Res. 91) concerning the frigate *Constitution*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A resolution (H. Res. 92) providing for the appointment of an additional standing committee, to be known as the Committee on Insurance—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LOUD: A resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing investigation of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WACHTER: A resolution (H. Res. 94) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills to appoint a janitor of said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CASSEL: A resolution (H. Res. 95) authorizing the appointment of a janitor in the office of the file, journal, and printing clerks—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A resolution (H. Res. 96) authorizing the appointment of a stenographer to the Committee on Revision of the Laws—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ESCH: A resolution (H. Res. 97) concerning the compensation of the chief pages of the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Memorial from the governor and legislature of the State of Utah, indorsing the Brownlow bill for improving the public highways and urging its passage by Congress—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial from the governor and legislature of Utah, asking Congress for a grant of land for a State park—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 8134) granting a pension to James F. Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8135) granting an increase of pension to Silas M. Kirken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8136) granting an increase of pension to A. Scroggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8137) granting an increase of pension to Nina Holvenstot—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8138) granting an increase of pension to Similde E. Forbes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8139) granting a pension to John H. Wynne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8140) granting a pension to Lucy Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8141) granting a pension to Catharine Leonard—to the Committee to Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8142) granting a pension to Edward G. Hansen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8143) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ann Vaux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8144) granting a pension to Ada J. Lasswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 8145) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8146) granting a pension to George J. Kraus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8147) granting a pension to Louise Holz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8148) granting a pension to Lena Weinreich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8149) to correct the military record of Arnold H. Gaffron—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8150) to correct the military record of Balsor Gudermuth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 8151) for the relief of Sanford A. Pinyon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8152) for the relief of William T. Edwards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8153) for the relief of Soloman Taylor—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8154) granting a pension to Charles C. Howington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 8155) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Seelye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Loren H. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8157) granting an increase of pension to Milton H. Wayne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8158) granting an increase of pension to L. P. Storms—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8159) granting an increase of pension to Charles Leathers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8160) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8161) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 8162) granting an increase of pension to William J. Renard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 8163) for the relief of Daniel F. Ritchie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8164) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Mays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8165) granting an increase of pension to John Keys—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH (by request): A bill (H. R. 8166) granting a pension to Daniel Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 8167) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Edwards, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8168) to fix the status of the Fifth and Sixth Regiments of Delaware Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8169) granting an increase of pension to Eliza C. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 8170) for the relief of James J. Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8171) granting a pension to Lucinda M. Hutchins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8172) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Hollman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8173) granting an increase of pension to James L. Wiltsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8174) granting an increase of pension to Eli Baldwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 8175) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dulieu—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 8176) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Bishop—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 8177) for the relief of John Carr—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 8178) for the relief of Lewis Mock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8179) granting an increase of pension to Henry McLean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 8180) granting an increase of pension to Edwin F. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8181) granting an increase of pension to Martin B. Noyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 8182) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Huson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8183) granting an increase of pension to Henry V. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8184) granting a pension to William S. Foulke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 8185) for the relief of Robert C. Daley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8186) granting a pension to Samuel Hunter Knepley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8187) granting an increase of pension to Silas G. Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8188) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Gearheart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8189) granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 8190) for the relief of Mrs. Abigail A. Stover—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8191) granting a pension to John Hobart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8192) granting an increase of pension to Mildred A. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8193) granting an increase of pension to Perry B. Sibley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8194) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Read—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8195) granting an increase of pension to Myra Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8196) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8197) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Willson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8198) granting an increase of pension to John W. Richardson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8199) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Lindsay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8200) granting an increase of pension to Irene M. Bush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8201) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8202) granting an increase of pension to Henry Guy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8203) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe B. Colton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 8204) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim P. Golden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 8205) granting a pension to Leonora Ohl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 8206) granting an increase of pension to Carner C. Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8207) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Proctor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8208) granting an increase of pension to Eli Brainard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8209) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Yockey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8210) granting an increase of pension to Matilda E. Nattinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 8211) for the relief of the estate of H. S. Simmons, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 8212) to amend the act approved March 15, 1878, entitled "An act for the relief of William A. Hammond, late Surgeon-General of the Army"—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRONNA: A bill (H. R. 8213) granting an increase of pension to William Monteith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8214) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Slagg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 8215) granting an increase of pension to Ira Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 8216) granting an increase of pension to Philipp Cline—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8217) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. J. Tayman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8218) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Spangler—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 8219) granting an increase of pension to James M. McKain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8220) granting a pension to Helen I. McCold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8221) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Jackson Canife—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8222) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 8223) granting a pension to George Hovy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 8224) granting an increase of pension to William Weddington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8225) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester G. Hunter—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8226) granting a pension to Laura B. Ihrie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 8227) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Lewis M. Maney—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8228) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Benjamin Lillard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 8229) granting a pension to Amanda J. Alvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8230) granting a pension to Martha Rankin—to the Committee on Invalid ePnsions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8231) granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8232) granting an increase of pension to James M. Jared—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8233) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Power—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8234) granting an increase of pension to Peter Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8235) granting an increase of pension to John D. Tincher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8236) granting an increase of pension to William E. Frith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8237) granting an increase of pension to Noah Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8238) granting an increase of pension to Elihu Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8239) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Dowdell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8240) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Abernath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8241) granting an increase of pension to Mary Venard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 8242) granting an increase of pension to John Alves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8243) granting an increase of pension to John W. Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 8244) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to restore and pay Mary Kilcullen for mutilated currency—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8245) granting a pension to Frank R. Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8246) granting an Indian wars service pension to William Alexander—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8247) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Littleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8248) granting an increase of pension to Noah J. Crew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8249) granting a pension to Hannah Emerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8250) granting a pension to John M. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8251) granting an increase of pension to Abel S. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8252) for the relief of the administrator of the estate of Gotlob Groezinger—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 8253) granting an increase of pension to John Dolan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 8254) for the relief of Thomas Mundy, disabled by an accident at the life-saving station at Charlotte, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEPPER: A bill (H. R. 8255) for the relief of the heirs of William W. Dougherty, late Indian agent at Warm Springs Agency, Oreg.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 8256) for the relief of Mrs. C. N. Graves—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEGARE: A bill (H. R. 8257) granting an increase of pension to Eli Woodbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 8258) for the relief of W. P. Dukes, postmaster at Rowesville, S. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8259) for the relief of the trustees of the German Lutheran Church, of Orangeburg, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8260) for the relief of the legal representatives of J. H. Brantly, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8261) for the relief of the legal representatives of Naloti Biraghi—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8262) granting a pension to John N. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8263) granting a pension to Margaret Hertel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8264) granting an increase of pension to Simon P. Weed—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 8265) for the relief of the heirs of S. D. Fuller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8266) for the relief of the legal representatives of C. M. Bozeman, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8267) for the relief of the legal representatives of Thomas W. Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8268) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Tabitha W. Reese, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8269) for the relief of the heirs of William Wesley Turner, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8270) granting a pension to Cynthia Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8271) granting a pension to Adaline Simons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8272) granting a pension to Udariah English—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8273) granting an increase of pension to John M. Pearson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8274) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Burks—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 8275) granting an increase of pension to Robert Aucock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 8276) granting an increase of pension to Maitland J. Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8277) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Garst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 8278) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to Keystone Camp, No. 2879, of the Modern Woodmen of America, to certain lands for cemetery purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 8279) for the relief of E. J. Seeds—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8280) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas G. Wright—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8281) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah C. Jones and Mrs. Lucy F. Tyler—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8282) granting a pension to Mary J. Pearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8283) granting a pension to Tilman Giles, alias Robert Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8284) for the relief of Aimee H. Keller—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8285) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Sharpley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8286) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 8287) granting a pension to James Marshel—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 8288) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 8289) granting an increase of pension to Isaac J. Holt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8290) granting an increase of pension to Lloyd D. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 8291) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8292) granting an increase of pension to Aaron W. Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8293) granting an increase of pension to Don Carlos Sinclair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8294) granting an increase of pension to Lyman Vose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8295) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Hodsdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8296) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo Rockwood, alias George Rockwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8297) granting an increase of pension to Warren S. Rand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8298) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Cowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8299) granting an increase of pension to William R. Ladd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8300) granting an increase of pension to Georgia D. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8301) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Clifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8302) granting an increase of pension to Maurice Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8303) granting a pension to W. B. Grindle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 8304) for the relief of William B. Payne—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8305) granting a pension to Martha J. Kellogg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8306) granting a pension to William H. Pritchard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8307) granting a pension to William C. Estill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8308) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8309) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Westbrook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8310) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Dill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8311) granting an increase of pension to David Lemon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8312) granting an increase of pension to Abram Sours—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8313) granting an increase of pension to D. W. Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8314) granting an increase of pension to David M. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8315) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Cannedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPPERT: A bill (H. R. 8316) granting an increase of pension to William Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 8317) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 8318) granting an increase of pension to William Plunkett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8319) granting an increase of pension to John Gardner Stocks—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8320) granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Hazlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8321) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Spaulding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8322) granting an increase of pension to William H. Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8323) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Stoffels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8324) granting an increase of pension to James L. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8325) granting an increase of pension to William H. Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8326) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8327) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Reno—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8328) granting an increase of pension to Ira Grabill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8329) granting an increase of pension to William P. McWilliams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8330) granting an increase of pension to John Ashmore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8331) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8332) granting an increase of pension to William M. McCrary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8333) granting an increase of pension to John G. Honeywell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8334) granting an increase of pension to Eli Roth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8335) granting an increase of pension to John T. Harvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8336) granting an increase of pension to William Savage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8337) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Harlen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8338) granting an increase of pension to Isaac S. Doan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8339) granting a pension to Vienna Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8340) granting an increase of pension to Thomas K. Virtue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8341) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Kisling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8342) granting an increase of pension to Henry Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8343) granting an increase of pension to James W. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8344) granting an increase of pension to Amanda McConkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8345) granting an increase of pension to L. Sherwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8346) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Lake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8347) granting an increase of pension to Rowlin T. Parkhurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8348) granting an increase of pension to L. A. Persons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8349) granting an increase of pension to Adam F. Emge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8350) granting an increase of pension to De Witt Nash—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8351) granting an increase of pension to William A. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8352) granting a pension to Emanuel Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8353) granting a pension to Ellen Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8354) granting a pension to Margaret Pendergast—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8355) granting a pension to Thomas Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8356) granting a pension to M. E. Halderman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8357) granting a pension to Howard M. Stiles—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8358) granting a pension to William J. Warne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8359) granting a pension to Lora L. Warne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8360) for the relief of the personal representative of Jacob Bogert—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8361) for the relief of Daniel J. Ockerson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8362) for the relief of Mrs. M. E. Halderman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8363) for the relief of A. M. Ellis—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8364) for the relief of Charles H. Warren—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8365) for the relief of C. A. Berry—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8366) to correct the military record of William Vickory—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8367) to correct the military record of Stephen T. Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8368) to correct the military record of Henry Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8369) to correct the military record of James Owens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8370) granting the Court of Claims jurisdiction to hear and determine the claim of widow, heirs, and personal representative of Thomas Page for Indian depredation—to the Committee on Claims.

By. Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 8371) granting an increase of pension to August L. Schultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 8372) granting an increase of pension to George Quien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8373) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Weir—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8374) granting an increase of pension to Ellen R. Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 8375) for the relief of John B. Ford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8376) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. McConnell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 8377) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge to Joseph Brenise, late of Company A, Fiftieth Pennsylvania Veteran Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8378) granting an increase of pension to John Parrish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8379) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Wilhelm—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8380) granting an increase of pension to John Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8381) granting an increase of pension to Hugh E. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8382) for the relief of Frederick Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8383) granting an increase of pension to Capt. Henry Wilhelm—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8384) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bostick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8385) granting an increase of pension to William W. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8386) granting an increase of pension to William Zigman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8387) granting a pension to Joseph C. Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8388) granting an increase of pension to William D. Kimble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8389) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stiffler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8390) for the relief of William H. Bell, of Maryland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8391) for the relief of Emanuel Mackley, of Carroll County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8392) for the relief of W. A. Bird, of Harford County, State of Maryland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8393) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund Wolf—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8394) for the relief of Kate Kearney Henry, widow and executrix of James L. Henry, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8395) granting an increase of pension to Peter B. Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8396) granting a pension to Worthington Fringer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8397) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Bowers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8398) granting an increase of pension to James Walters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 8399) granting an increase of pension to Calvin W. Osborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TYNDALL: A bill (H. R. 8400) for the relief of George W. Ratcliff—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8401) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 8402) granting an increase of pension to Fred Loeffler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEMS: A bill (H. R. 8403) granting an increase of pension to James L. Rector—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8404) granting an increase of pension to John H. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 8405) to correct the military record of John Sanspree—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8406) granting an increase of pension to Susan W. Selfridge—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8407) granting a pension to Patrick Howe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8408) granting an increase of pension to Richard Prost—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8409) granting an increase of pension to George H. Stowits—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on the Public Lands was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 380) to authorize the sale of a portion of the Lower Brule Indian Reservation, in South Dakota, and for other purposes; and the same was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Modesto Irrigation Association, of California, against San Francisco having reservoir site in Yosemite Park—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, against revision of tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Moses B. Page—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary J. Allhands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Richard Larence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Abel W. Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ulisses C. Powell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel O. Tod—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also paper to accompany bill for relief of Christopher S. Guthrie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John M. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of J. A. Sachler and others, of Princeton, Pa., and Princeton Council, No. 402, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Thomas Carney and Samuel E. McCleary, to get Penrose and Dalzell bills, relative to pensioning prisoners of war, out of committee and aid in passing same—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James R. Todd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey: Petition of the Humane So-

ciety, against change of present law relative to live stock in transit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the legislature of California, for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of V. L. Mason, of Passaic, N. J., for single statehood for Arizona and New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of the Humane Society, against any amendment to present law relative to live stock in transit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Modesto Irrigation Association, against San Francisco having reservoir sites in Yosemite Park—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Resolution of the legislature of Missouri, for an appropriation for the Wisconsin River—to the Committtee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the legislature of Missouri, for an appropriation for improvement of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the legislature of Missouri, favoring an amendment to the Constitution for election of United States Senators by the people—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Henry Heil Chemical Company, of St. Louis, against enactment of pure-food legislation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Brown Shoe Company, for establishment of reciprocity relations with foreign countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Norwell-Shapleigh Hardware Company and others, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring change of postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BEDE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Alonzo Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petition of citizens of Colorado, for repeal of tariff on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the American Humane Association, against any amendment to the present law relative to transit of live stock—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Triumph Lodge, Ancient Order United Workmen, No. 68, of Pittsburg, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Modesco Irrigation Association, against San Francisco having water reservoirs in Yosemite Reservation—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of George W. Patten and others, against change of Grout law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of F. E. Penny and others, favoring a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CASSEL: Petitions of Washington Camp, No. 207, of Bowmansville, Pa., and Washington Camp, No. 557, of Lancaster, Pa., Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of the Duquesne Heights Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pittsburg, for a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Mount Washington Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburg, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Petitions of heirs of W. S. Dudley, late of Cass County, Mo.; heirs of James W. Gregg, late of Cass County, Mo.; heirs of George W. Hockensmith, late of Cass County, Mo.; heirs of John Ament, late of Cass County, Mo.; Mrs. Susan Porter; heirs of Jesse Ragan, late of Cass County, Mo.; heirs of George W. Yancey, late of Cass County, Mo; W. H. Gibson, of Jackson County, Mo., and J. S. Torbert, requesting reference of war claims to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: Petition of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers, of Anaconda, Mont., relating to wood alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DWIGHT: Petition of Painters Union No. 178, of Ithaca, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert A. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the American Bar Association and others, favoring present bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the public schools of Brooklyn, for legislation to preserve the frigate *Constitution*—to the Committee an Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the board of trustees of the sanitary district of Chicago, for appropriations—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the American Bar Association, the Merchants' Association, and others, favoring present bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, favoring tariff revision and reciprocity with certain European countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel J. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Daniel A. Proctor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George Bruner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ella T. Hopeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Carrie C. Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of H. A. Simmons—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of G. F. Brooks, Araminta Goolsby, A. Enochs, William H. Landrum, and W. H. Stovall, all of Tennessee, asking reference of their respective claims to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman Act—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Martha Kates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Hand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Harvey J. Fulmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Modesco Irrigation Association, against San Francisco having reservoir sites in Yosemite Reservation—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petitions of Hoboken Council, No. 384, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pennsylvania; Robert Duthie, and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Irad Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: Petitions of Council No. 42, of Fountain City; Council No. 35, of New River; Council No. 53, of London; Council, No. 38, of Wooldridge, and Council No. 43, of Knoxville, all in Tennessee, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Philipp Cline—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of council of Hartford, Conn., for preservation of the New Hampshire forests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Alves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John W. Warner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: Resolution of the senate and assembly of California, for a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress, for improvement of harbors on the Gulf and Pacific coast—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Isaac Witherwax—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John Dolan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: Papers to accompany bill for promotion and retirement of John W. Dillenback—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph Glassic—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Resolution of the Massachusetts legislature, for free trade between United States and Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Massachusetts legislature, for removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Massachusetts legislature, for a constitutional amendment regulating hours of labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Indian Association of Stockbridge, Mass., for legislation in behalf of the Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George Quien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Hartford (Conn.) city council, for preser-

vation of the New Hampshire forests—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. S. Fears—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jonathan Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joshua Parnell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of H. West—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: Petition of the Bethlehem Indian Association, favoring legislation for Indians in California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of the National Council of the Osage Indians, for one county for Osage Reservation—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SPERRY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Patrick Weir—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ellen R. Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petitions of the David Foser Company, the Western Show Company, the Minnesota Mercantile Company, and the Worrell Company, of Stillwater; French, Finch & Henry, William Weiskopf, and Weyerhaeuser & Co., of St. Paul, Minn., for two kinds of mail matter only and 1-cent postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the retail grocers and business men of St. Paul, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the business men of St. Paul and Minneapolis, for an amendment of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Ninth District Group of Minnesota Bankers, for repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the legislature of Minnesota, for opening to settlement certain lands in the Chippewa Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the St. Paul Rod and Gun Club, for bill H. R. 9302, for untaxed denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the St. Paul Commercial Club, against amendment of the Morris bill—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the Ramsey County Medical Society, of St. Paul, Minn., favoring the pure food and drugs bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SULZER: Petitions of the American Bar Association, the Commercial Law League of America, the Merchants' Association of New York, the National Board of Trade, and the National Association of Credit Men, favoring the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John A. Layton—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Elijah D. Guthrie—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Good—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Benjamin F. Heald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *December 15, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FRUTOS TOMAS PLAZA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a letter addressed to the President of the United States, received from His Excellency the President of Ecuador, expressing thanks for the action of the Congress of the United States in authorizing Frutos Tomas Plaza, a citizen of Ecuador, to receive instruction at the Military Academy at West Point; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PENALTY FOR EXTORTION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, together with the draft of a bill to amend section 5481 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to the punishment of officers of the United States guilty of extortion; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

SOLDIERS' ADDITIONAL HOMESTEADS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, together with the draft of a bill to repeal section 2306 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to the soldiers' additional homestead law; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

PUNISHMENT FOR EMBEZZLEMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, together with the draft of a bill to amend section 5491 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to punishment of officers or agents of the United States guilty of embezzlement; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

PUNISHMENT FOR PERJURY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, together with the draft of a bill to amend section 5392 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to the punishment of persons guilty of perjury; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, together with the draft of a bill to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the compulsory attendance of witnesses before registers and receivers of the Land Office;" which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

RECEIVERS FOR LAND DISTRICTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, together with the draft of a bill to abolish the office of receivers of public moneys for land districts, and for other purposes; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, together with the draft of a bill to empower officers, clerks, inspectors, agents, and employees of the United States to administer oaths, and for other purposes; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

TITLE TO PUBLIC LANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, together with the draft of a bill to punish persons who fraudulently obtain, or attempt to obtain, title to public lands, and for other purposes; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1905, on the 20th day of said month; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the board of directors of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Columbia Heights Citizens' Association, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the operation of street

railways in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Columbia Heights Citizens' Association, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of building lines in the District of Columbia on streets less than 90 feet in width; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCUMBER. I present a petition of divers temperance associations, relative to the sale of intoxicating liquors. The petition is very brief. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD, together with the five signatures showing what associations are represented.

There being no objection, the petition, with the signatures, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Territories, as follows:

To the honorable United States Senate:

The undersigned, in behalf of large organized constituencies, and representing, as we believe, the sentiments of 20,000,000 of church members as made known by resolutions and otherwise, respectfully petition your honorable body to enact the following moderate and conservative measures in defense of law and temperance:

First. To fulfill the nation's treaty covenants with Indian Territory to protect it against saloons by attaching to any statehood bill that shall include Indian Territory the Gallinger twenty-one year prohibition which was voted by the Senate in the last Congress.

Second. To provide in any civil government or licensing bill for Alaska that no saloon shall be licensed where a majority of the people within 2 miles are not white men.

Third. To forbid the sale of intoxicants in old soldiers' homes (which was voted by the Senate in the last Congress), and also to forbid such sales in all other Government buildings and in ships, parks, and premises owned or used by the United States Government.

Fourth. To protect State liquor laws of all kinds against nullification by outside liquor dealers selling to "speak easies" under the plea of interstate commerce, as was voted by the House in the Fifty-sixth Congress.

FRED'K D. POWER,
Secretary Congressional Temperance Society and International Reform Bureau, Vice-President of Anti-Saloon League.
MARGARET DYE ELLIS,
National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Superintendent of Legislation.
WILBUR F. CRAFTS,
Superintendent of International Reform Bureau.
CHARLES SCANLAN,
Field Secretary Presbyterian Assembly's Permanent Committee on Temperance.
O. R. MILLER,
Field Secretary National Temperance Society.
JOSHUA LEVERING,
Of Prohibition Party.

Mr. SCOTT presented the memorial of A. F. Southworth, of Huntington, W. Va., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BURNHAM presented the petition of Rev. S. E. Quinty, of Derry, N. H., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of Mount Prospect Council, No. 16, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Plymouth, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented the petition of Jessica Randolph Smith, of Henderson, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation granting an increase of pension in certain cases to soldiers of the Mexican war; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Augustus Saint-Gaudens, of Windsor, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a memorial of Mount Lafayette Division, No. 572, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Woodsville, N. H., and a memorial of Local Division No. 45, Order of Railway Telegraphers, of Littleton, N. H., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PILES presented petitions of Local Union No. 131, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Seattle; of Local Union No. 98, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Spokane; of Local Council No. 3, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Bellingham; of the Seattle-Ballard Shingle Weavers' Local Union, No. 12, American Federation of Labor, of Ballard; of Local Council No. 2, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Seattle, and of Local Union No. 162, International Union of Steam Engineers, of Everett, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of Local Union No. 951, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Brainerd, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants' Association of Aitkin County, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of a drainage canal from Waldeck to Pine Knoll in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Portland, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation providing 1-cent letter postage on all mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

THE SHIPPING BILL.

Mr. FRYE. I present a communication from the Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, War Department, transmitting a copy of a report submitted by the United Chambers of Commerce of Manila, the Shipowners' Association of the Philippines, and others, together with an excerpt from a special report submitted to the secretary of finance and justice on October 8, 1903, by the collector of customs for the Philippine Islands, relative to the so-called "shipping bill" and the effect of its enforcement in the Philippine Islands, etc. I move that the communication and accompanying papers be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have just noticed that the bill (S. 1801) regulating the creation of forest reserves appears to have been referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game. It was actually referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which is the proper committee to consider the bill. I ask that the bill go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I requested this reference yesterday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho asks that Senate bill 1801 be recalled from the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage, to report it with an amendment, and I submit a report thereon.

It is proper I should say, in connection with this report, that the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] will probably file a minority report at a later day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go to the Calendar.

IMPROVEMENT OF ANACOSTIA RIVER FLATS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 71) requiring the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare a report upon the improvement of the Anacostia River, to report it favorably without amendment. The bill relates to the health of this District and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. There is no appropriation in the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It directs the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to submit to Congress a report upon the improvement of the so-called flats of the Anacostia River from its mouth to the District line, with recommendations and estimates of cost.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FISH-CULTURAL STATION IN ILLINOIS.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (S. 653) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Illinois, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

INVESTIGATION OF BLACK SANDS OF PACIFIC SLOPE.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, by mistake a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey, forwarding a report on the progress of the investigation of the black sands of the Pacific slope, etc., was referred to the Committee on the Geological Survey. I should like to have it referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining. The investigation is as to whether the sands contain gold or not. I will say for the information of the Senate that I care nothing about it, but the gentleman who made the report asked me to have the communication transferred

from the Committee on the Geological Survey to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HALE. Is it the report of a committee under a resolution?

Mr. SCOTT. It is a paper.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is a communication.

Mr. HALE. It is a pretty wild and vague proposition, anyway. We have had it up in some of the other committees, and they never considered that it had substance enough to entitle it to much consideration. I do not think it is very important to which of these committees it goes. If it is only a paper I shall interpose no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall withdraw the request. I was requested by the gentleman who made the report to make it. He suggested that it had gone to the wrong committee and he wanted to appear before the committee. As I have made a request to be relieved of further service upon the Committee on Mines and Mining, the question of reference is nothing to me.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from West Virginia is withdrawn.

Mr. HALE. The difficulty in the matter is that all these new schemes for extending governmental authority and investigation involve not simply an initial appropriation but a constantly increasing appropriation, and when you grant the first lodgment the bureaus having charge of the subject invariably increase their estimates and demands, and before you know it there will be a division or bureau in the Department devoted to the examination of sands, to see if there is any gold in the sands; and the Government is doing it. There is no reason why the Government should exploit this matter. If the sands are rich or auriferous, private enterprise will do it.

I have seen so much of this disposition to extend the governmental intrusion into all branches of business life that I perhaps am much prejudiced against it. I hope nothing will come out of this matter to whatever committee it goes. I hope it will be allowed to die, and that we shall not be called upon for appropriations to build up a bureau to find if there is gold in the sands.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, just one moment, if the Senate will indulge me. I think the Senator from Maine has forgotten that he probably voted for an appropriation for this purpose some time ago, and that this investigation has been going on. The machinery, as I understand it, is now on the coast and the work is under way at the present time.

I do not know what this report is. I have not read it. The request came to me from a departmental officer to have the reference changed from the Committee on the Geological Survey to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. HALE. I do not know of any appropriation in this direction having been made, but it may have gone through in some way, and it appears that silently and in the fugitive way I have indicated this matter has been growing. They will get the machinery and be ready to come to Congress for a large amount of money. Well, we will meet that, Mr. President, when it comes up.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, I do not know what this report is, but I understand it has some relation to a prior appropriation, and that it is proposed to continue an investigation of the black sands of the Pacific coast. Is that the report, I will ask the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. SCOTT. That is my understanding.

Mr. FULTON. I do not intend at the present time to discuss the question, but I can not consent to allow the matter to go by on the suggestion of the Senator from Maine that no appropriation ought to be made for this purpose.

There was appropriated at the last session of the last Congress, as I recall, $25,000 to prosecute these investigations. The result which has been accomplished by the Geological Survey in carrying on those investigations is most remarkable. They have demonstrated throughout the mining States the possibility of saving immense quantities of gold, the exact percentage I can not now recall, but immense quantities that they were losing before by the processes that were in vogue.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me——

Mr. FULTON. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that the investigations conducted in Portland during the recent exposition developed the fact that they extracted platinum, which is a very valuable and a very rare metal, and I have in my possession, not here, a beautiful piece of steel that was made from those black sands in a State where there is not any iron. It seems to me that it is an industry which ought to be developed in some way.

Mr. FULTON. I was just coming to that. They have discovered in one locality on the Pacific coast sand that carried platinum in such quantities that Doctor Day, who is in charge of the investigation, is of the opinion that that field alone will supply sufficient platinum for the commerce of the United States. They have also demonstrated that the black sands carry iron ore in sufficient quantities to supply, I think, something like 600 pounds of iron ore to the ton of sand.

I only refer to this to show the wonderful success that has met all their investigations so far. When this matter comes up again I shall probably ask the attention of the Senate while I make some observations upon it, but I simply make this statement at the present time in response to what the Senator from Maine said.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon a question for information only. How does this investigation differ from the other investigations conducted by the Geological Survey except in name?

Mr. FULTON. They have gone out to the field near where the sands are and they have invited people who had experimental machines to come there and set them up, and under the superintendence of the Survey they have given the machines practical tests.

Mr. SPOONER. I am not speaking of the methods employed by the Geological Survey, but the substance. How does the investigation of the black sands of the Pacific coast, with reference to ascertaining whether they are auriferous or not, differ from any other subject investigated by the Geological Survey?

Mr. FULTON. They are simply being investigated on a larger scale; larger machines are being handled to show that their use is practicable, and also, as I have said, different machines have been given an opportunity to make tests. The great difficulty heretofore has been to secure the proper machinery for separating the mineral from the black sand.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, in answer to the Senator from Wisconsin, I will ask the Senator from Oregon if it is not a fact that these investigations have been conducted under the direction of the Geological Survey by Doctor Day?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; they have.

Mr. SPOONER. But my question, going to the subject-matter, was this: How does this investigation differ from a great many other investigations which are regularly conducted by the Geological Survey under the appropriations by Congress?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have had an impression, I may be wrong, that this is the first time this particular investigation has been conducted.

Mr. HALE. I will say this in answer to the Senator. The discussion is very illuminating. It is an extension——

Mr. SPOONER. I want some illumination; that is all. Like the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] I want light.

Mr. HALE. It is an extension of what the Geological Survey is doing in a great many branches of private industry, in promoting information to be taken advantage of by private industries. Nobody ever thought of this investigation until lately the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] thought about it. This is the first opportunity. It adds to the jurisdiction of the Geological Survey. I had forgotten that $25,000 had already gone into it. It will soon be $50,000. There is no doubt but that the investigation has shown that this machinery can be improved. It is not governmental machinery; it is private machinery.

I should like to have the Government investigate and show to the lumbermen of the State, which my colleague and I represent here, processes by which they can utilize sawdust. It would be a very valuable thing for that great industry, and if the Government should do it, it would prevent expense being incurred, which is done constantly by my constituents who are spending money in finding out how machinery can be improved in mills by which the waste material can be utilized.

Now, that is just one of the things that this does. The Geological Survey asks to take not governmental machinery, but private machinery, and, after its investigations, which are paid for by Congress, to report how these machines can be improved so that they will save in this way, not save to the Government, but save to individuals.

The Senator is a lawyer, a better lawyer than I am, and he knows something about constitutional limitations and the proper limitations. If we are going on and the Government is to take in hand all of these things, I want the industries in my State to have the fostering care of the Government, and I want them to be able to cluster under the wings of the Government. I want the Government to help pay, so that their business can be more profitable than it is now. But I have never asked that that shall be done.

Mr. FULTON. I suggest that so long as the distinguished Senator from Maine occupies a seat in this body there is no doubt that the citizens of Maine will cluster under the wings of the Government all right. They have been clustering there for a good many years; and I observe that whenever some people from the western portion of the country like to get in and do a little clustering the constitutional limitation steps in and prevents them.

Now, I do not know of anything in particular that this Government does in the way of developing industries that it is not for the individual, and when it is for the individual if it is a sufficiently large number of individuals it becomes for the benefit of the public. This is for the benefit of the miners throughout the entire West, I may say throughout the entire country, for the mining regions are located in the West. It is not for the benefit of any particular locality. It is for the benefit of one of the greatest industries of this nation.

It is proposed by a great many and advocated very earnestly, and I believe very properly, that there should be established a department of Government under which should be placed the mining industries and interests of this nation, so great are those industries. Then is it improper or is it a waste of the money of this country to spend, if we do spend, $50,000 or $100,000 in developing better processes by which the minerals of the country can be collected and saved?

I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate this morning in discussing the matter, but, Mr. President, I could not consent that it be passed by and sneered at as if it were without merit.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there are no further reports of standing and select committees, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions is next in order.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 1810) for the erection of a memorial on the grounds of William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., in honor of Hon. Peyton Randolph, first President of the Continental Congress: which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1811) to establish the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battlefields Memorial Park, in the State of Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1812) for the relief of Lieut. James M. Pickrell, United States Navy, retired; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CLARK of Montana introduced a bill (S. 1813) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of John Murphy, alias John Martin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1814) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Weller; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FOSTER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1815) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph L. Bernard and Anna Holmes Bernard, both deceased; and

A bill (S. 1816) for the relief of the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana.

Mr. ALLISON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1817) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Gray;

A bill (S. 1818) granting a pension to Edward T. White; and

A bill (S. 1819) granting a pension to Minerva Kenney.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 1820) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURKETT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1821) granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. Andrews (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1822) granting an increase of pension to L. C. Sheppard;

A bill (S. 1823) granting an increase of pension to Ira G. Foster; and

A bill (S. 1824) granting an increase of pension to James P. Robey.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1825) for the extension and improvement of Massachusetts avenue to Western avenue NW., District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1826) granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Paine;

A bill (S. 1827) granting an increase of pension to George C. Chase; and

A bill (S. 1828) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Abbott.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced a bill (S. 1829) granting a pension to Rebecca Pritchard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FLINT introduced a bill (S. 1830) making appropriation for the removal of the quarantine station at San Diego, Cal., and to acquire a new site, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 1831) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Eureka, Cal.; and

A bill (S. 1832) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at San Diego, Cal.

Mr. FLINT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1833) granting an increase of pension to Henry Tobin;

A bill (S. 1834) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Partridge;

A bill (S. 1835) granting an increase of pension to James G. Doane;

A bill (S. 1836) granting an increase of pension to Abel Fleming;

A bill (S. 1837) granting an increase of pension to Philip Gavin;

A bill (S. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Harvey S. Harriman;

A bill (S. 1839) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Long Overton; and

A bill (S. 1840) granting an increase of pension to James Prettyman.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1841) granting a pension to Robert Catlin; and

A bill (S. 1842) granting an increase of pension to Ransom O. Thayer.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1843) to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, entitled "An act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war,' approved July 27, 1892;" and

A bill (S. 1844) granting a pension to all surviving officers and enlisted men of the United States Army and Navy, both Regular and Volunteer, who were serving on board the sloop of war *Cumberland* on March 8, 1862.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced a bill (S. 1845) to authorize the paving of Twenty-third street NW. between S and U streets; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WARNER introduced a bill (S. 1846) for the relief of Louis Benecke; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 1847) granting a pension to Nelson J. March; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STONE introduced a bill (S. 1848) for the relief of Joseph Hemmerback; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 1849) granting an increase of pension to David T. Pettie; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 1850) for the relief of W. D. B. Dodson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1851) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Broadman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1852) granting an increase of pension to Milton Marsh;

A bill (S. 1853) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Ghrist;

A bill (S. 1854) granting an increase of pension to David M. Taylor;

A bill (S. 1855) granting an increase of pension to J. J. Brown;

A bill (S. 1856) granting a pension to Wilson Zurmehly (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1857) granting an increase of pension to William Van Tilburgh (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1858) granting a pension to Lina V. Dietz (with accompanying papers).

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 1859) for the relief of O. P. Cobb's heirs and others; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1860) to provide for the establishment of an annex to all National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1861) for the relief of George Schild; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1862) for the relief of Joshua T. Reynolds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1863) for the relief of the heirs of Capt. James Holland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 1864) for the relief of James H. Oliver, a commander on the retired list of the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced a bill (S. 1865) granting an increase of pension to Solomon H. Baker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 1866) granting a pension to Jefferson Wilcox; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1867) for the relief of the estate of Henry Banks, deceased;

A bill (S. 1868) for the relief of Honora Ryan;

A bill (S. 1869) for the relief of the estate of John W. Anderson, deceased;

A bill (S. 1870) for the relief of Sarah Jane Bellah, administratrix of the estate of James W. Bellah, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1871) for the relief of the trustees of Pleasant Grove Baptist Church, of Ringgold, Ga.

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1872) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. White (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1873) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Carey; and

A bill (S. 1874) granting an increase of pension to John W. Faulkner (with accompanying papers).

Mr. CARMACK introduced a bill (S. 1875) to fix the liabilities of common carriers, railroad and transportation companies, for negligence in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1876) for the relief of the estate of Alexander F. Beckham, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1877) for the relief of J. C. Brooks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SMOOT introduced a bill (S. 1878) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Provo, State of Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1879) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo F. Harmon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McLAURIN introduced a bill (S. 1880) for the relief of John H. Myers; which was read twice by its title, and with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

INTRODUCTION OF REINDEER INTO ALASKA.

Mr. TELLER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to return to the Commissioner of Education the original photographs which were sent to the Senate for publication in the following documents: Senate Executive Document No. 70, Fifty-third Congress, second session; Senate Executive Document No. 92, Fifty-third, third; Senate Document No. 111, Fifty-fourth, first; Senate Document No. 49, Fifty-fourth, second (being Sixth Annual Report of Introduction of Domestic Reindeer into Alaska); Senate Document No. 30, Fifty-fifth, second; Senate Document No. 34, Fifty-fifth, third; Senate Document No. 245, Fifty-sixth, first; Senate Document No. 206, Fifty-sixth, second; Senate Document No. 98, Fifty-seventh, first; Senate Document No. 70, Fifty-seventh, second; Senate Document No. 210, Fifty-eighth, second; Senate Document No. 61, Fifty-eighth, third, the same being the annual reports on the introduction of reindeer in Alaska.

INVESTIGATION OF HAZING AT NAVAL ACADEMY.

Mr. CARMACK. I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate be authorized and instructed to inquire into reports of recent brutalities practiced by students of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, and to report the result of such investigation with such recommendations as may be deemed necessary to put an end to such practices.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HALE. I did not hear the first part of it. Does the resolution direct the Naval Committee to make an investigation?

Mr. CARMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALE. I think that is very proper.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1905, on the 20th day of said month was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CANADIAN ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

The Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a report by the Secretary of State submitting a claim of the Canadian Electric Light Company, of Levis, Quebec, on account of damages caused by the U. S. S. *Essex* to the company's cable on July 17, 1904.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1905.*

SETTLEMENT OF SAMOAN CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State concerning this Government's obligation to pay to that of Germany the sum of $20,000, under the convention between the United States, Germany, and Great Britain for the settlement of Samoan claims, signed at Washington on November 7, 1899.

Prompt action should be taken to discharge this conventional obligation.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1905.*

CLAIM OF FRENCH CABLE COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a report by the Secretary of State resubmitting a claim of the Campagnie Francais des Cables Télégraphiques for damages done to their cables by United States military and naval authorities during the Spanish-American war.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1905.*

POSTAGE ON PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

Mr. STONE. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate at this time the resolution which I submitted yesterday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no further resolutions,

concurrent or other, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution yesterday submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]; which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be directed to inform the Senate whether under the construction placed by his Department upon existing law prescribing the postage for periodical publications, and under the rules and practice of his Department, periodicals published by colleges and universities, or by alumni associations or students of colleges and universities, are admitted to the mails as second-class matter; and also to inform the Senate whether any discrimination has been made or preference allowed any such publications over other similar publications in admitting them to the mails; and if so, to inform the Senate in detail, so far as practicable, to what extent and in what particular instances such discriminations have been made or preferences allowed, and how long the same have been continued, with the reasons therefor.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I wish to detain the Senate a few moments in an effort to explain the occasion for this resolution and its object.

I desire to say at this point that there is no purpose in submitting the resolution to criticise the Post-office Department, but I think, on the information I have, that a condition has grown up in the Department concerning matters such as I am proposing to inquire about, which ought not to exist, which is wrong, and my purpose is to bring the facts before the Senate as a basis for some action, if it can be had, to correct that condition.

If there be no objection, Mr. President, I will ask the Secretary to read a letter which I received from the editor of a publication known as "The Missouri Alumni Quarterly," issued at Columbia, Mo. This letter I received some weeks ago, shortly before I came to Washington to attend this session of this Congress, and it quite fully explains the matter in hand.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri sends to the Secretary's desk and asks to have read a certain letter. Without objection, it will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

ALUMNI ASSOCIATION, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, Mo., November 16, 1905.

Hon. WILLIAM J. STONE,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will, we trust, pardon this intrusion upon your valuable time, but we must call your attention to a recent ruling of the Post-Office Department, which involves us in serious financial loss and those authorities in a grave injustice.

The Alumni Association of the University of Missouri has recently begun the publication of an "Alumni Quarterly," a magazine of from 60 to 70 pages, published four times a year at stated intervals, price $1.50 per annum, and devoted to any and all things of interest to former students and graduates of the university. It is, in all respects, similar to magazines such as the "Harvard Graduate Magazine," the "Michigan Alumnus," the "Brown Alumni Monthly," the "Yale Alumni Weekly," and scores of other publications which are freely allowed entry to the mails as second-class matter. The "Vanderbilt University Quarterly," published, not independently like our magazine, but by the authorities of that university, frankly as a kind of bulletin of news and at the purely nominal subscription price of 50 cents per year, receives those rates. Even the "Independent," a purely student publication at this very University of Missouri, secures them. But—and this is our point—when we recently, in September, when our first number appeared, made application for such rates, our application was turned down. Now, we feel keenly that this action is a very grave injustice to us, to the interests of our great and growing university, and therefore to our entire State, and we wish to protest against it. And we protest all the more vigorously because the money loss involved, besides the petty annoyances to which we will be subjected by this ruling, may mean the failure of our publication. All we want is "a square deal," a fair field, and no favors. If we are to be excluded from the benefits of the second-class rates, we demand that similar publications be treated in the same way. If the others are to enjoy them, we demand them also as our right. And we speak in behalf of 25,000 former students and graduates of the University of Missouri.

We trust that amid your many more important duties you will find time to have this wrong righted.

Very sincerely,

W. W. ELWANG, *Editor.*

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, on arriving in Washington I visited the office of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General and discussed this matter with him and his chief clerk. The Third Assistant Postmaster-General said he would have it examined and would write me concerning it at an early date, which he did. I will ask the Secretary to read his letter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, December 7, 1905.

Hon. W. J. STONE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Referring to your personal call yesterday, relative to the recent denial of admission of The Missouri Alumni Quarterly to the second-class of mail matter at Columbia, Mo., I have the honor to inform you that, judged by the copy of the September, 1905, issue submitted with the application, this publication clearly comes within the class referred to in the inclosed marked copies of Circulars II and XIII as inadmissible to the second class of mail matter.

The law (act of March 3, 1879) does not prohibit the admission of publications published by or for colleges, schools, etc., as a class, but only those whose scope is restricted to such an extent that they are merely local bulletins of personal information and not information of a public character in the particular sense contemplated by the law.

The claim made by the publisher that other publications apparently similar in character are passing in the mails at the second-class rates of postage is undoubtedly well founded, but this is one of the abuses of the second-class mailing privileges which this office is endeavoring to correct as speedily as the circumstances in each particular case warrant.

The letter addressed to you by the editor of The Missouri Alumni Quarterly is returned herewith as requested.

Respectfully,

EDWIN C. MADDEN,
Third Assistant Postmaster-General.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I might have let the matter rest at that point and left the correction of the whole matter to the Department except for what follows. In one of the circulars referred to in the letter just read, inclosed to me, is what I hold in my hand—the one referred to as Circular No. XIII. It is a reply made by the Postmaster-General of date February 26, 1902, to a resolution of the Senate, and from this I desire to read. The resolution was passed by the Senate February 4, 1902, and is as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be directed to inform the Senate what is the construction placed by his Department upon the existing law prescribing the postage for periodical publications like those published by churches, parishes, missionary and other associations, containing in part advertisements, in part general intelligence or miscellaneous articles, and in part items of news of special interest to the members of the particular organizations under whose authority they are published, giving either, as may be found convenient, a list of such publications in regard to which special rules have been made by the Department, or such examples as will illustrate the position of the Department.

It will be observed that this resolution is similar in form to the one I have offered and covers substantially the same ground. in reply to that resolution, amongst other things, the Postmaster-General said:

Directly answering the inquiry in the resolution, I have to say that the present position of the Post-Office Department toward publications issued by the institutions named in the resolution is that when their contents consist wholly or mainly of matter relating to those institutions, and not of matter of a general public character, that they do not come within the scope of the law; that is to say, they have not the inherent qualities of genuine newspapers or periodical publications "originated and published for the dissemination of information of a public character" in the sense contemplated by law. Hence they may not be admitted to the second class.

Mr. President, I have no wish to question at this time the accuracy of this construction of the postal law. It may be correct; for my present purposes, I am willing to consent that it is correct.

Mr. SPOONER. Is it a college monthly?

Mr. STONE. In response to the Senator, I will say that I hold in my hand the issue of September last of the publication I am speaking of, and concerning which this correspondence was had. It is called the "Missouri Alumni Quarterly." It is printed at Columbia, Mo., at which place our State university is located. It is printed under the auspices of the alumni association of the university. There are some 25,000 former students of that university, not all graduates, and therefore not members of its alumni association, but men and women who have gone out from the university and who are scattered broadcast over the country and are engaged in all the multitudinous activities represented in the industrial and professional life of the country.

It would seem to me, Mr. President, that a publication of this character, having some 70 pages of reading matter, original and selected, and a great deal of which is of general interest, should have the privilege of the mails as second-class matter. Even if true that the larger part of the contents of this publication be of special interest to the students, former students, and officers of the university—even if that were the entire character of its contents—it clientele is so large, embracing some 25,000 people, that it is, in my opinion, of such importance and dignity as to entitle it to the mailing privileges it seeks.

Mr. SPOONER. It is not printed for the purpose of making money?

Mr. STONE. It is not printed, as the Senator says, to make money.

But the particular point I desire to present and emphasize is this: I hold in my hand the other circular referred to in the letter of Assistant Postmaster-General Madden—Circular II—inclosed to me with his communication, from which I wish to read. This is a circular letter bearing date December 18, 1902—three years ago. It is directed to the postmaster at Chicago, Ill., and is a letter written in reply to an inquiry made of the Department by that postmaster. The inquiry evidently concerned publications of the very character of the one printed by the Alumni Association of the Missouri University. I read as follows:

The Department has uniformly held that publications like—

The one which is being considered, the name of which is not given—

published by students and whose columns are composed almost entirely of purely local items concerning the students themselves, or the uni-

versity, college, or school to which they are attached—no different, indeed, from newspapers or periodicals published by the employees of any mercantile establishment by themselves and for the dissemination among themselves of items of interest solely to them—are not published "for the dissemination of information of a public character" within the meaning of the law; nor are they "devoted to literature, the sciences, arts, or some special industry;" and, inasmuch as their purpose and object are not such as the provisions of the law prescribe to entitle them to the subsidized second-class rates of postage, they are, therefore, not admissible to the second-class of mail matter.

Now, I call special attention to this clause in that circular:

The claim that publications similar in character to this publication are passing in the mails as second-class matter is no doubt well founded; but the mailing thereof at the subsidized second-class rate of postage is one of the many abuses of the second-class mailing privilege which the Department is endeavoring to eradicate as speedily as possible and as the circumstances in each individual case will warrant.

The language I have just quoted from this letter of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, Edwin C. Madden, of date December 18, 1902, is almost identical with the language used by the same officer in one paragraph of his letter to me, read by the Secretary.

Now, Mr. President, assuming that the construction of the law as made by the Department is correct and should stand, I have a right to protest, not in a spirit of resentment, but as a matter of justice and equality, that if publications like this Missouri Alumni Quarterly and identical with it are admitted to the mails as second-class matter, and are to-day enjoying that privilege, then it is a privilege that ought to be extended to all such publications. It ought to be extended to all or denied to all.

The statement in the letter of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General to me that an effort is being made by the Department to correct the abuse complained of as rapidly and speedily as possible loses its force when I find that exactly the same question was submitted to the Department nearly four years ago by a Senate resolution, and that three years ago the same Assistant Postmaster-General, in a letter to the Chicago postmaster, stated, as he does in his letter to me, that such publications were being admitted to the mails; that it was an abuse of the law; that they were improperly and unlawfully admitted, and that the Department was striving to correct the evil as speedily as it could be done. It seems to me that three or four years ought to be ample time to correct this abuse, if it be an abuse, and if there is a real purpose to correct it. It ought not to require much time to make the correction and the process for doing it simple.

Now, we are told by Mr. Elwang, the editor of this Missouri periodical, that several publications—the names of which he gives, and of identically the same character as the one with which he is connected—are admitted to the mails as second-class matter; and I have a letter from him this morning stating that a similar publication issued from the University of Wisconsin has been enjoying this privilege for more than seven years. That is the thing I protest against; not that I object to the privileges enjoyed by other college publications, but to the fact that like privileges are denied to similar publications. I want to know, and I think the Senate ought to know, Mr. President, whether this condition exists and the reason for permitting it, and to find that out I have offered this resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE].

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, returned to the Senate the bill (S. 1475) to provide that the 2 per cent bonds issued under section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans,' approved June 28, 1902, shall have the same rights and privileges that are accorded by law to other 2 per cent bonds of the United States," being, in the opinion of the House, as respects the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution, an infringement on the privileges of the House.

PANAMA CANAL BONDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution from the House of Representatives; which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 15, 1905.

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1475) to provide that the 2 per cent bonds issued under section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans,' approved June 28, 1902, shall have the same rights and privileges that are accorded by law to other 2 per cent bonds of the United States," in the opinion of this House, as respects the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution, is an infringement on the privileges of this House, and that the said bill be taken from the Speaker's table and be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the resolution may lie on the table for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

PANAMA CANAL APPROPRIATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no further morning business that order is closed, and the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 480, being the deficiency appropriation bill for the Panama Canal.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. TILLMAN. I do.

Mr. BACON. I wish to offer an amendment to the bill. I offer it as an amendment to come in as a separate section at the close of the last section of the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following as a new section:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury, within ninety days from the passage of this act, and thereafter at the beginning of each regular session, shall submit to Congress estimates in detail covering all salaries and compensation for all persons, except laborers, employed in the construction of the Panama Canal, or in connection with the same, by the Isthmian Canal Commission, including all officers and officials of said Commission.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the bill we have under consideration deals with a very important matter, and the more we discuss it the greater its importance grows, because we find that it involves other serious and grave questions.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] yesterday, in discussing this bill, declared that the annexation of the Philippines and their government since the war, with all its consequences, had cost us $800,000,000. He expressed his opinion that the benefits were nothing. I do not know whether his estimate is correct—I presume it is approximately so—but it seems to me that the annexation of the Philippine Islands has involved this Government in far more serious trouble than the mere expenditure of hundreds of millions, though that were done wantonly, uselessly.

We have lost our simplicity as a republic; we have thrown away the ideals of the fathers; we have abandoned all the fundamental principles of self-government and of free government to enter upon—I will not say the downward road, but certainly, unless something is done to check it, it will prove to be a downward road that will grow very steep the farther we travel that way. Virgil tells us that the descent to hell is very easy—facilis descensus averni—but it is the retracing of one's steps, the returning, the getting back, that involves labor and work; and it appears to me that it is opportune for the Congress to consider gravely whether there is not here in this bill and the policy involved cause for serious and careful study. It opens up an issue that must be met some time. The sooner it is met the better for all concerned.

In his maiden speech, as it was called, the brilliant Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] gave the Senate an exhibition of his marvelous powers as a rhetorician and the faculty which he possesses of coining fine phrases and words, probably licking them into shape after considerable time and labor, and then reproducing them as an orator. I have no criticism to make of the Senator. I do not possess that happy faculty. I am sorry for it. I only envy him the ability to prepare a speech and then deliver it after he has been able by time and labor to perfect it, to polish it, to make it glitter in all its parts, and have it joined together logically and neatly in the very best literary style.

I wish to quote a brief paragraph which I recollect. It struck me very forcibly at the time, so I got the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and looked it up. I will read it as illustrating something of the new faith that not only obtains but is being put into practice, and as I am an old fogy I want to take issue with this new doctrine of government.

I repeat that our Government and our administrators must be examples. You can not teach the Filipino by precept. An object lesson is the only lesson he comprehends. He has no conception of pure, orderly, equal, impartial government under equal laws justly administered, because he has never seen such a government. He must be shown the simplest results of good government by actual example in

order that he may begin to understand its most elementary principles.

Such a government will have its effect upon us here in America, too. Model administration there will be an example created by ourselves for model administration here; and our own example is the only one Americans ever heed. It is not true that charity begins at home. Selfishness begins there, but charity begins abroad and ends in its full glory in the home. It is not true that perfect government must be achieved at home before administering it abroad; its exercise abroad is a suggestion, an example, and a stimulus for the best government at home.

Mr. LODGE. When was that, let me ask the Senator?

Mr. TILLMAN. January 9, 1900.

Here we have the new evangel of imperialism—Cæsarism—the doctrine that the Constitution of our fathers and the laws of Congress are not altogether essential to the best government. I am interpreting liberally, because I shall give examples to show that I have foundation for my interpretation.

Now, to get a little nearer home, or to come back home after this excursion into the East, I wish to call attention briefly to two or three things which have struck me as illustrating the idea of the Senator from Indiana in regard to the improvement on our past methods of governing ourselves, which our experience in the Philippines has brought to us.

The President of the United States, as every man recognizes, is a brilliant man, an able man, and a hard worker. I will go further than that, and say that I believe he is a patriotic man, and that he has at heart nothing but the best interests of his country, as he sees them. Now, in saying this I am very liberal. But I want to direct your attention to two or three actions of his which, in my judgment, prove beyond dispute that he is, when his heart is set on anything, absolutely oblivious of the law, indifferent to the Constitution, and in the determination to have his own sweet way he tramples under foot ruthlessly the Constitution of his country, or else, which would be almost an impossible supposition, he does these things without knowing. He is ignorant.

I will illustrate by reference to his action in the Panama Republic business, when, without any authority of law or of Congress, he sent an armed vessel of the United States to a harbor belonging to the Republic of Colombia, which Government was preparing to reduce to subjection her rebellious province—Panama—and gave notice, after he had recognized the Panama Republic, that any attempt on the part of Colombia to bring troops to the Isthmus or to come within 50 miles of it, as I recollect the order, would be prevented by arms. If that was not an act of war, I do not understand the meaning of the term.

Mind you, those of us who were anxious for the Panama Canal—and I was among the number—did desire to get it in some decent and honorable way. There were some of us who wanted it so badly we did not care whether or not there was any decency or honor in the transaction. Therefore we ruthlessly pressed forward, or the President did, the Government backing him up by a large majority, and set up this Panama Republic which possessed the jewel we wanted, as Senator Hoar phrased it—that is, the Isthmus across which we proposed to cut the canal. The result has been that we have got what we claim to be a good title to the Isthmus and the right to cut the canal through it or across it, and that is all.

I merely cite that to illustrate my opinion that the President had no authority or right as Chief Executive of this Republic to do what he did. But we indorsed his action. We approved it—I mean a majority of the Senate and of Congress did—we appropriated money to purchase the title of the French company, and we are at work under their franchise cutting through the Isthmus.

To come down a little further—to illustrate my contention that the Chief Executive ignores the Constitution, tramples the law under his heel, exercising in his own person both executive and legislative functions, ignoring the Senate—he sent to this body the past winter a treaty with the Republic of Santo Domingo. That treaty was not ratified by the Senate. The Senate refused to give its approval to the proposal that this Government should enter upon the untried path of being policeman for the Western Hemisphere and debt collector for all Christendom.

But as soon as the Senate adjourned and "Congress was no longer on his hands," to use a phrase which I believe was originated by Mr. Cleveland, the Chief Executive goes forward along the lines laid down in his treaty, taking the ports of Santo Domingo under control, through American officers, and puts a fleet there to protect the Morales Government and to protect the Americans in collecting the duties on imports into that island; and that condition is in full force and effect now. The treaty, if it had been ratified, would have authorized this, but the Senate refused to ratify the treaty, and yet the treaty is being carried out just as though it had been ratified.

This is an illustration of what I have said is a new departure in controlling our destinies and having the Executive become the one factor in Government, while the Senate sits here to servilely submit and the House is gagged. Even if it wanted to speak it could not. I do not think it wants to very much. So we have an exhibition of the rapidity with which we are traveling toward one-man power and centralized government and the abolition of any law but executive authority wherever the Chief Executive chooses to usurp power. Give a man an inch, I have always heard, and he will take an ell.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from South Carolina allow me to ask him a question for information?

Mr. TILLMAN. I am glad to have the Senator from Wisconsin ask me a question.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator be good enough to say what power he understands the President to have usurped in any arrangement which has been made with Santo Domingo or in respect of Santo Domingo since the adjournment of Congress?

Mr. TILLMAN. I assert that practically the President is carrying out the treaty with that so-called "Republic."

Mr. SPOONER. In what respect, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. TILLMAN. He has a fleet there protecting the Morales Government in control of the island and protecting the American officers who are collecting the revenues from imports in the exercise of unlawful authority.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator think under the Constitution the President is to ask the Senate where he shall send ships of the Navy?

Mr. TILLMAN. No.

Mr. SPOONER. Then wherein, because our ships are in or about the harbors of Santo Domingo, by order of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has he usurped any power in that respect?

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, it is not the fleet being there that I am speaking about. I am speaking about carrying out the treaty which has not been ratified.

Mr. SPOONER. And I ask the Senator to be kind enough to indicate, in order that the Senate and I may fully understand him, in what respect the President has carried out the treaty or any part of it since the Congress adjourned?

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Wisconsin is a very adroit antagonist in a law court, and he is a supple acrobat in playing with words, if that is not an Irish bull of a simile.

Mr. SPOONER. It is a bull all right.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to ask the Senator a question. Is not the present condition of affairs in respect to Santo Domingo the very relation which the treaty would have produced?

Mr. SPOONER. Not at all.

Mr. TILLMAN. What would it have been?

Mr. SPOONER. The President states in his message. If the treaty had been ratified the custom-houses of Santo Domingo would be in the custody of officers of the United States, serving under the designation or appointment of the President. The Senator so understands it, does he not?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. The President states in his message, which I understand to be the fact, that the officials now acting in Santo Domingo who are Americans are acting under appointment of President Morales.

Mr. TILLMAN. By what authority?

Mr. SPOONER. By authority of President Morales.

Mr. TILLMAN. Who suggested their names?

Mr. SPOONER. The President probably recommended them as honest and efficient men.

Mr. TILLMAN. Ah! It is all beating about the bush. It is accomplishing indirectly and by trickery, if I may use such a phrase, what the Executive proposed to do if the treaty had been ratified, and when the Senate would not give him the legal authority, he took the authority in his own hands to go forward and do what he wanted to do; and now the whole programme is to play on words and to deny that he has usurped authority, although in effect and in fact he has done it.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator asked me a question. I was endeavoring to answer it. There is no trickery about it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, no. It is bold, brazen.

Mr. SPOONER. It is not a nice thing to impute in the Senate to the President of the United States, to whatever party he may belong, trickery.

Mr. TILLMAN. When a man accomplishes something by indirect methods, by unlawful methods, that he can not get at by direct methods, I call it trickery. I may be wrong; I sometimes say things rather bluntly and maybe my words are too blunt, but I still have that impression; and I can not get rid of it unless the Senator can convince me that I have misunderstood the situation.

Mr. SPOONER. First, while I do not want to take the Senator's time, that is a nasty and undignified word to be applied——

Mr. TILLMAN. Just suggest something that is not nasty and undignified, because I do not like to use nasty and undignified phrases.

Mr. SPOONER. To be applied in one of the coordinate, independent branches of this Government to the head of another.

Mr. TILLMAN. Suggest something better.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator's idea is so utterly wrong that I do not think it can be repaired and made right.

I want to say this to the Senator: If the President of the United States had appointed Americans to go there and the Americans under his appointment had taken the custom-houses of Santo Domingo and administered them, distributing the funds received as provided by the treaty, the President would be carrying out the treaty and it would be an utterly indefensible thing—a thing that could hardly be imputed to any President we have ever had. He has not done that, he says.

Mr. TILLMAN. Yet the Senator acknowledges that these men are there doing this thing. The money is being distributed; as the treaty provides, it is being put in bank.

Mr. SPOONER. The President has not done that.

Mr. TILLMAN. The 45 per cent which was to go to the Dominican Government is being delivered to the Dominican Government, and the 55 per cent which was to go to the creditors pro rata, or something like that, is being held.

Mr. SPOONER. He has not done that.

Mr. TILLMAN. Tell us what he has done.

Mr. SPOONER. As I understand his message, he says what he has done. As I understand the fact to be, he has done this: In order to maintain the status until the Senate could act upon the treaty——

Mr. TILLMAN. When the Senate had adjourned, having the whole summer to sit here and deal with the treaty and had refused peremptorily to take it up or consider or ratify it, what excuse did he have for not withdrawing and coming away and leaving the Senate to deal with the subject this winter? It was just his own idea; the necessity of the situation.

Mr. SPOONER. I will not attempt to answer any further the Senator's question, if he will not permit me——

Mr. TILLMAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. But I insist that he shall answer it. Tell us what he has done.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me I will proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will be quiet and sit down until the Senator gets through answering.

Mr. SPOONER. That encourages me to proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator does not need very much encouragement to proceed.

Mr. SPOONER. I will say this and very briefly, for I do not wish to interrupt the Senator.

The Senate adjourned without action upon the treaty. I do not mind saying in the open, Mr. President, although perhaps its propriety may be challenged, that, in my opinion, the Senate ought not to have adjourned without acting upon the treaty in the circumstances, either by ratifying it or rejecting it, for it left the President of necessity in a position of embarrassment. It is well settled, and it has always been, and in the nature of things must be, that it is the duty of a government which has entered into a treaty with another government to do nothing, or to permit nothing to be done, pending its ratification which would change the status so as to render ratification unavailing or rob either of the parties to it, if ratified, of the advantages contemplated in its negotiation.

The Senate adjourned without acting upon the treaty. It was the duty of Santo Domingo under international law to maintain that status, to keep all foreign governments, creditors of Santo Domingo or representing creditors of Santo Domingo, from seizure of the custom-houses or sequestration of its revenues. It was easy for us to maintain on our part the *status quo*, for we had nothing to do, and the President could fold his arms and wait. But Santo Domingo could not as against foreign ships. In the Venezuela matter the tribunal at The Hague had made a decision which put upon every foreign government the motive, a premium upon making haste with its war ships to levy forcible execution—if I may use that word—upon the governmental revenues of the debtor Government.

Mr. TILLMAN. When they were weak.

Mr. SPOONER. That has nothing to do with what I am saying. That tribunal decided that the Government which first sent its ship and the second and third were entitled to preference in the peaceful collection of their debts later.

Mr. TELLER. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir; although I am speaking in the time of the Senator from South Carolina, and I do not want to take it.

Mr. TELLER. I have just come into the Chamber and I did not know that.

Mr. TILLMAN. Go ahead. I have no objection to having the Senator from Colorado interrupt the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. TELLER. Does that decision of The Hague Court apply to cases where there was a controversy between governments as to the validity of the debt? Was it not to apply where the debt was acknowledged?

Mr. SPOONER. It was a controversy between foreign governments and Venezuela as to the debt. It was a controversy between Santo Domingo——

Mr. TELLER. Wait a moment. Do I understand that the court at The Hague decided that where a government made a claim against another government which that government denied they were then justified to take possession with their ships?

Mr. SPOONER. The Venezuelan claims were, a part of them, private claims. Germany sent her ships there, England sent ships there, France did it—or the third government was Italy, perhaps.

Mr. TELLER. Did they not decide that the debt was owing and Venezuela declared it was not owing?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly they decided that the debt was owing——

Mr. TELLER. They rendered judgment.

Mr. SPOONER. As debts were owing to other governments, which did not send any ships there. Debts were owing our citizens, and we did not send ships there. What they decided was that governments which moved first and sent ships first were entitled to preference—to priority of payment over those governments which did not employ military force by way of menace.

Now, when the Senate adjourned, under that doctrine it left every motive to foreign governments to send their ships to Santo Domingo, and one ship was sent there to seize the custom-house. If the President of the United States had folded his arms, if he had waited until this day, does the Senator think that other ships of creditor nations would not have been in the harbor of Santo Domingo?

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not want to interrupt at this stage.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator can answer that in a moment now. President Morales, out of his helplessness, knowing, as I understand it, for I am stating it as I understand it, that the treaty could not be carried into effect, as the President knew, as everyone knew, asked the President to recommend to him honest, capable American citizens whom he might appoint as the agents, not of the United States, but of Santo Domingo, to collect these revenues, and dispose of them, not as the United States should say, not as the proposed treaty provides, but as Morales, by decree, might declare, hoping thereby, with the presence of American ships, which had been there more or less for some years, and which the President does not have to ask permission of the Congress to send anywhere, provided it be not as an act of war, that the status would be maintained. The President recommended officials competent, so far as ability goes, honest men, men who had proved themselves in our own service worthy of confidence. Those men were appointed by Morales. Those men can be dismissed by Morales. Those men are paid by Santo Domingo. They are the agents of Santo Domingo. They are disposing of the funds as decreed by President Morales; and undoubtedly the fact that they are American citizens, although acting as the agents of a foreign government, with the moral effect of the presence of American ships in that vicinity, have operated to maintain the status and send away the Italian war ship, and probably to keep others away.

The President states that it is an arrangement temporary in its character. If it shall be the pleasure of the Senate when it acts upon the treaty to reject it, the arrangement is at an end. These agents are paying over to Santo Domingo the proportion of collections which Morales decrees. If the treaty were being carried into effect there would be some distribution being made of the surplus over the 45 per cent.

Mr. TELLER. Where does it go now?

Mr. SPOONER. It is deposited to abide the result.

Mr. TELLER. The result of what?

Mr. SPOONER. The result of our action on the treaty. If the treaty is not ratified it belongs to Santo Domingo, and each government will pursue its own course toward the seizure of it and the collection of its indebtedness.

So, Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina may call it trickery——

Mr. TILLMAN. That is what it looks like to me.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator may call it trickery, he may call it usurpation. In fact there is neither trickery in it nor

usurpation in it, in my opinion. The President has done what, being left as he was left by the nonaction of the Senate, it was his duty to do, and that is all.

Mr. TILLMAN. Has the Senator answered the question to his satisfaction?

Mr. SPOONER. I have answered it to my satisfaction in this respect: I have attempted to state to the Senator the facts as I understand them.

Mr. MONEY. Is the Senator through?

Mr. SPOONER. I am through. I beg the pardon of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. MONEY. I do not care to interrupt this debate, except that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has evidently impressed on his mind a situation different from what I have of Santo Domingo. As a matter of fact, the relations which exist between the United States and that Republic are of a unique character and unprecedented in the history of this country. There are, I understand, six war ships there. I do not know that they are needed anywhere else, and they must cruise; their crews are to be paid and their expenses are to be paid. So I see no objection to that. I have heard it said that there were eleven there. Whether it is to impress upon them the authority of the President of the United States and the power of the United States to take absolute charge of that country, as the President has proposed to do, I do not know, and I am indifferent about it.

As a matter of fact, we are proceeding there now, as I understand it, not on account of any proposed treaty yet pending before the Senate, and which, if the Senate has considered it has at least declined to ratify, but we are proceeding at Bahia under a decree made by the President there and two or three of his friends and not by the Congress.

Mr. SPOONER. When the Senator says the President, he means the President of Santo Domingo.

Mr. MONEY. Oh, I mean President Morales. I said "there." I mean the colored gentleman who presides over the destiny of that mixed little Republic. That decree is called in itself a modus vivendi—a diplomatic phrase that Senators are perfectly familiar with, and a phrase that can only be used when there are two parties to a contract.

Mr. SPOONER rose.

Mr. MONEY. If the Senator will excuse me a moment, a modus vivendi means an agreement between two sovereigns for a tentative or temporary relation pending negotiations between them that it is supposed will lead to a treaty ultimately.

Mr. SPOONER. Let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that he is undeniably correct, in my opinion, in saying that it is not a modus vivendi, and that the application of that phrase to it is absurd.

Mr. MONEY. Of course I am glad to accept the affirmation of the distinguished Senator in this matter, but I am speakiug of the character of the arrangement by which the fiscal matters are being managed there in that Republic. As a matter of fact, this modus vivendi is nothing of the sort. It is a decree of this President Morales, assisted in its make-up by two or three of his friends, I presume members of his cabinet. And then he appoints whom? A man recommended as very competent and worthy for the place by the President of the United States, and that man assisted by whom? By a man whom he appoints without anybody's recommendation. And those two Americans are there to-day, dispensing the business of that country, collecting its revenues and making a deposit, after the 45 per cent allowed for the current expenses of the Government of Dominica, in a bank in New York, which the Senator says will be the property of the Republic of Santo Domingo. As a matter of fact, it is there subject to drafts drawn by Morales, every one of which must be countersigned by Colonel Colton, of the port of Bahia.

Then these two American citizens who have been selected, one by the President and the other by the first, to administer these affairs are both borne upon the rolls as civil officers of the United States. They are absent indefinitely with leave and without pay. They are lost to the service of this country for the time being, but carried on its rolls to enable this black republic to struggle out of the maze that has been caused by twenty-eight revolutions in about the same number of years, having had in that brief space of time twenty-four Presidents, only one of whom was elected, the others coming in as this one did—by assassination.

Now, this is a pretty mess into which the United States chooses to enter itself—I will not say the United States, but its Executive Chief—without the consent of Congress, upon a treaty based upon an instrument that was two years old before it was brought to the attention of the Senate and which, in my opinion, would never have been brought here if it had not been discovered that such a treaty was in existence; a treaty that, in the first place, is signed by an American minister who signs himself as representing the Republic of the United States of North America—as if there was such a republic on the face of the globe—who did not even know the name of the government he represented there.

Now, by this treaty, which is not under discussion, and it would be out of place to mention it if it were, except in executive session, we are called upon to subscribe to a modus vivendi, a decree by this President and two of his friends, and submit to him for his use two officers of the United States, and to have at the command of those officers a fleet of six men-of-war of differing sizes and classes, of course, and according to another report eleven vessels of war. In other words, we are about to embark upon the business of taking care of other people and attending to other business than our own, departing from the time-honored custom of Washington and Jefferson to stay at home and enter into no alliances except those of a strictly commercial character, and it is expected that this Senate and the people of the United States are to approve of this proceeding.

Then Venezuela comes in with her eighty revolutions in eighty-one years. In fact, as a traveler once said in the Revue des Deux Mondes, from Patagonia to Panama it was one series of unvarying despotism tempered by assassination.

And now where will we end? Because the President has said to us that if these several republics lying south will behave themselves, pay their debts, abstain from disorders and riotous conduct, and not loosen the bonds of civilization, we will be very helpful to them, as he is being now in Santo Domingo; but if they do not pay their debts and should become in any manner in his judgment unseemly, then we have the "big stick," that we have heard so much about, come into play. Walk softly with the "big stick" and you will go far with the President, which by recent light I interpret to mean that the "big stick" is to be displayed upon weaker republics and we are to walk softly among the greater nations of the world.

Now, Mr. President, whatever may be the fate of the measure pending, whenever you introduce here a discussion of the act of the President in that regard it seems to me almost indefensible. I do not wish to say anything that would detract from the power and privilege and prerogative and the constitutional duty of the President to do what in his mind seems best for the interest of this country, but there is such a thing as constitutional limitations upon his power; there is such a thing as limitation by the President; there is such a thing as respect due to the opinion of the world; but when it is believed, as he says he does, that he can better promote the interests of the country by interference without a constitutional warrant for it, it is time for this Senate at least to cry a halt.

The President admitted in the message sent to this honorable body that he had violated international law. Why? Because in his judgment it was better that he should do as he did. According to the decision of the Supreme Court international law is the law of this country. The Constitution does not say so. It says that the laws and treaties passed agreeably to it shall be the law of the land. But the Supreme Court has said in a hundred cases perhaps that international law is a part of the law of the land. So the President sets aside not only international law, but the law of the land, and substitutes his own judgment. I ask you, Senators, what are laws for, whether organic or statutory, but to prohibit and limit the Executive from substituting his will for law; in other words, in this country his will for the will of the whole people of the United States expressed in their statutes, in their treaties, and in the decsions of her courts?

So, Mr. President, I decline to entertain the view expressed by my distinguished and able friend from Wisconsin. I know his mind is clear enough, but we have always to view things from different standpoints. The learned judges upon the bench will differ with the same facts and the same arguments presented by the same distinguished counsel. So I beg leave to differ yet antipodally with him on this question. I do not believe we have any business there. I do not believe the President has any authority to make business there. I think our business is to attend to our own business and let other people alone. This imaginary obligation imposed by the Monroe doctrine is a pure fiction, a mere figment of his brain. It has no lodging place in any conduct of any administration that I am aware of or any doctrine taught by any man that spoke upon the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. MONEY. I yield so far as I am concerned.

Mr. TILLMAN. This debate has gone entirely away from the question.

Mr. MONEY. I beg pardon. I took the floor.

Mr. TILLMAN. I brought this question in as an illustration of something else, and I do not want to cut it off. It is very interesting and instructive, and I am obliged to my brethren on this side of the Chamber for coming to my assistance with their greater familiarity with our foreign relations and international law than I claim to possess. I am dealing with a concrete proposition, and I want to call the Senator's attention to it before I leave. I will give him a chance, but I do not shut him off like he has done me on several occasions. The President, in this message which the Senator has quoted, says:

> This treaty is pending before the Senate. In the meantime a temporary arrangement has been made——

Mr. SPOONER. In what part of the message?

Mr. TILLMAN. On page 28, near the middle.

> In the meantime a temporary arrangement has been made which will last until the Senate has had time to take action upon the treaty.

Mind you, the Senate had time, and the Senate did not want to take action. The Senate adjourned, as it had a right to do. It is a temporary arrangement he made to carry out in effect just what the treaty provided for and that the Senate would not agree to. The Executive steps forward by what I called a trick, accomplishes his own purposes and puts the treaty in operation; and the Senator from Wisconsin, with his magnificent ability as a special pleader—not that he has not got ability that is very magnificent along logical and forceful lines, but with his magnificent ability as a special pleader comes here and undertakes to brush me aside as an ignoramus who knows nothing about the question, and all that kind of thing.

Now, having called his attention to the fact that this thing is being done by arrangement of the President, after the Senate would not do what he asked them to do or wanted them to do, if the Senator wants to pursue it I am willing to give way further.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not rise for the purpose of participating further in debate with the Senator from South Carolina. I will have abundant opportunity to do that later on. I have a fairly good memory, and I am not aware that I have ever shut the Senator from South Carolina off much in the matter of debate with me.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will say in explanation that the Senator was so enthused with the pursuit of his own thought that when I saw a chance to stick, as I imagined, a little bit of a stiletto into his argument and knock it into smithereens or put a quietus on it, I think he must have had a suspicion that there was danger and he could not see me. [Laughter.] I have stood here and said, Mr. President, at least three times, as the RECORD will show, when he was in one of these high flights of oratory, of his pursuing his theme, and he did not hear me, and of course I could not get the ear of the Senator—not that he was not fair or wanted to be unfair, because he fears no man in debate and has no occasion for anything of that sort, but I just simply remarked it in passing. I want to give him every chance in the world, and I want him to pursue this subject, because we have now the time. This is not any short session. We have from now until next December to discuss the question as to whether the Chief Executive has not trenched upon the prerogatives of the Senate and is not pursuing in this and a whole lot of other things, some of which I propose to discuss later if my time does not give out, where he ignores the law and does as he pleases, so to speak; and his brethren on the other side seem to be unwilling to stop him.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, only a moment. Now and then when I have a little time on my hands to waste I look at one of my speeches in the Senate and I find the time pretty evenly divided between the Senator and myself. I never objected to his interrupting me but once, as I recollect it. I find another thing, too, that invariably whenever the Senator has been hard pushed, not by anything, of course, except facts or a sound proposition that was put at him, he has immediately delivered a eulogium on my magnificent ability as a special pleader. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. What is the fact in this case? [Laughter.]

Mr. SPOONER. It is the same old fact.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is not a fact, all the same.

Mr. SPOONER. I undertook simply to relate to the Senator what I understood to be the difference between the situation as it is to-day and the situation as it would have been——

Mr. TELLER rose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to remind Senators that the rule requires that before they can take the floor they must be recognized by the Chair.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is in order.

Mr. SPOONER. I am not discussing in any way the treaty. That is not permitted under our rules. I have only intended to narrate, as I understand them, the facts, to show the Senator from South Carolina the difference between the situation as it exists and the situation as it would exist had the treaty been ratified and put into operation.

Now, I do not want the Senator from Mississippi to leave the inference, unchallenged by me, that I announced in the observations I was permitted by the Senator from South Carolina to address to the Senate any adhesion to the theory that it is part of the Monroe doctrine or a corollary thereof that the Government of the United States shall attempt to appoint itself receiver of all defaulting South American republics. I have not understood that that is involved in this question at all. That is all I wish to say.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will not go away.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator need have no alarm.

Mr. TILLMAN. I just wanted to get through this and dismiss it and go on to something else.

Mr. SPOONER. I will be here.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I will resume before I dismiss the phase of this debate, which has been emphasized by the Senator from Wisconsin, by reading a brief extract from the President's message relating to the present situation in Santo Domingo:

> Under this arrangement the Dominican Government has—

That temporary arrangement which I mentioned a little while ago—

> Under this arrangement the Dominican Government has appointed Americans to all the important positions in the customs service—

An arrangement made between Morales and President Roosevelt, mind you, and it takes two to make such an arrangement—

> and they are seeing to the honest collection of the revenues, turning over 45 per cent to the Government for running expenses and putting the other 55 per cent into a safe depository for equitable division, in case the treaty shall be ratified, among the various creditors, whether European or American.

This question, I presume, will be debated at great length later on, and I want to say here and now I had not the slightest idea or purpose of precipitating any discussion of it in open Senate, or even to participate in it in executive session when we shall come to consider the treaty. But before dismissing the subject I want to emphasize the point that practically the situation is the same as though the treaty had been ratified.

I was trying to speak to the point, when this side issue was raised, that we have since we entered upon the imperial policy discovered that we are a great nation, governing the Philippines, having conquered them with the bayonet, governing them arbitrarily, without any regard to the rights of the governed or anything of that sort, ignoring and abandoning all of our time-honored principles of government, turning our backs on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and all that kind of thing—I was pointing out that we have progressed very far in these seven or eight years along the line of Executive usurpation and of apparent, if not actual, servility and cowardice on the part of both branches of Congress in dealing with the Executive in his encroachments upon the prerogatives of the legislative branch of the Government. I had got to that point, and was illustrating, simply as one of the things which had been done, the action in regard to Santo Domingo. I have some others that will relate more particularly to this appropriation bill which we are discussing, and I want to illustrate the trend of Executive thought and the conditions.

The Secretary of War, in a speech which he delivered in St. Louis on November 18 last, speaks about the Panama Canal Commission. I will read from his speech. He said:

> The President had submitted to Congress during the winter of 1904–5 a recommendation for amendment to the law by which he should be given a freer hand in the number of agents to be selected by him for the work which the act of Congress made it mandatory upon him to perform. He informed Congress that the method of construction by a commission of seven was clumsy and ineffective. The House of Representatives gave the requested power to the President in a bill which it sent to the Senate.
>
> There the bill met determined opposition, and in the short session it was entirely possible for its enemies to defeat it.

With the result that is mentioned by Mr. Taft. And in order to accomplish his purpose again, ostensibly obeying the law, but really not obeying it at all, he secured the resignation of those seven commissioners. Then Secretary Taft proceeded to say:

> And appointed a new Commission under certain regulations as to their procedure, by which he hoped to secure in practice greater centraliza-

tion of power in the hands of a chairman and an executive committee less than the whole Commission, with its acts subject to confirmation by the Commission.

Finally, here is the accusation, baldy and boldy made, that the enemies of this proposed change in the character or the composition of the Canal Commission had been able to defeat it in the Senate, an indication that there are probably malign influences here or that the Executive will was not obeyed here absolutely and implicitly, and therefore it was necessary, in the judgment of the man at the White House, to go along anyhow under the responsibility imposed on him to build this canal.

Now, it is to deal with this new Commission—some of its personnel—that I want to talk a little. Under the general authority given to the President to construct the canal, without limitations as to the number of his agents, the amount of their compensation, or anything like that—spending $135,000,000 at least, probably $335,000,000, nobody knows how much before we get through with it—instead of Congress taking the time and trouble to provide for some machinery that would have limitations and restrictions upon it, and legal bars to climb over before certain things could be done, everything is in the hands of the President. The President appoints a Commission, puts it under the control of the Secretary of War, and the Commission thus constituted, under the general suprevision of the Secretary, and finally under the presonal direction and control of the President—the Secretary being his intermediary and agent—has done certain things. The first is the appointment of that Commission. I will read their names, though Senators are familiar with them, and I will state their compensation.

Name.	Position.	Salary.
T. P. Shonts	Chairman of Commission	$30,000
C. E. Magoon	Commissioner and governor of Zone	17,500
M. T. Endicott, U. S. N.	Commissioner	7,500
O. H. Ernst, U. S. A	do	7,500
P. C. Hains, U. S. A	do	7,500
B. M. Harrod	do	7,500

Here I note something that I want light on. Mr. Endicott, as we all know, is Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Navy Department. "Admiral" is his official title. He gets as admiral $6,220 a year, while his compensation as canal Commissioner is $7,500, an addition of nearly $1,300. Mr. Ernst, who is in the Army as a colonel of engineers, gets $5,220 a year as such Army officer, and $7,500 as a Commissioner—an increase of $2,300. P. C. Hains, United States Army, who is a retired brigadier-general, gets $4,125 a year as an Army officer, and his salary as Commissioner is $7,500.

I read section 1763 of the Revised Statutes. It may not apply to this matter, but I want some of the lawyers on both sides to listen to this, and tell me whether it does not apply; and if not, why not.

SEC. 1763. No person who holds an office the salary or annual compensation attached to which amounts to the sum of $2,500 shall receive compensation for discharging the duties of any other office, unless expressly authorized by law.

Now, these three men whom I have mentioned as Commissioners are only three of many, but I should like to have it settled, at least in the minds of Senators, whether or not it is a lawful exercise of Executive authority to make appointments that appear to be absolutely prohibited by the statute.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from South Carolina permit me to interrupt him?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. BACON. Has the Senator the Spooner Act before him?

Mr. TILLMAN. No; I have not.

Mr. BACON. I want to use it in reply to the question the Senator has asked.

Mr. ALLISON. Section 7 of the Spooner Act.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina has asked for an explanation of the matter. I can probably give it to him. With his permission, I will endeavor to do so.

I think that the criticism made by the Senator is eminently proper to be made in all cases where the law does not authorize a departure from the restriction in the section read by him—that is, where there is not some other statute. I have had occasion formerly to remark that in the Senate, in instances where officers of the Army were on duty in Cuba, and where very large sums of money were allowed to them, as I thought then and still think, in absolute contravention and violation of the provision of law which the Senator from South Carolina has read. I think, however, in this case the seventh section of what is known as the Spooner Act does authorize the appointment of Army and Navy officers to these positions and does contemplate that they shall be paid sums other than the amounts specified by the law as their salaries as such military and naval officers.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator please read it?

Mr. BACON. I will; and I will state to the Senator that if he will mark the language and give it a reasonable construction I do not see how any other conclusion can be reached. Of course the mind of the framer of a law as to the construction of its provisions is not the legislative mind, and his decision is not a decision that is conclusive by any means as to the proper construction of a law, but his intention in framing it may assist in such construction. As I stated a few days ago, when this statute was under consideration it so happens that that particular provision of this law was drafted by myself. If it does not plainly express the intention I have indicated it is my fault in not having used sufficiently plain language. But that was the intention I had in drafting it. I will read the entire section in order that it may appear in the RECORD, since the question has been raised. Section 7 of what is known as the Spooner Act is in these words:

SEC. 7. That to enable the President to construct the canal and works appurtenant thereto as provided in this act, there is hereby created the Isthmian Canal Commission, the same to be composed of seven members, who shall be nominated and appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall serve until the completion of said canal unless sooner removed by the President, and one of whom shall be named as the chairman of said Commission. Of the seven members of said Commission at least four of them shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering, and of the four at least one shall be an officer of the United States Army, and at least one other shall be an officer of the United States Navy, the said officers respectively being either upon the active or the retired list of the Army or of the Navy. Said Commissioners shall each receive such compensation as the President shall prescribe until the same shall have been otherwise fixed by the Congress. In addition to the members of said Isthmian Canal Commission the President is hereby authorized through said Commission to employ in said service any of the engineers of the United States Army at his discretion, and likewise to employ any engineers in civil life, at his discretion, and any other persons necessary for the proper and expeditious prosecution of said work. The compensation of all such engineers and other persons employed under this act shall be fixed by said Commission, subject to the approval of the President. The official salary of any officer appointed or employed under this act shall be deducted from the amount of salary or compensation provided by or which shall be fixed under the terms of this act.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to read the remaining part of the section, for I think the part I have read covers the ground and answers the question of the Senator from South Carolina.

If the Senator will pardon me a moment further, I will simply call his attention to the provisions which were attempted to be expressed there as the intention of the law.

In the first place, there is an express authorization for the appointment of Army officers and Navy officers, not only those who should be nominated or named as Commissioners, but also Army officers who should be appointed as engineers. There is also express authority to the President as to the Commissioners, and to the Commissioners as to the other officers, to fix the salaries—speaking generally—and including Army and Navy officers, without limitation or exception.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator pardon me a moment?

Mr. BACON. Just one second. In the same connection there is the distinct statement that an officer of the Army or of the Navy who should be thus appointed should have the amount of his official salary as an Army or Navy officer deducted from his salary as an employee in the construction of the canal. This clearly indicates that the Army and Navy officers who should be selected for this work should have the same salaries as civilian officers selected for similar work. The provision that their salaries as military or naval officers should be deducted from the salaries thus fixed for them in connection with their canal work leaves no possible escape from that conclusion.

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, I am entirely satisfied now. I had not run on that fact. Of course I knew about the statute prohibiting a man holding two offices and getting paid for them, but I had not run on that particular provision in what is called the "Spooner Act," is it?

Mr. BACON. Yes. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] will not misconstrue my not having stopped at the moment he asked.

Mr. SPOONER. I only wanted to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the act referred to not only conferred upon the President the authority to appoint an Army officer or a Navy officer, but absolutely required him to do it.

Mr. BACON. Yes; it does.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not complaining of that at all, because I think the Army and Navy of the United States have as fine engineers as the world can produce, and I am a little surprised that we did not find one of those officers who was competent to take charge of this canal as chief and build it upon the same

lines of thoroughness and efficiency and economy as the Congressional Library building over here was constructed. I think the work of constructing that building was performed under an Army engineer, was it not?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. As I said, I merely wanted to get light. I do not know whether I give any light, but I break a hole through the glass so that somebody else can get some sometimes. [Laughter.]

Having disposed of the question as to the legality of the action of putting the Army and Navy officers under the Canal Commission at an increased compensation, the next query that presents itself to my mind is—well, I will say the advisability of taking a man, as Admiral Endicott, who, while he is a very eminent engineer and a man of very high attainments, is about the hardest-worked man I know of in the Navy Department or in any other Department, for he has charge of the construction of all the great docks and other improvements at our various navy-yards, and I know that he is up to the eyes, if not buried, in work, with no opportunity to do more than possibly consult when any question of great engineering moment might be before the Commission. Then the inquiry is, If he can not in the very nature of things, without neglecting his present duties, attend to the duties of a Commissioner, why should they increase his salary at all? He certainly can not go to the Isthmus. He certainly is not going to run any danger of getting malaria or swamp fever or yellow fever or any of the other troubles which might warrant an increase of compensation; and I am willing to acknowledge that an Army officer or Navy officer or civilian who goes to the Isthmus and runs the risks there ought to get better compensation than an employee in this country. That is all right. I do not object to that at all. I myself would not be willing to go there without getting increased compensation; and I always like to treat the other fellow as I should like to be treated myself.

So I am not objecting to that. But the question now is to get back to Mr. Shonts. He receives $30,000 a year. The justification for it, as set forth by Mr. Taft, who is the President's mouthpiece in a measure in this matter, besides what the President said in his message, is that Mr. Shonts has had the experience of a railroad man. He is not or was not president of a great railroad system, because, examining the Railway Guide yesterday, I found out that the Clover Leaf Railroad, of which he was president, only runs from Toledo to St. Louis, and has no forks or branches. It is a straight shoot of 500 or 600 or may be 800 miles; I do not know exactly. Anyhow, I should not consider it as a very great railroad, as railroads go. He may have been president of other railroads; I do not know. He may be the very best man for this place that can be found in the United States; I do not know. Having his road, though, run through prairie, most of the way on a perfectly level country, there are very few engineering problems that anybody connected with it has had to solve; and if his presidency of that railroad did not have something behind it in the way of experience elsewhere, or at least of qualifications that had been shown to exist in other work, I should not consider that as being any very strong proof of his fitness.

But I have got nothing to say about that one way or the other. I propose to deal with Mr. Shonts as the chief executive of this Commission in the light of certain things that have come to my knowledge and have been suggested to me in the hearing we had. In the first place, I have understood that when Mr. Shonts was appointed—sometime last April, I believe it was—he was given to understand, or at least it was the common expectation and so announced, that just so soon as he could wind up his connection with the railroad he would resign and devote his whole time to canal work. Does anybody know whether he has resigned or not? I ask the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON].

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know. I think he has resigned; but I am not certain.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have looked in the Railway Guide for November, in the big book that we are all in the habit of looking into when we want to hunt up our schedules when we desire to roam around—and I roam around a little occasionally—and I saw that he was put down as president of the Clover Leaf Railroad.

Mr. ALLISON. He may be.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure; always.

Mr. HALE. From my information on this subject, I think the Government was very fortunate in securing the services of Mr. Shonts. I know something about him. He is a man of great executive ability. He had displayed that not only in reference to the railroad of which he was president, but in other railroad enterprises. He is a man after the Senator's order of mind; he is courageous; he takes responsibility; he knows how to say "no," and, from my acquaintance with him, I believe he has the discrimination to settle the proper time when to say "no;" and he has great force and executive ability. I think if he is given pretty free rein he will advance that work down there faster than anybody else ever has advanced it or is likely to.

I did not mean, in rising, to interrupt the Senator to go generally into this matter, but as special attention has been called to it I thought perhaps the Senator might not be unwilling for me to give my views about Mr. Shonts and his relation to the enterprise.

Now, as to whether technically there has been a resignation of his presidency of that railroad, I do not know. I supposed that he had resigned. I know that when he took up the canal work it was upon the agreement that he should give his entire time and ability to it and that he should in great degree have control and not be hampered in the work. He is that kind of man that he does not desire any kind of work unless he can carry out his views to their ultimate result. I think I may say that, while I do not know whether technically he has presented his resignation or not, he has given himself faithfully and his entire time to this work.

Later in the discussion I may have something more to say about this, but just at this time I wanted to say that in relation to Mr. Shonts.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want the Senate clearly to understand that I am not after any particular man. I had never heard of Mr. Shonts, except through the newspapers, until his appointment. I saw him the other day and was favorably impressed with him. I have no malice against him. I am not gunning for him at all, as the phrase might be. He may be the right man in the right place; I hope he is; but I am merely dealing with the general management as we find it and trying to get at the true inwardness of the situation.

The Senator says he thinks Mr. Shonts has resigned. How many times has he been to the Isthmus in the seven or eight months that he has held office? Twice, I understand, and then for a week only.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, with pleasure. If I am misstating or misunderstanding conditions, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. HALE. My understanding is that the fundamental act requires that there be—I may be wrong—sessions held on the Isthmus four times a year.

Mr. TILLMAN. A session might be an hour or it might be a month.

Mr. ALLISON. The requirement in regard to sessions on the Isthmus is in the President's order.

Mr. HALE. It is in the President's order, based upon the Spooner Act, but I do not think it is contemplated that the chairman of the Commission shall spend most of his time on the Isthmus. The engineer necessarily has to do so, as has Governor Magoon.

Mr. TILLMAN. Governor Magoon has really very little or no connection with the canal. It is Mr. Stevens at present, and it was formerly Mr. Wallace.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Stevens is engineer and does necessarily have to reside on the Isthmus, and Governor Magoon is part of the machinery of the whole thing.

Mr. TILLMAN. He is running the civil branch down there, and he is at Panama.

Mr. HALE. He is at Panama. But if the civil machinery runs badly it would interfere with the canal. He stays on the Isthmus. How much time Mr. Shonts has spent there I do not know, but, knowing him as I do, I do not believe he has in any way shirked any responsibilities and come away from the Isthmus when he was needed there.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not charge that he has. I am merely trying to find out how he is discharging the great and important duty that has been imposed upon him, for which he is being so well paid. I understand he has only been there twice—one week in July and one week in October; and I see in the New York Herald of this morning an article from a special correspondent, in which he says that all those from Washington connected with the Canal Commission, including Mr. Shonts, who go down there, act as though they were expecting to catch yellow fever as soon as they get off the ship and they hustle at a double-quick to get away. I presume I would like to get away, too, if I was running that risk, but still a man ought not to be

paid for something he does not do, and at least as the important head of a great work it would appear necessary for Mr. Shonts thoroughly to familiarize himself with all the conditions there of any moment and to be able intelligently to direct from here the campaign in building the canal. That is the only contention I am trying to make.

Mr. HALE. The Senator has expressed that very well. He has expressed in words better than I could what Mr. Shonts's duty is—so to inform himself of conditions there that he is able to manage and supervise and see that the right thing is done. I have no doubt Mr. Shonts has done just that.

Mr. TILLMAN. I would a heap rather have a committee go down there, run the risk of getting yellow fever, and have a fight with the mosquitoes, and not carry along a bucket of whitewash prepared to smear it on anything they found wrong, and come away and say so. There are some reasons why I have that opinion, and I will give them before I get through.

I wish now to ask another question. Mr. W. Leon Pepperman, who is chief clerk of the Commission, or rather he is assistant chief, as they call it, is also, I am informed, or was, an employee or official of the Clover Leaf road, and is still an employee of the Clover Leaf road, and is doing work for it. Is that true or not?

Mr. HALE. I can only say that I do not know the least thing about it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am sorry we did not go a little more fully into this investigation when we had Mr. Shonts and those other gentlemen in the Appropriations Committee room the other day. The thing was so hurried there and there seemed to be such intense pressure to get this money available that we did not really probe as deeply and as thoroughly into the various phases of this business as I think we ought to have done. This phase of it will illustrate the absolute necessity, as I take it, for the Interoceanic Canals Committee to begin, at the very earliest date after it has been organized and the vacancies have been filled, to perform its legitimate functions as the intermediary between the Senate and the canal and its control and direction, and give us light whenever we ask for it and be able intelligently to discuss these matters.

Mr. HALE. I agree entirely with the Senator that that committee ought to do that.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not see how they are going to do it unless they go down there. I do not want the Senate to order them off on a kind of a risky expedition that might involve some of them being hauled home on ice, but the duty should be imposed on somebody, and I confess I want to see it performed.

Mr. HALE. Now, will the Senator allow me for a moment? This reference to Mr. Pepperman——

Mr. TILLMAN. I simply ask for information whether or not he is still an employee or an officer of the Clover Leaf road and is not engaged a good part of his time in transacting railroad business?

Mr. HALE. If the Senator has investigated——

Mr. TILLMAN. I am asking. I want to know. I want somebody else to investigate. I can not investigate.

Mr. HALE. Nobody has any absolute knowledge or is infallible about this matter. I do not believe it is true. I doubt if the Senator has, although he may have, information, any more than a statement or rumor, that this man Pepperman, who is employed on the canal work, employed by the Isthmian Canal Commission, employed by Mr. Shonts as its chairman, with whom he had been associated in railroad work before, who certainly has duties enough to absorb all his time and all his ability, is at the same time employed by a railroad corporation and is giving them a part of his time and is being paid therefor.

I shall be very much surprised, Mr. President, if investigation by whomsoever it is made discloses that fact. Should it disclose that fact, I should say that that is a grievance and a wrong which ought to be righted at once. We hear a great many things; we hear a great many rumors, and statements are made in reference to this and that which investigation does not disclose as being well founded.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am only sorry, as I said, that we did not have more time, or were not able in the brief time at our disposal, to make examination of the gentlemen before the committee. If they swear or say on their honor that they are no longer connected with the road and have received no compensation for work done for the road, that will satisfy me.

Mr. HALE. If we had thought of it——

Mr. TILLMAN. I say it illustrates the miserable policy we are pursuing, if the Senator will permit me. As long as the House of Representatives, under its present organization—and I have no right possibly to mention it even, because I want to be entirely respectful to the coordinate legislative body—continues the policy of making bond provisions and emergency appropriations parts of the same bill and will not allow examination, and the committee report it under the rule and gag everybody and double-quick it through and send it over here, and then we in less degree imitate their drastic processes and double-quick it through, so long the intelligent performance of our duties is impossible; and having no hope that the House is going to change its procedure, at least in the near future, it impresses upon me the greater responsibility of the Senate to legislate intelligently and to be able to inform the country just what is going on, and be able to justify any appropriations of public money and be able also in a measure to certify to its honest expenditure.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is all I am trying to bring about.

Mr. HALE. But the Senator will recognize the situation. We were confronted with an undoubted and an undisputed necessity for making this appropriation early. It did not come within our province to go into all of the investigation with reference to the situation. But I think the Senator will bear me out that as a result of the day, the long day, which we spent in faithful examination, in bringing these officials before us and searching them with such questioning as brought out the facts, and important facts, the committee obtained a very valuable education.

Now, I do not say that it did all that it could have done if it had been a committee to which was intrusted the whole subject-matter. If it had been that kind of a committee and we had gone into it to that extent, it would have taken weeks, and the other committee of the Senate that will take it up, whenever it reaches it, will find its work very laborious and very extended and most important.

But I think the Senator, who has been long a member, and an active and important member, of the Committee on Appropriations, will see that, confronted as we were with the necessity of making this appropriation, we could not spend more time on it. The holidays were impending. It is well known you can not keep Senators here. It will be all that the veteran chairman of the committee, who has charge of this bill, can do to get the bill in conference before the House and Senate practically dissolve, and the Members hie away to their respective homes. We had that in view, and the committee is a practical kind of a committee, dealing with all those questions, and I do not think the Senator himself, with his experience in the Senate and on that committee, will say seriously that he thinks we have slighted the public interest in not going into all these questions.

It did not occur to me that there was any question—I never heard it raised—that either Mr. Shonts, whom I do know a good deal about, and Mr. Pepperman, about whom I know little or nothing, was still connected in any way with any railroad enterprise, and not giving his entire time to the canal business. I hope an investigation will show to the Senator that while this has been stated to him, or a memorandum given to him, he will find he is mistaken in that regard.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to say in addition to what has been said, and so well said, by the Senator from Maine, that the inquiry by the Senator now in respect to these two gentlemen is the first intimation I have ever had that either or both of them were not giving their whole time to this work in which they are engaged. I had not for a moment supposed that in the examination we had the other day it was necessary to ask Mr. Shonts if he was giving his attention to this business, nor did I for a moment suppose that Mr. Pepperman was not doing it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. CULBERSON. I wish to say to the Senator from South Carolina that I have no personal acquaintance with Mr. Pepperman, but as a member of the Philippines Committee I know he has been connected for some time with the War Department. He was connected with the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the War Department before he had any connection with the Panama Canal, as I understand. While I am unable to state positively that he no longer has any connection with any railroad company, I think it altogether improbable that he has any such connection.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not going to be satisfied, I will state right here, with anybody's belief, because beliefs do not answer in this case. I will take the words of these gentlemen that they have severed their connection and the dates when they did it. That is all; and there is no need for this quasi or indirect defense. The best evidence, according to my knowledge of evidence, is to get it direct; and these gentlemen are available, and let us get it direct.

Mr. HALE. Indeed we will.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well——

Mr. HALE. I have just had this statement given me:

Pepperman was never with the Clover Leaf or any other road. He has been in the Government service for ten years or more—in the civil government of the Philippine Islands and chief clerk of the Insular Bureau before being transferred to the canal work.

That is in correspondence with the impression of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON].

Mr. TILLMAN. By whom is that signed?

Mr. HALE. I do not know who it is.

Mr. TILLMAN. I would rather the Senator would not read it. We do not want any anonymous communications sent in here.

Mr. HALE. I venture to say it is better authority and will be better borne out by the facts on investigation than the so-called authority that the Senator has launched upon the Senate and charged this man with what has never taken place.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not charged it. I have made an inquiry.

Mr. HALE. No; but the Senator has stated——

Mr. TILLMAN. No; I did not state. I said it was what I have heard.

Mr. HALE. That is it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well.

Mr. HALE. This is what I have heard.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; you did not hear that. You got that in writing. You can not even tell who wrote it.

Mr. HALE. Neither has the Senator stated how he heard that this man is still employed by the railroad company. The Senator can take this memorandum. Nobody would send me a memorandum unless he knew what he was talking about.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is very easy to write a thing. I want the Canal Committee, for which I wanted to get a job the other day, given some work. I am afraid they will grow rusty unless somebody puts them to work.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is wrong about this man.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope I am. I would be the last one to accuse a man of something that might be offcolor or dishonest. I make an inquiry that is very necessary to be made. If you get the Railway Guide of the United States, you will find Mr. Shonts's name in it. Take the Railway Guide for November, the month just gone, and he is still noted as president of the Clover Leaf road, and is published as such. It may be that the printer had the type stereotyped and did not take the trouble to change it, but I think that the Clover Leaf Railroad keeps up with the changes in administration as well as with the changes in schedules.

Mr. HALE. I can say to the Senator that this memorandum was handed to me while on my feet by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KITTREDGE], who is on the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. It was given to him by a well-known correspondent here in Washington, who signs his name, and the Senator can read it. I think it is Ohl.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not sufficiently interested in that to care to read it.

Mr. HALE. I see the Senator is not. I am.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not, for this reason: If these men should state that they are not still connected with the railroad and are not getting paid by it for work done for it while they are getting pay from the Government as canal commissioners and officers, I want to know it. There is so much in the shape of smoke—stench, I had almost said—that I should like to have the thing ventilated fully.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Senator will not make any more charges as serious as this one——

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not made any charges.

Mr. HALE. Unless he has some testimony.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have not made a charge. I have asked a question. I thought you gentlemen on the other side would probably be able to answer it authoritatively, but you are not.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. TILLMAN. Always.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from South Carolina says he has information on the subject or has learned that Mr. Shonts, for example, is still president of the Clover Leaf Railroad Company.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have given the Railway Guide, which can be found in the Sergeant-at-Arms's office, as authority for it.

Mr. ALLISON. I was about to ask the Senator if he had knowledge of this on yesterday.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; I did not. I went in and looked myself as soon as I heard he was connected with the Clover Leaf road.

Mr. ALLISON. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that this information was in the possession of the Senator from South Carolina yesterday, and therefore he could have asked the question.

Mr. TILLMAN. I did not know yesterday, but if I had known it yesterday it would have availed nothing, as it was day before yesterday when we had our hearing in the Appropriations Committee room. I certainly would not have gone out without asking the question if I had known about it then.

So much for that. Now, let us come to another phase. In the hearing we had before the committee the other day it was brought out that among the appointees or employees of the Canal Commission is one gentleman by the name of Bishop, whose duties were pretty clearly set forth in that hearing—I will read them directly—but about the necessity for whose employment we were not entirely satisfied. I find in the minutes of the Isthmian Canal Commission of October 30 this resolution:

Upon motion of Commissioner Ernst, seconded by Commissioner Hains, it was

Resolved, That to facilitate the dispatch of current business at Washington office of the Commission, the chairman be, and he hereby is, empowered to authorize and direct in writing the secretary of the Commission or other employee of the Commission to approve for payment, under the caption "By direction of the chairman," vouchers for any payments by the Commission, and to make requisition for supplies for the maintenance of said Washington office.

Mr. Bishop is Mr. Shonts's appointee, and it appears that there are occasions when both Shonts and Pepperman are absent from the main office here, and that it was necessary, in order to have the business go on, for somebody else to be authorized to sign. So Mr. Bishop was empowered in that resolution. I will deal a little more fully with Mr. Bishop by reading from the testimony of Secretary Taft at the hearing:

Senator TILLMAN. I notice that the secretary of the Commission gets $10,000.

Secretary TAFT. Yes, sir.

Senator TILLMAN. Does the Commission sit here?

Secretary TAFT. It does, part of the time.

Senator TILLMAN. Practically all the time?

Secretary TAFT. Practically; it sat here most of the time.

Senator TILLMAN. I say, practically all the time?

Secretary TAFT. Well, its minutes are kept here. The records are kept here, and a very large part of the clerical work is done here, though by direction it has to meet four times a year on the Isthmus.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I know the Senator has got away from Mr. Pepperman, but perhaps he will allow me, as I have the official record from the Bureau of Insular Affairs, to state that Mr. Pepperman went to the Philippines, in our civil service, in 1900, but for many years previous to that he had been an examiner under the Civil Service Commission in Washington; that after he returned from the Philippines, in 1901, he entered the Bureau of Insular Affairs, where he has remained until the present time; and, so far as the Bureau of Insular Affairs knows, he has had no connection whatever with any railroad at all, but has been in the service of the Government for the last ten or fifteen years.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is all right, but I want Mr. Pepperman himself to say. I am not going to take any secondary evidence when I can get the original man; that is all.

Mr. LODGE. That is the report of the bureau in which he has been employed.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not want to appear to doubt the integrity of purpose and the perfect honesty and honorable dealing of any of these gentlemen. I do not want——

Mr. LODGE. But, Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina, with no authority that I have heard him cite except that of rumor, has been casting very serious reflections on this gentleman. I never heard of Mr. Pepperman in my life until the other day, but I think any man is entitled to be taken on the official record furnished by the War Department rather than on the rumors of newspapers until at least he can be heard from.

Mr. TILLMAN. I only want to have him heard from instead of having Senators get up here and give us secondary evidence. That is all there is to it.

I have received a communication, and I will see what it says. [After a pause, reading:]

I have just talked over the 'phone with Mr. Pepperman, whom I know very well. He was never and is not now connected with the Clover Leaf Railroad. He has been in Government service twelve years, and I am sorry that somebody apparently has misinformed you.

All right. I apologize to Mr. Pepperman.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator's correspondent may have been talking to some other man over the 'phone.

Mr. TILLMAN. Hardly. We almost always recognize the voice. I could tell the voice of the Senator from Wisconsin,

even from Milwaukee, at my house over the long-distance telephone. I will gamble on it. That is a little too thin. That is some more special pleading.

I come back to Mr. Bishop, since Mr. Pepperman has disappeared and is not a person who is a little off on drawing two salaries.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from South Carolina was a little off.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will say I was a little off. I am willing to acknowledge it, and when that is the case will straighten up things any time and anywhere. I hope Mr. Shonts will come out of the situation with equal credit to himself—honestly I do. I was reading from the testimony of Secretary Taft.

Mr. FORAKER. What page?

Mr. TILLMAN. Page 53.

Senator TILLMAN. I notice that particular officer [Mr. Bishop] because I can not see why the mere keeping of the records of the work of the Commission requires so much skill or so much brains.

Secretary TAFT. He is the historian of the Commission. He was employed at a time when it was thought necessary to have a man of very considerable journalistic experience, for the reason that the attacks on the canal, its construction, and the preposterous misrepresentations concerning everything, both on the Isthmus and here, had gotten to such a point that it seemed necessary for the Commission to protect itself in some way.

Senator TILLMAN. So he is the press agent, then, of whom we have heard in the debate?

Secretary TAFT. You can call him a press agent if you choose to.

Senator TILLMAN. I would not call him that, except from your description of him.

Secretary TAFT. Well, that was added to his duties as the secretary of the Commission, the recorder of the Commission, and its historian.

Senator TILLMAN. Is it the duty of this Commission to run a political campaign to defend itself?

Secretary TAFT. No, sir; but it is the duty of the Commission to correct impressions that are circulated maliciously for the purpose of interfering with its work.

Senator TILLMAN. But ought not those to come through you, through official reports and data, rather than through communications to the press?

Secretary TAFT. No; it is not a question of communications to the press. I can communicate matters to the press; but the question is of running down every misrepresentation over this country. He has a record there that would startle people—the stories that have been started with a view simply of impeding the work of the canal?

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure, always.

Mr. SPOONER. Is the Senator reading from page 53?

Mr. TILLMAN. I am reading from page 53 of the first edition. I think they have added to it two or three pages, and you will find it on page 54 or 55 in the edition you have.

Mr. SPOONER. That is what I wanted to interrupt the Senator for. I have page 53, and it does not contain that statement.

Mr. TILLMAN. I got the first publication that was sent to the Committee on Appropriations, and I have not taken the trouble, having marked my copy, to go to the newer and later edition.

We have there the statement by the Secretary, who is, of course, at last directly responsible, for he is Mr. Shonts's superior officer, that the Canal Commission has in its employ a man of ability as a journalist and of long experience. I think in his own testimony he stated that he had been editor of the New York Herald or Tribune, or some such paper, and there is no doubt about his mental acumen and brightness. We found that out very readily when we began to cross-question him. They pay this man $10,000 a year. Yet he has never been to Panama and he has no special aptitude, as I can see, for any work that the Commission needs to have done. It is not, I believe—at least I have never heard it before—customary, to use the phrase of the Senator from Maine; it is an innovation in any Department of the Government, however important, to take the public money and employ a man at a high salary—twice what I get—to exploit its work and to defend it through the press.

It is very evident that his labor, from his own testimony, is comparatively light. The Commission meets only occasionally, all its meetings are short ones, and the mere keeping of the minutes and the other ordinary work of a secretary, I think, could be done by any first-class clerk in this city at $2,000 or $3,000, which would appear to me to have been ample for such a thing or even for a first-class newspaper man. I presume that we have on the newspapers in Washington as bright a class of men as this country affords, and some of them get very high salaries—William E. Curtis, for one that I recall, and several others whose pay goes up into the thousands. But it is the purpose of employing this man that I am criticising or discussing; and he has a clerk whose sole duty appears to be, according to his own statement, to read some hundred and odd leading newspapers from all over the United States, of all the cities, and mark every article that is for or against the Canal Commission's work, in praise of it, or in criticism of it, and anything that strikes him as important he submits to the Canal Commission.

So we find that the process of hypnotizing public opinion or of misinforming the people is in progress here at a very great expense; and the first thing that struck me when this matter was brought out was that people who were entirely innocent and who need no defense would not take the trouble to be worried and put a $10,000 man at work upon the duty of defending them.

The Commission undoubtedly did this by Secretary Taft's approval and also that of the President, and I can not for the life of me see what justification there is for the public money to be spent in that way. The press representatives in Washington may some of them be dirty and low in their instincts, be disposed to lie or misrepresent.

It is charged by Secretary Taft that this crusade, I will say, was an organized one, that the effort to flyblow the work of the Commission and to belittle it, to confuse the public mind, had gone to such length that he felt it absolutely necessary to do something to defend the Commission and keep it from losing the confidence of Congress. There is mention made of a concerted, organized scheme of obstruction which would, as the Secretary feared, produce want of confidence, alarm the public mind as regards the probable ultimate cost of the canal, and in the end defeat it, or if not defeat it bring about a retardation of its construction that would be beneficial to these railroads that were mentioned as furnishing the fund.

Mr. GALLINGER. Hinted at.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Bishop said he himself was offered $12,000 by this opposing organization, and he mentioned the three dead elements of opposition, the Nicaragua route, the Darien route, and the Tehuantepec route as being in the combine; but he was very tender and unwilling to locate the railroad opposition. Now, that is something which our Committee on Interoceanic Canals might, if it sees fit, find out, if it is worth while.

I asked Secretary Taft if he felt there was any instrumentality on earth that could defeat the construction of the Panama Canal now that the United States has gone about it, and he said he did not think it could, but that it would retard it, and that is all these people hope to do. If they are willing to pay $12,000 for Mr. Bishop to lead an organized movement of slander and abuse and misrepresentation and lying, and all that kind of thing, it is worth our while to see whether there is any conspiracy on foot here looking to befuddle the minds of Senators and Congressmen to get us confused.

I remarked, and I still think, that as soon as we get rid of the suspicion which is now abroad, that the Canal Commission and its head, the chief engineer, and Mr. Shonts and others occupying the higher places have gained the confidence of the country—and I hope they will if they have not already got it—that as soon as they shall have demonstrated their business capacity and their earnest zeal in carrying forward this great work successfully at the minimum of expense, all of this swarm of gnats, or mosquitoes, or whatever other simile you might use, of misrepresentation, will disappear entirely.

But I believe the newspapers of this country would be glad to publish the truth. One of them, the Herald, has now a special correspondent on the Isthmus who is sending home some very interesting reading, by the way, which I will bring to the attention of this body presently. While he is only a newspaper correspondent, I happen to know him personally, and I have not the slightest doubt that he is telling the God's truth as he sees it.

It looks like we are almost as far away from the Panama Canal as we were from the Philippines. We never could get anything from there, the trouble being that the language shut off the plaintiff in the case, and we were the defendants, and there never was any indictment brought that would go very far. We got into the administration of the water cure and some cold-blooded murders through that instrumentality, and there were very unpleasant incidents brought out in one way or another; but let us hope for God's sake, for the honor of the country, that we will have nothing of this sort in the way of dishonorable practices and peculation in Panama.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator will bear me out in this statement. I think when the statement made by Mr. Bishop was put before the Committee on Appropriations there was this general feeling about it. In the first place, Mr. Bishop himself did not in any way hesitate or qualify or give any intention of a desire to conceal his relations to the Commission. He stated

in answer to questions put by the Senator, by the chairman, and by me that his duty was as a historian, a literary editor; that his connection with the Commission, so far as any actual clerical or secretary's duties were concerned, was very little. When we followed him up he stated that his method of conducting this position as literary secretary and as historian was twofold—first, to accumulate information for the purpose of writing a history of the canal, which he will do in due time, and, next, to gather newspaper comments and intelligence from the press everywhere and disseminate that. We asked for what purpose, and I used the phrase, "Were you doing this to manufacture public opinion?" His reply was, "Not to manufacture," and I said the phrase was not used offensively, but Mr. Bishop means that it was done for the purpose of creating public sentiment.

Now, I think the feeling admitted universally was that it is an innovation; that for any branch of the Government to seek to make public sentiment by incorporating into its duties a press department that shall communicate with the newspapers for the purpose of creating public sentiment is what has never been done. Every great event in our history has been criticised mercilessly. Every great public man who has illustrated our history and our annals has been cruelly and mercilessly criticised, and has borne it, and has looked to time and the work that he has done to justify him. He has not felt it necessary to have a press bureau in order to create public sentiment. If Mr. Shonts is responsible, or if the Secretary is responsible for this departure from all usage heretofore, I am bound to say that I think they have made a mistake.

But, Mr. President, sensitive, as we should be, to any attempt of this kind to incorporate a press agency with a Department of the Government to manufacture or to make public sentiment, the newspapers ought to be ten times as sensitive as we are to anything of this kind.

Mr. TILLMAN. And I think they are.

Mr. HALE. The press of the country is a great estate. The newspapers make great mistakes and are sometimes cruelly unjust, both to men and to measures. But as a rule their purpose is high because the objects they seek are for the public good, and they are a great and beneficent power in the land.

But, Mr. President, if the Government or any part of the Government establishes as a part of its duties a press agency to create public sentiment through disseminating their statements and their reports to the press, you have got first a prejudiced press; you have got a selected press. The newspapers are selected to disseminate this intelligence and make this public sentiment, and at last, if you have an unscrupulous Administration, you have a hireling press.

The preference that is given by the selection of newspapers to disseminate the Government's views in order to make sentiment before the public is a thing that the newspapers ought to be more sensitive about than we, and we ought to be very sensitive. I think it was the feeling of the entire committee that this was an innovation, and a most unfortunate innovation.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Maine, in his usual forceful way, has stated in better terms than I could the feeling, as I gathered it, of every member who was present. We do not think that it is the business of any department of this Government to take public money to undertake to bamboozle us or the people either, or to defend themselves, whether they are accused justly or unjustly. They must rely upon the integrity of their motives and the purity of their administration to get the confidence of Congress and the good will of the people.

But, nevertheless, we have got this very thing which the Senator has condemned in such strong terms, and we are paying $10,000 for the luxury. I do not know whether it is an oriental method or not, but you know what is meant by the freedom of the press. I rather think this is a Russian method, or a kind of an importation from St. Petersburg as St. Petersburg used to be, by which certain things were inspired.

But Mr. Bishop has been very busy along that line, and when questioned specifically to point out some of the concrete things which his superiors felt were necessary for them to know, to give an illustration, for instance, of the kind of work he did for his money, he mentioned three newspapers as having published some four or five weeks or two months back some very false and erroneous statements in regard to what was going on and the attitude of this Commission, one being the Washington Post, one being the Savannah Morning News, and one being the Charleston News and Courier. I find upon examination that they are practically all three the same thing; that there is absolutely no difference in them except the little caption or starter. It is the same story, and I do not think them of sufficient moment to incorporate as illustrating the kind of ducks Mr. Bishop has been shooting. They are too pitiful and contemptible for anybody to have been alarmed at or to have given a moment's thought to, because the newspapers are teeming with such stories every day almost, written by Tom, Dick, and Harry for a dollar or two, and they go in one ear and out the other.

I have, however, here a somewhat more or less direct charge which occurred in the New York World of Sunday, September 10. It relates to the action of Chairman Shonts in letting the contract for the eating houses on the Isthmus, or the running, I will say, of the hotel privileges or commissary. I will have this, with the consent of the Senate, incorporated in my remarks without reading it.

Mr. GALLINGER. What paper is it in?

Mr. TILLMAN. It is from the New York World of September 10, and would appear to be a charge that is very serious and that needs investigation. If it were like those that Mr. Bishop illustrated with by sending to us, I would not incorporate it, but this came from another source and has sufficient weight behind it to make it worthy of the consideration of the Interoceanic Canal Committee to go to the root of it. It, as I said, relates to the letting of the contract by Mr. Shonts to one J. E. Markel.

Mr. TELLER. Let it be read.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is getting late, and I do not want to take all day. If the Senator wants to hear it I will send it to the desk and have it read. Probably it is better to do that. I do not want to shoot at anybody from the bushes.

Mr. GALLINGER. The concession has been revoked since then.

Mr. ALLISON. It never went into effect.

Mr. GALLINGER. It never went into effect.

Mr. TILLMAN. But the scandal, if there be scandal, comes in the original contract having ever been made, and the reasons which actuated those who let it. That is where the milk in the cocoanut is, if it has got any.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the matter referred to.

The Secretary read as follows:

SHONTS ADMITS TRUTH OF CANAL FOOD CHARGES—WAS A PANAMA RAILROAD CONTRACT, AND LAW DOESN'T REQUIRE ADVERTISING FOR BIDS—MENUS SHOWN—RIVAL BIDDER SAW HUDGINS & DUMAS'S—THE CHAIRMAN FAVORED J. E. MARKEL ON ACCOUNT OF HIS LARGE EXPERIENCE.

"I turned over all those menus to D. W. Ross, the general purchasing officer of the Panama Railroad. I suggested that it was a good thing to let all the bidders know what menus each one turned in.

"I am not a hotel man and I did not attempt to frame up specifications that would have required the training of a hotel man to get up. I just asked all these men right in here, and around this table we talked over the matter of bids and what should be put in the bids."—Statement made by Chairman Theodore P. Shonts, of the Isthmian Canal Commission, at his office, No. 24 State street, yesterday.

Theodore P. Shonts admitted yesterday the truth of one of the charges made by Hudgins & Dumas, bidders on the contract to feed Panama Canal employees, that a sample copy of a menu they included in their bid for the commissary concession was given to the successful bidder, J. E. Markel, of Omaha, by his authority.

"Concerning the talk about collusion," said Chairman Shonts, "I will say that if Mr. Markel put in his written offer the exact weekly menu that the other bidders put in theirs, that is exactly what he should have done. I told Mr. Ross, our purchasing agent, that it would be well for him to get suggestions from all the bidders and put the specifications in the written offers as much alike as possible, so that a fair comparison of the bids could be made."

The estimate made by Hudgins & Dumas, that the contract for the commissary work along the canal would be worth $50,000,000 for the five years' term, is too high, Mr. Shonts thinks, as many of the canal employees will live in houses to be built along the canal, instead of in the commissary hotels and camps.

"I gave J. E. Markel the contract, it is true, without any advertising in advance," added Chairman Shonts. "It was not a Government matter that required any advertising, but was a Panama Railroad contract. I made a common-sense selection and the best I could make. There may not have been much red tape in sight, but it was absolutely necessary for us to do something in a great hurry to get decent commissary service along the canal. Mr. Stevens, down on the Isthmus, was daily asking us to send his men food.

"When I found one bid so much lower than what seemed to me possible I did write a letter, just as Hudgins & Dumas say, calling attention to some apparent misunderstanding on their part. I wrote a letter worded almost the same to all the bidders. The low bid was amended, and the bidders who are now objecting thanked me and admitted the misapprehension under which I thought they were laboring. The contract was then let, after the figures, the experience of the bidders, and the facilities they had were all considered.

"For instance, J. E. Markel, the successful bidder, has been in the commissary business for forty years. He holds contracts for the commissary trains along the line of the Illinois Central, Kansas City Southern, and other roads. He has hundreds of men ready to send to the Isthmus. They are all trained men. If he keeps a corps there a few months and the climate so enervates them that they have to come back he has a new corps ready.

"Hudgins & Dumas, who had the commissary contract for Ellis Island, did well with it, but this Isthmus contract is a different proposition. I thought Markel could swing it better than anyone else. He got the contract."

Another point brought out by Chairman Shonts was that the Panama Republic in its treaty rights excluded the commissary storekeeper from coming into competition with the natives, but that as there had been such an abnormal raising of prices all over the Isthmus by the native storekeepers, the treaty had been abrogated for a while so far as allow-

ing the Panama Canal commissary to sell general food supplies to all comers. At any moment, however, the treaty rights may be again enforced.

Hudgins & Dumas, in dealing with the contract had thought to make their money on the concessions to sell general supplies. Chairman Shonts said that the enforcing of the treaty clause would cut off this chance of profit, and that was why he wrote the firm to change its first bid.

Chairman Shonts declared that while J. E. Markel apparently was the higher in his bid he was really the lower. He offered to feed all employees over 12 years of age at $30 a month in the "gold class," which covers all the upper branch of labor. Between 12 and 5 years the price per month was put for "gold children" at $10 each. Daily boarders were to get fare at a dollar a day, and anyone between 5 and 12 years old was to get food for 40 cents a day. Single meals for adults were to cost 33⅓ cents. For children between 5 and under 12 years, 13 cents a meal was the rate.

Rooms are to be cared for at $6 a month in the Markel contract, and for children under 12 years of age there is to be no charge.

The "silver men" schedule by the month Markel offered to take at $12 a head. The "silver men" are common laborers. Under 12 years of age children were to be fed for $5 a month. Adults per day were to be charged 45 cents; children were to be taxed 20 cents. Adult single meals were to be 15 cents, with children at 10 cents.

"As the Hudgins & Dumas bids made it $30 a month on their gold schedule and $5 for the care of rooms, children to pay the same all through, the average made the Markel bid the cheaper," continued Chairman Shonts.

At the office of the Panama Railroad Company it was said that it was true, as alleged by Hudgins & Dumas, that D. W. Ross, purchasing agent of the company, and Chairman Shonts were with J. E. Markel, the successful bidder, in Panama, and that all these came back to the United States together.

J. E. Markel has given a bond in $100,000, and is now in possession of the contract, it is said. He expects to get his men in Panama in three weeks.

PRESIDENT HAS PANAMA CHARGES.

[Special to the World.]

OYSTER BAY, L. I., *September 9, 1905.*

The complaints of Hudgins & Dumas and H. Balfe & Co., alleging unfair influences in the awarding by Chairman Shonts, of the Panama Canal Commission of a $50,000,000 commissary concession to J. E. Markel, of Omaha, Nebr., were received by the President this morning.

The President, after reading the telegrams, referred the matter to Shonts, with the request that a report be made upon the charges as soon as possible. The President will take no action pending the Shonts report.

It is understood here that pending official and specific information on the subject the President is not inclined to attach undue importance to the mere fact that the huge Panama contract was awarded to the highest instead of the lowest bidder. It is pointed out that Hudgins & Dumas were themselves awarded the valuable Ellis Island commissary concession a few years ago, although their bid was much higher than that of competitive bidders. The awarding of the contract to them was followed by vehement protests from the defeated bidders, who took the matter directly to the White House.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, it is to be expected that when bids are advertised for to do any important public work there will be more or less disappointment. The contention will usually arise from the unfortunate or unsuccessful bidder that he has been cheated or swindled, or something of that sort. We have that sort of thing coming up every day, and therefore that is to be expected. The point here that makes this possibly an exception to that is the eminent respectability of the firm of Hudgins & Dumas, who claim that this contract was given out by favoritism—a firm who have had the concession to feed the immigrants on Ellis Island, and who, I am informed, are perfectly reliable men. I presume that if the committee see fit to investigate and find out whether there was any underhanded or dirty work in the letting of this contract to Markel they can find plenty of witnesses to go to the very bottom of it. The peculiarity about this contract is that the concession or contract was suddenly canceled without apparent reason. I understand that the excuse given was that Mr. Stevens had cabled that the eating arrangements which he himself had perfected were sufficient to supply the demand, so that there was no need for any contract with anybody: but the correspondent of the New York Herald, who, as I say, is on the ground, whom I know, and I will mention his name—Mr. Alvord—who for a while was chief clerk in the Congressional Library, but who felt that he was suffocated over there in that atmosphere of dust and literature and decided he would like to get back into the world, and who went back to his old love of newspaper correspondent and is down yonder, is, I understand, writing some very interesting letters, giving what he says is the exact condition which exists there. If those letters are true, and I think it is our duty to find out whether they are true or not, it is very necessary, in the interest of economy and efficiency of work, that we find out whether the situation is as Mr. Alvord depicts it.

We heard something yesterday in regard to the relation between the Panama Railroad and the Canal Commission; that it had been found they are to all intents and purposes one and the same thing—that is, the direction and control of the railroad is under the direction and control of the Commission. I shall not go into that branch of the subject extensively because of the fact that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] indicated yesterday evening that he would take that up. I see he is here and is prepared to elaborate it fully and to show just what the situation is, and I will only mention that the newspaper article which I happen to have in my hand, dated this morning—in fact, it is the New York Herald of Friday, December 15—speaks of a condition of congestion in the management of the railroad down there that is simply fearful, that being a transcontinental line for carrying freight across the Isthmus intended for the Pacific coast of South America as well as of our own country. There are several lines of steamers from New York and ports of Europe that are handling freight and delivering it there, and I presume with the extra work that is put on the railroad by reason of this increase in labor or tax on its facilities by the canal work that is being pressed it has simply got buried under an avalanche of freight that it can not handle. That only illustrates the necessity and importance of double tracking the railroad while the canal is under construction to enable it not only to handle Government freight in the canal construction, but also to handle that transcontinental business. I think it would be very interesting to those Senators who have not read this article to have this plain story from Mr. Alvord put in the RECORD. I will ask to have it read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina asks for the reading of a newspaper communication, which, in the absence of objection, will be read.

The Secretary read from the New York Herald of Friday, December 15, 1905, as follows:

CONGRESS MAY BE ASKED TO CURE PANAMA RAILROAD ILLS—PUBLICITY OF CONGESTED CONDITIONS ONLY PARTLY RELIEVED THE JAM OF FREIGHT AND CONSEQUENT LOSS TO SHIPOWNERS AND MERCHANTS.

[Special correspondence of the Herald.]

PANAMA, *December 5, 1905.*

"If you had indigestion to start with and were forced to eat four or five meals a day for several months, what condition would you be in?"

That was the reply Chief Engineer Stevens made to Chairman Shonts's inquiry as to the freight blockade on the Panama Railroad. The dose of publicity given by the Herald has helped the patient, but the medicine must be continued. Mr. Stevens subsequently cabled Washington that the road was in its normal condition. It is. There are more than 6,000 tons of delayed international freight piled up in Colon and Panama, and steamships are still forced to lose days in idleness waiting until overcrowded wharves are cleared so that they may come alongside and discharge their cargoes. No fault can be found with the disposition on the part of resident railroad managers to remedy this condition. They are now keenly alive to the necessity of permitting the world's commerce to flow unhindered across the Isthmus and are doing all in their power to move cargoes as fast as received.

For this improvement the shipping agents are warm in their thanks to the Herald, to those editorials, based on the facts of the case, they ascribe the change of spirit that has come over the hitherto autocratic transisthmian carriers. Mr. W. G. Baird, of the Rock Island system, the new superintendent, has done wonders, considering the inefficient subordinates he has had to help him. One of the chief mistakes seems to be that he is forced to do all the work himself.

The whole road needs reorganization. By laboring actually night and day Mr. Baird has managed to reduce the congested freight from 8,500 tons, when the Herald called attention to the glut, to about 6,000 tons, which he promises to clear in time.

This is pleasant news to shippers, but they know he can not do much under the policy of indifference to the rights of commerce pursued by the Canal Commission.

Secretary Taft and Chairman Shonts amuse the Zone officials and assistants alike. After touch and go visits of a few hours, during which they plainly show they almost know they are going to die of yellow fever, the Secretary returns to Washington to give out interviews of impressions and the chairman in after-dinner speeches shows clearly to whom he thinks credit should go for the wonderful things done on the Isthmus.

There has been progress. The sanitation is better; all classes of employees live in suitable habitations; wholesome food is furnished at reasonable cost; the dirt will soon fly to some purpose if Mr. Stevens is let alone.

There would seem to be no need of exaggeration on the part of those who have prudently remained 2,000 miles away while all this has been brought about. Mr. Taft's statement that Panama is being rapidly paved and that the jungle has been cleared away for half a mile on both sides of the railroad must be impressions. The paving was begun in October. On December 1, by actual measurement, 380 feet had been laid. In no place has the jungle been cleared away for more than 30 rods at camps, and for the most part the branches and leaves of tropical plants wave with the wind of passing trains. These are not important facts, but they illustrate the value of impressions. The voicing of these impressions may have been to offset "the industrious and voluble band of Ananiases" which, Mr. Shonts told the American hardware manufacturers at their banquet in Washington, moves to and fro in the land to deny the reports he and the Secretary make at long range.

Taking their cue from Assistant Secretary Rossbottom, of the Panama Railroad Company, who stated to a Herald reporter in New York that the cause of the glut of international freight on the Isthmus was due to the shutting of Central American ports against the railroad during the last season, the official impressionists in Washington ascribe the disgraceful condition of the freight business eighteen months after the Commission took charge of the road to the quarantine of Panama on account of the bubonic plague and yellow fever.

FACTS V. IMPRESSIONS.

That is their impression. What are the facts? The first quarantine for bubonic plague began on June 28 and ended on July 18. The dates are from the records of the shipping houses affected, as are the following facts: In this short three weeks only ports in Nicaragua and Costa Rica were closed. Not one port in all the long coast south of Panama, where the bulk of American and European merchandise is consigned, was closed a minute in consequence of the plague.

There was another period of quarantine for the plague in August, affecting the same ports for about the same short time. At no time

has there been any quarantine on the Pacific coast on account of yellow fever. The shippers assert that this is true. It is an important fact, for it serves to illustrate the uselessness of trying to cover up by impressions the blunders of the Canal Commission in the management of a short railroad that formerly was of service to international trade.

An investigation of shipping conditions made on December 1 by the Herald correspondent showed the statement that all accumulated freight is now cleared away to be also an impression. Current freight is being moved more promptly, but there is still a congestion and always will be under the present system of conducting the business of the road.

Mr. Shonts, in his famous "Me, Taft, and Roosevelt" speech, said that the only really valuable asset from the French was the Panama Railroad; that it had been neglected and was obsolete; that its wharves, warehouses, terminal facilities, locomotives, and cars were unable to handle the commercial business the road was doing; that it had no mechanical appliances on the docks to assist in receiving or discharging steamer's cargoes; that it was paralyzed by additional work required of it for the canal, and that "it was necessary, consequently, to begin at once the construction of new wharves, equipped with modern mechanical appliances, and of terminal yards at both ends of the road, of extensive warehouses, of new and more powerful locomotives, larger passenger and freight cars," etc.

That was the promise eighteen months ago. The Commission started with three wharves at Colon, and the promise that it would line for a mile with new docks the magnificent water front afforded by the canal, which the French had dug far into the interior. To-day there are five wharves, the old ones, to which little or nothing has been done, and two small and utterly inadequate new sheds built on the canal. At least ten good wharves are needed to take care of the transisthmian freight alone. There is one derrick crane on one of the new sheds, a steam transporter on the other, and two railroad or traveling cranes on flat cars. That is all the new mechanical appliances in sight. It is said that 1,100 cars have been ordered, but after eighteen months only 200 flat cars have arrived, and they are used for canal work.

The harbor is not even kept dredged. There is one old Scotch machine left by the French, for which some new buckets arrived last week.

The result in one instance of all the wonderful things that were to be done is the utter disruption of the regular sailings of vessels from the Pacific side. Before the Canal Commission began its work it was a matter of pride for years for one line to arrive at Colon on Monday and sail with its cargo from Panama on Thursday. It has not been able to do this since the Commission took hold, and the schedule has been abandoned.

SOME RECENT EXPERIENCES.

The logs of the two steamers since the normal condition of the road was announced in Washington indicate that the impressionists are still active. The *Dictator*, with 1,400 tons of freight, from Liverpool, made Colon on November 21. She should have been discharged at once. She was not touched for two days and was not finished until November 29. Her sailing date was November 24. The bulk of this freight on December 1 was still on the Colon wharf. It should all have been in Panama one week before. The loss to this vessel through the delay of the railway was about $500.

The *Isis*, with 1,700 tons of freight, from Hamburg, arrived on November 29. She was held a day in stream, owing to the overcrowded condition of the wharves, and suffered a loss of $300 from the same cause as the *Dictator*. On December 2 the French and Italian steamers arrived. There was a berth for only one, and the Italian had to lie at anchor. On December 3 the *Nicaraguan* arrived and was not berthed until December 5. This shows the need of wharves at Colon and the failure of the Commission to provide them.

Its delinquency so far as supplying railroad facilities is concerned was demonstrated by an inspection of the wharves. On December 1 wharf No. 1 was jammed with freight discharged by the *Virginia*, which arrived on November 24. At wharf No. 2 the *Isis* and the *Venetian*, which arrived on November 28 and was also held a day in stream, were discharging. Wharf No. 4 was fairly cleared, a great improvement over two weeks before. The other wharves were badly crowded. The desire of the railroad company to force steamers to berth at No. 2 is well understood and resented by forwarders. It is a very costly wharf for ships. Tracks have been put down the center, presumably to take cargo direct from vessels, but when there are no cars—as is now always the case—the freight has to be piled on the narrow sides that remain. The ship pays for putting cargo over the side, but all other expense should fall on the railroad. When the cars are not there the wharfage room soon fills up, and the ship is compelled to employ labor to take its freight out of the way or stop unloading. To hold the ship idle is expensive, and the freight is piled along the sides. This costs about 40 cents a ton. It is expensive to the railroad, too, which is now a United States Government line. It costs it as much more to move the freight thus piled. If the cars were there, there would be no expense, as it could be loaded from the ship's slings. The congestion makes this impossible.

All the claims of the impressionists at the head of the Canal Commission that ample wharves have been built and railroad facilities provided to care for international commerce are groundless. It has suffered terribly since the Commission took charge of its only avenue across the Isthmus. It is a case of lack of foresight in the first place and indifference or incapacity since the cries of the shippers began. The owners of one of the largest lines that has suffered wrote to its agents for an explanation of the insufferable conditions on the Isthmus, and the reply is an indictment of the Canal Commission, to which the attention of Congress may be called.

These are the counts:

First. Failure to increase the number of cars of the Panama Railroad to keep pace with the traffic, or to enlarge wharves, or to provide sufficient warehouse accommodation to allow cars and cargoes to be unloaded and stored promptly.

Second. Failure to recognize the paramount necessity of increasing the number of all kinds of cars to cope with the large increase of traffic caused by the business of the canal, to construct wharves inside the canal of sufficient capacity to handle its business without interfering with those outside devoted to transit traffic, and failing when this was not done to dredge the canal to allow vessels bringing canal material sufficient water to get to the inadequate docks, thus forcing them to outside docks, to the costly delay of regular commerce.

Third. Failure to employ proper stevedores to handle wharf labor, which results in great loss of time to both ship and railroad. Even with the poor facilities competent stevedores would be able to load and discharge ships much more quickly than is now possible.

Fourth. Lack of a head to the freight department of the railroad.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, the article just read illustrates, if anything, the chaotic condition on the Isthmus by reason of mismanagement or nonmanagement of the Panama Railway. I said, before having the article read, that there was, of course, a great increase of work required of the railroad; but that was to be expected. This thing has been going on now for two years and more, and even a single-track railway with sufficient switches can handle a vast amount of freight when it has only got 46 miles to transport it. If there is now efficient and able management there and money is not being squandered, as well as the whole thing being mismanaged, it ought to be a source of congratulation to the people of the country that we appear to have gotten some one there who is better qualified than those we have heretofore had there. But, in view of the misinformation, or the contradiction in the statements which have been made in regard to the situation on the Isthmus as to docks and all that kind of thing, and about pavements that we have been told exist, but which this correspondent says are mere figments of the imagination and have no actual existence, there is evidently a misrepresentation going on in high places as to the actual conditions. While we may have the impression conveyed that those in authority hope for better conditions soon, those conditions have not yet arrived, or else this man who is on the ground and who, as I said, is a reputable gentleman whom many Senators know and who has no motive, so far as I can see, to tell lies, must be woefully mistaken.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Am I correct in the assumption that, recognizing the necessity for better transportation facilities, the Commission has taken steps to double-track the railroad across the Isthmus?

Mr. TILLMAN. I think Secretary Taft said as much.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I have noticed that their plan is to immediately commence that work. There is undoubtedly a very serious blockade there now.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes. I think the Senator will also observe, in connection with his statement, that about half of this appropriation is for increased facilities on the railroad at Panama.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, in connection with this railroad, I want to call attention to another phase of it that is a matter of very serious concern, it appears to me, to all of us, as marking our progress toward arriving at the end regardless of the legality of the path by which our officials are going. Secretary Taft has said in a speech—I have seen it somewhere from him, perhaps in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee the other day, and I am sure this is correct—that in order to make some immediate progress toward betterment of the railroad the Canal Commission had authorized the issue of some bonds, six or seven hundred thousand dollars' worth. I will ask the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] as to that?

Mr. ALLISON. The Canal Commission has not issued any bonds; but the Panama Railroad Company——

Mr. TILLMAN. But the Canal Commission, which is in direct control of the Panama Railway, have authorized the Panama Railway to issue its own bonds.

Mr. ALLISON. The Panama Railroad Company have issued bonds from their treasury amounting to $628,000. That is all.

Mr. TILLMAN. I read it in the copy of the hearings had before the Committee on Appropriations. I do not happen to have my hand on it now.

Mr. ALLISON. It is in the hearings, and I have this morning a letter from Secretary Taft which states the amount of the bonds sold by the Panama Railroad.

In accordance with the above authority—

That is, the authority of the directors of the Panama Railroad Company—

on November 28, 1905, the 628 bonds were sold to MacKay & Co., at 105, realizing $659,400.

Mr. SPOONER. Can the Senator from Iowa inform me whether that transaction occurred before or after the acquisition by the United States of the outstanding stock?

Mr. TILLMAN. It is a very recent occurrence.

Mr. ALLISON. On November 8, 1905, these bonds were sold at $105.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Secretary anywhere in his testimony make any exposition of the theory on which that was done?

Mr. ALLISON. The general reason for it was that there was a great necessity for money and the fact that the Panama Canal Commission was indebted to the railroad. They took these bonds and sold them.

Mr. SPOONER. Has there been any expression by the Commission or by the Secretary about the question of the authority to do that thing?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think any question of the authority has been suggested either by the Secretary or the Commission. The bonds were in the treasury of the Panama Railway Company, and they needed money, and they sold them, with the privilege of redeeming them at the price at which they were sold. In the meantime they bear interest at 4½ per cent.

If the Senator from South Carolina will yield to me one minute more, I will ask to have this document—because it bears right upon this question—printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TILLMAN. Possibly I had better make myself clearly understood, and the Senator can do that afterward.

Mr. SPOONER. Were the bonds sold in the market?

Mr. ALLISON. They were sold in the market at 105, with the privilege of redeeming them at pleasure at the same rate; and it is further explained in this letter that $540,000 of the proceeds which the Senator inquired about are now on deposit with some trust company, bearing from 3 to 4 per cent interest.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator want to put that statement in the RECORD?

Mr. ALLISON. I think it had better be printed in the RECORD, or read.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am very willing to let it go in without being read—it will only consume time to read it—unless the Senator particularly desires to have it read.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the communication will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 15, 1905.

SIR: I have the honor to hand you herewith the following statements showing the financial status of the Panama Railroad Company:

Statement of income account and financial exhibit from January 1, 1905, to November 1, 1905.

Statement of estimated cash receipts and disbursements for the month of December, 1905.

Statement of payments for equipment contracted for, with estimated dates of payment.

Statement of proceeds from the sale of Treasury bonds.

It is very apparent that to meet the indebtedness of the railroad company falling due during the next few months the amount due the company by the Isthmian Canal Commission should be paid at an early date.

The exhibits left with you on Tuesday, being a statement of income account and financial exhibit and a statement of the earnings, operating expenses, and general statistics for the month of September and nine months of the fiscal year, will show full detail in respect to classified earnings, expenses, etc.

Respectfully,

WM. H. TAFT,
Secretary of War.

Hon. WILLIAM B. ALLISON,
United States Senate.

Estimated cash receipts and disbursements of the Panama Railroad Company for the month of December, 1905.

Cash on hand December 1, 1905		$806,118.09
Receipts:		
From transportation	$119,000.00	
From connecting carriers	19,804.56	
Isthmus agency	10,000.00	
Miscellaneous	8,903.22	
		157,707.78
Total		963,825.87
Disbursements:		
Isthmus supplies	160,158.24	
Steamship expenses, coal, labor, etc	107,070.49	
General expenses	2,345.60	
Isthmian Canal Commission	4,066.25	
Repairs to steamships	15,668.00	
Payment on account of 12 locomotives	148,200.00	
Claims	2,200.34	
Advance charges	5,164.74	
Isthmus labor and expenses	137,500.00	
Redemption of sinking fund 6 per cent subsidy bonds	30,000.00	
Coupons	4,102.50	
Miscellaneous items	2,000.00	
		618,476.16
Estimated cash on hand December 31, 1905		345,349.71

E. S. BENSON, *General Auditor.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 15, 1905.*

Statement of payments for equipment contracted for by Panama Railroad Company, with estimated dates of payment.

Date due.[a]		
Dec. 15, 1905. 12 locomotives	$148,200	
Dec. 20, 1905. Payment account La Boca crane	5,025	
		$153,225
Jan. 1, 1906. 10 refrigerator cars (estimated)		10,000
Feb. 1, 1906. 2 wrecking cranes	24,900	
Feb. 1, 1906. 1 pile driver	10,075	
Feb. 1, 1906. 2,500 tons rails	76,125	
Feb. 10, 1906. Payment account coal-unloading plant	33,000	
Feb. 15, 1906. 6 cabooses	6,000	
Feb. 15, 1906. Four engines	49,400	
Feb. 25, 1906. Balance due on cantilever crane	9,000	
		208,500
Mar. 1, 1906. 6 passenger cars	$46,464	
Mar. 1, 1906. 6 cabooses	6,000	
Mar. 15, 1906. 4 engines	49,400	
Mar. 20, 1906. 200 box cars	230,000	
		$331,864
Apr. 15, 1906. 4 engines	49,400	
Apr. 20, 1906. 200 box cars	230,000	
Apr. 20, 1906. Balance due on La Boca crane	1,675	
		281,075
May 20, 1906. 100 box cars		115,000
June 10, 1906. Balance due on coal-unloading plant		11,000
Total		1,110,664

[a] The date of payment is based upon the present expectation of contractor as to the earliest deliveries they hope to be able to make.

NOTE.—In addition to the above it is expected that an approximate expenditure of $170,000 will shortly be authorized for the erection of a refrigeration plant, bakery, and laundry at Colon.

E. S. BENSON, *General Auditor.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 14, 1905.*

PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY,
OFFICE OF GENERAL AUDITOR,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1905.

On November 8, 1905, the board of directors of the Panama Railroad Company passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the executive officers be, and they are hereby, authorized to sell the 628 Panama Railroad 4½ per cent twenty-year sinking fund gold bonds, now held in the Treasury, at as favorable a price as possible, but not less than 104½, the proceeds thereof to be applied to the purchase of equipment and the improvement of the company's facilities."

In accordance with the above authority, on November 28, 1905, the 628 bonds were sold to MacKay & Co. at 105, realizing $659,409.

On account of the failure of the Panama Railroad Company to receive the amount due from the Isthmian Canal Commission, they have been required to use part of the above sum to meet their current expenses, there now being on deposit of the original amount received, with bankers and trust companies $540,000 drawing interest at 3 to 4 per cent.

E. S. BENSON, *General Auditor.*

Statement of income account and financial exhibit of Panama Railroad Company from January 1, 1905, to November 1, 1905.

EARNINGS.

Railroad transportation	$1,549,788.12	
Railroad miscellaneous	362,764.78	
Steamship line	1,165,058.38	
Total		$3,077,611.28

EXPENSES.

Railroad	$1,213,610.35	
Steamship line	1,106,328.27	
Total		2,319,938.62
Net earnings		757,672.66

INCOME ACCOUNT.

Net earnings	$757,672.66	
Interest and exchange	21,237.40	
Panama Railroad's proportion of adjustment of freight on coffee shipments from Central America to Europe, season of 1903–4	3,539.15	
Total		782,449.21
Charges against income account:		
Accrued interest on first mortgage bonds	$86,561.25	
Redemption of first mortgage bonds	125,000.00	
Subsidy to Republic of Panama	20,833.33	
Subsidy to Republic of Colombia	187,500.00	
Dividend (No. 120)	350,000.00	
Drawback on Colombia and Panaman produce	8,306.13	
Total		778,200.71
Balance carried to credit of profit and loss		4,248.50

PROFIT AND LOSS ACCOUNT.

By balance to credit of profit and loss January 1, 1905	$4,797,423.44	
Balance of surplus income for ten months ending October 31, 1905	4,248.50	
Redemption of first mortgage bonds	140,000.00	
Total		4,941,671.94
To sundry adjustments, ten months ending October 31, 1905		6,628.57
Balance to credit of profit and loss account		4,935,043.37

ASSETS.

Cost of road and equipment	$11,762,380.51
Real estate on Isthmus	266,116.74
Floating equipment	640,906.80
Improvement and construction work uncompleted	131,122.57
Steamship replacement fund	222,539.44
Advance of subsidy to Republic of Colombia	715,000.00
Bonds in treasury	775,365.00
Cash on deposit with financial agents for redemption of bonds	26,015.36
Cash in banks and with agents	454,613.81
Coal and supplies on hand	455,443.61
Due from connecting lines	130,969.50
Due from United States Government	638,922.54
Due from companies and individuals	42,419.26

Miscellaneous accounts	$137,211.59
Unearned insurance and charter of steamers	32,957.29
General average disbursements	4,917.78
Total assets	16,436,901.80

LIABILITIES.

By balance to credit of profit and loss account	$4,935,043.37
Capital stock	7,000,000.00
First mortgage bonds of 1897	2,879,000.00
Sinking fund subsidy bonds	715,000.00
Bonds drawn for redemption—not presented	25,595.00
Interest accrued on bonds—not due	29,970.00
Accrued funds for redemption	267,175.36
Accrued subsidy to Republic of Panama	17,708.33
Interest on bonds due and unpaid	4,950.00
Unpaid wages	4,034.24
Isthmus drafts—not presented	91,494.28
Due to connecting lines	60,410.87
Audited vouchers and pay rolls	334,352.39
Miscellaneous accounts	72,167.96
Total liabilities	16,436,901.80

E. S. BENSON, *General Auditor.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 14, 1905.*

Mr. TILLMAN. My only purpose in mentioning this transaction was to point out what I conceive to be the absolute usurpation of power on the part of the Commission or the railroad directors, and the members of the Commission and the railroad directors are one and the same men. I do not understand this double dealing, this hocus pocus, "now you see it and now you don't." My purpose in mentioning it was to say that they had no right in law to do this thing.

Mr. ALLISON. They claim this right because the Panama Railroad Company is a separate and distinct corporation under charter of the State of New York and organized under the laws of the State of New York. It has a distinct organization, and does a commercial business as well as the business for the Government. It runs ships, etc., between Panama and New York, as everyone knows. Therefore, as directors of the Panama Railroad Company they make such resolutions as——

Mr. TILLMAN. In other words, I go out and resolve that I have the right to do so and so, which I would not have the right to do as a Senator, but still I am a Senator, and while I recognize that the Senator is not authorized to do this thing, I do it all the same. It is just a hocus pocus. It is like the Dominican treaty programme.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly what the Senator from Iowa says is true——

Mr. TILLMAN. It is a figment of the brain—and that is all—as to the legality.

Mr. HALE. It is not that.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is a technicality.

Mr. HALE. The company is organized under the laws of the State of New York, and that is the reason why it is done. But it is easy enough for us to legislate to put an end to these conditions, so that this anomaly will disappear. But you can not blame them for continuing an organization when it is a matter of statute law of the State of New York. That is what they have done. We can stop it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am only concerned about doing it. I am not talking about what we can stop. I know we can stop it, but the only concern is that the Executive and his agents and his instruments go forward and do whatever they see fit to do without inquiring as to the constitutional or legal right to do it; that is all.

Mr. ALLISON. They are directors of the Panama Railroad Company.

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes; but who elected them?

Mr. ALLISON. The stockholders.

Mr. TILLMAN. The United States is the only stockholder. It is nothing more or less than increasing the public debt of the United States, and the Senator knows in legal effect that is the result. It is a wholly unwarranted and improper exercise of power.

Mr. ALLISON. That may be, although technically——

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, technically! When the members of the Panama Commission adjourn and go into the next room and organize as the directors of the Panama Railroad Company, and the railroad directors do what the Commission can not do lawfully, and then say that the thing is legal and binding, I say it is a figment of the imagination. It is a hocus pocus that comes from the fact that Secretary Taft, having had absolute domination and control, being a regular imperator or little king in the Philippines, has grown accustomed to having his own way, and he goes forward without regard to the Constitution or the law, either.

I am going back to the original contention which I made in my opening this morning, that we are degenerating and getting far away from the purposes of a free and self-governing people; that we have imported from the Philippines these Cæsar-like transactions.

Mr. HALE. One of the things the Senator complains about in this particular proceeding is that this transaction did increase the debt of the United States. I hope the Senator realizes that this whole business is going to increase the debt of the United States, and to an extent that neither he nor I ever dreamed of.

Mr. TILLMAN. Let us do it ourselves in a legal, constitutional way, and I will vote my share and take the responsibility; but I do not want any decree like that of Mr. Morales in Santo Domingo, to dish out money of the United States or contract debts for the United States, by order of the Secretary of War or by order of the Panama Railroad directors or by order of the Panama Commission. I am calling attention to a usurpation of authority somewhere.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure, always.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not rise to discuss the question whether or not the issue of bonds by the Panama Railroad Company was authorized, but I do understand the Senator to criticise the maintenance of the separate organization.

Mr. TILLMAN. No. I think it almost absolutely necessary that there should be an organization, but I want it to be sufficiently distinct, so as to have one responsible to the other. I do not want to have the two interlocked, so that you can never locate any usurpation or any mistake, and so that whenever the railroad does something wrong they will say the Canal Commission did it, and whenever the Commission does anything wrong they will say the railroad company did it. Let us separate them by legislative enactment of some kind and create through law some provision for the control of this property under the direction of the President, if you want to, but primarily under the direction of some enactment by Congress.

Mr. SPOONER. Of course it is entirely competent for the Government, it having acquired the entire stock of the company, to assume the mortgage and take the property over, so that it will be owned by the Government without the intervention of any corporation. I understood the Senator from Maine rather to commit himself to the proposition that that would be wisely done.

Mr. HALE. I beg pardon.

Mr. SPOONER. I say it is entirely competent for the Government, owning all the stock of the Panama Railroad Company, to have the property conveyed to the Government and dispense with the corporation.

Mr. HALE. Obliterate it?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes. I understood the Senator from Maine rather to commit himself to that proposition.

Mr. HALE. I think we can do that.

Mr. SPOONER. I think that is a subject which demands considerable thought.

Mr. ELKINS. Who would be the directors?

Mr. SPOONER. That can be arranged. But I think there is very much to be said, and something on both sides, and that we ought not to be too quick about that. I do not see how it is possible that the situation could be other than it is, in so far as the corporate railroad organization is maintained as the operator of the railroad, and I understood the Senator not to criticise that.

Mr. TILLMAN. Without having given any serious consideration to it, it appears to me as a practical man that it would be better to have the accounts of the railway company kept entirely separate and distinct from those of the canal——

Mr. SPOONER. I suppose they are.

Mr. TILLMAN. And that the expenditures for improvements and equipment and betterment should come in a separate category.

Mr. SPOONER. I suppose they are kept distinct.

Mr. TILLMAN. But we can not get any reports from them. The Senator from Iowa did not produce them here. Of course I presume he has them now. But I complain of this effort, by our new method of running the Government, to have us legislate in the dark, and not trust us as part and parcel and a responsible part of the Government, with the necessary facts. That is what I am trying to impress here in my feeble way. We, as Senators, owe a duty to ourselves and to our constituents and to our oaths of office to stop this control of affairs by the President and his agents when it is unlawful for him to act. That is what I am trying to impress here.

Mr. ALLISON. The accounts of the Panama Railroad Company are kept distinct and separate from the accounts of the isthmian canal.

Mr. TILLMAN. Would it not have been a nice thing for them to have sent them along?

Mr. ALLISON. The Secretary of War stated to me that he would leave with the committee a copy of one of the statements of the railroad company. I examined it and found it somewhat defective, and this morning the Secretary sent me a statement as respects the accounts of the Panama Railroad Company, showing its receipts and expenditures for a year past, I think by months, and giving also the debt, etc. So we have now a full statement of the condition of the railroad company.

Mr. TILLMAN. I suggest to the Senator that he had better have it printed as a document, so that those who want to continue the debate to-morrow can use it. We have intimations here——

Mr. ALLISON. That is a good suggestion. I ask to have it printed as a document, as well as in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, the communication will be printed as a document in addition to being put in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will yield to me a moment more, I wish to say that yesterday I stated the debt of the Panama Railroad Company at a much larger figure than it is. It is less than $3,000,000, as shown in the statement which I have had put into the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE. Including the recent loan referred to——

Mr. ALLISON. Including the recent loan.

Mr. LODGE. Of six or seven hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. ALLISON. Six or seven hundred thousand dollars, but not including the contract made between the Canal Commission and the railway company as to the double track.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have seen a copy of the contract in the documents here, and it has appeared to me rather a remarkable transaction, as I said, with the Canal Commission adjourning, and, without going out of the room, acting as directors of the Panama Railroad Company. It is very much like we used to do in South Carolina in some political days that I recall. The Alliance would hold a meeting and pass resolutions and adjourn, and the Democrats would then assemble; but nobody would leave the hall and nobody would come in. There was no change of personnel or principle, because we were all white men and were determined upon white supremacy, and were not worrying about any outside influence.

Mr. ALLISON. It was regarded as a proper transaction at the time.

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes; a proper transaction.

Mr. ALLISON. I suppose this will be.

Mr. TILLMAN. I suppose so; but this is governed by law, and that was governed by necessity.

Mr. SPOONER. The trouble is this is not governed by any law enacted by Congress.

Mr. TILLMAN. No.

Mr. SPOONER. If there is any trouble in this respect, it is the fault of the Congress. Congress provided that the United States should buy the property of the New Panama Canal Company, and with it nearly the entire capital stock of the Panama Railroad Company——

Mr. TILLMAN. All of it.

Mr. SPOONER. Not all of it.

Mr. TILLMAN. We did not buy all of it originally, but we have it now.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator did not allow me to complete my statement, which will take but a moment. I refer to the original act and the shares owned by the new French canal company. Since that time it is true the Government has acquired all the shares, and the Government has thereby become the sole stockholder in that great corporation, which owns and operates the railroad. Now, it must have directors. We have made no provision of law as to how the directors shall be elected. It is left to the Administration—to the President for the time being—and it is perfectly natural and indeed inevitable that the members of the Commission should be directors of the railroad company, representing the stock of the United States as far as they go. We have to make some provision for that.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not criticising in any adverse spirit the present arrangement, for it, or something nearly like it, will have to exist, as a matter of common sense.

Mr. SPOONER. While it might be improved upon in some respects, it is inevitable. It is not to be criticised.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not criticising it. I simply want the whole subject to be ventilated. Let us get at all the facts and expenditures and see where the money has gone and know what is doing. I do not believe it is the business of the Senate to sit here dumbly and pass laws sent to us without any light being given to us, especially when money is involved. That is my idea of duty. I want to say here that we can not afford longer to do it. These methods are not American, and we ought to go back to old-fashioned methods of legislation.

I am nearly through. I do not know that it is altogether advisable to raise the issue that will be presented in this clipping, which I will have read, but I do not care to have the responsibility for concealments of any kind connected with the construction of the canal, and I do not want to appear to connive at or condone or in any wise approve or indorse certain things that I know the overwhelming majority of the American people will not indorse. I merely present it for the purpose of letting the country realize a phase of the canal building which nobody has ever contemplated or spoken of hitherto, and that will, I am sure, cause the Canal Commission, which is charged with the responsibility for it, to step about pretty lively, to use a slang phrase, in order to explain and defend it.

I send to the desk an article from the New York Herald of November 25, written, I am informed, by the same correspondent whose letter of December 15 I had read a little while ago. I do not know whether I shall have it read or whether I shall have it printed. I understand that several of my fellow-Democrats want to go on with the debate. I will not be here to-morrow. If it is desired, I can briefly outline what the article relates to, and then Senators can have it read if they want. It is in regard to the charge, which I suppose is not denied, that under the authority and direction, and order, I presume, of those who are controlling affairs down there they have sent one of our ships to Martinique and brought a shipload of negro women and distributed them up and down the camps of the railway. It is so near akin to the African slave trade, only it is more infamous, that I would like to have some explanation and justification for it if anybody proposes or is ready to give any. I will read it, I reckon.

Mr. TELLER. Who sent the ship?

Mr. TILLMAN. The engineer, or the superintendent of labor, or some one down there—Mr. Burnett, I think his name is. I will ask to have the article read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. TILLMAN. It begins on the first page and then goes over to the middle of the second page, and is marked with a pencil. It is very salty reading for Christian people.

The Secretary proceeded to read the article, and after having read for some time,

Mr. LODGE. If I may interrupt the reading a moment, I understood the charge to be, as outlined by the Senator from South Carolina, that this cargo of women was brought there in a vessel of the Commission under their authority. It seemed to me such an extraordinary charge——

Mr. TILLMAN. That is what the paper states.

Mr. LODGE. Very well; that is what the paper states; that is all right. It seemed to me such an extraordinary charge to make that I went to the telephone and called up the Secretary of War. I told him the charge that was being read in this paper from the desk, and he said that on his authority I might say on the floor of the Senate that it was a lie. I use his own language.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the article; and, after having read for some time,

Mr. TILLMAN. At the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa, let the balance of the article be printed without reading it. It is well understood what the situation is.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection the request of the Senator from South Carolina will be complied with.

The entire article is as follows:

[From the New York Herald, Saturday, November 25, 1905.]

CLERGY RAISE MORAL ISSUE ON ISTHMUS—IMPORTATION BY CANAL OFFICIALS OF NEGRO WOMEN RAISES STORM OF PROTESTS—MINISTERS WILL MAKE AN APPEAL—THEY WILL URGE THAT THE BRINGING IN OF WOMEN BE STOPPED AT ONCE—DEFENDED BY AN OFFICIAL—HEAD OF BRANCH OF LABOR AND QUARTERS DECLARES LABORERS WOULD NOT OTHERWISE REMAIN.

PANAMA, PANAMA, *November 18, 1905.*

The recent importation of 300 negro women from Martinique and the statement that more are to be brought by the Canal Commission officials in charge of the labor branch of the work have stirred up the Americans on the Isthmus, especially the clergymen.

These ministers are shocked and indignant at the course of the officials. They declare the only way to straighten out the whole transaction is to stop bringing in women and to compel those now here to marry or go back.

The canal officials say they are compelled to furnish the laborers with "wives," and point out that ceremonial marriages are almost unknown among blacks in Caribbean lands.

The Rev. Thomas B. Wood, in charge of the American Protestant chapel in Ancon, and a prominent Methodist missionary in South America, said:

"I have heard of this monstrous iniquity, and I make my cry, as

they say in Spanish, out of the skies. I had intended reaching the American people through our religious press, but welcome the opportunity of addressing them through the Herald.

CHURCHES WORKING TOGETHER.

"Here all national and church lines are wiped out and all denominations of the Protestant Church work together for general morality. The ministers of the Episcopal Church minister more to the spiritual needs of the blacks than do the ministers of other churches, but they will find us cooperating with them against this labor policy. We are all alive to its awful consequences.

"Not without protest shall we see this Isthmus turned into a free-love community, for that is what it means. When that protest is heard by the ten millions of Methodists and the six millions of Baptists in the United States there will be no uncertain response. Exposure of the facts should raise such a storm of indignation as will maintain our national decency on the Isthmus as it is maintained by our Government at home.

"Are we to have a sewer of moral degradation because we want a canal? That is what this policy will produce. I have heard it has been advanced that it is necessary. There is not the slightest need of it. Think of the degradation to our country! The eyes of the world are focused on us and what we are doing here.

"Our ability, our honesty, our Protestantism, is on trial. Particularly are the eyes of the South Americans watching us. From us they are beginning to draw their inspirations, held back only by those who teach them we are loose in our marriage vows and that the United States and its religion do not stand for moral purity.

"If the importation of these women is not stopped by a great popular demand started by our churches, these people and the world at large will conclude that we stand for all that is vile, and the evangelical work of years will be undone."

REGARDED AS A REPROACH.

The Reverend Mr. King, of the British Wesleyan Church, said: "It is inconceivable that American officials should bring these women here without requiring them to marry. Their living in a state of free love in Jamaica has been felt by all the English churches to be a reproach to the country, and the strongest possible efforts have been made for years to get them to marry. The news that they are being taken to an American colony and allowed to continue their obnoxious custom will be received with sorrow and amazement in England."

The same sentiment was expressed by the Reverend Mr. Eskins, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, of Panama, who added: "The Martinique women could not have been brought here in such numbers, no matter what the ascribed reason may be, without a knowledge of the great harm that must result. It is an awful mistake."

To the protest of the clergy is added an equally strong objection by the physicians from the standpoint of public health.

BROUGHT BY THE SHIPLOAD.

In order to keep the negroes at work on the canal the Commission, through its branch of labor and quarters, sent agents to Jamaica and Martinique to bring to the Isthmus as many negro women as wished to come. They were offered free transportation with board on an American vessel and the promise of food and quarters until they could provide for themselves.

There was no trouble in Martinique in getting together 300, and they arrived at Colon on the steamship *Floridian* a few days ago.

Negro laborers along the canal were greatly excited when they heard the women were coming. Work was generally deserted, and thousands flocked to the wharf days before the *Floridian* was due. The steamship's appearance in the bay started a riot. The men fought with one another for advantageous positions on the dock.

OFFICIAL CLAIMS TRANSPARENT.

As a matter of form the women were told to point out their "husbands," but the officials themselves tell many a story of how women were given out that shows how transparent is the claim that any serious effort was made to allow the men to take only those women whom they had left behind in Martinique, and how fallacious the promise that other women who accompanied these so-called married women would be put to work in American families.

If a woman after talking with a man asserted she was willing to become his wife, they were permitted to leave the dock together, without even a promise that they would be legally married.

Much the larger portion of the cargo of women was put aboard the cars and distributed along the line. A few who asked for work were given it in the Commission hotels, but others were left at various camps "in proportion to the size of the camp." The pretense was that they might find work in American families.

In Bas Obispo there are ten American families, several of which had servants. They were left eighty of the imported women. The laborers there number 300. The proportions were the same at all the camps in which the women were left. Quarters were given them and they were fed as long as they remained in them. One of the officials said yesterday that nearly all were already mated and off the Commission's hands.

LIKE DARKEST AFRICA.

A man writing from one of the camps to the Herald correspondent says: "Before these women were brought here we had an orderly and quiet community. The night they came it was awful, and since then I feel I am living in darkest Africa. If I can not get a transfer I shall send my family back to the States. I can not allow my wife and children to remain in such an atmosphere.

The importation of these women and others to come is warmly defended by Henry Burnett, who, in the absence of Jackson Smith, is acting chief of the branch of labor and quarters. Mr. Burnett has shown much ability in working out the problem of furnishing food and quarters for white as well as black labor. He has clean-cut features, a frank manner, and impresses one as an able and practical man. When asked what excuse there was for bringing these women to the Isthmus he replied:

"No excuse. It was the only thing we could do to keep our laborers here. Anyone who has had any experience with the West Indian negroes knows they won't work any place without their women. What has been done is always done by all employers of such labor on great works. We were losing fully a third of ours, and we had to stop it. The men said if their wives were brought over they would be more contented.

"There was great need of servants by American families and in the Commission hotels. The Martinique women are cleaner in their habits and make better servants than those from Jamaica. So we decided, as we had about 2,000 Martinique men here and will have more, we would begin by bringing over their women.

AFTER WOMEN IN JAMAICA.

"An agent was sent to tell those who had men on the Isthmus, and those who did not have, but who wanted work, that they would be brought here free and given food and quarters until they were settled. Three hundred have come. We have an agent in Jamaica now who will allow every sixth laborer to bring his wife with him. Every third foreman is granted the same privilege. It's the only way we can get them."

"Don't you consider their relations immoral, and don't you know that the people of the United States may object to the continuance of such relations on its soil under the sanction and by the act of its Government?" Mr. Burnett was asked.

"I can't see why they should," responded Mr. Burnett. "We are down here to build this canal. What have the morals of a lot of West Indian negroes got to do with it? I assert that they are not immoral in preferring to live with a woman without a marriage ceremony. They may be unmoral—that is, without morals as we understand morality—but they are ofttimes truer to the women they select than our people, who have a ceremony performed.

"Not one in a thousand or five thousand of the natives of those islands or in Central or South America gets married. They can't afford it. Marriage to them means a great and expensive ceremony, complete wardrobe, and a well-furnished house. They won't marry without all this.

MARRIAGE CERTIFICATES UNNECESSARY.

"We ask them to come over here to work for us, and they ask us to send for their wives. It is decided to do so. All I require as the acting head of the branch of labor and quarters is that a woman says such a man is her husband and I give her to him. It isn't for me to ask for a marriage certificate.

"There may have been some mistakes, but so far as we are able we have seen to it that only the men who have been living as husband and wife at home are allowed to obtain possession of any of these women.

"I have heard that some of the men took the tickets given them with the names of their wives, selected others who could not read, told them it was an order for them, and took them away. The tickets, I hear, were in some instances retained and passed around among laborers who had none and who played the same trick. These cases will be investigated and straightened out."

Here is a case coming under my personal observation which may or may not be typical:

Rose Montrose, who is darker than the darkest queen in Africa, was found sitting on the porch of one of the houses set apart for laborers in Bas Obispo. There were many other women about the camp wearing the gay turban of the Martinique, laughing and chattering with all the abandonment of the French West Indian. Rose's face was sad; she took no interest in the others' gayety. It was a refined face, and the contempt that flashed from her eyes and the haughty curl of her lips made it striking and strong.

ROSE MONTROSE'S STORY.

"What's the matter?" she was asked. "Don't you like it here?"

"No. I came for work," she replied, "but I see it was not for work I was brought."

"Who brought you here?" was asked, "and what were you told?"

"The people who are building this canal brought me here from Martinique," she answered. "I was born on the British island of Dominica, but I went to Martinique to get work. There I was told by the man who was getting women to come here there was plenty of work here, and so I came, but it seems it was to choose a man I was wanted. But I shan't do it; I will starve first."

The girl's story was that on arrival on the Isthmus she was sent, with other women, to Bas Obispo, ostensibly to be given work in an American family. Days passed and no one came to tell her where to go or what to do. Finally she appealed to a Zone policeman, who told her to choose a man, as the other women were doing. She indignantly refused to follow this advice, and it was supplemented by the warning that if she did not observe it she would be thrown out of her quarters.

"And what shall I do?" inquired Rose. "I can not do as they say."

"Rose," asked Sanitary Inspector Davies, who had come up while she was talking, "are you a good girl and do you really want work?"

The earnestness of her reply satisfied the inspector, and Rose was engaged at once. A report this evening from Mr. Davies says she has taken hold of her duties with an ardor which indicates that she really wanted work, and will make an excellent servant.

An American who has lived many years on the Zone says several natives went to him with the statement that they understood the United States was selling Martinique women for $25 each. They offered $50, and could hardly be made to understand that the story was not true.

It is currently reported that several Martinique negroes obtained two or more of the women, and have sold them to their fellows for from $8 to $12 each.

Most Americans in the Canal Zone are incensed and humiliated by what is going on around them. Their sense of decency is offended and their pride in their country deeply hurt. They can no longer point to it as a model when questioned by Panamans, whose amusement over their discomfiture is apparent.

Mr. TILLMAN. After the emphatic denial of the Secretary of War I shall be only too happy if it can be shown that no such disgraceful condition exists there. But I contend that they must investigate a little. This is not the Philippines, and we can not take offhand statements from men in the War Department, however emphatic the language or however high the station, as covering the whole facts, until we see whether it is so or not.

Mr. LODGE. The statement, as I understood it, was that these women were being brought in Government vessels.

Mr. TILLMAN. The statement is that a ship—it does not say a Government ship—was sent to Martinique, and the head of the labor bureau there, Mr. Burnett, whose name is mentioned, has been said to state that it was necessary.

Mr. LODGE. That they were being brought under Government auspices?

Mr. TILLMAN. Being brought under the Canal Commission's auspices, under his auspices.

Mr. LODGE. The Canal Commission's? That I understand the Secretary of War to deny absolutely.

Mr. TILLMAN. I shall be only too happy if his statement proves to be true.

Mr. LODGE. Against an anonymous newspaper statement I prefer for the present to take the statement of the Secretary of War.

Mr. TILLMAN. I prefer to take his statement, where he knows it to be true. I do not prefer to take his statement in this case without at least having somebody else given an opportunity to investigate the matter. Mr. President, I have only a few more words. I have trespassed much longer on the patience of the Senate than I had anticipated or desired to do. The debate ran off on various branch lines that I had not expected it to take, and there have been a great many things brought out which may be necessary or valuable. A great deal of it probably is of no use to anyone. But my sole purpose was—

First, to emphasize the necessity for the Senate of the United States to take its share of responsibility for the control of this great work, and so legislate as to protect the Treasury from any embezzlements or stealing.

Second, it was to call attention to the fact that by reason of our negligence, or from other reasons or other influences which may have governed us, we have given an excuse for what I believe to be Executive usurpation. If I have in ever so slight a degree been able to call attention to some things which need defense and explanation, and so cause a thorough and searching investigation into the canal affairs, I will have accomplished all that I set out to accomplish.

During Mr. TILLMAN's speech,

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, before that article is read, while I dislike to do so, I would ask the Senator from South Carolina to permit me to offer an amendment to the pending bill, which I ask to have read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas offers a proposed amendment to the pending bill, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. After the word "Congress," on page 3, in line 22, it is proposed to add the following:

Provided, That no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used to pay the expenses of a literary bureau connected with the Isthmian Canal Commission, or pay the salary, compensation, or allowance, by whatever name called, of any person who may be engaged in such work for or in behalf of said Commission.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

After the conclusion of Mr. TILLMAN's speech,

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, it seems evident that we can not complete the bill to-night. Several Senators have expressed a desire to speak briefly on the subject, and if I can have an understanding that a vote shall be taken to-morrow, which is very important, I will then ask that the bill may be laid aside for the moment, and I shall move an executive session.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be completed at the session to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the pending bill be completed at to-morrow's session.

Mr. LODGE. That it be voted on before adjournment.

Mr. ALLISON. Before adjournment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That it be voted on before adjournment. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PAY OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

Mr. ALLISON. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1905, on the 20th day of said month. I ask unanimous consent that it be now considered.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALLISON. Now I will take the liberty of making another motion. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 16, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 15, 1905.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF NEW MEXICO.

William J. Mills, of New Mexico, to be chief justice of the supreme court of the Territory of New Mexico. A reappointment, his term expiring January 30, 1906.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICES.

Frank W. Parker, of New Mexico, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of New Mexico. A reappointment, his term expiring January 9, 1906.

John R. McFie, of New Mexico, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of New Mexico. A reappointment, his term expiring January 30, 1906.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

William Harrison Bradley, of Illinois, lately consul at Manchester, to be consul-general of the United States at Manchester, England, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Lincoln Avery, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Huron, in the State of Michigan. (Reappointment.)

Clarence A. Hammett, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for the district of Newport, in the State of Rhode Island. (Reappointment.)

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

Oscar Lawler, of California, to be United States attorney for the southern district of California, vice L. H. Valentine, whose term expires December 16, 1905.

Reese Blizzard, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of West Virginia. A reappointment, his term expiring December 16, 1905.

Charles A. Wilson, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island. A reappointment, his term expiring January 20, 1906.

Abram M. Tillman, of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee. A reappointment, his term expiring January 31, 1906.

MARSHALS.

John W. Overall, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee. A reappointment, his term expiring March 8, 1906.

Charles D. Elliott, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia. A reappointment, his term expiring December 16, 1905.

Stephen P. Stone, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the western district of Pennsylvania. A reappointment, his term expiring December 16, 1905.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Morgan O. Llewellyn, of New Mexico, to be surveyor-general of New Mexico, to take effect January 29, 1906, at the expiration of his term. (Reappointment.)

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Thomas H. Bartlett, of Grangeville, Idaho, to be register of the land office at Lewiston, Idaho, vice John B. West, removed.

Manuel R. Otero, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Santa Fe, N. Mex., to take effect January 29, 1906, at the expiration of his term. (Reappointment.)

Edward W. Fox, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Clayton, N. Mex., to take effect January 12, 1906, at the expiration of his term. (Reappointment.)

Walter G. Robinson, of Florida, to be register of the land office at Gainesville, Fla., to take effect March 15, 1906, at the expiration of his term. (Reappointment.)

Howard Leland, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Roswell, N. Mex., to take effect January 29, 1906, at the expiration of his term. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frederick Mueller, of New Mexico, to be receiver of public moneys at Santa Fe, N. Mex., to take effect January 12, 1906, at the expiration of his term. (Reappointment.)

Henry E. Bowman, of New Mexico, to be receiver of public moneys at Las Cruces, N. Mex., to take effect January 29, 1906, at the expiration of his term. (Reappointment.)

Henry S. Chubb, of Florida, to be receiver of public moneys at Gainesville, Fla., to take effect March 15, 1906, at the expiration of his term. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Infantry Arm.

First Lieut. George H. Shields, jr., Twelfth Infantry, to be captain from November 2, 1905, vice Drouillard, Third Infantry, resigned.

First Lieut. Eleutheros H. Cooke, Tenth Infantry, to be captain from November 15, 1905, vice Blow, Fifteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Second Lieut. Harry W. Gregg, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from November 2, 1905, vice Shields, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Sylvester C. Loring, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant from November 11, 1905, vice Burr, Fifteenth Iufantry, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Howard W. Stone, a citizen of Iowa, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of March, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

Julian P. Willcox, a citizen of Colorado, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 13th day of April, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

The following named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 19th day of June, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Bennet Puryear, a citizen of Texas.
William W. Buckley, a citizen of Kansas.
William C. Wise, jr., a citizen of Virginia.
William D. Smith, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Harold B. Pratt, a citizen of New York.
Randolph Coyle, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

Philip H. Torrey, a citizen of Montana, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 18th day of July, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

Benjamin B. Gossett, a citizen of South Carolina, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 18th day of August, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

Robert L. Denig, a citizen of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of September, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Schuyler C. Rutherford to be postmaster at Watseka, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois, in place of Lorenzo F. Watson. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 15, 1905.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Jesse E. Wilson, of Rensselaer, Ind., to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Benjamin F. Harper, of Indiana, to be Auditor for the War Department.

DEPUTY AUDITOR FOR THE POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Charles A. McGonagle, of Indiana, to be Deputy Auditor for the Post-Office Department.

DEPUTY AUDITOR FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

S. John Abbott, of Delaware, to be Deputy Auditor for the Treasury Department.

AGENT AND CONSUL-GENERAL.

Lewis M. Iddings, of New York, to be agent and consul-general of the United States at Cairo, Egypt.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

Leo Allen Bergholz, of New York, to be consul-general of the United States at Beirut, Turkey.

CONSULS.

Albert Leffingwell, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Warsaw, Russia.

John McMackin, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Georgetown, Guiana.

Mason Mitchell, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Chungking, China.

Thomas P. Moffat, of New York, to be consul of the United States at La Guaira, Venezuela.

Edwin W. Trimmer, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Cape Gracias á Dios (Port Deitrick), Nicaragua.

Chester Donaldson, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Port Limon, Costa Rica.

William W. Handley, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Trinidad, West Indies.

PENSION AGENTS.

William V. Willcox, of Des Moines, Iowa, to be pension agent at Des Moines, Iowa.

Wilder S. Metcalf, of Kansas, to be pension agent at Topeka, Kans.

William Rule, of Knoxville, Tenn., to be pension agent at Knoxville, Tenn.

COMMISSIONERS OF IMMIGRATION.

Louis T. Weis, of Maryland, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Baltimore, Md.

George B. Billings, of Massachusetts, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Boston, Mass.

John J. S. Rodgers, of Pennsylvania, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Philadelphia, Pa.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

George W. Allen, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Key West, in the State of Florida.

John E. Stillman, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Pensacola, in the State of Florida.

Tip Warren, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Apalachicola, in the State of Florida.

William L. Gerrish, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Saco, in the State of Maine.

Charles H. Darling, of Vermont, to be collector of customs for the district of Vermont, in the State of Vermont.

Curtis S. Emery, of Vermont, to be collector of customs for the district of Memphremagog, in the State of Vermont.

Matthew B. Macfarlane, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of Tampa, in the State of Florida.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Elam H. Neal, of Indiana, to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of Indiana.

J. Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to be collector of internal revenue for the eighth district of Kentucky.

Henry P. Bardshar, of Arizona, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of New Mexico.

David H. Moore, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the eleventh district of Ohio.

Marion K. Lowry, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Virginia.

William E. Glasscock, of West Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of West Virginia.

APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

William P. Luck, of Louisiana, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana.

Theodore D. Kalbfell, of Missouri, to be appraiser of merchandise at the port of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri.

ASSISTANT APPRAISERS OF MERCHANDISE.

William F. Comly, of New Jersey, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York.

John W. Burgess, of Delaware, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise, in the district of New York, in the State of New York.

Edward J. Rodrigue, of Louisiana, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in the district of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

S. W. Andrews to be postmaster at Walnut Ridge, in the county of Lawrence and State of Arkansas.

IDAHO.

J. M. Elder to be postmaster at Coeur d'Alene, in the county of Kootenai and State of Idaho.

LOUISIANA.

Louise Alvarez to be postmaster at Covington, in the parish of St. Tammany and State of Louisiana.

MISSISSIPPI.

W. T. Branch to be postmaster at Winona, in the county of Montgomery and State of Mississippi.

Anna Durham to be postmaster at Clarksdale, in the county of Coahoma and State of Mississippi.

Alice S. McLean to be postmaster at Greenwood, in the county of Leflore and State of Mississippi.

Emma Pringle to be postmaster at McHenry, in the county of Harrison and State of Mississippi.

Rosa M. Ruff to be postmaster at Houston, in the county of Chickasaw and State of Mississippi.

MISSOURI.

Francis M. Harrington to be postmaster at Kirksville, in the county of Adair and State of Missouri.

Frank McKim to be postmaster at Tarkio, in the county of Atchison and State of Missouri.

W. O. Keffer to be postmaster at Liberal, in the county of Barton and State of Missouri.

NEVADA.

Edward R. Collins to be postmaster at Goldfield, in the county of Esmeralda and State of Nevada.

NEW YORK.

Adam N. Finucan to be postmaster at Pittsford, in the county of Monroe and State of New York.

Charles A. Fowler to be postmaster at Rome, in the county of Oneida and State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John G. Brown to be postmaster at Red Springs, in the county of Robeson and State of North Carolina.

Victoria L. Martin to be postmaster at Tarboro, in the county of Edgecombe and State of North Carolina.

C. G. Rosemond to be postmaster at Hillsboro, in the county of Orange and State of North Carolina.

Adolphus R. Wilson to be postmaster at Dunn, in the county of Harnett and State of North Carolina.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Sallie B. Gregory to be postmaster at Meshoppen, in the county of Wyoming and State of Pennsylvania.

Alfred P. Laubach to be postmaster at Siegfried, in the county of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *December 15, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. POLLARD was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Regular Army retirement (H. R. 12306, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session), no adverse report having been made thereon.

Also, by unanimous consent, Mr. POLLARD was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Nebraska State Militia (H. R. 13561, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session), no adverse report having been made thereon.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and pending that I would like to get some agreement for unanimous consent for limit of debate. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] if we can not agree this morning on some time for limiting the debate?

Mr. HEPBURN. I think there will be no trouble about that. I have no anxiety as to continuing the debate.

Mr. PAYNE. There are some gentlemen who want to be heard on both sides, and I think if we say an hour and a half it will be sufficient.

Mr. HEPBURN. It will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. MANN. Why not make it a little longer than that?

Mr. PAYNE. Say two hours; an hour on a side.

Mr. MANN. I think it ought to be longer than that. There are a number of gentlemen that want to be heard.

Mr. HEPBURN. Let us make it two hours.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about this. There are several gentlemen over here who want to make speeches, and people who want to make speeches want to make them, and this is just as good a chance to make them as I know of, or that will come up at this session.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] wants fifteen minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He has that time, and you can not take it away from him. I think that the debate ought to be extended.

Mr. PAYNE. I think that if we have two hours on a side, to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] and myself, it will be sufficient.

Mr. MANN. Why not agree to vote at 4 o'clock?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Make it 5 o'clock.

Mr. PAYNE. I dislike to take up the whole of this day. It keeps the Committee on Ways and Means here, and they have an important engagement with a gentleman from a distance.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from New York will permit me, we will endeavor to relieve the committee to-day, so that they will have more time hereafter.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that I am informed by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House that a number of gentlemen have appealed to him for time, and want to speak on this subject.

Mr. PAYNE. I will not make any suggestion for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. What is the request of the gentleman?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I do not make any request in view of the opposition here.

Then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of resolution No. 42, relating to the distribution of the President's message.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the question of what committee the reference to insurance contained in the President's message shall be referred to is an important question, but it is an insignificant one in comparison with some of the other matters that it necessarily brings up.

It is my purpose this morning briefly to discuss what may be called the "technical question" of what committee that should go to, and then to voice a protest against the tendency indicated in that part of the President's message relating to insurance and other great corporations.

We have had curious arguments made by the chairmen of two committees of this House. The chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce desires that this reference shall be to his committee and desires it by a vote of the Committee of the Whole in order that the House may go on record as declaring that Congress should have jurisdiction of all the great corporations that happen to do business outside of the lines of the State creating them. He said that in so many words yesterday.

On the other hand, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means presents to the House this peculiar proposition, that inasmuch as we can have nothing to do with insurance except by virtue of the taxing power—a proposition to which I agree—therefore we should disregard the moral obligation that is placed upon Members of this House and should use the taxing power immorally, to do what it was not intended the American Congress should do—that is, enter the domain of the police power that belongs to the States.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman does not attribute that position to me, does he?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am attributing this position to the gentleman, that if his argument meant anything at all it meant, as I understood, that the House had no jurisdiction over the question of insurance except by virtue of the taxing power.

Mr. PAYNE. That is correct.

Mr. SHERLEY. That therefore it should go to the Committee on Ways and Means, the committee that has jurisdiction of matters raising revenue; and the intimation was—because I would not assume that the gentleman desires to refer it to his committee for the purpose of smothering it; I am assuming that he wants to be fair with the House and that he proposes the House shall consider the great question—that when he desires a reference of it to the Ways and Means Committee he desires it sent there for the purpose of using the taxing power so as to affect insurance.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman's intimation is for him to make, of course. I made no intimation of what my position was on the subject, otherwise than it was the only jurisdiction that the House had.

Mr. SHERLEY. You desired it to go to that committee, as I understood you, for the purpose of enabling the House through its taxing power to legislate.

Mr. PAYNE. I made no intimation of what that committee will do, or of what I myself will do. I merely stated the law of the House as it was, that it should go to that committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman say to the House whether he wants it to go to that committee for the purpose of pigeonholing it, or whether he thinks that committee will be justified in legislating?

Mr. PAYNE. "The gentleman from New York" does not make

any proposition with reference to that, other than what he has already stated.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am willing to let the gentleman's position stand as he stated it.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LITTLEFIELD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

An act (S. 1169) for the refund of certain tonnage duties; and

An act (S. 1475) to provide that the 2 per cent bonds issued under section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall have the same rights and privileges that are accorded by law to other 2 per cent bonds of the United States.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The committee resumed its session, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania in the chair.

PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman from Kentucky will yield to me, I want to make a motion that the committee rise now, so that the House may consider the matter which has just been reported in the message from the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PAYNE. I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman, but he has just begun, and I want to move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Kentucky declines to yield, the Chair is of the opinion that the motion of the gentleman from New York would not be in order.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask the gentleman to yield for that purpose.

Mr. SHERLEY. As soon as I get some information perhaps I will yield. I do not desire to embarrass the House, but it is hardly fair to take me off my feet when I have but begun my argument. I should like to know what time the House will consume in the consideration of this subject. Mr. Chairman, having learned the purpose of the request, and with the understanding that I have a right to the floor when we go into committee again, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that the committee do now rise.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I think the rest of the House would like to know what the programme is on this subject.

Mr. PAYNE. The House will know in a moment, if the gentleman will allow us to rise.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. It may be too late then.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentleman from New York has been recognized to make the motion.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House resolution 42, and had come to no resolution thereon.

PREROGATIVES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1475) and offer the following resolution, after which I will ask to have the bill read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up from the Speaker's table the following Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1475) to provide that the 2 per cent bonds issued under section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall have the same rights and privileges that are accorded by law to other 2 per cent bonds of the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That the 2 per cent bonds of the United States authorized by section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall have all the rights and privileges accorded by law to other 2 per cent bonds of the United States, and every national banking association having on deposit, as provided by law, such bonds issued under the provisions of said section 8 of said act approved June 28, 1902, to secure its circulating notes, shall pay to the Treasurer of the United States, in the months of January and July, a tax of one-fourth of 1 per cent each half year upon the average amount of such of its notes in circulation as are based upon the deposit of said 2 per cent bonds; and such taxes shall be in lieu of existing taxes on its notes in circulation imposed by section 5214 of the Revised Statutes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill S. 1475, in the opinion of the House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution, and is an infringement of the privileges of this House, and that the said bill be taken from the Speaker's table and be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to discuss this resolution at any length, as the matter was fully discussed at the last Congress, in reference to the agricultural appropriation bill, which came over here with a revenue amendment attached by the Senate. On that occasion the precedents were stated to the House, and on a yea-and-nay vote only three or four gentlemen voted against it, and that because of their doubt as to whether the bill really contained a revenue clause or not. The bill was sent back to the Senate, and the Senate acquiesced in the decision of the House, and withdrew the amendemnt from the bill. Now they send over here a bill which is purely a measure of taxation. They propose that the 2 per cent bonds to be issued for the construction of the isthmian canal shall be taxed the same as other bonds for which provision of law is made that they shall be used as a basis for the currency of the national banks. They reduce the tax on those bonds to be sure, but the bill authorizes a tax. This is a tax bill pure and simple. The Constitution has provided for the origination of these bills in the House of Representatives. The framers of the Constitution thought there was a reason for this. The House has contended immemorially, they have always contended that they have the right, and they have asserted the right time and again to institute revenue measures. They have the only jurisdiction in the Congress of the United States where these measures may be originated. Therefore, I ask the House to adopt this resolution; and in that connection I do not care to take up the time of the House by debate now. I may desire to extend my remarks citing some of the precedents; but the Constitution is so familiar, and this clause of the Constitution is so familiar that I do not think it is necessary for me to recite them for gentlemen to vote intelligently upon this resolution. [Loud applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, this comes to me rather suddenly, and is rather an astonishing thing. I saw in the morning papers that the Senate had taken this action, but I thought they had taken it en route to settlement and the passage of a bill "for the construction of an isthmian canal." This matter comes back entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal," etc., but there is nothing in it at all except a provision for putting certain bonds in another class; and in my opinion it is undoubtedly a violation of the privileges of this House, as given to it by the Constitution of the United States. [Loud applause.] I believe that the position taken by the gentleman from New York is correct, and I think we ought to pursue either the course suggested by him or some other course that would indicate our opinion to the effect that it is a breach of the constitutional privileges of the House. I see no objection at the first blush to the resolution as read:

Resolved, That the bill S. 1475, in the opinion of the House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution and is an infringement of the privileges of this House, and that the said bill be taken from the Speaker's table and be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. If there is no debate upon this question, I shall ask for a division, in order that we may have a rising vote and a count on this subject. I do not care to ask for the yeas and nays, but simply call for a division.

The question was taken on agreeing to the resolution; and on a division there were—ayes 357, noes none.

So the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. PAYNE. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House resolution 42, and the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is never pleasant to find one's self in the position of Mahomet's coffin, suspended between heaven and earth, but I was very glad to yield the floor that this committee might rise, in order that the House might maintain its constitutional rights. It is so seldom that a member of this body has a chance to protest against the constant disregard of

the constitutional rights and dignities of the House that I am always willing to yield the floor for any such purpose. [Applause.]

To return to the subject of discussion, I know of no more immoral practice than that which has grown up in the House of Representatives of using the taxing power for other purposes than the raising of revenue. It may be that in other countries the taxing power has been necessary as the weapon of liberty, either by denying appropriations or by taxing particular things, but in America the theory of our Constitution has been, and still is, that through other means the liberties of the people are guaranteed, and the taxing power was given only for the purpose of raising revenue. So, when you find upon this floor serious discussions of the reference of a bill to the Ways and Means Committee, upon the implied, if not the openly expressed, opinion that the taxing power shall be used not for the purpose of revenue, but for the purpose of doing something that otherwise Congress could not do, and that it was not intended that Congress should do, I, for one, propose to protest. Therefore, I am opposed to the reference of this matter to the Ways and Means Committee. I am also opposed to the reference of it to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It is conceded by the distinguished chairman of that committee that the Supreme Court will have to change its mind in order for this Congress to have jurisdiction under that clause of the Constitution. He enters the domain of prophecy and says that they will do it. It may be that he agrees with Mr. Dooley, who, in the discussion of the insular cases, said to Hennessy that he was in some doubt as to whether the Constitution followed the flag, or the flag the Constitution, but it was evident that the Supreme Court followed the election returns. [Laughter.]

It may be that he considers the clamor now being raised throughout the land for the regulation of insurance companies by the National Government will have sufficient effect that, in the event of national legislation, the Supreme Court will sustain it and overrule itself. About that he may be a better judge than I am, but it is apparent to every Member on this floor that the discussion had for the past two days shows that it is the overwhelming judgment of the House that, as the Constitution is now interpreted, we have no such jurisdiction; that if we are to legislate on this subject, we must discover some other provision of the Constitution than the commerce clause.

Now, we have a great committee in this House, a committee that not only reports bills for legislation, but is also the judicial adviser of the House. The Committee on the Judiciary is supposed to be made up in its membership of the ablest lawyers in the House. They are there for the purpose of not only originating legislation, but they are there for the purpose of instructing the House upon questions of constitutional power. What more proper than to do what the Senate has done, make reference of a matter of this kind to the Judiciary Committee, that they may report back to the House whether, in their judgment, this House has jurisdiction, and if it has jurisdiction, the extent of it. Shall we determine now that one or the other of these committees may have this matter without a proper investigation? If the House is to now determine that fact, then, on the knowledge that the House has of the decisions of the Supreme Court, it ought not to refer this to any committee, because this House knows that it has been expressly declared that there can be no interstate commerce in insurance. Of course it can be reached collaterally, but isn't it a humiliating spectacle, isn't it such a spectacle as has been responsible for a whole lot of trouble in America, that men sworn to support the Constitution, representatives of a great body of the Government, are willing to disregard its plain limitations, and by subterfuge, under the taxing powers, do that which in their hearts they do not believe they are entitled to do? The fact that the House has done it, the fact that we have got precedents for it, only makes it worse. It only shows how one thing leads to another. The other day a statement was made in the other branch of the National Legislature that that provision in the law creating the Bureau of Commerce and Labor, relating to insurance, crept in there without the knowledge of that body; that had they had knowledge of it, there would have been a pronounced protest; and now we have a marked illustration of the danger of a precedent.

The President of the United States in his message says that because Congress has given to the Bureau of Commerce and Labor the power to make certain general investigations and inquiry as to insurance, therefore we have presumptively declared that it is a matter proper for national governmental control, and that declaration is used as a lever to make us go a step further. I understand that some member of the Judiciary Committee will offer an amendment referring this matter to that committee, and I hope that that amendment will prevail.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to turn from this discussion of a narrow proposition to the discussion of a broader one. I believe the House will bear me out in the statement that I have never taken a partisan, captious position on the floor. I do not propose to do it now, but if I should let pass by in silence certain portions of the President's message without a protest, I should consider that I had no reason to be upon this side of the aisle, that I ought to go over to the other side. If I am to assume the position that seems to be taken by some, of out-herodding Herod, then I propose to go into Herod's camp where I can do it effectively, and not remain outside of it. I want to protest against that modern theory so pronouncedly and ably stated in the President's message that because a thing is big therefore it must come within the national jurisdiction. It is true that this whole country has been stirred from one end to another by the disclosures in regard to life insurance. It is also true that every one of those disclosures have been made known to the public by State agency and not by the National Government. It is true that the Supreme Court of the United States in deciding the case of Paul against Virginia, in deciding the cases that followed after that, plainly indicated that the States had complete—not only complete, but exclusive jurisdiction over the subject. Yet we have sent us a message saying that the time has arrived where it is evident, in the judgment of the people, that the States can not manage these things and that we must come to the National Government.

The President in his message says:

> The fortunes amassed through corporate organization are now so large, and vest such power in those that wield them, as to make it a matter of necessity to give to the sovereign—that is, to the Government, which represents the people as a whole—some effective power of supervision over their corporate use. In order to insure a healthy social and industrial life, every big corporation should be held responsible by, and be accountable to, some sovereign strong enough to control its conduct.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The makers of our National Constitution provided especially that the regulation of interstate commerce should come within the sphere of the General Government. The arguments in favor of their taking this stand were even then overwhelming. But they are far stronger to-day, in view of the enormous development of great business agencies usually corporate in form. Experience has shown conclusively that it is useless to try to get any adequate regulation and supervision of these great corporations by State action. Such regulation and supervision can only be effectively exercised by a sovereign whose jurisdiction is coextensive with the field work of the corporations—that is, by the National Government. I believe that this regulation and supervision can be obtained by the enactment of law by the Congress. If this proves impossible, it will certainly be necessary ultimately to confer in fullest form such power upon the National Government by a proper amendment of the Constitution It would obviously be unwise to endeavor to secure such an amendment until it is certain that the result can not be obtained under the Constitution as it now is. The laws of the Congress and of the several States hitherto, as passed upon by the courts, have resulted more often in showing that the States have no power in the matter than that the National Government has power; so that there at present exists a very unfortunate condition of things, under which these great corporations doing an interstate business occupy the position of subjects without a sovereign, neither any State government nor the National Government having effective control over them. Our steady aim should be by legislation, cautiously and carefully undertaken, but resolutely persevered in, to assert the sovereignty of the National Government by affirmative action.
>
> * * * * * * *

And again:

> The great insurance companies afford striking examples of corporations whose business has extended so far beyond the jurisdiction of the States which created them as to preclude strict enforcement of supervision and regulation by the parent States. In my last annual message I recommended "that the Congress carefully consider whether the power of the Bureau of Corporations can not constitutionally be extended to cover interstate transactions in insurance."
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> That State supervision has proved inadequate is generally conceded. The burden upon insurance companies, and therefore their policy holders, of conflicting regulations of many States, is unquestioned, while but little effective check is imposed upon any able and unscrupulous man who desires to exploit the company in his own interest at the expense of the policy holders and of the public. The inability of a State to regulate effectively insurance corporations created under the laws of other States and transacting the larger part of their business elsewhere is also clear. As a remedy for this evil of conflicting, ineffective, and yet burdensome regulations there has been for many years a widespread demand for Federal supervision. The Congress has already recognized that interstate insurance may be a proper subject for Federal legislation, for in creating the Bureau of Corporations it authorized it to publish and supply useful information concerning interstate corporations, "including corporations engaged in insurance." It is obvious that if the compilation of statistics be the limit of the Federal power, it is wholly ineffective to regulate this form of commercial intercourse between the States, and as the insurance business has outgrown in magnitude the possibility of adequate State supervision, the Congress should carefully consider whether further legislation can be had.

The President's reference to the reasons that controlled the makers of the National Constitution in framing the commerce clause is, I suggest in all humility, not historically accurate. The fact is, the convention of Virginia and Maryland was called—the convention that led up to the subsequent convention which adopted the Constitution of the United States—for the

purpose of trying to arrive at some method of settling the conflicts that arose as to the commerce on the rivers and waters that divided those two States and to arrive at some method by which States would not be able to hamper and handicap the commerce of other States. As a result of that convention came the national convention that adopted the Constitution. Now, the commerce clause has two provisions in it. They are in the same sentence, but they are distinct in the sense that they were put into the Constitution. One of them relates to the power of Congress over foreign commerce; the other relates to the power of Congress over interstate commerce. It was desired at that time that the United States of America might have a weapon that she might use against England, who was then fighting her commerce on the high seas. It was expected that the United States of America should use its power through that provision against other nations, but that part of it which relates to the States was put into the Constitution for the purpose of preventing the States from discriminating against the commerce of their sister States. It was put in there for the purpose of keeping commerce free, not for the purpose of shackling it. Yet to-day, and for many years past, it has been made the pretext for giving power to the National Government to hamper and control. Now, I trust I am not a man who looks backward. I hope I am not speaking of the tender grace of a day that is dead, but I do feel that half of the evils that confront the country to-day confront it because we have disregarded the fundamental theory of our Government. I believe the way to govern best is not only to govern least, but to govern as near as possible at home. [Applause.]

That is my kind of Democracy. That is the reason I am where I am. If we could make the people of the States realize that of necessity under the Constitution 95 per cent of the things that relate to life, liberty, and property belong to the States, and unless we change the organic law must remain with the States—if we could make them realize that therefore they must make their own State governments effective in order to deal in nine cases out of ten with those matters that affect life, liberty, and property, we might hope to solve our problems. But what has been the result? Largely as a heritage of the civil war, largely as a result of the acceleration that was given to the national power due to the emergency that that conflict brought about, we have had the spectacle that whenever a condition requiring a remedy arose in a State, the people, instead of trying to solve it there, come to the National Government and undertake to have the power under the Constitution stretched so as to bring the matter within the national domain.

The people, simply because the National Government seemingly acts, think that it always acts better. They think it acts better because they know less about its actions. They get a knowledge of what it does simply from the men who do it. The newspaper accounts which go out nine times out of ten necessarily go from the very source that has done the act which is to be reviewed by the people. Naturally the report going out is favorable, and they get the notion that if the action is by the National Government it will be better action. Maybe it is better, but, gentlemen, there is no reason why it should be as good. There is not a power contained in the Constitution of the United States in regard to most questions arising that is not contained in even greater measure within the State. Tell me that States composed of millions of people, bigger than some of the great nations of the world, are not able to have proper officers, capable of proper legislation, solving these problems, and what is equally important, capable of enforcing the law! I will not admit it.

This tendency toward centralization has gone on until, from having started out a hundred years ago in fear of the Executive, we have become afraid of the legislative bodies; from a fear of the National Government, to now a total disregard of State power. The people have a distinct contempt for the State legislatures, and they have more or less contempt for the National Legislature. It has become so that a member of the State legislature has to almost prove aliundi that he is an honest man and a man of good ability. Gentlemen, you get the service you expect. The people have restricted them; they have hampered them. Recent State constitutions have restricted the meetings of the legislatures to once in two years. They have restricted that meeting to sixty days or some short period. In a special session they are restricted to considering what the governor desires shall be considered. All these are indicative of the fact that the people are fearful of these bodies. The result is we have brought on this floor great questions not properly here, and we have to spend nine-tenths of our time in determining not what we ought to do, but how we can do it. If the theory of the National Government being not only supreme, but all embracing, if the theory as voiced by the President in his message is right, then I for one agree to the suggestion made in that message when he said that if we can not do these things, if we can not take charge of this insurance matter, we ought to amend the Constitution. I go further and say that if we are going to attempt this and similar things, if we must take care of them here, then I am in favor of abolishing State government. I would a great deal rather see this body dealing with what it should do instead of always having to consider whether it can do it. That is common sense. If this idea of concentration is right, if centralization of power is right, then let us go on and carry it out. It is true we will be giving the lie to the theory which has prevailed in America since the beginning; it is true we will be running in the face of Anglo-Saxon history.

If it is true the time is coming when we are to have such power not only given the National Government, but are also to have given to the executive arm of the Government the right to handle everything under the sun, from football up, let us abolish the State government outright and make a clean job of it. Look how this idea of centralization is working right here among us. Look how it is working with the two bodies of Congress. One body, because it was smaller and because it had in a sense executive power, in that it could pass upon Presidential appointments, has grown and grown, until to-day this body is practically ignored, and we had the spectacle a few moments ago of that body, in plain contravention of the Constitution, undertaking to pass a bill that only could originate here. It is simply a further tendency toward centralization. You are not only concentrating the States out of their power, but now you are beginning to concentrate the different bodies of the National Government out of theirs. Against that, as a Democrat, as a believer in the history of my nation, I protest. It is for this reason I have taken advantage in this body when the President's message was up for discussion to voice my protest. I had been in the hope that some man abler than I, some man longer in the service of the House, might have felt called upon to do it, but in the absence of that I felt I should be untrue to those motives which actuate me, to the position I occupy in this House, if I did not protest.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Does the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I have enjoyed the address so far very much, but I wish to ask the gentleman if it is not true, in his judgment, that gentlemen from the Southern States—Democrats from the Southern States—have a marked tendency to yield up their ideas of State rights in order that their States or their districts may get some benefits or emoluments out of the United States Government? Is not that the marked tendency with Democrats in the House?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman has asked me a frank question. I will answer it frankly. It is true that in the past the ark of the covenant of local self-government has rested among the Democrats of the South. It is true to-day, unfortunately, that there are some of them, breaking the traditions, as I conceive them, of the party and of the country, who have wandered away after the fleshpots of Egypt. But, gentlemen, what is true in one instance on this side of the House is true in nearly all instances of that side of the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is my answer to the gentleman.

I realize that in a large measure I stand in some particulars alone on the floor even as a "voice crying in the wilderness." I realize that the American people, from having been a very sober people, slow to form an opinion, have become a mercurial people, with opinions over night. I realize that in men's memory history goes back to the last edition of the paper of the day before, and their view of the future goes forward to the first edition of the day after. I realize that any clamor that happens to be loud enough may not only get the ear of individual Members, but it may get even the ear of the Executive of the nation; and because there is now a clamor we have sent to us a message saying that we must try and find a way in and out of the provisions of the Constitution to do certain things, and then if we can not do them we must do away with the Constitution in order to do them.

The messags makes the surprising statement that the States are unable to control insurance. On what theory is that made? Does not every man know that if you had the right sort of law, and, what is better still, the right sort of enforcement of the law, in the States that the power exists there to control insurance and control nine-tenths of our other troubles?

The President speaks of the fact that overcapitalization is the worst evil in connection with big corporations. Does not every man who is the least of a lawyer know that it is in the power of a State that creates the corporation to prevent overcapitalization? It can put all of the restrictions upon it that it pleases.

Now, it may be a sufficient answer to you—it is not a sufficient answer to me—to tell me the State has not done it. I say what we must do in this country is to awaken the people to a realization of that power at home; demand that a man shall exhaust the power that is given to the States before he comes to the nation. Why, if the President's theory is true, then there is not a city in the Union that should not be put under the control of the State government, because they have all been notoriously badly managed. Now, if the fact that they are badly managed, if the fact that the people of the city do not manage them right, do not elect the proper sort of officials to the common councils, is sufficient reason, then by a parity of argument the State should take control of the cities, and you should have them managed by your legislatures and the governors of your States. You only need to examine the proposition to see how it strikes at the fundamentals of this Government. Take the history of England and see what has been done in her city governments. It is true that Parliament is all powerful, and always has been, but it is also true that there is more local government there to-day than there is here, despite our boast. They send men of the highest ability to the common councils of their cities; put in men capable of occupying any position in any legislative body, and as a rule all of these cities are efficiently and capably managed, and they do not need to appeal to Parliament.

If the cities and the States should send into public life the right sort of men, making it worth while for a man to be independent, and keeping him in his position when he does show independence—if they would do that, you would find nine-tenths of the questions that trouble the Government would no longer be sent up here to trouble us. Every man in this House knows that the size of this House, the amount of business that comes here, practically prevents real judicial consideration of questions. [Applause.] The day has gone by when the House of Representatives can intelligently do affirmative work. There is no man here but who in his heart of hearts knows this to be true. What has been the result? You send important measures to a committee; you put into the hands of a few men the power to bring in bills, and then they are brought in, with an ironclad rule, and rammed down the throats of Members, and then those measures are sent out as being the deliberate judgment of the Congress of the United States; but no deliberate judgment has been expressed by any man. Now, if you are going to bring in additional to that other problems that you think should receive consideration, where are you going to end? Will it not have a tendency to end altogether in a government of bureaus? No man that will be frank in the statement of his opinion but knows that that is true. We all admit and we all admire the ability of the President; we realize his purpose is a high and lofty one, and yet we permit ourselves to sit silent, voicing no protest against a message to Congress that contains more of centralization than any other message that was ever written to the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will it disturb the gentleman if I make a suggestion or two along the line of his argument?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not at all.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Has the gentleman from Kentucky considered in his evident study of this question how you would establish two jurisdictions, two supreme authorities—one supreme in the State and one supreme in the United States—so as to administer in the form of regulation or taxation or prescription the duty of a corporation, it being an instrumentality of the States in some industry or in any other branch or business, so as to have both jurisdictions operating upon that corporation at the same time; and would it necessarily in the long run oust the State jurisdiction absolutely and put the whole power in the General Government? I am on the side of the gentleman; I am a Democrat in the matter of the rights of the States to control their own local institutions, and have always been so. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SHERLEY. I am glad to have such able support, and in answer to the gentleman's question I will also try to be as frank as the gentleman was in propounding his question. No lawyer—no real lawyer—who has ever advanced beyond the mere citation of cases and gone into the philosophy of the law but what knows that the problem offered by a dual system of government is one of the most difficult problems ever offered to a people. And a further difficulty in that problem has been caused in large part by the extension of national control to the exclusion of State control, because of the temporary inefficiency of State governments. But the main idea that I wish to convey is this: Not that we do not realize the great inherent difficulty, that we do not recognize that there are many questions that lie on the border line of the jurisdiction of the two governments, questions about which men must differ and about which the courts have differed, and that when these questions come up it must follow that one or the other of these governments will get the jurisdiction to the exclusion of the other, according to the trend of the times, and frequently the practicability of its dealing with the question, but that as to those things that are clearly within the State's power and can be controlled by the State, that when no effort is made by the State to remedy the evil that that neglect should not be made an argument and an excuse for this Government, the National Government, entering the domain. Now, here is a practical illustration in the insurance matter. Here is a matter that has come to the attention of the people—this corruption, this wrongdoing—by virtue of a State investigation. Our States are just beginning to awake to a long-neglected duty, beginning to investigate and to formulate laws to control the situation. I undertake to say that if persevered in the States will be successful. The condition arose simply because the States have been neglectful of their duties in the past, and now we are told that we should, in advance of any results growing out of the States' activity, take the matter from them, notwithstanding the evil that inherently follows an entrance by the National Government into the State domain. It is not only true physically and mentally, but true governmentally, that a power unused becomes weakened and will in time be destroyed.

Let any part of the anatomy of man cease to be exercised and used and that part goes into decay until it finally disappears. Let the quality of local government, let that power which rests in the States, fail to be used; let the people forget that they have in their own hands the power to remedy evils; let them forget that after all it depends upon the moral atmosphere of the people themselves, their desire to enforce the laws that they pass—let them forget that and come constantly to the National Government for aid, come up here away from the place of the evil, and you will find that the ability to solve problems at home will die because of disuse. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Gentlemen, we make too many laws; we enforce too few. The trouble is that out of hypocrisy, out of cant, which seems to be a part and an attribute of the Anglo-Saxon, we are willing to pass laws that we do not believe in. There comes a clamor, and we yield to the clamor for fear of our jobs, and we put the law on the statute book when we do not think it ought to be there. Even although it remedies a particular evil, we know that it carries in its train many other evils. Then having put it there we wink at its being ignored. Why, gentlemen, we pass every year numerous temperance laws and then permit them to be dead letters, because we have been cowards and were afraid not to pass them, and yet do not want them enforced. If the people will enforce the law, if we can have the enforcement of the law against the high as well as the low, we will solve many of our problems without any need for new legislation. Nothing has come out in the insurance investigation that the State of New York can not handle, and most of the problems can be handled on the criminal side of the law docket. [Applause.] It is a question whether the people of New York will have the courage, but if they do not have it that is no reason why we should take up their burden. We must send back word to them, "You must solve your problems at home. If you do not do it, they will not be solved." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. In a colloquy with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] yesterday the following occurred:

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman tell the House how many members of the American Bar Association voted on that resolution?

Mr. BARTLETT. I have not the minutes of the American Bar Association.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is it not a fact that only a very small minority voted on it at all?

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not know. I know of a committee of five appointed by the American Bar Association to investigate and report on it. Four reported in favor of regulation and one against.

I wanted to ask the gentleman the source and extent of his information on the subject. I have information from a gentleman who was at the meeting of the American Bar Association during the whole of its session, and he reports to me that when it came up the president ruled it out on the ground that it was not accompanied by any proposed bill, as provided by their by-laws, and without a dissenting voice the report went out, and no vote was taken at all upon the subject at the meeting of the American Bar Association. I will ask the gentleman if that information is correct?

Mr. SHERLEY. My own information is not definite. I will say to the gentleman that I have the honor to be a member of the American Bar Association. I attended one of its meetings, and while there I saw matters of very great importance that happened to interest some particular member of the association brought into that body, and by the advocacy of that member,

nobody else having thought or cared about them one way or the other, the approval of the body was put behind them. So that without meaning to cast disrespect upon a very great organization, I do consider that in the absence of something affirmatively showing that the matter was considered at length by its membership, inasmuch as only a very small minority ever attends its meetings, its action is not entitled to such great weight as to determine the position of this House.

Mr. PAYNE. I did not understand the gentleman as to whether he was there and could say that a vote was or was not taken.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I was with the distinguished gentleman on the other side of the world. I was not at the meeting this year.

Mr. PAYNE. I see. I think you will find that no vote was taken; that it was ruled out by the president.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Kentucky concluded his remarks?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. I desire to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. MANN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Georgia that he promised to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to interrogate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if it is necessary, I yield to the two gentlemen sufficient time for the colloquy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, as I understand, reserves his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand that the gentleman reserved his time.

Mr. SHERLEY. I did reserve my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. I merely want to say this in answer to the question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. I did not undertake to say yesterday that I was present at the meeting of the Bar Association, of which I am a member and have been for years, but I stated that the newspaper account of the proceedings before that association contained a statement of the majority report of the committee, which I hold in my hand—a committee appointed at a previous meeting of that association to consider the question—reported to the bar association and that it adopted. That is what I stated, and all I intended to state. I do not want the gentleman from New York or my friend from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] to understand that I approve of the majority report; on the contrary, I stated that I did not, and that my views were very different from those contained in the majority report. I agree with the minority report as to the constitutional right to regulate insurance business.

Mr. PAYNE. I did not understand that the gentleman from Georgia intended to state that he was present. I supposed, of course, that he spoke simply from report, and I thought he was misinformed. Now I have given my authority, and the gentleman and I have no difference on the subject.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I have been unable to satisfy myself as to the effect of the proposed amendment to the pending resolution, upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. I have always regarded resolutions distributing the subjects contained in the President's messages as somewhat perfunctory in their character, and not as affecting in any degree the jurisdiction of the several committees as fixed by standing rules of the House, and I would so regard the pending resolution, except for the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has made it an important issue. He has announced, in support of his amendment to the resolution, that there is no power in the Federal Government to regulate or control the business of insurance excepting through the power of taxation, and if his amendment prevails it will be tantamount to a decision on the part of the House that he is right, and it will be notice to the country that the House of Representatives has decided that it has no control over the subject of insurance excepting through the taxing power.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. DALZELL. Does the gentleman mean to argue that if the House should send this subject to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that would be an implied judgment on the part of the committee that insurance is commerce?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. In effect it might be; it would imply at least that the judgment of the House was that insurance might be interstate commerce. Now, if it were not for the argument made by the gentleman from New York in support of his amendment I would not take the position I do. In my opinion the amendment of itself does not bear any such jurisdictional significance as he attaches to it, but in view of the position he takes and the issue he makes, we must meet it.

My position is that in view of the argument and the grave questions presented by it the House is not ready yet to determine that there is no power in Congress to regulate insurance by any other method than taxation. The House is not ready yet for the final decision of that question, and, in my judgment, while the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is insisting that the subject be referred to that committee, and the Committee on the Judiciary contends that the subject ought to be referred to that committee, I say, "A plague upon all your houses." The reference of this subject is in a large matter a ceremonial matter. Leave out the amendments altogether and pass the resolution in the form the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee first proposed it, and allow the Speaker a free hand to refer bills to the appropriate committees, according to their character and provisions, and not in pursuance of any implied direction in a resolution distributing the subjects connected with the President's message. That would leave questions unsettled. No question would be decided, either directly or by implication, and it would leave the Speaker entirely free in the reference of bills and resolutions upon this important, this vital, this current question in American politics and morals.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. If this were referred to the Judiciary Committee, would it not eliminate the elements of controversy and fail to indicate any implication on the part of the House?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It would have that effect; a reference to the Judiciary Committee would be a colorless reference, a reference without significance in a sense.

Now, I might with equal propriety, Mr. Chairman, insist that this subject ought to be referred to the Committee on the Census——

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Oh, the gentleman does not really think that as a serious proposition?

Mr. CRUMPACKER (continuing). The committee of which I have the honor of being chairman, because the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor in his recent report recommends that the Director of the Census be authorized by legislation to collect statistics respecting fire insurance, marine, and life insurance. If the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] prevails, following the custom of the authorities in the House referring bills or resolutions, I suppose legislation of that kind would have to go to the Committee on Ways and Means. I have in mind the reference of a bill in the last Congress, a bill extending the coastwise laws to the commerce of the Philippine Archipelago. That bill in no wise modified or changed the navigation laws of the country. It in no wise affected the coastwise business of the United States proper, but it affected simply the commerce of the Philippine Archipelago. It merely extended the navigation laws to the situation there, and I took the position before the gentleman who had control of references that in view of the fact that it affected the interests and the commerce of the Philippine Archipelago, the Committee on Insular Affairs, which had charge of that business, should have jurisdiction of the bill, because it affected no interests except Philippine interests. But the bill was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Now, the duty of that committee is to promote legislation to build up and develop the merchant marine. The business of the Committee on Insular Affairs is to support legislation to build up and develop the commerce and civilization of the Philippine Archipelago. I suppose the interests of the merchant marine were regarded as paramount and the bill went to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and that committee reported a bill providing that the coastwise laws of the United States should apply to the Philippine trade on the 1st day of July, 1905, and forever thereafter.

The members of the Committee on Insular Affairs, who at least may be presumed to know something about the peculiar conditions of that archipelago, insisted that the coastwise laws ought not to apply before the 1st day of July, 1909. They were defeated in their position in the House, but an amendment was made fixing the application of the coastwise laws after the 1st day of July, 1906. It is now admitted by everybody in the country who knows anything about the situation that that law must be modified before it goes into operation, else there will be serious disaster to the Philippine commerce and prosperity generally. I cite that example simply to illustrate the custom of references. It illustrates a method that is followed, and that is that where one committee has jurisdiction of a general sub-

ject, to refer all bills on that subject to that particular committee. I think bills ought to be referred according to their character. I was very much impressed with the argument of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] yesterday, that bills ought to be referred, as far as possible, in accordance with the dominant purpose of the bill. Almost every bill that is introduced—that is, bills of any special importance—contains a number of features, and might perhaps be referred to one of three or four committees. It is often that legislative measures have a dominant and a subordinate purpose. There may be incidental things connected with bills, but where the dominant purpose can be discovered I think it ought always to control the reference of the bill. Now, it has been suggested in the course of this debate that the regulation of insurance companies could be effected through the mails. It has been suggested that legislation might require all insurance companies in the United States to comply with certain conditions in reference to publicity, and then laws might be enacted preventing companies that refuse to comply with those requirements the privilege of the mails, and thus, indirectly at least, compel insurance companies to submit to the prescribed regulations and conditions. On the other hand, my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS] has a bill pending providing for regulation of insurance in the District of Columbia, the Territories, and the insular possessions of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, nobody questions the power of the Government over the regulation of insurance in the District of Columbia, in the Territories, and in the insular possessions, and the measure proposed by my distinguished colleague seems to be an entirely practicable one. Should a bill of that kind go to the Committee on Ways and Means? Ought it not more properly to go to the Committee on the District of Columbia, to the Committee on the Territories, or to the Committee on Insular Affairs? Any one of those three committees would have jurisdiction, but the Committee on Ways and Means would not naturally; certainly it would not unless this amendment be adopted. Mr. Chairman, in view of the discussion up to date, it seems to me there is much force in the proposition I made a moment ago, that there ought to be no reference of the subject of insurance to any committee, that the resolution ought to be adopted just as it was originally written, and the Speaker should be given a free hand to refer bills upon the subject of insurance to any committee that he thought they should go to under the definition of jurisdiction in the standing rules.

This could harm no one. The subject of insurance is by implication distributed already. Let me ask, Mr. Chairman, Is not the subject of insurance already effectively distributed? All measures in relation to taxation or revenue go to the Committee on Ways and Means now, without this amendment. If a bill imposing a tax upon the business of insurance in the country should be introduced it would go to the Committee on Ways and Means. All matters in relation to interstate commerce under the rules already go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. If a bill or resolution should be proposed undertaking to regulate the subject of insurance under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution it would go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. All matters in relation to post-office activities already belong to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. If a bill should be proposed undertaking to affect or regulate the business of insurance through the mails that would go to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. So, it is seen, Mr. Chairman, that in effect, without any express declaration upon the part of the House upon the subject, insurance in all its aspects and features is already adequately and satisfactorily disposed of, and by passing the resolution without amendment we will not go to the country as having decided this thing or that. We should not undertake in this manner to interpret the jurisdiction of the committees or to control the Speaker of the House in the reference of bills and resolutions. It is a practical solution of the question, and the only practical solution of the question in my judgment. It would be infinitely better to make no specific reference of insurance, and leave this grave question about the power of Congress to regulate the insurance business, about the power of Congress to use the taxing authority to regulate commerce, these grave questions that have been so ably discussed, to a later day in the session, when there can be a full opportunity for investigation, more time for study, that we may more intelligently dispose of them.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois yields ten minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can contribute very much to this debate, but I do want to emphasize a little what the gentleman from Indiana who has just taken his seat has stated. I agree fully with the position as stated by the gentleman, that bills when introduced should take the regular course and go to the committee properly having jurisdiction. I have examined the message of the President on the subject of insurance, and there is certainly nothing in that part of the message that would suggest that the subject of insurance should be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, stated that when he prepared the resolution that he did not include the words "and insurance," which clearly indicates that there was nothing in the message that suggested that the Committee on Ways and Means was the proper committee to have jurisdiction of this subject. He states that one of the reasons why he proposes this amendment is because certain bills have been introduced proposing to cover the question of insurance regulation through the taxing power, and because of that fact all bills referring to the subject of insurance should properly go to the Committee on Ways and Means. He has also stated that it is a rule of the House that when a committee has jurisdiction of a subject, that then all bills relating to that subject, though containing some technical provision which possibly might send them to some other committee, for the sake of uniformity they should go to the one committee. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that his argument in that respect is against his position, for it can not be claimed that the subject of the regulation of corporations is one over which the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction, and therefore the committee having jurisdiction of the regulation of corporations should have referred to it all bills pertaining to that subject. Mr. Chairman, some genius in this House might prepare and introduce a bill covering all the different phases of the question of regulation of railroads. There would be in that bill the rate question. There might possibly be a provision reaching the refrigerator or private car lines through the taxing power of the Government, and if that provision was in such a bill then, under the logic of the gentleman from the State of New York, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, that bill should go to his committee, and because that bill went to the Committee on Ways and Means then, in order that there might be uniformity, all other bills relating to that subject should be referred to that committee. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what purpose the Committee on Ways and Means has in proposing this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois yields five minutes additional time.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. It is very apparent, Mr. Chairman, that the purpose of the committee was to get control and get jurisdiction of the subject of insurance, and certainly in view of the distinguished gentlemen who compose that committee I would in no way cast any reflections upon their motives.

We know that, whatever motives prompted them, they were honest in suggesting it to this House. We know, Mr. Chairman, that recent investigations have developed the fact that insurance companies have spent large sums of money, if we can believe the reports, in having representatives in attendance at the legislatures of the different States for the purpose of influencing and preventing legislation. Some one might say that possibly one of these representatives, while on his way to some State capitol where a legislature is about to convene, stopped off at Washington and quietly suggested to some friend the committee that ought to have referred to it any bills that might be introduced upon the subject of insurance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we do not believe that that occurred. We have too high a regard and too much respect for the membership of this committee to believe that they would in any way be improperly influenced or affected by any suggestion. But we do find in the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] that the subject did not occur to him, and it did not until suggested by some member of the committee. I submit that the Committee on Ways and Means has no jurisdiction of this subject, that the rules that we have are sufficient to govern what shall be done with bills that may be introduced in this House, and that this amendment or no other is necessary at this time. Let the bills take their regular course and go to the committees that properly have jurisdiction of them.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL].

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, the people of this country are perhaps as interested in this question as in any which has arisen for a long time. Relatively a few people are interested in railroad legislation, but a majority are directly or indirectly concerned in life insurance, and therefore concerned in the action of Congress in this matter. In my judgment Congress should not be foreclosed by any action at this time by referring all bills pertaining to insurance to any one committee. The Ways and Means Committee has jurisdiction of every bill the primary object of which is taxation, but no such bill will pass. For while the people are interested in controlling, regulating, and purifying the life insurance of our country they are not in favor of taxing those companies or their business, for the reason that the policy holders would have to pay the tax.

For greater reasons, in my judgment, those bills should not be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It has been held that marine insurance is not commerce. Now, if marine insurance is not commerce, what can be said in favor of the claim that life insurance, accident insurance, fire insurance, employers' liability insurance, elevator insurance, rent insurance, mercantile accounts insurance, and many other forms of business now classified under the head of insurance, are commerce? It will not be asserted by any man that transactions of this character are commerce, and therefore no valid claim can be made that they should be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Many bills have been introduced and others will be introduced which the Committee on the Judiciary will not claim should be referred to them, and the same applies to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

But there is another idea, simply a suggestion, which I would offer for the consideration of this committee. I quite agree with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] that there is a marked tendency of late toward paternalism, or paternal government, and I am not a strong advocate of that form of government. I agree with him that the central Government is growing stronger day by day relatively to the strength of the several State governments. Every dollar spent for canals, every dollar spent for irrigation, every dollar spent for the improvement of rivers and harbors, every rural delivery carrier started on a route tends to enhance the power of the National Government relatively to the power of the governments of the several Commonwealths. But this argument does not apply especially to the Republican party. There is a marked tendency on the part of gentlemen, Members of this House, Democrats from Southern States, to surrender the doctrine which they inherited from Calhoun and to abandon their ideas of States rights in order that they may get a little pork in the barrel, or that they may get some benefit from the central Government for their several States or districts.

The Democratic party in the State of New York only a few years ago introduced a plank in its platform for ownership of the anthracite mines. On the 7th of last November a Member of this House on the Democratic side ran for mayor of New York on a municipal-ownership plank and received a very large vote, and possibly on a fair canvass and honest count he was elected. I say possibly because I venture no opinion as to the merits in that contest. There are in our country many advocates of Government ownership of railways, telegraph and telephone lines, and, in short, in favor of governmental or municipal ownership of all property employed in the production and distribution of the necessaries of life. The signs of the times all indicate that there is a marked tendency toward paternal government, and I do not know of any business where paternalism would be as wise or beneficial to the people as in life insurance. This is offered merely as a suggestion. It may come up as a matter of serious consideration by and by. With the central government as the life insurance company, as the underwriter of all policies, all the expense of the vast competition which is now being waged between the several companies would be saved. Those expenses are very heavy. The commissions and other expenses in securing new insurance are very large. As a result the cost of insurance in the great life companies is nearly as much again as it ought to be. It is nearly as much again as the real risk would justify. If the expenses of competition and the extravagance and waste in those large companies were eliminated, insurance could be sold for about one-half what it costs now, because not more than one-half the income is paid out as actual benefits for loss.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL] yield to his colleague, Mr. COCKRAN?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. COCKRAN. Does the gentleman include among expenses of insurance the wholesale swindling testified to on the part of officers at recent investigations?

Mr. DRISCOLL. No. I do not include the enormous salaries. The swindling has been indirect largely. I do include, of course, the large salaries all along the line in those companies.

Mr. COCKRAN. Would the gentleman make a distinction between this and ordinary swindling?

Mr. DRISCOLL. There was swindling; but, aside from the salaries, it does not appear in the companies' reports. I now refer to expenses that are accounted for and are reported in the books of the companies. They are very large; much more than they should be, and therefore the insurance is very expensive to the policy holders. If the Government were the insurance company such legislation would do away with the agents all over the country and with the officers who are drawing large salaries, and would eliminate the expensive competition which now prevails. Every individual could get his insurance directly from the Government. There would be no solicitors or agents, and people would take no more than they could afford. Many people are of sanguine temperament. If they are doing fairly well they think the good times will continue. They are often persuaded to contract for more insurance than they can carry when fortune turns against them a little. In such cases they must surrender their policies at considerable loss. Under this system insurance would necessarily be cheap, the security sound, and payment in case of loss certain. There are political economists who say that the government which sells the largest amount of bonds to its own people is the most stable government. If bonds have a tendency to make a government durable, how much more would insurance accomplish in that direction? Relatively few people buy such bonds, while the majority of the people are directly or indirectly interested in life insurance, and every such person would be concerned in keeping the government sound and permanent.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I was interested in what the gentleman stated, and I notice that the gentleman said that the expenses of the companies were unnecessarily large, and I suppose he probably refers to the three great companies located in New York?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I would like to be advised whether the insurance superintendent of New York has made any recommendation as to what are the legitimate expenses and as to a reduction that should be made.

Mr. DRISCOLL. The superintendent of insurance of the State of New York commenced an investigation of the Equitable Life Assurance Society last spring, and I happened to be the counsel in that investigation, which really started this convulsion which has spread all over the country. He investigated into the expenses incurred in the management of that company and made a report on that question.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I have read the report and had it in my room, but I do not remember that that report included a suggestion with reference to the reduction of expenses.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I am not sure that it did.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What I wanted to get at was whether the superintendent of insurance had made any specific recommendation in that respect.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I do not think he did.

Bills or resolutions may be introduced in order to give the Government power along the lines of this plan of insurance, and certainly such bills or resolutions should not be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, nor should they be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. I quite agree with the gentlemen who have preceded me that we should not foreclose ourselves at this time by referring all bills and resolutions on the subject of insurance to the Committee on Ways and Means on the theory that the only way of getting jurisdiction of this insurance question is by the taxing power of the Government. Nor should they be referred to any other one committee, but the reference of each bill and resolution should be determined by its own provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

[Mr. MANN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, this debate has taken a range far beyond a mere question of procedure in the House. It has touched a most important question of Federal jurisdiction. It has done more. It presents a question affecting the very existence of republican government and our power to take effective action for its preservation.

A most interesting contribution to the discussion has just been concluded by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. With the object which he had in view I sympathize most

heartily. The method by which he pursues it I think is open to question. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has bemoaned the decline of State governments and the decay of representative bodies, including this one—two features of our evolution which I believe to be ominous in the last degree. But the gentleman says that he is opposed to any use of the taxing power as a means of enforcing authority by this House over important questions affecting the public welfare. So far as I could understand his argument, he stated that while this taxing power had been the effective weapon by which representative bodies had established their authority in the past, for some reason or other not made quite clear to me, and I fear not quite clear to the House, it was not proper or judicious at this day to invoke it for the preservation of the authority which had been established by its exercise. I have observed through all this discussion on the part of gentlemen who have opposed the reference of this question to the Committee on Ways and Means a disposition to treat the taxing power of this body as though it were a mere power conferred by law on some city or village government to levy an assessment for the support of a municipal department. It is important and, I think, essential to remind gentlemen that this power of taxation vested in the House of Representatives by the Constitution is the weapon by which all the importance of legislative bodies has been established.

If the conception of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and other gentlemen who have spoken on this subject be correct, then that provision of the Constitution which places in our hands the exclusive right to originate revenue bills is a mere idle expression—superfluous, meaningless, unimportant. Sir, I do not believe any line of the Constitution is either superfluous or meaningless. There are weighty reasons why that power has been bestowed on us. Sir, I think anybody familiar with the debates in the convention where our Constitution was framed will concede that through all the discussions it was assumed that this body would always be the important feature of our Government, and its importance in the judgment of the framers was assured when the taxing power was placed in our hands. If we are but a board of aldermen to decide whether the rates levied to support some city or village government should be 1, 2, 3, or 4 per cent on the assessed value of all its property, then the power to originate revenue bills might have been placed at the other end of the Capitol without in the slightest degree affecting the importance of this body. But, sir, because all the successful battles for liberty have been fought with that weapon, it was intrusted to us by the wise men who established this Government, in the belief that privileges which heroes had won in the field patriots would conserve in the council chamber. That power of taxation we have a right to exercise absolutely according to our own discretion. As we use it our consequence and our dignity will stand in the structure of our Government. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] bemoans very properly the fact that legislative bodies have sunk into contempt while the body at the other end of this Capitol, which has some share of executive power, has risen steadily in importance, and he assigns the reason for it correctly. The reason is that the Senate of the United States exercises to the full every function and power the Constitution has placed in its hands. Every day witnesses not a recession or concession, but a new and further assertion of authority. Only this morning we in this Chamber felt bound to rise unanimously and declare that this last intrenchment of our power, this exclusive right to originate revenue bills, should not be broken down without at least a protest from ourselves. Yet the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], while recognizing and, indeed, deploring the growth of the Senate and bemoaning the decay of the House of Representatives, tells us in the same breath that he disapproves any use of the one power, the one weapon, by which our consequence can be established.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. COCKRAN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. I differ simply because I do not believe that is the only power by which the House can assert its dignity and do not think the makers of the Constitution intended it should be the only power.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I supposed, of course, that was the gentleman's view or he would not have made the speech he did upon the floor, but the fact remains that he has bemoaned the waning dignity of this body and he has deplored, or, I believe, criticised, the growth of the other. My object now is simply to supply an explanation of what he considers a calamity and to suggest a method by which it can be repaired. With singular force he declared that powers which are not exercised are powers which are declining, that powers unused are perishing powers. The power to arrest our decay and reestablish our consequence is ours, yet that is the power which the gentleman even now declares is not a proper or legitimate one to be used in maintaining our authority and our dignity. While that power is vigorously asserted there is no subject within Federal control on which we may not exercise the dominant influence, aye, sir, that we were not intended to dominate by the framers of our Constitution. The mere grant of this exclusive right to originate revenue bills shows that we were intended to be the principal feature of this Government. If we have declined and decayed, it is not for lack of power, but through failure to exercise the powers which are ours. The power of the English House of Commons theoretically is very little. Theoretically it is vastly inferior to that of the Lords; practically it is paramount through its control of the purse. Under the feudal system representative bodies had no power except the right to levy taxes. They had no right even to consider any other question unless it was expressly submitted by the sovereign through officers of his own selection and household, known as "lords of the articles."

The gentleman deplored a recent tendency of State constitutions to limit subjects which State legislatures can consider when called in extra session to those which the governor might submit to them. You see, sir, there is nothing original in personal government. There is nothing original in the forms by which distrust of popular government seeks expression. That tendency, which the gentleman deplored, is but a revival here in this land of the power exercised through lords of the articles under feudal institution, when the sovereign treated the legislature, parliament, or council simply as a body whose advice he might ask on certain matters, but whose authority, except upon taxation, he did not concede. The power over the purse alone was always conceded to the representatives of the people; and yet upon this slender foundation the stately structure of the British House of Commons has been erected, which dominates the entire English system, and which furnished the framers of this Constitution with a model for the establishment of this body.

Mr. SHERLEY. May I interrupt the gentleman again?

Mr. COCKRAN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is it not true the use of the power over the purse was in respect to appropriations, and not to do an arbitrary and unconstitutional thing?

Mr. COCKRAN. No, sir; the gentleman must study history a little more carefully. On the contrary, the power which was used most frequently and most effectively was the very power of which this House has deprived itself by special rule, the power to impose conditions on appropriations, to impose taxes on domains, privileges, monopolies, and other features of their political system which they considered dangerous to the prosperity or the liberty of the citizen.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does not the gentleman know that the National Government has no police power and it has been so declared, and does the gentleman not believe that the use of the taxing power for police purposes is unconstitutional to-day?

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not conceding that this is a police power. The gentleman undertakes to anticipate the point at which I am aiming, and being doubtless innocent of the course of reasoning which I am pursuing, is naturally ignorant of the end which I seek to attain. [Laughter.]

I trust the gentleman will possess his soul in patience and at the end of a very few minutes he will understand precisely the character of the proposition which I am seeking to establish. I say, Mr. Chairman, that this body uow possesses sufficient power to establish its consequence and its predominance if we choose to exercise it. There is but one change, one amendment that in my judgment could possibly increase its efficiency in legislation or its capacity to defend itself, and that concerns simply the term for which its Members are elected. Where a Member is chosen practically for two sessions and by the operation of our constitutional system one session must be held after the election of his successor, it necessarily happens that the very day on which he takes his seat upon this floor and begins the discharge of his duties he is at once thrust into the throes of a contest for reelection. No man can perform his duty here wholly and efficiently when every day his mail is charged chiefly with information, representations, remonstrances, and appeals that concern not the public business at hand, but the prospect before him in his own district. [Applause.] If this democratic body is ever to acquire and exercise the measure of power which the builders of this Government believed it should possess in order that this constitutional system may be safe and prosperous, there should be at least one or two sessions in which Members could devote themselves to their public duties free from the distraction of a campaign

for reelection. Apart from that there is no effective power the Constitution could bestow on us that it has not already bestowed when it gave us the taxing power.

If we have no importance, it is not because we lack power, but because we have put away the great power which has been conferred upon us. And strange as it may seem, the gentlemen who are the most solicitous about the Constitution, the gentleman who describes that instrument as the sacred ark of the covenant—I think I am using the exact words of my friend from Kentucky—condemns as vicious a use of its most important feature, the one on which depends the importance of the body of which he is already a distinguished member and certain in the near future to become one of its most brilliant ornaments. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the suggestion which I would like to place before this committee is that there are various provisions of the Constitution which may be invoked to deal effectively with the abuses grown out of the maladministration of these insurance corporations. But before we consider the remedy which should be applied, let us for a moment consider the nature of the difficulty which confronts us. I believe that on any subject fairly within the authority of the Federal Government—any subject over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction—this House has the right to exercise the taxing power in any way it pleases for the maintenance of its own authority and the enforcement of its own views as well as for the general welfare of all our citizens.

For no other purpose was the taxing power—the right to originate revenue bills—confided to us. I am perfectly willing to admit that we should not undertake to establish jurisdiction by extending arbitrarily the taxing power into fields not properly belonging to the dominion of Federal authority.

Mr. SHERLEY. How does the gentleman explain the case of Dewitt?

Mr. COCKRAN. I beg the gentleman will not interrupt now by asking me to explain special cases. I entreat the gentleman to realize that, after all, he is but one Member of this House, though probably the best among us all, and I am addressing a collective body of which at least 250 Members are present, I can not in the course of this discussion meet every possible difficulty that may arise in the gentleman's mind. If he will allow me to finish, and make note in the meantime of any question that he chooses to ask, at the end I will be glad to spend an hour or two hours in cheerful and, I hope, improving colloquy with him. [Laughter.]

Now, a more important matter, Mr. Chairman, than satisfying the scruples, or shall I say attempting to follow the interesting speculations of the gentleman from Kentucky, is a definite statement of the precise question presented to this House.

We have heard much about the difficulty of dealing with the matter of insurance. From the beginning it seems to have been assumed that the existence of large corporations, each prosecuting its business in several States, and all the corruption and vice in the management which have recently been laid there, are in some way or other inherent in every insurance system, and that the only reform possible is to provide some means of regulating them. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] pleads for a State regulation; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], if I understand, pleads for a Federal regulation. Now, I think it is possible to exercise the power of this General Government so as to remove completely the conditions which have produced the sinister fruits of corruption which we all deplore. If that can be accomplished, then it is clear no regulation of a Federal character anyway will be necessary or advisable.

What then, Mr. Chairman, is the question before us? I believe that it touches the very existence of republican government. I believe that the continued existence and growth of these institutions are absolutely inconsistent with the safety of republican government in any State which charters them or any State in which they operate, and that the Congress of the United States, whether by exercising the taxing power or otherwise, is bound to deal with them by section 4 of Article IV, which makes it a duty of the Federal Government to guarantee a republican form of government to every State in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, do gentlemen present understand fully the operation of life insurance under existing conditions? Here are corporations possessing enormous funds, whose wealth must necessarily continue to grow rapidly and steadily and whose possessions can never be distributed. Three companies in the city of New York possess assets amounting to a billion and a quarter of dollars. Half of that enormous wealth has been created within a span of time only one-half as long as my own memory covers. It is no exaggeration to say that in the course of a few years, if this system be tolerated, those companies will control from three to five billions of dollars. These three companies have been administered for a long time on a perfect understanding between their managers, and under the pressure of existing conditions there is little doubt that they will soon be controlled by a single hand.

Now, here is a peril to republican government which can not be exaggerated. It is a feature of government in every State, an essential feature of its juridical system, that property shall not be allowed to grow and accumulate indefinitely by being tied up in any form or under any condition. Every State takes precautions to insure the distribution of property by prohibiting any suspension of the power to alienate it beyond a fixed and limited period. In our State property can never be tied up for more than two lives actually in being. In every other State some provision of kindred character has been established. Yet here we have already a billion and a quarter of wealth controlled by three men and certain in a short time to be concentrated in a single pair of hands. In the course of a very short time—not one generation—we will see five or six billions of dollars controlled by a single man. And this vast sum, which can never be distributed, must, in the nature of things, grow from year to year.

Now, such a system, I submit to the committee, must sooner or later produce conditions absolutely inconsistent with republican government. Suppose an individual were able to accumulate such an enormous fortune as that, and suppose by the use of it he were able to dominate our markets, regulate prices, control all means of transportation. Would he not become a power stronger than any State government? But, sir, the very employment and investment of such vast funds would force him to assume such powers and to exercise them. He could hardly avoid, if he would, taking the Government into his pocket, or at least into his hands, and threatening, as we have already seen, a powerful insurance officer threaten a rival with the use of it as a club to beat down opposition. If a single individual were found owning property to an extent that made such an exercise of power possible, would not the ingenuity of every statesman, of every thoughtful man, be exercised to find some means of changing the conditions under which such a peril had been developed? Yet, Mr. Chairman, if these vast funds were the property of an individual owner he would be under the restraining influence of possession, the fear that by any abuse, or even a display of his power, he might risk its security and perhaps its total loss. But, sir, it is the most serious feature of this evil system that these large funds are in the control of men who don't own them and who have little, if any, personal interest in them.

Now, I ask gentlemen of the committee to consider a moment this condition. In the city of New York alone three companies closely connected hold $1,250,000,000, and that fund can not be distributed. It will not be distributed. It must continue to grow, and it is held and controlled at the disposition of men that have really little or no interest in its safety or honest investment.

This condition alone, if there were no other vicious feature of the system, would suffice to make it incompatible with republican government. But that is not all. Every State in the Union, as a necessary precaution for its safety, provides that trusts can be established under its laws only for certain strictly limited and clearly defined purposes, and one feature that runs through them all, without exception, is that no trust can be tolerated where the cestui que trust can not see for himself the manner in which his trustee discharges his duty.

Here are funds amounting to one billion and a quarter—trust funds—and the cestuis que trust can not tell how they are invested or employed until through chance a legislative investigation shows that they have been largely made to flow in channels of crime and corruption. Mr. Chairman, either of these vicious features, both of which violate laws and principles considered fundamental in every State, would make the system dangerous to republican government. Where they coexist—where a huge fund, which is steadily growing, can not be distributed, and where that fund is a trust the execution of which can not be scrutinized by the cestuis que trust, the system is absolutely and inevitably inconsistent with republican government. Republican government, to preserve its own existence, must destroy such a system or the system will first corrupt and then strangle republican government. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the committee that there is but one remedy for this abuse. The conditions which have preceded it must be uprooted. You can not regulate anything so inherently vicious as this. The features of the system which have made it vicious must be overthrown—destroyed root and branch. What objection can there be to this? I am not now discussing the precise method by which a remedy should be applied. I merely ask, Is there any reason why these great insurance companies

should not be restricted to guarding and prevented from wasting the economies of citizens by restricting them to the same field of operation which savings banks now cultivate? The huge, sinister growth of these companies comes from their power to do business in several States. Why should not this power be ended by Federal enactment?

At this point I suppose there rises in the minds of many here the question, Has not this growth of assets resulted in cheapening the cost of insurance? If the answer must be in the affirmative there would be grave reason for moving slowly and with great hesitation to change a system which, however evil in some of its features, had yet operated to encourage economy among the citizens by augmenting its profits.

But, sir, the exact opposite is the truth. As these assets have grown, the rates of insurance, instead of falling, have risen. This growth, which has imperiled the safety of the State, has also imperiled and impaired the resources of the insured. I may be asked, Do I advocate here the prohibition of insurance? By no means. I should be the last to advocate any measure that would be calculated to discourage economy or to refuse it every encouragement within the power of the State. But, sir, it is not essential to effective insurance that these companies should be permitted to grow to this enormous size and to extend themselves all over the United States. The remedy is to confine them to each State, as savings banks are confined to-day.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL] spoke of huge expenses, of $150,000 salaries, of an army of agents who are growing rich by soliciting business. All these are but sources of corruption, of crime, of waste, in no way beneficial to the insured. There is nothing about insurance companies essentially different from savings banks. They are very similar enterprises. The savings bank accepts a deposit, pays a certain amount annually for it, and returns the deposit at the wish or demand of the depositor. The insurance company invests not merely the deposit, but its earnings, and when the depositor or insured dies pays the deposit and all it has earned to his heirs or assigns. In each case the essential function is the prudent investment of money.

This is not a difficult or a mysterious function involving any particular skill. The investement of money by the savings banks of the United States has been singularly successful. By figures furnished me this morning by the Department of Commerce and Labor I find that in the United States to-day there are $3,093,077,357 of the savings of the poor. They are properly and carefully invested. By the Insurance Yearbook it appears that the total assets of life-insurance companies in the United States are $2,500,000,000. The savings banks hold funds more than 20 per cent greater than all the assets of the insurance companies. These funds have been accumulated without the aid of agents, without misleading or elusive pretenses of dividends, without paying $150,000 to any president of the corporation. They do not menace the morals, they do not menace the laws, they do not menace the government of any State in this Union. Here is the field to which insurance should be confined. Believe me, Mr. Chairman, this whole investigation shows that a president who draws $150,000 or $100,000 a year is paid that enormous salary not for any peculiar capacity to serve the policy holders, but for peculiar skill and efficiency in swindling them. [Applause.] That is made absolutely clear by the evidence taken on the proceedings before the New York committee.

It is above all in the interest of the insured—the policy holders—that I believe insurance companies should be placed on exactly the same footing as savings banks. But, sir, it is not alone for the safety and welfare of the policy holders, important though they be, that I am concerned. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the main objection to this system is that it endangers a republican form of government. I have shown you how its operations, even if honestly conducted, necessarily invade two features of the juridical system which every State has deemed essential to its own safety. But, sir, in practical operation these enormous funds, in the hands of men who do not own them, have poisoned the fountains of government, corrupted its administration, imperiled its existence. I have said that it endangers republican government. Sir, it has destroyed the efficiency of republican government in many directions already. What spectacle is it that we deplore? Has it been merely the commission of crime, however heinous? Why, sir, crime occurs everywhere. Crime occurred in High Heaven itself, where the visible presence of the Fountain of all Goodness did not restrain angels from plotting offenses against His Majesty. I do not therefore expect that this earth, or any part of it, will ever be free from crime. But the distressing feature of this spectacle is not the commission of offenses, but it was the avowal of criminality by the criminals, without any apparent consciousness of their own infamy. Before a sorrow-stricken and humiliated community they smilingly mounted the witness chair and cheerfully confessed their crimes, as though they were making professions of excellence. And whither did they go after their confessions were complete? Was it before a grand jury or even before a police magistrate? No; they went back to the very offices where they had practiced their abuses; and the question which men are asking everywhere to-day is not how soon they will be in the penitentiary, but how soon they will condescend to take their hands away from what is left of the treasures confided to them for safety and which they have looted remorselessly. Sir, we are edified now by the spectacle in New York City of the attorney-general and the district attorney working day and night to deliver over to justice men who in small districts have violated the purity of the ballot box. Everyone bids them godspeed. The penitentiary already has received many of those accused. But there has not been one question advanced by an officer of the law to these criminals who have confessed to unblushing perjury and stupendous peculation. [Applause.]

An unfortunate woman who has extracted a ten-dollar note from the pocket of some drunken voluptuary pursuing pleasure in the night is sent to the penitentiary, or is on the road to it, before sundown the next day. These criminals by their own confessions, who have not robbed the vicious and the profligate, but who have robbed the industrious poor of millions, not one of them has been called before a competent body even to explain his infamy. It was only the other day that a negress, who had managed to wheedle a vicious dotard out of some property, was exposed in the public print, and at midnight the officers of the law, the chief prosecutor, surrounded by a gallery of reporters, detectives, spectators, and degenerates, broke down her door with an ax and dragged her triumphantly before the bar of a criminal court, where, I may add, no criminal offense was ever proved against her. Has one of these criminals, whose confessions of infamy were evidently based upon the cheerful assurance that the size of their fortunes gave them immunity—has one of that class found the door of his office battered down by an ax? Has any grand jury been called to consider his robberies? No, sir; we find that the criminals who have befouled their offices have themselves undertaken a "housecleaning," and the law stands by mute and motionless in the presence of this condition against which a popular verdict of bitter condemnation has already been rendered and against which a popular uprising is absolutely inevitable. [Applause.]

Sir, it is idle to call that a republican government where the law is formidable only to petty offenders and helpless or subservient before gigantic crime. Where is that equality before the law which is the very corner stone of our constitutional system, if it is still in existence, when the self-confessed thieves of millions are still enjoying free opportunities of larceny while thieves of small sums are languishing in our prisons? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to criticise any particular prosecuting officer. Believe me, I make full allowance for the conditions which confront him and confront us. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that there are at this moment resources at the disposal of society sufficient to put any man possessed of eight or ten million dollars in jail. It is a humiliating confession, but it may as well be made. The whole tone, the whole trend of public opinion, is to sit down helpless before vice when it is colossal. We all deplore it, but no man yet has raised his hand to strike where its perpetrators command millions. I ask any gentleman on this floor if this be not the most sinister, if this be not the most ominous, spectacle ever presented in the history of this country?

Mr. Chairman, distressing and degrading though these revelations may be, we have not yet been permitted to see even the surface of these infamies. Do gentlemen know how the majority of these crimes are perpetrated, secure from punishment, and almost from discovery? I can give you some insight into it. You may have wondered why it is that eminent financiers, who seldom have sufficient time to visit their friends or even dine with their families, always find ample leisure to serve on the boards of direction of these eleemosynary companies. The explanation is very simple. Service there was always equivalent to a fortune.

A financier who belonged to a board himself—or whose partner sat on it—which controlled hundreds of millions of dollars had no hesitation whatever in offering to take an entire issue of bonds by another great corporation. If the amount were $100,000,000 he would take them, say, at par, because he knew perfectly well that if he failed to dispose of them at a profit this insurance company with huge funds, in which none of its directors had any personal interest, would be made to take

them off his hands on his own terms. But the fact that he was known to have bid for them was generally sufficient to give value to these securities above the bid. It being known, or rather believed, that he was willing himself to pay 100 for them other men of smaller means became eager to buy them at a small advance, and as they bid against each other the price usually advanced to 101 or 102, and thus the whole issue would be sold to the public at such a rate as yielded the enterprising financier between one and two millions of dollars, and this without his being called upon to write a check for one dollar. And of that operation, with its huge profits made through use of funds which this financier had no right whatever to use, no trace whatever appears in the records of the insurance company. It was only in the few instances, where the enterprise failed and resulted in loss, which the insurance company was compelled to make good, that any trace was left by which the original transaction could be established. For every one that failed a hundred succeeded, and thus for every infamy we have discovered one hundred, one thousand, infamies have been perpetrated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit to this committee—I submit to this country—whether this system of accumulation, unnecessary, unjustified, and unjustifiable, productive of nothing but fraud and corruption, which causes no benefit, but much injury, to the policy holders, which can be profitable to none but thieves, swindlers, and exploiters—I submit whether it must not be terminated by some method or other if republican government is to be preserved. I repeat that I have no desire to check insurance; on the contrary, I want to encourage it, and the best encouragement that you can give it is to make the funds absolutely secure which are embarked in it. It can not promote their safety or their profitable investment when they are intrusted to the control of financiers who have made finance synonymous with piracy. [Laughter and applause.]

Place insurance in the hands of men who realize that the investment of funds is but the discharge of a simple function and you will have your insurance assets grow as have grown the savings bank deposits, without the intervention of agents who plunder the insured or of high-salaried officers who grow rich at their expense. But, sir, some gentlemen may still ask, Is there not some way by which this great business can be preserved, while stripped of its pernicious features? I answer, None in its present extended form. It is absolutely vicious; it is the creation of a trust which can not be scrutinized by the cestuis que trust; it is the creation of a huge fund, which must grow from day to day and can never be distributed, in violation of the fundamental principles upon which the juridical system of every State is built. It yields no result or benefit to anybody except to criminals who exploit it. It must be suppressed, changed, brought within the limits where its operations will be salutary to the state by encouraging economy on the part of citizens without ever threatening the purity of government. Thus, and thus only, can this country escape from the peril which it has developed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as a proof that no special skill is necessary to the effective prosecution of the business of insurance, we have but to look at the method by which these three companies have undertaken to reorganize themselves. What is the first thing they have done? Do they enlist the service of insurance experts? Not by any means. The first thing the reformers did was to send the experts all away. The Equitable Company has been reorganized on a somewhat peculiar basis. A very rich gentleman whom we all have the right, I suppose, to call a philanthropist—

> For he himself hath said it
> And it's greatly to his credit—

[laughter]—has purchased the control of this company and given two millions and a half for stock that can pay him $3,500 a year. That is to say, through philanthropy he has given an earning power of $125,000 for an earning power of $3,500 a year. He is too good a business man to have done that as a matter of commerce. There is no explanation for it except philanthropy. [Laughter.] Now, in order to enlist popular approval for this philanthropic enterprise, what has he done? Has he explored the insurance world for some of this talent which has commanded $150,000 a year or $75,000 a year? By no means. He has gone outside the field of insurance altogether and appointed a kind of financial vigilance committee, and not one of the vigilantes has ever had anything to do with an insurance company except that possibly one of them may have borrowed money from it.

A very eminent statesman, one of the most eminent of our time, has been called from the classic shades of Princeton, where he has been spending the decline of an illustrious life in composing philosophical contributions to the thought of the century, and empowered to select trustees for a company engaged in a business with which, so far as I know, he has never had the slightest acquaintance. Associated with him are two other gentlemen, one who, as I said, may have borrowed money from an insurance company, but certainly never had anything to do with the administration of one, himself a financier of no mean distinction, while the other is a judge, an eminent judge, a judge whose motives nobody will ever question, but who in assuming this peculiar function of a vigilante must necessarily disqualify himself from sitting in a great number of cases which the State of New York had expected him to adjudicate. And to put this reform in practical and efficient operation a gentleman is selected who may have been a good railroad man—I believe he was—and we have the authority of the President for it that he was an excellent Cabinet officer—too good, in fact, to remain [laughter]—and this gentleman, who in the occupation for which he had been specially trained I do not believe could command over $25,000 or $30,000 a year, gets $80,000 to manage a business for which he has had no qualification or preparation whatever. Now, that is reform as the insurance companies themselves conceive it.

In the Mutual we have the very board of trustees whose members had themselves either been active agents in these frauds—who had either been privy to them or who had tolerated them—choosing a new head, and that selection is generally attributed to the influence of a gentleman who has leaped into a peculiar fame through articles published in Everybody's Magazine and which seem to describe him as the triumphant and successful hero of a hundred larcenies. [Laughter and applause.]

In the New York Life its vice-president, after avowals of crime, after swearing on his own oath that he had purchased one day bonds and sold them the next day at an advance of 2 per cent to the company whose interests he was bound to place beyond his own, driven from his post by the indignation of the community, finds himself followed by the adulation of this board, and complimentary resolutions—complimentary to his efficiency in plunder—have been spread through the public press as advertisements paid for out of the funds of the policy holders whom he had robbed.

Sir, remember that we have merely been permitted to glance at these infamies by accident. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] asked, Is it not a State agency that has uncovered these frauds? Sir, the State agency has not uncovered them. It has covered them up, steadily and ceaselessly. The State insurance commission, as is generally believed, was neither a barrier nor an impediment to these frauds. Its head, nominated by the companies themselves, its operation and examinations, in the nature of things, tended not to check, but to facilitate the doubtful enterprises of the officers. The State stood supine. Nay, sir, not supine. Forgive me; it cast actively over these transactions the mantle of concealment, and the whole sickening story became public through a quarrel between the gentlemen who had been enjoying the plunder. A young man whose youth did not fit him for the mysteries of this temple of iniquity was a little too frank and candid for the associates with whom he was thrown. [Laughter.]

They undertook to throw him out not because he was dishonest. That fact would have tended if it existed to bring him close to their bosoms, but they threw him out because he was inefficient in plunder, and in opening the doors to eject him they afforded the public a view of the rottenness that lay behind it. [Applause.] Then and not till then the State reluctantly, slowly, shamefacedly entered upon the field of inquiry, and the result has been the discoveries which have justified this debate here to-day.

Sir, where companies grow as strong, as rich, and so utterly irresponsible as those under discussion, there is no agency, State or Federal, that can control them. When I look back at the opportunities these men enjoyed, when I realize that some of them might have helped themselves to a hundred and fifty thousand dollars a day instead of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year, I confess that I can not hold them to have been reckless or extravagant in piracy; I am rather inclined to consider them examples of moderation in piracy. I have no doubt that to-day Mr. Perkins and Mr. McCurdy are both echoing and repeating the pharse of Lord Clive, when he was examined before a committee of Parliament concerning the treasure abstracted from Surâjah Dowlah. After describing his walk through the room in which the vast treasures were stored, the gold and the silver, the precious stones, all piled one over the other, of which he took but £300,000—stole but $1,500,000 when the whole was absolutely at his mercy—he said, doubtless from the bottom of his heart: "Considering my opportunities, by God, sir, I am amazed at my own moderation." [Applause.]

Sir, these gentlemen may well say, "considering our opportunities we are amazed at our own moderation." While these insurance companies are permitted to exist in their present form they will continue to furnish opportunities of plunder, and while these opportunities last they will be abused and perhaps not always with the same moderation. Remember that the lesson of these exposures is not that there is much difficulty or danger in perpetrating similar offenses, but that it was gross stupidity from the criminal point of view which led to their discovery. These malefactors had but to possess their souls in patience, to wait until the young man had been educated up to their own depravity and these crimes would never have been unfolded. [Applause.] What lesson will you teach them now? Will you by a refusal to take effective action for their suppression in their present pernicious form confirm these rapacious officers, or successors chosen by themselves, in the possession of the powers which they have so grossly abused? Will you make these opportunities more secure and more abundant by allowing them to continue under pretense of regulation through some agency, Federal or State, which their billions can always control? Will you restore these powers to them, enlightened as they are now by these experiences which have showed at once the helplessness of government and the power of public opinion? Will you encourage them to greater, more deadly efficiency in plunder by leaving them to use the arts of corruption for the control of public officers while exercising more prudence to keep the public gaze from discovering their iniquities? That, sir, is the lesson which will be taught them if this body take no action to remove this grave peril.

Consider, Mr. Chairman, the demoralization of our civic and commercial life which these exposures have disclosed and which they illustrate.

Everywhere we find a disposition to accept this corruption and this depravity as necessary features of our political system. I see here in the President's message something more significant than that which my friend from Kentucky brought to the attention of the committee. It is the sentiment which dominates all his recent addresses. "*There are selfish and brutal men*," he says "*in all ranks of life. If they are capitalists, their selfishness and brutality may take the form of hard indifference to suffering, greedy disregard of every moral restraint, which interferes with the accumulation of wealth, and cold-blooded exploitation of the weak.*" Similarly, in Richmond, Va., I think it was, he said that the man for whom he had the greatest contempt was the one who could practice wrong at the expense of his neighbor under protection of the law. Sir, that language is a confession that civilized society has failed to establish any effective means of preventing the commission of offenses by some men against others. I do not believe it is justified. There need not be, there should not be, in a well-organized state power in any man to commit a wrong at the expense of another without punishment by the law being quick and sure upon the footsteps of the perpetrator. When we find such inadequate and fanciful suggestions for regulating rather than preventing crime, I am always reminded of what I think is the besetting weakness of the estimable and admirable character who is President of the United States.

He has a strong affection for the moral law. He wants to keep it constantly before him as the guiding principle of his life, but he commits the fatal mistake of believing that it can be invoked effectively to regulate the distribution of plunder. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Sir, the time and place to invoke the moral law is before the exaction of plunder. If the gratification of greed by perpetration of wrong against morality and justice be once permitted, then to invoke the moral law for its regulation would be like burglars calling upon a policeman to enforce fairness in a distribution of their booty. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is everywhere apparent, I think it is the sinister feature of our political condition—the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL] drew attention to it—a disposition in this country to treat the possession of wealth as presumptive evidence of depravity. In all of our political contests poverty is something of which men boast; the possession of wealth is something that a candidate denies or explains, if he can. And yet why should not the possession of a fortune be a source of honor, credit, and popularity in every community? Why this distrust of success, for the possession of property is the fruit and badge of success? It was not always so. I remember thirty years ago in the city of New York the largest fortune was owned by a man named A. T. Stewart. He was not a lovable character; he was parsimonious, hard, unneighborly; he never built a library; he never wrote a check for a maternity hospital, and yet his fortune, then as large in proportion to those of other rich men as Rockefeller's or Carnegie's is to-day, was not unpopular. It was not assailed or endangered by public hate. It was guarded and fortified by public approval and public support. Why? Because it had been made by a great public service. He was the first person who introduced into the retail trade the principle of one price, so that every man, woman, and child was treated alike who came to his counter. And that system proved so profitable to him that it became the governing plan of every store. The community reaped immense benefit from it, while its originator made an enormous fortune, and the community, mindful of the good he did, respected his fortune as the legitimate monument to the service he rendered his fellows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COCKRAN. May I have a few minutes more?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed until he concludes his remarks. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] may proceed until he concludes his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I remember a conversation with perhaps the leading living English philosopher, a gentleman who had visited this country and had written about it very sympathetically. He said: "There is one feature of your political life which I never could understand. There is no country in the world where an idler is held in such profound contempt, and there is no country where the millionaire is viewed with such deep distrust. Now, since the object of industry is to accumulate property, it seems to me that you are traveling in a vicious circle. If you are idle you are despised, and if you are industrious and possess property, the result of successful industry, you are distrusted." Now, there was a good deal of force in that suggestion. It is an extraordinary situation, but it is capable of explanation. The reason why fortunes have become unpopular here in America is that many of them—most of the great ones—have sprung from vile sources and have worked grave mischief to the morals and civic honor of the country. [Applause.]

The American people are not a people of levity. They have not, as my friend from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has said, changed from a careful and sober to a mercurial and thoughtless people. Their intellectual functions are not confined to what the newspaper said yesterday and to anticipating its remarks of to-morrow.

I think the American citizen shows absolute independence of the newspapers' opinion and sometimes considerable contempt for it. I think he reaches his own conclusions with unerring judgment, and the soundness of his reasoning on this matter is a high tribute to his keen perceptions, his indomitable courage, and uncompromising virtue.

Vast fortunes which have been accumulated in violation of law, stand as monuments, not of efficiency in industry, but of ingenuity in swindling and criminality. Some of the largest fortunes in their accumulation have violated the fundamental moralities upon which the safety of our Constitution depends. You gentlemen on the other side have often spoken of a disposition, recently manifested throughout the country, to distrust the judicial department. This is deplorable, but is the fault wholly with the populace? Sir, is the judicial department wholly free from reproach? Why is it that the judicial establishment has undoubtedly become an object of suspicion and distrust; not, I will say, Mr. Chairman, to all the people, but to a very important element in our community? Why, because while it has been singularly effective in maintaining the balance of power between the different departments of Government, while it has been bold and vigorous in maintaining individual rights against disturbance by legislature or executive, or both combined, it has not shown the same vigilance in preventing fraud by capitalists that it has shown in restraining the course of the peace by strikers in labor disputes. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to discuss here the wisdom of the judicial ingenuity by which the operations of courts of equity were extended to criminal offenses. That may or may not have been a great contribution to the security of human society. But I am sorry that while it has been made impossible for any man to run a strike of any extent without getting into jail or without coming into serious conflict at some time or other with an injunction or some other manifestation of judicial activity and vigilance, gigantic fortunes have been made by palpable fraud and open lawlessness without check or hindrance from any judicial authority.

Rockefeller's fortune is a monument of crime. [Loud applause.] He does not deny—nobody does—that it is a product

of conspiracy. Yet there never has been an injunction issued to prevent its accumulation; no writ or other judicial process threatens or is likely to threaten the security of his hold on it. What manager of any company now hesitates to use the property of his stockholders as though it were his own? Where is the railroad president who hesitates to use private cars and private trains, to travel for pleasure across the continent at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars to his company, through fear that any judge or grand jury or prosecuting officer, State or Federal, would require him to answer a charge of wasting funds intrusted to him as trustee?

Sir, these are facts, patent, obvious, undeniable, which we must all deplore. It is time we should consider them—time that we should consider how the demoralization of the public conscience worked by them can be cured. Mr. Chairman, I have said that no man can make a fortune by honest effort which the American people will destroy or public opinion will allow to be endangered. To erect around property, around fortunes, however large, the barrier and rampart of healthy public opinion is indeed an important and a pressing duty. The first step is to make industry—honest industry—the sole fountain of wealth. So, sir, when this huge enginery of fraud is before us, active, sinister, deadly, we must take action which will make its further operation impossible. We at least must say that whatever power we may find it necessary to invoke we shall find some means of making the further operation of these sinister organizations impossible. It may be said that if we restrict the operation of these particular insurance companies to the States which have chartered them they will be unable to prosecute their business in view of contracts already made. Sir, if their withdrawal from business be the necessary result of legitimate restraint, let them, in Heaven's name, go out of business. The problem is simplified decisively by the fact that if they liquidate now the policy holders will be gainers, not losers, by it. The only men that I know who would be subjected to any loss if to-day we should pass some measure making it impossible for any insurance company chartered by a State to do business outside of that State would be, first, the presidents, officers, and agents of those companies, whose opportunities of swindling would be contracted, and, second, that eminent philanthropist who, having risked two millions and a half of dollars for the good of the public, I am sure would rejoice in a dispensation that enabled him to make the sacrifice complete. [Laughter.]

Sir, this being a novel subject, one that raises grave doubt as to how we should proceed, it seems to me that better than a reference of it to any standing committee would be the appointment of a special committee to consider the whole matter in all its branches and report back to this body, first, whether the continued existence of life insurance under the present system is consistent with the security of a republican form of government, and if they find that it endangers the public safety, to suggest a remedy by which the abuse may be eradicated if a remedy be within the power of the Federal Government.

Sir, I do not undertake to suggest the precise steps by which an effective remedy should be established. That I leave to the committee, whichever it may be, to which the House will ultimately refer the whole subject. My object now is, by pointing out the evil, to show the pressing necessity that some remedy, immediate and effective, must be provided if republican government is to survive.

Sir, if this body and this Congress take efficient action to correct this abuse, it will be the first step not merely in the purification of insurance, but in the purification of our whole financial and industrial system. Surely it is time that we should take measures to eradicate this popular idea that the temple of finance is necessarily a den of thieves, a place where conspiracies are hatched against the welfare of the community. Unfortunately, its history for the last few years has justified this suspicion, but that is not its natural function. Financial institutions, stock exchanges, corporations, markets, are all devices to improve and promote the capacity of men to serve one another. The largest profits will be made, believe me, in honest industry rather than in plunder. I do not want any ingenious man reduced to idleness, but I want to divert everyone from avenues of plunder, where he is dangerous, to avenues of industry, where he will be valuable. And he himself will not suffer by the change. The fortunes that stand as monuments raised by honest industry are already inspiring and numerous. By establishing the reign of honesty they will be multiplied and their increase encouraged.

All that we need, Mr. Chairman, is to perform our duty as the Constitution imposes it upon us, as our consciences disclose it to us. We should not tear down the temple, but we must use the scourge which our constitutional system has placed in our hands to drive from the temple the thieves who have violated it. [Applause.] Then will it be a source of prosperity to the people, of honor to the country, and of measureless credit to this legislative body, which, having met these monsters of fraud and corruption that had defiled our whole system—political, financial, and industrial—has shown the courage to face them, the skill to overthrow them, the strength and virtue to slay them. [Applause.]

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the House is in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to consider the message of the President of the United States, but it seems to have resolved itself further into a committee of inquiry into whatever wrongs may be existing in the Union. Joining in that spirit of the House, I would ask their attention to one portion of the President's message in which he refers to the Navy Department. After recommending the annual increase of one battle ship he uses the words:

> If the officers and men are not thoroughly skilled in and have not been thoroughly trained to their duties, it would be far better to keep the ships in port during hostilities than to send them against a formidable opponent, for the result could only be that they would be either sunk or captured.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, the first duty of a solider, or anyone destined for the military service of his country, is to learn to respect the law, and, second, to obey the mandates of his superior officer. So greatly has this been disregarded at the Naval Academy of our country, where these officers are educated and graduated for their future service, that the attention of the House being called to it they found it necessary in the appropriation bill appropriating money for the fiscal year ending 1902, after the appropriation for the Naval Academy, to insert the following:

> *Provided further*, That the Superintendent of the Military Academy shall make such rules, to be approved by the Secretary of War, as will effectually prevent the practice of hazing, and any cadet found guilty of participating in or urging the maintenance of such practice will be summarily expelled from the academy, and shall not thereafter be appointed to the corps of cadets or be eligible for appointment as a commissioned officer of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps until two years after graduation of the class of which he was a member.

Mr. Chairman, as one of the visitors of the Naval Academy I know that after the passage of this act the then Superintendent said if Congress would stand by him he could put down this nefarious practice. In pursuance of that at the first offense cadets were expelled from the academy and they were not allowed to graduate. Hazing disappeared temporarily, but when a bill was introduced into this Congress that these cadets be restored to the academy, and was passed, we felt that it was dangerous ground to tread upon. We knew that the bill originated in the kind-heartedness of the man who introduced it and of those who supported it; but many of us who felt the same personal pity and regard for the cadets who were expelled felt that it would be injurious to the academy; that Congress, instead of standing behind the Superintendent and representing public opinion, which had forced this law upon the statute book, was giving notice that the cadets would be restored and that they might continue this practice.

Now, Mr. Chairman, take up the daily press of to-day and you will see what takes place. Notwithstanding the terrible catastrophe that resulted in the death under this false system of honor which exists at the Naval Academy, which was enough to have appalled older people, they will find that this nefarious practice still continues. If, in my judgment, it had one particle of effectiveness in making brave men for the Navy, I would be the last to raise any objection against it. But, sir, in my judgment, it is the most cowardly, abject practice that can be entered into in any institution. The man is approached by hazers, and if he dares to show any resistance, if he is imbued in any way with the proprieties that he should obey the law of his country, or that he should carry out the orders of his commanding officer, he is hazed, and if he rebels and shows resistance, under this code that exists, he is obliged to go out within a few days and fight an upper-class man. Is that arrangement fair? Not at all. He must fight a chosen man of the class two years above him, one of the most skilled in athletics, and even if he prevails he must go out again and fight another man and be licked. If he does not then take a second thrashing, he is ostracized at the academy; he will be a marked man through all his course, and throughout the Navy, and his standing as a brave man is gone.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I appeal to Representatives here that it is time for this House to take some action. The law of the land, as well of the people, as expressed, as passed by Representatives of this body, is being defied daily. In yesterday's paper the report came to us from Annapolis that three cadets had been reported, and two were to be expelled. And in the very next paper comes the news that more hazing has taken place.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman what remedy he suggests. Congress has passed very severe laws forbidding hazing, providing penalties, and when the cadets at the academies have violated that law, flagrantly and notoriously violated it, they have been expelled and then have come to Congress and appealed for special exemption from the penalties of their own acts, and Congress has invariably forgiven them and put them back. Now, what remedy can the gentleman suggest?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman from Texas had waited a few minutes, I was coming to that very question, and that is the object of my taking up the valuable time of the House this afternoon.

The gentleman will remember that I was one of those who fought bitterly the passage of the act at the last Congress. It was defeated by those who saw the necessity of possibly appearing hard hearted against these boys at that time. It was defeated twice on the floor of this House. A third time it was brought up, when the good heart of the President had been appealed to—and those personal appeals, we know, are hard to resist—and he sent in a special message to this House, and it was passed. But I will say my object in taking up the time of the House at present is that it is time for us, as the representatives of the people, to send word in no unmistakable terms to these young men at Annapolis, who are being educated at public expense by the taxpayers of the country, that if they continue to defy the sentiment of this country this Congress will not repeat the mistake which, in my judgment, it made at the last session; and the gentleman from Texas and those within sound of my voice, I think, will agree with those who opposed the passage of this bill before, that it must be done in no uncertain terms. We represent the voices here of the American people, and I had proposed yesterday to introduce a resolution appointing a committee of this House to go to the academy and examine into the cases and to report remedies. But upon conference with the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs I found that a member of that committee had already introduced a resolution looking in the same direction, and I considered that he was much more the proper person to do that, and that it should be done under the auspices of the committee which we have designated to carry out our legislation and methods relating to the Navy. Now, I wish to call attention, while I am on this subject, to that resolution. It was introduced yesterday and sent to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I am told it will be followed up. I would also like to call attention to the bill that has been introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], looking to punishment of this very crime.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to correct the statement of the gentleman to this effect, that the resolution referred to has not gone to the Committee on Naval Affairs, but instead it has gone to the Committee on Rules, and that makes a difference.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I had understood, and in fact I thought I was informed this morning by a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that it had gone to that committee. I am very glad to be corrected. I hope the Committee on Rules, then, will not report out any such bill as the Naval Committee did report out last year restoring those cadets to the Academy.

Mr. MUDD. Did not the gentleman from Pennsylvania vote for that?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I did not. I aided on two different occasions on the floor of this House in defeating the bill, and although I could not have helped it, I presume, I regret to say that the bill was brought up on a day that I was absent. It was backed by the President's message or it never could have passed this House. I wish further to say, Mr. Chairman, that these young men, in defying public opinion, are doing what no other set of citizens dare to do. The voice of the American people is potent. The gentleman asks a remedy. Let every cadet, whether he participates in the hazing or is on duty and should report the same, be expelled. The Naval Academy is not in the position of our other institutions of learning, who are seeking to increase their number of students for pecuniary reasons and for fame. But there stand 1,000 good American boys ready to take the place of any cadet who will not obey the law of his country, or not bow to public opinion, or not submit to the rules of his superior officers. In my judgment the whole discipline of the Navy hinges on the school where the officers are taught. If an officer does not learn to obey, we can not expect that one below him will.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. I am with the gentleman, and want to stop hazing; but, is it not a fact that there is a law now against hazing at West Point and Annapolis?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman had paid that attention to my remarks which I wish he had, he would have heard me read it.

Mr. SULZER. I did; but if the law is violated who is responsible for the violation?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Congress is responsible for restoring those cadets after the provisions of the law were carried out by the superintendent of the academy. [Applause.] If the gentleman will bear with me, I wish to state that my whole object in taking up the time of the House at this time is to call the attention of the older Members, who may have forgotten it, and of the newer Members, who may not be aware of it, to that fact.

Mr. SULZER. I agree substantially with the gentleman, but is it not true that the Secretary of the Navy the other day approved the findings of the court-martial which tried a young man for hazing, or fighting, in which another cadet, his opponent, was killed?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. In reply to the gentleman, it is a matter of opinion only, but in my judgment the Secretary of the Navy was entirely too lenient on that occasion—mark you, not that he was so unfortunate as to kill a classmate, because the testimony showed that young Branch was probably killed by striking his head while falling. My ardent sympathy goes out to Meriwether, for all through his life he will carry what he can not undo and what will be a source of regret to him; but the Secretary of the Navy should have expelled that cadet, in my judgment, for breaking the law of the land and not obeying the orders of his superior officer, for that is the strength and the foundation of all military service.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennslyvania if he does not think the ruling of the distinguished Secretary of the Navy rather tends to impress the people with the idea that he wanted to minimize the offense committed when he draws a distinction in the manner of the commission of manslaughter between death caused by a blow of the fist and death caused because a man is knocked down and crushes his skull on the ground or on some structure? In other words, is not that a result that logically leads up to this; if A crushes the skull of B with his fist he has committed manslaughter, and if he crushes his skull with a club it is the club that crushes it and not the man? Now, is not that sort of ruling indicative of the purpose of practically nullifying the laws of the country?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I think the ruling of the Secretary, as I have already said, was too mild. In the incident of the death I sympathize and think it was unfortunate; but that death is part and parcel of this code that exists at the academy, which is responsible for the hazing and for the breach of discipline and for the breaking of laws. It is the code, and it is the carrying of it out and the insistence of the cadets in clinging to and carrying out this code that we must stamp out; and I say, if they will not desist, turn them out of the academy by the dozens or by the hundreds, for there are lots of American boys, as each one of us knows by the applications we have—and we regret we can not appoint them all—who are good enough and loyal enough Americans to go to that academy and fit themselves for the great naval arm of the military service. There is no difficulty in filling the places of those; and, mark my words, expulsion will stop this practice, for a boy who gets his appointment to Annapolis has too valuable a thing for life to throw it away by clinging to any ridiculous code that has come down to him from the past.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I think I have shown my object in addressing the committee. This thing must be stamped out, and in my judgment Congress alone can do it.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. With pleasure. I am glad to see so much interest in the subject.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Chairman, whether he does not think that the dignity of this House and good government at the Military Academy or at the Naval Academy would be subserved by leaving the government of schoolboys to schoolmasters, where, in my opinion, it properly belongs?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I think the dignity of this House would be conserved if the schoolmasters carried out their duty and put the thing down, but the schoolmasters do not. Their sentences are light, and we, as representatives of the people who pay the taxes for the support and education of these boys, have the right to know that our money is being expended properly and carried out for the good of the service. To refer to the words of the President, "battle ships and the whole Navy are no good without competent and efficient officers," and, as the gentleman from New York stated in regard to insurance, we must go to the root of the evil. We must go down to the training school which fits and educates officers for the Navy and implant some ideas of discipline and obedience. When you do that you are going to the root of the evil, for the future competency, efficiency, and bravery of the Navy—in my judgment better than all the rules and regulations you can make and leaving it to the schoolmasters, as the gentleman from West Virginia suggests, who, up to this time, have not succeeded in stamping it out. Captain Bronson, Superintendent there, said that if Congress would stand by him he would stamp it out, but Congress has not stood by the Superintendent of the Academy. We put back boys by a special act who had been expelled, and in my judgment that is a great evil, and that is why I have asked the attention of the House—to put this matter before them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes' time to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORRELL], and I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania yields ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORRELL].

Mr. MORRELL. Mr. Chairman, referring to the resolution that at present is before the House, I would like to say that I am entirely in sympathy with the remarks made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], and for this reason: There does not seem to be any logic, to my mind, in the assignment of the bills that have already been introduced in regard to the subject of life insurance. I had the honor, I think, to introduce the first bill on this side of Congress on the subject of Federal control of life-insurance companies. That bill I introduced on the 11th of December, 1903. It provided a remedy through the Post-Office Department, and it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. On the day following of the next year—the 12th of December, 1904—I introduced another bill, which simply provided that a commissioner of insurance should be attached to the Bureau of Commerce and Labor. That bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. On the first day of this session I introduced three bills on the subject of life insurance. One of these bills was practically the same bill that was referred last year to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Yet all of these three bills were this year, without exception, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly of the opinion that either these bills should be referred to the committee according to the subject-matter of the bills and the remedy suggested or else they should be referred to an entirely impersonal committee, such as the Committee on the Judiciary.

As far as the constitutionality of Federal control of life-insurance companies is concerned, I am satisfied in my own mind that such control can be exercised under the Constitution. In connection with the bill I introduced last year I consulted eminent lawyers in regard to the point of constitutionality, and one of them, the Hon. James M. Beck, who was lately the Assistant Attorney-General of the United States, was so satisfied in his mind in regard to the constitutionality of its provision that he volunteered to come to Washington and to appear before the committee and argue that phase of the question.

Mr. FINLEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORRELL] yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY]?

Mr. MORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I will yield.

Mr. FINLEY. I wish to ask the gentleman to what extent there can be better control, and to what extent the control the States now have may be assumed or taken over by the Federal Government?

Mr. MORRELL. The gentleman from South Carolina asks two questions—first, to what extent there can be better control, and, second, how far the National Government may assume or take over the control now exercised by the States. Both questions are, I think, answered in the bill introduced by me on the first day of the session for extending the visitorial power of the United States over certain corporations organized under State laws and for taxing such corporations. My view is that the control exercised by the Bureau of Currency over the national banks is better than that exercised by the State of New York over the insurance and trust companies of that State—infinitely better. The stockholders and depositors and creditors of national banks and the general public are better protected under the national banking system than under the lax and crime-breeding insurance system which now prevails in this country. This is manifest to everybody. The reason for it may be, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has just said, because the States have neglected their duties or failed to exercise their powers in the matter. But it seems to me that, in some cases, at least, the States have abused their powers; that they have used their powers in connivance with dishonest men to plunder and hoodwink the people of other States. There is no doubt, for instance, that the State of New York has not only neglected its duties in respect to the business of life insurance, but has gone on from negative wrongdoing to affirmative wrongdoing, and has done so to such an extent as to demand the intervention of Congress for the protection of citizens of the United States living in other States. For, as I shall show in the course of my remarks, that State has in its statutes passed in 1890 and 1892 deliberately laid the foundation for the very abuses that have arisen there.

The bill which I have introduced is designed to correct those legal outrages. It is a very brief bill, a mere skeleton; but I think it covers the whole ground, including the question of taxation, which has plunged us into this debate. It is an attempt to adopt the principles and methods of the national banking system to the business of life insurance, and is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sovereign visitorial power of the United States shall be, and is hereby, so extended as to include the inspection, supervision, and control of every life-insurance corporation organized under the laws of any State whose assets or any part thereof are, or may hereafter be, invested in the capital stock of any trust company or banking association, and of every trust company and banking association so organized whose capital stock, or any part thereof, is owned by any life-insurance company; and the Comptroller of the Currency is hereby authorized and required to ascertain by investigation of the affairs of insurance companies, trust companies, and banking associations the facts necessary to form the basis of the supervision and control herein provided for: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed to deprive any State of its visitorial power over any such corporation, except where the State authority conflicts in its action with the provisions of this act: *And provided further*, That it shall not affect strictly benevolent associations or institutions insuring only their own members.

SEC. 2. That the provisions of Title LXII of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to national banking associations, shall be applied in the visitation of life insurance and trust companies and State banking associations under this act, so far as the said provisions may be appropriate. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and required to enforce them.

SEC. 3. That every such insurance company shall pay to the United State, in the month of January, a duty of one-fourth of 1 per cent each year upon the average amount of its gross assets for that year beyond the amount invested in United States bonds; and every such trust company and banking association shall, in like manner, and at like times, pay to the said Treasurer a duty of one-half of 1 per cent upon the average amount of its capital stock and of its deposits during the year, and also upon the average amount of its investments beyond the amount invested in bonds of the United States. And in order to enable the Treasurer to assess the duties imposed by this section each corporation liable to the payment of such duties shall, within ten days from the 1st of January each year, make a return under the oath of its president and treasurer to the Treasurer of the United States, in such form as he may prescribe, of the average amount of its gross assets beyond the amount invested in United States bonds, and the average amount of its investments, deposits, and capital stock for the year next preceding the 1st day of January; any such corporation failing to make such returns shall be liable to a penalty of $1,000, to be collected in the manner in which penalties are to be collected of other corporations under the laws of the United States.

The day following the introduction of my bill the President, in his annual message, discussed the subject at considerable length. I quote extracts from his message relating to the supervision of corporations of every kind which do an interstate business, and also from that portion of the message in which he deals specifically with insurance companies. On the subject of visitation in general, the President says:

Where there is no governmental restraint or supervision some of the exceptional men use their energies not in ways that are for the common good, but in ways which tell against this common good. The fortunes amassed through corporate organization are now so large, and vest such power in those that wield them, as to make it a matter of necessity to give to the sovereign—that is, to the Government, which represents the people as a whole—some effective power of supervision over their corporate use. In order to insure a healthy social and industrial life every big corporation should be held responsible by and be accountable to some sovereign strong enough to control its conduct.

* * * Experience has shown conclusively that it is useless to try to get any adequate regulation and supervision of these great corporations by State action. Such regulation and supervision can only be effectively exercised by a sovereign whose jurisdiction is coextensive with the field of work of the corporations—that is, by the National Government. I believe that this regulation and supervision can be obtained by the enactment of law by the Congress. * * * There at present exists a very unfortunate condition of things, under which these great corporations doing an interstate business occupy the position of subjects without a sovereign, neither any State government nor the National Government having effective control over them. Our steady aim should be by legislation, cautiously and carefully undertaken, but resolutely persevered in, to assert the sovereignty of the National Government by affirmative action. * * * The great insurance companies afford striking examples of corporations whose business has extended so far beyond the jurisdiction of the States which created them as to preclude strict enforcement of supervision and regulation by the parent States. * * * The inability of a State to regulate effectively insurance corporations created under the laws of other States and transacting the larger part of their business elsewhere is also clear. As a remedy for this evil of conflicting, ineffective, and yet burdensome regulations there has been for many years a widespread demand for Federal supervision. The Congress has already recognized that interstate insurance may be a proper subject for Federal legislation, for in creating the Bureau of Corporations it authorized it to publish and supply useful information concerning interstate corporations, "including corporations engaged in insurance." It is obvious that if the compilation of statistics be the limit of the Federal power it is wholly ineffective to regulate this form of commercial intercourse between the States, and as the insurance business has outgrown in magnitude the possibility of adequate State supervision the Congress should carefully consider whether further legislation can be had.

The President, quoting from a previous message on the subject, added another strong reason for Federal supervision and control of insurance companies—a reason which, in my opinion, would be conclusive, even if it were the only reason. He said:

The United States should in this respect follow the policy of other nations by providing adequate national supervision of commercial interests which are clearly national in character. My predecessors have repeatedly recognized that the foreign business of these companies is an important part of our foreign commercial relations. During the Administrations of Presidents Cleveland, Harrison, and McKinley the State Department exercised its influence, through diplomatic channels, to prevent unjust discrimination by foreign countries against American insurance companies. These negotiations illustrated the propriety of the Congress recognizing the national character of insurance, for in the absence of Federal legislation the State Department could only give expression to the wishes of the authorities of the several States, whose policy was ineffective through want of uniformity.

These are the practical arguments in favor of the exercise of visitorial power by the Government of the United States. As such they are sufficient. But there seems to be in Congress no right to deprive any State of its visitorial power over any corporation created by itself for public purposes so long as the activities of such a corporation are strictly confined to the limits of the parent State. Judge Story's opinion in the Dartmouth College case (4 Wheaton, p. 673) has been regarded as conclusive on that point. And Judge Cooley says:

In the United States the legislature is the visitor of all corporations created by it where there is no individual founder or donor, and may direct judicial proceedings against such corporations for such abuses or neglects as would at common law cause a forfeiture of their charter. (1 Cooley's Blackstone, 482, note.)

But the maxim *cessat ratio, cessat lex* applies in this case as well as in others, so that whenever the activities of a corporation created by any State reach beyond the territorial limits of that State and mingle with the business activities of the nation or of foreign countries it becomes the right and duty of the Federal Government to control such corporation; and the State which permits its creatures to work beyond its own boundaries must be regarded as having surrendered its exclusive visitorial right over such creatures and as having voluntarily cast the burden of managing them upon the national authorities.

By means of my bill the United States would adopt these truants of the States and place them under proper surveillance. It would make them Federal corporations for certain purposes, but would not deny to any State the right of controlling its own offspring within its own boundaries unless that offspring engages, directly or indirectly, in the business of banking. It would take control of corporations organized under State laws for conducting the business of life insurance whenever they form combinations with trust companies and banks whose business is not confined within the limits of the parent State but enters into the general current of our national business. This right of visitation is a public right existing in the Government for the very purpose of examining into the affairs of a corporation with a view to keeping it within its legal powers. It is inherent in every government, just as the police power is.

The relations existing between the three great life-insurance companies of New York and the banks and trust companies of that city have been very clearly shown by the testimony taken by the Armstrong committee. The report of its proceedings of the 27th of November, 1905, contains some testimony by Mr. George W. Perkins, who was connected with J. P. Morgan & Co., with the United States Steel Corporation, with the New York Security and Trust Company, and with the New York Life Insurance Company. If there were no other evidence to show the community of interest between banks, trust companies, insurance companies, and speculative enterprises, to say nothing of the infamous methods pursued by such combinations, this testimony of Mr. Perkins would alone be sufficient warrant for extending the visitorial power of the Federal Government over every life-insurance company affiliated with a trust company or a bank. Mr. Perkins said:

The Steel Corporation was organized in February of 1901, and at that time a syndicate was organized in connection with the forming of the corporation. It was about that time that I entered the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. In addition to this syndicate formation it was necessary for the corporation to appoint some one the registrar of its $500,000,000 of preferred stock. The office of registrar was very much sought after by the trust companies, and I used my influence to control the placing of that, and also the allotment of $3,000,000 in the syndicate.

I then approached the New York Security and Trust Company and told them I could arrange for them to be made registrar of the $500,000,000 of preferred stock, and to be allotted $3,000,000 in the syndicate, and if so, I wanted them to set aside a substantial interest in the syndicate participation for whomsoever I might designate.

And he designated the New York Life, which, upon his sole authority, took a participation of $2,325,000, and made no record of the transaction. Mr. Perkins also played an important part in the Northern Securities concern. This was a sort of trust company or security-holding company, organized under the laws of New Jersey in November, 1901, with a capital of $400,000,000. There were fifteen directors, of whom eight were connected officially with the three great life insurance companies. These were James J. Hill, trustee of the Equitable Life; George F. Baker, trustee of the Mutual Life; George W. Perkins, trustee and financial manager of the New York Life; E. H. Harriman, a director in the Equitable; James Stillman, director in the Mutual; Jacob H. Schiff, director in the Equitable, and John S. Kennedy, trustee of the New York Life. The three life insurance companies represented in the directorate of this unlawful concern furnished $19,755,000 toward floating the stock of that concern.

The little coterie of capitalists to which Mr. Perkins and about thirty others belong wield a greater power in this country by means of the corporations which they control than the thirty tyrants of Athens ever wielded. They exert a money power greater than ever before existed anywhere in the world. They control railway interests exceeding $11,000,000,000 in value. They control life insurance companies whose assets amount to a billion and a half dollars. They control great industrial enterprises like the United States Steel Corporation, the Standard Oil Company, the Amalgamated Copper Company, the International Mercantile Marine Company, the Public Service Corporation of New Jersey, the New York Consolidated Gas Company, and the street railways of Greater New York. And, in addition, they control such financial institutions as the National City Bank, the National Bank of Commerce, and the Hanover National Bank, besides numerous trust companies which perform all the functions of banks except issuing notes to circulate as money. The banks are so entangled with the other mass of interests under their control that the whole system, including the banks, must stand or fall together; and if the system fails, the entire national banking system will go down with it. A glance at the directorates of some of these institutions will show how they are interlaced. Thus, for instance, the National Bank of Commerce, in which the Mutual Life owns $4,500,000 of stock and the Equitable $3,653,000, we find in its directorate Valentine P. Snyder, George J. Gould, James W. Alexander, H. C. Deming, James H. Hyde, and William H. McIntyre, of the Equitable Life; Frederick Cromwell, Richard A. McCurdy, Alexander Iselin, jr., G. G. Haven, James N. Jarvie, Augustus D. Jouillard, and H. McK. Twombley, of the Mutual Life, and John Claflin and Alexander E. Orr, of the New York Life.

Every one of these men must own, in his own right, at least ten shares of the capital stock of any banking association of which he is a director, in order to comply with section 5146 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. So that here we find a partnership between the directors of these three great life insurance companies, as individuals, and the companies, as corporations, in a national bank. The profits of these directors of the bank depend largely upon the amount of money deposited in their bank by the life insurance companies, of which they are also directors. Is it any wonder that the Mutual Life keeps $7,000,000 on deposit in that bank? Or that the Equitable Life and the New York Life also keep large deposits there? Are not these men doing a banking business upon the money of the insurance companies? If so, are not the insurance companies being used as banking instrumentalities? Should they not be

brought under the same supervision and control as the banks to which they have thus been made subsidiary? Whether the banks are at the mercy of the insurance companies, as Mr. Schiff declares, or whether the insurance companies are at the mercy of the banks, as Mr. Cromwell declares, in either case both classes of institutions should be under Federal supervision, for it is certain that the ruin of one class would work the ruin of the other, and thereby cause the derangement of the entire business of the country.

Not only have the insurance companies gone directly into the banking business as partners of their directors, trustees, and executive officers, in cases like that of the National Bank of Commerce, but they have gone into it much more extensively by indirection, through "syndicates" and "joint accounts." In these transactions the directors and officers of the insurance companies enter into contracts by the terms of which they, on behalf of the insurance companies, agree to furnish the ready money necessary to buy large blocks of bonds or other securities, and on behalf of the banks which they also represent, to take all or any part of the profits, not less than half, without incurring any risks. Very often, too, the officers and directors of the insurance companies "participate" in these "syndicates," with much profit and no risk to themselves. The testimony of Mr. Richard A. McCurdy and Mr. Frederick Cromwell, of the Mutual Life; Mr. George W. Perkins and Mr. John A. McCall, of the New York Life; Mr. James H. Hyde and Senator CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW, of the Equitable Life; and Senator JOHN F. DRYDEN, of the Prudential, given before the Armstrong committee, explains these operations. They are clearly in violation of law, but are defended upon the ground of necessity. The argument in favor of them was succinctly stated by Frederick Cromwell when he was on the witness stand on September 13, 1905. Mr. Cromwell said:

We are partners in every syndicate which we go into, and the syndicate has as its manager a banker. We do not do a banking business, and I go so far as to say that unless we went into the syndicate we would not be able to invest our funds.

We couldn't make the transactions of $100,000,000 a year in the securities of this company without using the syndicates, I think.

If he had said that this company was in the habit of entering into partnerships with bankers, in order to do a banking business, which it was not authorized by its charter to engage in, he would have expressed the truth more clearly. Mr. Cromwell gave a list of sixteen underwriting syndicates in which the Mutual Life had participated and the names of the bankers who conducted them. In every case the syndicate made a profit, arising in part from the purchase by the life-insurance company of the securities it handled. Mr. Cromwell, Mr. McCurdy, and others participated in these profits. Mr. Cromwell's personal gains amounted to $26,371. The bankers who conducted these syndicates were J. P. Morgan & Co., Speyer & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and Strong, Sturgis & Co. The securities handled included the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad bonds, which played such an important part in the Northern Securities deal; and also the Third Avenue Consolidated bonds, Southern Pacific bonds, Pennsylvania Railroad bonds, Oregon Short Line bonds, and Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe bonds.

The New York Life and Equitable Life also participated in some, if not all, of these syndicates, all three of the insurance companies becoming in this way partners in a banking business, and furnishing to E. H. Harriman the ready money necessary to enable him to control the Union Pacific Railroad and to Hill and Morgan the cash needed to develop the Northern Securities deal.

On the 24th and 27th of November, 1905, it was established by documentary and oral evidence before the committee that the New York Life was in the United States Steel syndicate with J. P. Morgan & Co., though that syndicate had not been mentioned in the list submitted as "a complete list." I quote from the New York Evening Sun's report of the proceedings of November 24 and 27 an account of this affair, because it illustrates the methods of the New York Life in its operations through its subsidiary trust companies and through its vice-president and financial manager, Mr. George W. Perkins, with J. P. Morgan & Co., of which firm Mr. Perkins is a partner, and because it also shows the relation between the New York Life and Andrew Hamilton, the notorious lobbyist of the associated insurance companies. The report of the proceedings of the 24th is as follows:

Milton Mattison, a bookkeeper in the New York Life, took the stand. He presented a list of participations of his company in various syndicate transactions. Mr. Hughes asked him why the transaction in steel through the New York Security and Trust Company was left out.

"That was not among our securities," replied the witness.

Mr. Hughes then read an entry from the New York Life blotter, dated April, 1903: "U. S. Steel syndicate, 3.006 per cent on $2,325,000, less ¼ New York Security & Trust Co., $52,417.13. The above amount received under their contract. Mr. R. ordered this stamped."

A letter was also offered in evidence from Alexander S. Webb, jr., secretary of the New York Security and Trust Company, to E. P. Randolph, treasurer of the New York Life, which read in part: "We beg to send you check for $52,417.13, being dividend upon the interest in the U. S. Steel syndicate which we are carrying for you."

Pinned to this was a memorandum, which the witness told Mr. Hughes was in Mr. Shipman's handwriting:

"The above amount was received from the New York Security and Trust Company. Mr. Webb will send another letter."

"What amount of money had the New York Life paid on account of that participation?" asked Mr. Hughes.

"It didn't pay anything; it put the amount in the trust company as a deposit. I presume $2,325,000. That was No. 4 account. That is the natural inference."

"We don't want natural inferences," observed Mr. Hughes. "I had a natural inference that all participations were included in this list."

The report of November 27 contains the testimony of Mr. George W. Perkins in relation to this transaction, a portion of which I have already quoted. Mr. Perkins had been taken into the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. just before the United States Steel Corporation was formed, perhaps with a view to enlisting the New York Life in the venture. He became a member of the steel corporation. He went into the syndicate to float its stock. He then made a verbal arrangement with Mr. Charles S. Fairchild, president of the New York Securities and Trust Company, by which that concern was to take $3,000,000 of steel stock and shift $2,325,000 of it to the New York Life, the latter company depositing that amount with the trust company. No record of this transaction appeared on the books of the New York Life, except in the blotter of the company's treasury department, in which there was the following memorandum:

Commissions and profits earned by syndicate participations in 1902 (on account of United States Steel Corporation syndicate dividend), $27,876.71.

The above amount was received from the New York Security and Trust Company, account of compensation for funds contributed (under their guaranty) to their participation in United States Steel syndicate. Five per cent was declared, amounting to $67,107.50, with trust company's commission out, but only $27,876.71 was remitted to us

See trust company's letter October 1.

Andrew Hamilton received balance, $59,310.79, under Mr. G. W. Perkins's arrangement.

In explanation of the secret arrangement for the payment to Hamilton, Mr. Perkins said:

In the fall of 1901 President McCall stated to me that in connection with moneys expended on behalf of the New York Life he had had the Central National Bank and the New York Security and Trust Company advance Hamilton and E. E. McCall, at different times from 1896 to 1901, various sums of money, secured by notes of those gentlemen, and that he would like to have the balance remaining unpaid in both these institutions put into one account and paid out of subsequent profits that would result from the arrangement between the New York Life and the trust companies in the steel syndicate transaction.

I therefore arranged with J. P. Morgan & Co. to pay the Central National Bank, as they did on December 31, 1901, the sum of $40,751.39, and to the New York Security and Trust Company, on the same date, the sum of $15,969.16, making a total of $56,720.55. This sum was carried by Messrs. Morgan & Co., without any obligation from Mr. Hamilton or anyone else, until it was deducted, with interest at 6 per cent, in October, 1902, from the profits then distributed to the trust company, and a statement was furnished by Morgan & Co. to the trust company, and in turn by the trust company to the New York Life.

It appears further on in Mr. Perkins's testimony that all the members of the finance committee of the New York Life, which at that time consisted of Mr. Perkins himself, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McCall, Mr. Langdon, Mr. Morrison, and Mr. Grace, knew fully the particulars of this steel syndicate transaction, and knew also that there was no record made of it in the minutes. Mr. John A. McCall had previously sworn to the correctness of reports to the insurance departments of the States, in which reports there was no mention of the New York Life's participation in the steel syndicate. He had also sworn to the correctness of a statement of the "legal expenses" of the New York Life, from which the payments made to Hamilton and E. E. McCall out of the profits of that syndicate were omitted.

It was also shown by the testimony of Mr. Perkins and Mr. Mattison on the 24th and 27th of November that the New York Life had advanced $930,000 to enable Mr. Perkins to conduct a syndicate or joint account transaction in Mexican Central bonds in 1904. The Mexican Central Railway was to be provided with $2,000,000 immediately. Mr. Perkins agreed with a representative of Kidder, Peabody & Co., of Boston, to furnish one-half of this sum, and arranged with the New York Life to make the loan. On June 27, 1904, $1,000,000 worth of bonds were delivered to the New York Life, for which it sent its check to the Boston bankers for $930,000. The New York Life received as its compensation the interest on the $1,000,000 worth of bonds, which amounted to a little less than $6,000. One-half the profits on the resale of the bonds amounted to $40,000. This sum was paid to the New York Life by Kidder, Peabody & Co., on September 17, and was turned over to Mr. George W. Perkins, who says that he invested it in United States Steel common stock for the use of the Nylic fund, of

which he was trustee, but that it was not included in the $945,146 which the New York Life had contributed in that fund according to his previous statement on that subject. Mr. Perkins said that no record was entered in the books of the New York Life to show the receipt of the $40,000 profits made on the Mexican Central deal. No mention of it was made in the sworn reports made by the company to the insurance departments of the States.

On September 23, 1905, when Mr. Perkins was under examination, it was shown that there was what might be termed a fictitious sale by himself as financial manager of the New York Life to J. P. Morgan & Co., acting through himself as a member of that firm, of $800,000 of the stock of the International Mercantile Marine Company for $800,000 in cash; and that this sale, which took place the day before the New York Life made its report to the State insurance department, was reported as if it were a valid transaction; whereas, in fact, Mr. Perkins only had borrowed $800,000 from Morgan & Co. for two days, and the New York Life had recognized the transaction as a loan, and paid $266.67 interest for the use of the money for two days, and had not parted with the stock in question at all. It was also shown that two days after Mr. Perkins had made this pretended sale from himself to himself he resold to himself from himself the same stock for the same price, returned the money with interest to Morgan & Co., and the stock to the New York Life. In this way it was made to appear that the stock was selling at par when such was not the case, and the insurance department of the State was deceived as to the real condition of the New York Life.

Mr. Jacob H. Schiff, the manager of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., went into the directorate of the Equitable Life and became a member of its finance committee. Mr. E. E. Harriman, connected with Kuhn, Loeb & Co.'s banking and railroad enterprises, also became a director. The sequel shows that the Equitable's funds were used to advance the projects of banking and railroad business of Mr. Schiff's firm by participating in the $50,000,000 Union Pacific blind pool. On November 14, 1905, when Mr. James H. Hyde, of the Equitable, was on the witness stand before the Armstrong committee, he was asked by Mr. Hughes:

"Did you go into that transaction to facilitate Mr. Harriman's getting control of the Union Pacific?"

"That was not discussed," answered Mr. Hyde. "But it was understood, obviously," was the reply.

Mr. Hyde also testified that Harriman requested him to keep secret even from the directors the fact that Equitable money was being used in the pool in Hyde's name. He said that he even refused to disclose the fact to the superintendent of insurance.

He also said that Mr. Schiff was present at a meeting when one of the participations was made. When Mr. Schiff's testimony was recalled, Mr. Hyde said:

"Well, Mr. Schiff is a little hard of hearing."

The New York Security and Trust Company is only a fair example of those subsidiary companies whose stockholders and officers are made up of the trustees and directors and executive officers of the great life insurance companies and of bankers and brokers connected with them, and which form such a remarkable feature of the Wall street system. Almost every man whose name appears on the list of great financiers is interested in these trust companies. Some of these men are directors in nearly all of them, as well as in other corporations. Mr. Frederick Cromwell, for instance, is a director in sixteen corporations; Mr. Peabody, the new president of the Mutual, is in nineteen, and Hon. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW in more than seventy. Acting as the directors of the insurance companies, they buy for those companies large blocks of stock in a bank or trust company, and then, acting in their individual capacities, they buy for themselves other shares. Then they elect themselves directors and officers of these newly acquired institutions. Then, acting for the life insurance companies, they deposit immense sums of money belonging to the policy holders of their respective life insurance companies with these trust companies, and that increases the value of the stock enormously, because it enables them to do an exceedingly profitable business.

When Mr. Frederick Cromwell, treasurer of the Mutual, was on the witness stand September 14, he admitted that the Mutual practically owned the Morton Trust Company, the Guaranty Trust Company, and the United States Mortgage and Trust Company; that it owned 2,000 shares of the Morton Trust Company's stock, and that he personally owned 50 shares of it. He said that the profit on this stock had been $22,000,000. He admitted that in the National Bank of Commerce, one of the Mutual's subsidiary institutions, the Mutual maintained a deposit of about $7,000,000, which drew only 2 per cent interest, despite the fact that call money on the street brought 3 and 4 per cent. The Morton Trust Company has had a deposit of $500,000 belonging to the Mutual ever since it opened its doors; in the Bank of Morristown there is $250,000; in the Bank of California there is an investment of $500,000 in that institution's increased capital stock.

When Mr. Richard A. McCurdy, president of the Mutual Life, was on the witness stand October 19, 1905, he was asked about the Mutual Life's interest in the Fifth Avenue Trust Company. He said that the insurance company owned from 2,500 to 3,200 shares of stock, and that it kept on deposit with the trust company from $500,000 to $1,000,000. He was also asked if he had prepared a statement showing in what other financial institutions he himself held an interest, and he read from a paper a statement to the effect that he owned 50 shares of stock in the American Exchange Bank, 50 shares in the Bond and Mortgage and Guarantee Company, 1,132 shares in the National Bank of Commerce, New York; 50 share in the Commercial Trust Company of New Jersey; 200 shares in the Fifth Avenue Trust Company; 100 shares in the Mercantile Trust Company; 512 shares in the Morristown Trust Company; 200 shares in the United States Mortgage and Trust Company, and 50 shares in the Girard Trust Company, of Philadelphia. The Mutual Life held stock not only in the Fifth Avenue Trust Company, but in all the other institutions mentioned.

Should the Morton Trust Company have an opportunity to lend a million or two to the New York Central or some other railroad, but had not sufficient money on hand for the purpose, the Mutual simply increased its deposit to the required amount. Perhaps it got a shade more interest for the increased deposit, or perhaps only the regulation "2 per cent on daily balances." The trust company, however, got its 5 and 6 and 7 per cent from the railroad company.

This is just what the Equitable has been doing with those banks and trust companies for years—the Mercantile Trust and the Equitable Trust. And it is what the New York Life has been doing with the New York Security and Trust Company and its other "channels," what the Prudential has been doing with its "Fidelity Trust Company," and what the Metropolitan Life has been doing with its "Hamilton Trust Company."

The trust company is necessary to the syndicate, the insurance company is necessary to the trust company, and the money of the policy holders is necessary to both when the directorate of each has the same set of bankers.

The "yellow-dog fund" of the Equitable was concealed in the Mercantile Trust, under the name of the J. W. Alexander Account No. 3. We have just seen how the steel syndicate, out of the profits of which Hamilton was paid $59,000, was concealed in the New York Security and Trust Company. The wild-cat speculation of the Mutual Life in the New York Dock Company affair was conducted through the United States Mortgage and Trust Company. The general public and the public authorities are deceived in this way as to the real transactions of the insurance companies, and the abuse calls loudly for some remedy. Such things could not take place with impunity if the machinery of the Treasury Department of the United States were brought to bear upon insurance companies as well as national banks.

When life-insurance companies are so dominated or influenced by bankers that they find it impossible to do a legitimate business as life-insurance companies, why should they be exempt from the control of the same authority which controls the banks? The illegitimate practices of the men who conduct great financial operations must be stopped. The men must be reached. To say that they can not be reached by the Federal Government because the associations into which they have entered are organized under State laws, even though their doings threaten the stability of our national banking system and the existence of the Union, is an absurdity. If Congress has not the power to punish them for their violations of State laws, it has at least the power to have their business investigated and their business faults corrected, so far as that business and those faults endanger or embarrass the financial system of the nation. If we can not govern them without taxing them, then it is our right and our duty to tax them.

As it is nobody can feel safe, because nobody knows what these giants are doing. The reports which they have made to the State authorities have been shown to be false, and the reports of the insurance superintendents are clearly worthless or worse. The Equitable Life made its own attorney, a gentleman named Pierce, State superintendent of insurance. The three great companies have combined in order to support a corrupt lobby at Albany. They have been giving hundreds of thousands of dollars to such men as Andrew Hamilton, A. O. Fields, W. S. Thummel, and other lobbyists. The Equitable, according to the testimony, has paid $10,000 a year for a long time to Senator PLATT for use in elections. The Mutual has on several occasions paid $10,000 to Senator PLATT for the same purposes.

In the campaigns of 1896, 1900, and 1904, the Mutual, the Equitable, and New York Life, the Metropolitan, and the Prudential contributed large sums to the same national committee. The testimony of Messrs. Thummel, Perkins, McCall, Olyphant, Hegeman, Hon. THOMAS C. PLATT, Hon. JOHN F. DRYDEN, and Hon. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW discloses these facts.

These payments were not recorded in the books of the insurance companies. Neither were they reported to the authorities of any State in the sworn reports of those companies. Mr. Richard A. McCurdy swore that if any contribution had been made by the Mutual to any New York State campaign committee he knew nothing of it. Senator PLATT in his own testimony contradicted this statement. Concerning such contributions, Senator PLATT said that he had received as contributions to the Republican State committee's campaign fund the sum of $10,000 a year for a period of ten or fifteen years from the Equitable Life Assurance Society. During the same period he received $10,000 a year for a number of years, but not every year, from the Mutual Life Insurance Company. The Senator explained that the contributions of the Equitable and the Mutual had always been sent to him in cash by a messenger. When asked if he had ever solicited these contributions he said that he had not, but had talked with President McCurdy, of the Mutual, about funds.

On this point the questions by Mr. Hughes and the answers by Senator PLATT were as follows:

Q. How did it happen that the Mutual Life contributed the money? Was it in pursuance of an understanding between yourself and Mr. McCurdy?—A. I simply asked him at various times when necessities were very great for money, and he said he would be very glad to subscribe.
Q. This was for the State campaign?—A. Yes, sir
Q. And Mr. McCurdy so understood it?—A. He understood it, and could not understand it any other way, because I was not representing the national campaign.

Senator PLATT said that he had received a few contributions of $10,000 a year from Mr. John A. McCall, president of the New York Life Insurance Company, but had no personal knowledge as to whether or not the money came out of the funds of the company or was a personal contribution from Mr. McCall.

I submit the questions and answers as to the motives which prompted these contributions:

Q. Senator, what do you understand was the quid pro quo of those contributions? Did you ever understand that the companies might expect something in return?—A. I supposed that they would expect my influence in opposition to adverse legislation.
Q. Did they ever ask you to influence legislation?—A. Never.
Q. Could you have done so?—A. No.
Q. Then what service could you render?—A. I suppose that they thought I might have had some little influence with my party.

When Mr. Charles M. Turner, president of the Security Mutual Life Insurance Company, of Binghamton, N. Y., was on the witness stand before the Armstrong committee on December 7, 1905, he testified that a certain man named Keever was employed as the actuary of that company while also a clerk in the actuary's department of the State insurance department. Keever got a salary of $1,000 a year from the Security Mutual, but the witness didn't know how much the State paid him. He thought Keever might still be holding his job in the company. He managed not to let one job interfere with the other, of course.

The "legal expenses" of the Mutual were $347,000 in 1903, $130,000 in excess of 1902, when they were $216,000. For 1904 they were $459,000; in 1901, $243,000. In these four years the "legal expenses" of the Mutual amounted to $1,265,000. Mr. Robert Olyphant, who is a member of its committee of expenditures, says that money for secret and confidential purposes is charged to the account of "legal expenses."

Mr. Olyphant said on the witness stand October 10, 1905, that the Mutual Life had paid out $200,000 on vouchers of $25,000 each, in 1903 and 1904, on account of "private legal expenses."

This money had been turned over to E. L. Short, the general solicitor of the company, from whom no itemized account was required. Short used the money in "dealing" with State legislatures for the joint benefit of the three great life insurance companies.

Mr. Robert A. Grannis, vice-president of the Mutual Life, testifying on the same day, said:

If money was necessary to protect the company against adverse legislation, there was no hesitation in laying out the requisite funds.

Mr. Walter R. Gillette, vice-president of the Mutual Life, said that the general solicitor of the company could get whatever funds he wanted without giving any reason for it.

Mr. John A. McCall, president of the New York Life, in his testimony before the committee October 4, 1905, presented the following statement of the expenses of the "law department" of his company for the past six years, showing that nearly half of the gross amount of legal expenses went to Hamilton for lobbying purposes:

1900.	
For law	$203,792.84
For Hamilton	89,749.00
1901.	
For law	212,773.55
For Hamilton	107,809.35
1902.	
For law	172,632.37
For Hamilton	50,000.00
1903.	
For law	254,793.95
For Hamilton	88,126.35
1904.	
For law	172,698.42
For Hamilton	140,077.42
1905.	
For law	87,222.01
For Hamilton	12,164.90
Legal expense total	1,103,920.14
A. Hamilton's total	476,927.02

In justification of these enormous payments to Hamilton, Mr. McCall said:

At the beginning of each year every executive officer of every insurance company looks forward to the next five or six months with the utmost apprehension. For with each recurring year we are simply badgered to death in every State in the Union by a flood of legislative bills.

Sometimes these bills are introduced by men of honor, but generally they emanate from people who aim solely at "striking" at the insurance companies.

I may safely say that three-quarters of the bills introduced are blackmailing bills, simon pure, and it is the experience which we have had with these that makes the management of every insurance company fairly tremble at the beginning of each year.

The kind of work done by Hamilton under instructions from McCall is shown by the answers made by the latter to the questions of Mr. Hughes, counsel for the investigating committee. Some of these questions and answers are as follows:

Q. Was Mr. Hamilton expected to deal with the men who could produce the best results?—A. Yes. He was instructed to get the best fellow he could get.
Q. Lawyer, or any other man?—A. Yes.
Q. The right man retained in the right place could bring about the kind of legislation you desired for your company?—A. Yes.
Q. You know that some of those men who are thus retained represent other interests also in the legislatures?—A. Yes.
Q. And these men are so powerful that any legislator who opposes their wishes is apt to go out of politics?—A. Well, I can't say as to that, but I do believe his relations with politics do become strained.

Mr. William Barnes, an attorney for the associated life insurance companies, who cooperated with Hamilton and a man who had been superintendent of insurance, shows how effective these methods prove. In his testimony before the Armstrong committee, November 10, 1905, he said:

I recollect when I was superintendent that a judge who was turned out of office in 1873 carried around in his pocket an injunction, a temporary injunction, and the appointment of a receiver, for weeks, threatening the Mutual Life, to put it in the hands of a receiver. Fortunately that judge was put where he could not issue any injunctions or receiverships.

W. F. Thummel, a member of the "law department" of the Mutual Life, was on the witness stand October 6, 1905. He told how the States were divided up between the companies. The Mutual took care of legislation in Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, Washington, Oregon, and New Mexico. The Equitable had Maryland, South Carolina, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, Colorado, Arkansas, California, and Nevada. The New York Life had Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Tennessee, and Oklahoma. And the rest of the territory was generally regarded as open to be handled as situations might arise. He also told how the expenses of the work were divided by the three companies. He favored Federal control of life insurance on the ground that it would relieve the companies of the necessity of combating the innumerable "strike bills;" which he said "are now introduced in the State legislatures in order that the authors of them may get commissions from the insurance companies for killing them."

This testimony shows that the three great insurance companies of the United States, the greatest moneyed corporations in all the world, are managed by men so weak that they "fairly tremble at the beginning of each year" lest the legislature which they have corrupted should turn upon them and pass some law by means of which the policy holders might sue them for an accounting.

This testimony of Messrs. Maine, McCall, and Thurman further shows that, up to the present time, the organized life-insurance lobby has been uniformly successful in defeating legislation hostile to the interests of the life insurance oligarchy. It shows, moreover, that blackmailing methods have often been used by the oligarchy themselves; that some of the men retained by the oligarchy are so powerful, by reason of representing other great interests, such as railroads, that "any legislator who opposes their wishes is apt to go out of politics"—"that his relations with politics do become strained."

A bill to compel life insurance companies to include the whole contract between the parties in the policy when issued was recently defeated in the New York legislature by the life insurance companies; and since they do not professedly oppose any but blackmailing bills, that must have been considered such a bill by those companies. State Senator Brackett, who introduced it, says that for many years "the simplest bill affecting life insurance has needed the approval of the companies before it stood a ghost's show of passing."

It is said by Mr. Alfred Maine, associate auditor of the Equitable Life, in his testimony before the legislative investigating committee, on September 29, 1905, that Judge Andrew Hamilton, of Albany; Mr. W. F. Thummel, of New York City, and other eminent lawyers were paid jointly by the New York Life, the Mutual Life, and the Equitable to appear before the committees of State legislatures for the purpose of defeating all legislation not desired by them, and to modify or repeal all objectionable laws already on the State books; and that in 1886 and 1889 Hamilton had been paid by the Equitable for the performance of such work in Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, and Wisconsin. It has since been discovered that Hamilton alone has been paid $711,000 for use in such work by the three companies. This does not include the sums paid him by the Prudential and Metropolitan. The Equitable, having no "law department" of its own, employed Mr. Hamilton, of the New York Life, and Mr. Short and Mr. Thummel, of the Mutual Life, and paid one-third of the total expense of the joint lobby system. Mr. Maine explained this arrangement by examples. He said, for instance, that a payment made by the Equitable to Hamilton on April 28, 1903, amounting to $13,333.33, for work done in Wisconsin and neighboring States, was one-third of $40,000, which was the total cost of that work; the other two companies paying $26,666.66. And similarly with other payments made to Hamilton—$1,333.33 on June 7, 1895; on October 12, 1897, $333.33, and $7,666.66 on April 8, 1899, these sums representing one-third of the total payment in each case; the other two-thirds being paid by the other parties to this lobbying compact. Some of the vouchers produced in evidence are illuminating. One of them runs thus:

MAY 29, 1895.

The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States to Andrew Hamilton, debtor, to balance for services and disbursements in re nonforfeiture facts and report, statutes and amendments, $1,333.33.
Received payment.

ANDREW HAMILTON.

And here is another:

NEW YORK, *January 17, 1895.*

The Equitable Life Assurance Society to Andrew Hamilton, Dr.
To services in matter of two-year surrender-value repeal, etc., Missouri, $500.
Received payment.

ANDREW HAMILTON.

Senator JOHN F. DRYDEN, President of the Prudential, was on the witness stand last Tuesday. I quote from the Evening Sun's report of his testimony:

President DRYDEN testified that the following political contributions had been made by the Prudential to the Republican national committee: Six thousand dollars in 1896, $10,000 in 1900, and $10,000 in 1904. A statement of the legal expenses of the company was read by Mr. Hughes. Under the item "In connection with legislation" were the following sums: Four hundred and eight dollars and thirty-four cents in 1896, $9,137.63 in 1897, $4,560 in 1898, $15,000 in 1899, $3,843.32 in 1900, $3,703.43 in 1901, $3,152.40 in 1902, none in 1903, $7,276.50 in 1904, and $2,500 in 1905 up to September 1. Thus the total sum spent for legislation during the past ten years is about $50,000. The witness testified that the statement read was correct.

Mr. Hughes asked how the $15,000 spent for legislation in 1899 was divided.

"A payment to Andrew Hamilton accounted for $5,000 of it," was the Senator's reply. "He was a man of wide authority in insurance matters. He had written a book which attracted my attention, and I sent for him." The witness said he could not remember what was the particular service performed by "Judge" Hamilton, except that it had to do with legislation of "the usual kind" in Illinois.

In the same year the Prudential paid James H. Blood, of Denver, $7,500 to urge the repeal of a Colorado law prohibiting the insurance of children.

The Prudential also paid the Metropolitan Life $3,377 in 1899 as its share in legislative expenses.

The Prudential campaign contributions, testified the witness, were charged to "expense" in two cases and to "legal expenses" in the third.

Another great abuse is that different and conflicting reports are made under oath by the New York Life and other companies to the superintendent of insurance in different States. This fact was brought out by counsel for the investigating committee on September 28, 1905, and again on the 14th of December, yesterday. This point is so important that I reproduce the New York World's report of the testimony regarding it:

Profits made by the New York Life on sales of its securities during 1901 was taken up by Mr. Hughes. He read from the report of the company to the State insurance department on December 31, 1901, in which it was declared that these profits amounted to $3,075,371.99. He asked Mr. Perkins to explain this entry, in view of the fact that the profits of the company from the sales of securities during that year were $5,253,541.57. Mr. Perkins explained the discrepancy by saying that a number of deductions had been made as follows: To reduce the book value of real estate, $843,980, and agents' balances, $1,919,324, making a total of $2,763,715.

Mr. Hughes brought out the fact that the agents' balances did not amount that year to $1,919,324, but that the actual total was only $1,622,830, and that the difference, $296,904, actually came from the company's suspense account. Mr. Perkins disputed these figures until Mr. Hughes produced a copy of the New York Life's report for December 31, 1901, made for the State insurance department of Massachusetts. It developed that the report of the company to that State was different in many respects from its report made to the insurance department of this State.

On yesterday (December 14) Mr. Edgar Moier, actuary of the Provident Savings Life Assurance Company, testified that the statements of the gains and losses of that company, which were submitted by the company to the insurance departments of Wisconsin and Connecticut, were at variance with the records on the books of the company and inaccurate.

Then there is the matter of exorbitant salaries and commissions. For instance, the salary of Richard A. McCurdy, president of the Mutual Life, is $150,000 a year; the salary and commissions of his son, Robert H. McCurdy, the general manager, amount to $127,000 a year, and the commissions of Louis A. Thebaud, a son-in-law of Richard A. McCurdy, and a member of the firm of C. H. Raymond & Co., who are the New York agents of the Mutual Life, amount to $147,000 a year. Robert H. McCurdy swore on the witness stand that he did not know what his father's salary was, or how much his brother-in-law received as commissions; and Richard A. McCurdy swore that he knew nothing, "one way or the other," about the salaries or commissions paid either to his son or son-in-law.

A similar condition existed in the New York Life. The salary of Mr. John A. McCall, its president, was $100,000; that of John C. McCall, his son, was $15,000; that of Mr. Alfred McQuaid, one of his sons-in-law, was $15,000; that of Mr. Darvin P. Kingsley, another son-in-law, was $15,000; that of Mr. J. C. Burrill, another relative, was $7,500.

The salary of Mr. J. W. Alexander, president of the Equitable Life, was $100,000, and that of Mr. J. H. Hyde, first vice-president, was the same.

Mr. John R. Hegeman, president of the Metropolitan, received $100,000 a year, and Mr. Haley Fiske, vice-president, $75,000.

The extravagance of these salaries may be best illustrated by comparison. The chief executive of the Bank of England receives a salary of $10,000 a year. The president of the Bank of Germany receives $7,500. The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States receives $8,000. The President of the United States receives $50,000.

As a result of the financial methods and wasteful extravagance which have characterized the management of the great life insurance companies of New York since 1890, the dividends to policy holders have been reduced to almost nothing, the surplus earned has been steadily reduced, the ratio of surplus earned to income has been reduced, and all this has happened while the actual income has been enormously increased. For instance, the income of the Mutual, the New York Life, and the Equitable in 1903 was in the aggregate $239,371,595. The surplus earned was only $3,208,085; the ratio of surplus earned to income was 1.34 per cent; the dividends to policy holders were only $12,228,000.

In comparison with this showing, I find that the Northwestern Mutual, the Mutual Benefit, the Union Central, the Connecticut Mutual, the Massachusetts Mutual, the Penn Mutual, the National Life, the Ætna Life, and the New England Mutual, nine companies, which are not engaged in Wall street affairs, had an aggregate income of $114,676,532, while their surplus earned amounted to $12,925,568, and the ratio of surplus earned to dividends was 11.27 per cent. The dividends to policy holders was $12,901,023. It will be seen that while these companies received considerably less than one-half of the income received by "The Big Three," they paid in dividends to their policy holders nearly $700,000 more, and that the ratio of surplus earned to income in the case of these minor companies was many times greater than in the case of "The Big Three."

Exhibits of the business of the Mutual Life for 1873 and 1903, respectively, illustrate the lamentable decadence of that institution:

	1873.	1903.
Premium income	$17,818,889	$60,151,020
Dividends to policy holders	$8,397,676	$2,985,061
Ratio dividends to premium receipts.....per cent..	43.13	4.96
Management expenses	$1,889,285	$16,079,896
Ratio management expenses to premium income, per cent	13.44	26.73

In 1903 the aggregate expenses of the three largest savings banks in New York City were as follows: Salaries, $282,270; other expenses, $155,231; total expenses, $438,001. For the same year the aggregate expenses of the "The Big Three" life insurance companies were: Salaries, $2,849,220; other expenses, $37,738,413; total expenses, $40,587,633.

In view of all this, it is not surprising that the public has witnessed quarrels and scandals in the management of these three giant corporations, which seem to have conducted their business outside the domain of law and without regard to any moral standard. It is fortunate indeed that the country was not thrown into a financial panic by the methods of the men who managed those companies. That such a panic was imminent we are told by one of the greatest financiers in America. On the 8th of December, 1905, when Mr. Thomas F. Ryan was on the witness stand before the Armstrong committee, the following colloquy occurred between him and Mr. Hughes, the counsel for that committee:

Q. Will you state, Mr. Ryan, what led you to make the purchase?—A. I had very large interests that were sure to be affected seriously by any disturbance in the financial situation or confidence in New York, or any disaster that might come. I saw in the virtual certainty of a receivership of the Equitable Life such a disaster impending unless the factional differences in the company among the directors and the management of the company should be radically changed. To avert this and to prevent the frightful losses that would occur from the violent breaking up of the Equitable, not only to the policy holders, but to the financial community at large—myself as well—I thought that some one ought to undertake the business or——

Q. (Interrupting.) Or the acquisition of the stock?

A. Yes, sir; or in some way to stop the trouble that might ensue. The gentlemen connected with the large insurance companies did not seem to be in that position—I mean the financial people downtown—and I had never had any connection with the three big insurance companies except as a policy holder in each. I felt, therefore, free to act.

My first idea was to get together a number of policy holders who would take this company out of the hands in which it was going to destruction and give it a clean management, economical and efficient, and restore its prosperity for the benefit of all honest interests. I soon concluded that the amounts that could be obtained from disinterested people, people who had no axes to grind, would be very small, so I concluded to do it myself.

Q. Had you heard that there were gentlemen in Wall street who had made propositions to Mr. Hyde for the purchase of his stock?

A. There had been some such rumors, but I knew nothing about them.

Q. Did you regard it as a matter of moment whether the control of the stock should be bought up by men interested in financial enterprises who might have, as you expressed it a moment ago, "axes to grind?"

A. Well, I think it might be considered—might have been considered unwise.

Q. You were fully appreciative of the opportunities that might exist if persons desirous of furthering their own interests acquired control of that stock?

A. I can imagine that it might have been detrimental to the institution.

Q. Yes. You understand, of course, that the control of the large accumulations that such an institution as the Equitable has might be a decided advantage in connection with financial enterprises?

A. I can imagine that.

It must be confessed that Mr. Ryan has performed a great service, yet only a temporary service.

The State of New York, aroused by the criticisms of the rest of the world, and acting under the leadership of the great lawyer and honest man who has so ably and fairly conducted the examination as counsel for the Armstrong committee, will no doubt institute reforms; but those reforms will prove ephemeral and evanescent. The same spiders of finance who have woven their webs at Albany in the past will weave new and stronger webs in the future, unless the incentive is taken away by the certainty that any scheme originating in Wall street for robbing the people of other States under the cloak of a New York statute will be futile, by reason of Federal laws for the protection of our national banking system and the people of the States against their schemes of exploitation.

TAXATION AND SUPERVISION.

Mr. Chairman, when I read the evidence taken before the Armstrong committee it appeared to me to be unjust that national banks should be taxed on their capital stock and deposits, while the New York trust companies, conducted as "channels" of the insurance companies, were untaxed in respect to either. It occurred to me that fair play demanded the taxation of those institutions which were engaged directly or indirectly in the banking business; and hence I drew a bill with the primary object of taxing such institutions. And since, under our political system, the visitorial power usually and necessarily accompanies Federal taxation, it seemed to me of no consequence whether the proposition was designated a bill to extend the visitorial power of the Government over them or whether it was called a bill to tax, supervise, and control them. Whatever you call the measure, its substance involves both taxation and supervision, and both are necessary.

Taxation is necessary in order to protect honest national banks against unfair competition, and supervision and control are necessary to protect the Government and its agencies, and to carry out the scheme of taxation, also to protect the honest banks and to prevent the manifold abuses resulting from the present system. I have discussed only a few of these abuses. A summary of them may be stated as follows:

(1) Secrecy in the transactions of insurance companies of New York State, under section 56 of the insurance law of that State.

(2) The system of deferred dividends and tontine policies, which has arisen under section 97 of the same law.

(3) The complex relationship between the great insurance companies and the so-called "trust companies," under section 156 of chapter 690 of the New York banking law of 1892, which authorized the organization of trust companies with extraordinary powers.

(4) The participation of certain insurance companies in transactions known as "syndicates" and "joint accounts," by means of which the officers, trustees, and directors of the insurance companies enter into speculations in Wall street at the risk of the companies and yet share in the profits, if any, but manage to shift the losses, when losses occur, upon the shoulders of the policy holders exclusively.

(5) The unlawful practice which has arisen among the managers of the great life insurance companies, who are also the business managers of large banks, railroad companies, steel corporations, and the like, of acting in dual capacities, and diverting the money of the insurance companies into banking and speculative enterprises at the expense of the policy holders.

(6) A general disregard of the laws prohibiting the falsification of accounts, and requiring correct annual reports of the business of the insurance companies to be made to the State authorities.

(7) The employment of lobbyists; the use of corrupt means to influence legislation, and the payment of blackmailers who threaten or attempt to expose mismanagement on the part of the companies.

(8) The payment of extravagant salaries, commissions, pensions, and bonuses to officers, trustees, directors, attorneys, lobbyists, agents, and favorites, and the bribing of the agents of competing life insurance companies.

(9) Wasteful extravagance in efforts to get new business in this country and foreign countries at the expense of legitimate policy holders.

If it were not for the New York legislation of 1890 and 1892, which I have already characterized as affirmative wrongdoing, none of the abuses above enumerated could have been persistently practiced. It is necessary to examine that legislation, therefore, in order to expose the mischief and provide a proper remedy.

On May 22, 1890, the New York legislature passed "An act in relation to life and casualty insurance companies, associations, and societies," which was incorporated in the revised insurance law of the State as section 56 in 1896. Section 56 is in these words:

No order, judgment, or decree, providing for an accounting or enjoining, restraining, or interfering with the prosecution of the business of any domestic insurance corporation, or appointing a temporary or permanent receiver thereof, shall be made or granted otherwise than upon the application of the attorney-general on his own motion or after his approval of a request in writing therefor of the superintendent of insurance, except in an action by a judgment creditor or in proceedings supplementary to execution. (See Birdseye's R. S., second edition, vol. 2, p. 1622.)

Having secured this gag law, depriving policy holders and those for whose benefit the insurance was made of the right to sue for an accounting, or the appointment of a receiver, or for an injunction, there was in 1892 a general revision of the insurance and banking laws of the State for the evident purpose of placing the great insurance companies in a position to utilize their vast income and assets for the benefit of those who control them. (See chapters 689 and 690 of the New York laws of 1892.) Section 87 of chapter 690, which has been incorporated into the present insurance law of New York as section 97, professed to remove the restrictions as to the payment of dividends, and amended the previous law so as to allow the companies "to make and pay over dividends annually, or at longer intervals." The section, as a whole, reads thus:

Any domestic life insurance corporation which by its charter or articles of association is restricted to making a dividend once in two or more years, may hereafter, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in such charter or articles, make and pay over dividends annually, or at longer intervals, in the manner and proportions, and among the parties, provided for in such charter or articles.

Only one other law was needed to make these great insurance companies complete masters of the situation in the great financial center of the United States; and that desideratum was supplied by section 156 of chapter 689 of the banking law of 1892, which, among other privileges, conferred upon trust compa-

nies the right "to receive deposits of trust moneys, securities, and other personal property from any person or corporation, and to loan on real or personal securities."

This provision is the parent of the Morristown Trust Company, the Morton Trust Company, the United States Mortgage and Trust Company, the Mercantile Trust Company, the Equitable Trust Company, the Metropolitan Trust Company, and half a score of others formed by the officers, trustees, and directors of the Mutual, the New York Life, the Equitable, and the Metropolitan life insurance companies. I quote the whole of this remarkable section of law for the information of the House:

Upon the filing of any such certificate of authorization of a trust company, the persons named therein, and their successors, shall thereupon and thereby become a corporation, and in addition to the powers conferred by the general and stock corporation laws, shall have power:

1. To act as the fiscal or transfer agent of any State, municipality, body politic, or corporation; and such capacity to receive and disburse money, and transfer, register, and countersign certificates of stock and other evidences of indebtedness.

2. To receive deposits of trust moneys, securities, and other personal property from any person or corporation; and to loan money on real or personal securities.

3. To lease, hold, purchase, and convey all real property necessary to the transaction of its business, or which the purposes of the corporation may require, or which it shall acquire in satisfaction or partial satisfaction of debts due the corporation, under sales, judgments, or mortgages, or in settlement or partial settlement of debts due the corporation by any of its debtors.

4. To act as trustee under any mortgage or bond issued by any municipality, body politic, or corporation, and accept or execute any other municipal or corporate trust not inconsistent with the laws of this State.

5. To accept trusts from and execute trusts from married women in respect to their separate property, and to be their agent in the management of such property, or to transact any business in relation thereto.

6. To act, under the order or appointment of any court of record, as guardian, receiver, or trustee of the estate of any minor the annual income of which shall not be less than $100, and as depositary of any moneys paid into court, whether for the benefit of any such minor, or other person, corporation, or party.

7. To take, accept, and execute any and all such legal trusts, duties, and powers, in regard to holding, management, and disposition of any estate, real or personal, and the rents and profits thereon, or the sale thereof, as may be granted or certified to it by any court of record or by any person, corporation, municipality, or other authority; and it shall be accountable to all parties in interest for the faithful discharge of every such trust, duty, or power which it may so accept.

8. To take, accept, and execute all such trusts and powers, of whatever nature or description, as may be conferred upon or intrusted or committed to it by any person or persons, or by any body politic, corporation, or other authority by grant, assignment, transfer, devise, bequest, or otherwise, or which may be intrusted or committed or transferred to it or vested in it by order of any court of record or any surrogate; and to receive and take and hold any property or estate, real or personal, which may be the subject of any such trust.

9. To purchase, invest in, and sell stocks, bills of exchange, bonds, and mortgages, and other securities; and when moneys, or securities for moneys, are borrowed or received on deposit, or for investment, the bonds or obligations of the company may be given therefor; but it shall have no right to issue bills to circulate as money.

10. To be appointed and to accept the appointment of executor of or trustee under the last will and testament, or administrator with or without the will annexed, of the estate of any deceased person, and to be appointed as to act as the committee of the estates of lunatics, idiots, persons of unsound minds, and habitual drunkards. (Laws of New York, 1892, vol. 2, pp. 1908–1910.)

With these laws of New York before us, laws which affect every insurance policy holder in the United States; laws which render the national-banking system insecure and less efficient; laws which grant privileges to one set of corporations without the payment of any tax or duty, while the national-bank act taxes another set of corporations engaged in the same business—with all this before us, who will be so bold as to say that we have not as much right to tax and supervise and control the mongrel insurance trust companies of New York as we have to tax State banks of issue, or to tax filled cheese, oleomargarine, or patent medicines? Whether taxation is the condition precedent to visitation, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] contends, or whether the right to supervise is the condition precedent to taxation, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] contends, the fact is that both rights exist as concomitants of the power of Congress to pass laws to "provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." It was upon this theory that the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the great bank cases of McCulloch *v.* Maryland (4 Wheaton, 316), Farmers' Bank *v.* Dearing (91 U. S., 29), and Bank *v.* Nebeker (167 U. S., 196) were predicated. This Government has the right to establish a national banking system. If it has that right, it has, as a corollary, the right to safeguard that system. It may lay a tax or duty as a means of safeguarding it. Judge Harlan's opinion in Bank *v.* Nebeker establishes that point. The end carries the means along with it if the end itself is legitimate, unless the means are specially prohibited. Chief Justice Marshall's opinion in McCulloch *v.* Maryland establishes this point. Congress has the power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises" in order "to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." From whatever point of view we look at this matter we have the power to pass the legislation which I have proposed. And having the power to do so, I am convinced that under the circumstances it is our duty to do so.

As to the question of concurrent jurisdiction by the States and the United States, for which my bill provides, my impression is that it is entirely analogous in principle to the concurrent jurisdiction exercised by the two governments over the subject of pilotage or the building of bridges over navigable streams. The decided cases on these points are numerous. I think the subject falls within the scope of that class of legislation which the States may enact in the absence of legislation by Congress and in which State laws are abrogated by Federal legislation only to the extent to which such legislation fairly construed may reach. My scheme is not predicated upon the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. If it were, it would deprive the States of the right to tax the corporations affected by it, and that is not my object.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have answered the questions of the gentleman from South Carolina as well as I could. I have spoken plainly of the abuses that have been disclosed in New York, and especially of those statutes which, to my mind, constitute the ugliest and most dangerous features of the whole wretched business. Since I have listened to this debate I am more than ever convinced of the necessity of extending the sovereign visitorial power of the United States over the corporations which have grown up in Wall street under those statutes. I am of the opinion that the plan which I have proposed offers an effectual remedy for the mischief, and is perhaps the only sure remedy attainable.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I surrender the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I desire to add much to what I said earlier in the day, but certain remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] have made it seem to me proper that I should say a few words. The House always listens with great delight to the gentleman, and wisely so, and yet I never hear him make a speech without being reminded of a story that was once told by Huxley, when he said that "Herbert Spencer's conception of a tragedy was the destruction of a syllogism by a fact." And when the distinguished gentleman declined to yield to me on the ground that he would illustrate the tendency and purpose of his speech if I would only be patient, I could not help but think that he was considering the possibility of a destruction of one of his syllogisms by a fact. And it was just such a fact that I think necessary to bring to the attention of this House.

The point that I made in my speech, and that I desire to emphasize because of the very eloquent denial of it made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] is this: That there can be no more immoral practice than for members of a legislative body to use the taxing power, which is given them for the sole purpose of raising revenue, for some other and ulterior purpose. I not only maintain that, but, despite the fact that my reading may not be as extensive or along the same line as that of the gentleman, I maintain that where the taxing power has been used in support of the liberties of the English people it has been along the line of a denial of appropriations rather than the line of diverting it from its real purpose into other purposes not germane to revenue raising.

But if that be not historically true the gentleman overlooks this distinction—that in England there is not the limitation of power that there is in regard to our National Government. Here the taxing power is expressly given for one purpose and one purpose only, and the Supreme Court has had occasion repeatedly to declare that police power did not exist in the National Government.

The gentleman paints a wonderful picture of certain conditions. He tells you of the enormous power wealth has, how it is overriding the weak and the helpless. He tells you of the greed and the avarice of man; and yet, pointing out as only his eloquent tongue can, the absolute crimes of these men of wealth, he would in the same breath have this House guilty of the immorality of disregarding the Constitution, disregarding its oath, and using a power that is expressly granted for another purpose. The gentleman will not set an example of high morality that will cure an evil by committing another evil; it does not matter what object may be desired. I have never sub-

scribed to that doctrine that the end justifies the means, and I am not prepared to do so to-day. I would hate to see this House go on record disregarding the Constitution for the purpose of attaining an object, however praiseworthy.

The gentleman's speech suggests that action should be taken here, but not a word practically of what the legislation should be. He tells you truly what the conditions are which permit the accumulation of such wealth and power in the hands of a few men; rightly says it is an intolerable condition, but he might have added that it was in the domain of the States to-day, as it has always been in their domain, to limit the size and the power of these corporations.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a statement?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, I will extend the courtesy that the gentleman declined to extend to me.

Mr. COCKRAN. Do I understand that the gentleman considers there is anything immoral in the use of a power granted by the Constitution for a purpose considered salutary by the body exercising it?

Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably I do; I consider that when I agree to support the Constitution that I mean what I say, and I believe that the taxing power is a limited power, given to the Congress of the United States for the purpose of raising revenue only, and that I am morally guilty of a wrong if I use it for some other purpose than raising revenue.

Mr. COCKRAN. Where does he find any such limitation on the power as he describes?

Mr. SHERLEY. I find the limitation upon the right to levy taxes all through the Constitution.

Mr. COCKRAN. Where?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, well, if the gentleman expects my memory to be so remarkable that I can quote the whole instrument to him I am sorry to disappoint him.

Mr. COCKRAN. I am not asking the gentleman to quote the whole instrument, but any part or one word which justifies his statement.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will give the gentleman the name of a case where the Supreme Court of the United States has justified it, and that is the case of United States *v.* De Witt (9 Wallace), which the gentleman has doubtless read; and I will give him another case—the license cases.

Mr. COCKRAN. I have not asked the gentleman for any legislative construction whatever, because the whole theory of my speech was that we must consider for ourselves how we will exercise the powers clearly bestowed on us.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course that makes further argument futile. I have not reached that point of personal egotism where I am willing to put my construction against the construction given in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. COCKRAN. If the gentleman will allow me, I have not the egotism to confound myself with the House. I spoke of the House, not of myself.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, returning to the merit of the matter rather than to any exchange of witticism, in which I do not profess to be a match for the eloquent gentleman from New York, I desire to again state what is the actual proposition now confronting the House. If we are to permit the size of a problem or the evil in an existing state of affairs to make us disregard the powers that remain among the people in their State government, and to come to the National Government for aid, then the intelligent practical thing to do is to abolish the restrictions that now exist upon the national power, make our power as broad as the gentleman's opinion of it is, so that we may consider not how to do a thing, but simply what we want to do.

The point I wanted to make, and that I desire to emphasize, is that if the States do not use their power, then by not using it they will cease to have the capacity to use it, and as a result of that we will see a concentration and centralization such as the world never saw before. And in that connection it is a curious fact that the loudest advocates to-day for national control are the same distinguished gentlemen whom the gentleman from New York described in such glowing and accurate terms. They are the presidents of the life insurance companies themselves.

Mr. COCKRAN. If the gentleman will allow me for a moment, I do not like to interrupt so much——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. COCKRAN. It will probably save the gentleman a great deal of trouble if I remind him that I have argued against Federal supervision. I have argued against Federal regulation. I have argued in favor of exercising the Federal power to remit life insurance to the control of each State, as savings banks are remitted to it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has expired.

Mr. COCKRAN. I hope the gentleman will be given additional time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. SHERLEY. In response to the last suggestion of the gentleman from New York I can only say that as the law now stands the matter is entirely within the hands of the State, and was so expressly declared in Paul versus Virginia, and if we come into their domain we complicate the question instead of clarifying it. The gentleman makes quite a speech on the fact that the commissioner of New York, instead of investigating and exposing conditions there, has been one of the causes that permitted them to go undiscovered. I do not deny the accuracy of the statement, but if the gentleman is going to make a plea on the ground of the inefficiency of an individual officer, then he has destroyed all legislative and governmental activity. If the fact that that commissioner is a bad commissioner is sufficient ground for the State not to engage in any further investigation or regulation, what guaranty can the gentleman give that a commissioner of the United States Government will be any better official?

Mr. COCKRAN. The gentleman must realize that I am opposed to the creation of a United States commissioner and of everything with such an object in view. But will the gentleman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; for a question. I have only two or three minutes longer.

Mr. COCKRAN. Then finish your remarks.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; go ahead with your question.

Mr. COCKRAN. I was going to ask the gentleman if his contention was that the present control by the States is what he desires to maintain?

Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably.

Mr. COCKRAN. And yet the present control by the States has produced these infamies?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; the absence of control by the States has produced these conditions.

Mr. COCKRAN. The absence of its exercise. I think the gentleman will not deny that the States have the control of the subject, if they choose to exercise it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, the gentleman uses the word "control" in a double sense.

Mr. COCKRAN. I will change it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, they have theoretical control, but they have not exercised control.

Mr. COCKRAN. I merely wanted to get the statement of the gentleman before the House, so that we would all understand it. I will change the word from "control" to "jurisdiction." I understand from the gentleman that he contends the proper remedy for these conditions is to maintain the existing State jurisdiction. Am I right in that?

Mr. SHERLEY. With due apology, I think I can put my position so that the House may understand it, even if the gentleman from New York does not. I contend this, that it is proper for the States to exercise the functions that belong to them, among which would be the control of insurance. Whether that control should take the line that the gentleman suggests, of limiting the action of corporations to State lines, limiting their size, or what not, is a question of expediency about which now I do not profess to be able to answer. The point I make is this, that whenever you get to the position of saying that the State government is inefficient to handle a thing simply because it is big, and that therefore it must come to the National Government, then you have struck at the very foundations of Anglo-Saxon government. You have by the disuse of a function in the course of time created a condition where its use may not be possible, and you have produced a condition, in attempting to cure one evil, that will be infinitely worse. You will have a centralization of government that will be infinitely worse than anything this country has ever seen.

Mr. COCKRAN. Now, may I put my question? Am I correct in assuming the gentleman's contention is that the true way to remedy conditions is to maintain the present jurisdiction? Am I correct in that?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. COCKRAN. That is to say, the conditions which have produced this infamous state of affairs are the conditions that will cure it?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, no; the gentleman is witty, but not accurate. The conditions that have produced this condition of

affairs have been the nonuse by the State of the powers that belong to it, and the cure of these conditions is the use by the State government of the powers that belong to it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired and the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. SHERLEY. But, Mr. Chairman, did I not have some time in my own right reserved?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized in my own time to yield to the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will answer the question put by the gentleman from Kentucky. He has reserved out of his own time fifteen minutes that he may occupy. The Chair asks the gentleman from Kentucky whether he proposes to speak in his own time?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the Chair will so recognize me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Kentucky allow me a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; a question.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman think that if the State of New York and the State of Pennsylvania were able to manage their own insurance affairs it would relieve the rest of the United States of this incubus?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think there is power in the States to control the entire situation. Now, it is plausible to say that inasmuch as these corporations extend outside of the State line that you had better come to the National Government, whose jurisdiction also extends beyond State lines. I say that is plausible. Of course it has its advantages, but the disadvantages will lie in the fact that by virtue of it you are taking the government away from the people; you are putting it where it will not have the effectiveness it would if the power remained at home. You are enabling these very people, who are so powerful—as the gentleman says, more powerful than any government now—to deal with one particular government, with one power, instead of having to deal with the governments of the various States.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I base my question on the assumption that about two-thirds of all the insurance done in the United States is written by companies in New York and Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, and when we create a condition of State morality that will not permit the organization of a corporation in a State for the purpose of preying upon the citizens of other States we will have solved one-half of the problems presented to the American people. And until you do create a State sentiment that will give you proper laws in your State you can not solve the question by giving over the power of control to the National Government.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that I understood the gentleman from Kentucky. I should be greatly obliged if he will make one or two points clear. Now, before the gentleman from Tennessee occupied his attention, I understood the gentleman from Kentucky to say that he believed in maintaining the present jurisdiction of the State upon this question of insurance. Under this jurisdiction the conditions of which we complain have arisen. Is not that so?

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, the gentleman from New York is too good a logician to expect me to answer a question—what might be termed almost a trick question. It is true that these conditions have arisen where the States have had the jurisdiction they now have, but I said to the gentleman from New York that it was not because they had the jurisdiction; it was because they had not used the power that is given to them.

Mr. COCKRAN. And now the gentleman's remedy is to leave the State to pursue the same system of disuse of powers as they have heretofore?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; but I have a little more confidence, a little more faith, in the people than even the distinguished commoner who has interrogated me. I believe under the lash of an aroused public opinion the State legislatures will awake to their duty and do their duty, and I do not want them to be checked in their newly awakened activity by the National Government stepping into the domain. [Applause.]

Mr. COCKRAN. Now, go a step further. If the gentleman's anticipations are correct and the rosy picture he has drawn should be realized, his position would be unquestioned. But suppose he is disappointed. Suppose, two years from now, this investigation having ceased to be a nine days' wonder and this house cleaning having resulted, as is not improbable, in mere substitution of new agents to carry on the same old practices, what, then, would be his conception of a remedy?

Mr. SHERLEY. My position about that is my position about the great subject of government in general. Because I have seen the people fail, because I have seen abuse prosper, because I have seen the wicked and the powerful flourish as the green bay tree, it has not made me believe less in the people, but only more. The day may be postponed, but the day is not going to be brought nearer by saying to the people, "You must not use your power." It is not going to be brought nearer by concentrating the power a long way from home. It is going to be brought nearer and made more certain by making the people realize that in their own hands, on their own heads, the sin and the saving lies. They must go to work themselves, and they must do it through their agencies at home. [Applause.]

Mr. COCKRAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] if the power of the Federal Government is any less the power of the people than the power of the town, the power of the county, or the power of the State?

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall answer the gentleman in this way, and when I have answered I shall not further detain the House by this dissertation between the two of us, because I remember the gentleman's suggestion that I should not have the egotism to think that I constitute the House or that my private views and an explanation of them was the only matter of discussion. I will answer the gentleman in this way, that my conception of government, and the Democratic conception of government, has been, first, that that government which governs least governs best; second, that that government which stays closest home to the people is most democratic and less liable to abuse, less liable to get beyond control. It is easier for the people of the State of New York to know something of their State government than it is for them to know something of their National Government. It is easier for the people of Kentucky to know more about their State government than they do about the National Government. The fact that they do not know it is not a contradiction of my statement. They could know it. This I know, that when this country started on its career the State legislatures contained the ablest of men; that the time was when men resigned from the National Congress to take a seat in their State legislature. That may have been a false position, but it is not half so false a position as that which to-day makes your State legislature a disregardable body, and to which are sent men who are not capable of broad statecraft. And I say to you if there is any hope for the redemption of America, though the picture be as black as the gentleman has painted it, the hope lies in going back to the people and letting them learn the old lesson that they can not shirk responsibility, can not shift it off to another forum and expect relief; they must get it at home, and that thought was the cause of and excuse for my speech this morning. [Applause.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MCMORRAN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, it is great good fortune to have listened to two such addresses as we have heard to-day, one from the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], containing a clear analysis and sound and philosophical exposition of the status of this question in its relation to the Federal and the State governments—a statement of a lawyer, founded upon law, cool and clear; the other, an eloquent denunciation of wrong and vice and criminality in high place and an exposition of the underlying ethics, excelled by nothing that I have ever heard upon this floor. The gentlemen from New York and from Kentucky agree in their conclusion, to wit, that the Federal Government has no jurisdiction over the subject-matter of insurance. Now, Mr. Chairman, these speeches have been a public benefit, but they have been to some extent a personal injury, because they have cut out from under me many of the things that I desired to say, because these gentlemen have said them better. I shall, however, begin by saying that I agree with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] that what the Irish call "home rule" is, as a rule, the most honest rule. [Applause.] It is honest for the reason that the men who are the "rulers," so called, the men in whom power is lodged, are neighbors of the men who lodge it, personal acquaintances of theirs—their characters intimately known—and because they exercise the power under the eyes of their neighbors and friends, who can at intervals withdraw it. I believe in it in an ascending scale, leaving power—in as far as can with safety be left—first to the individual, second to the family, third to the town, fourth to the county, fifth to the State, and sixth, and then only when the Constitution expressly or by necessary or obviously proper intendment delegates it, to the Federal Govern-

ment. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] has correctly said that all the liberties of the English-speaking people were founded upon the assertion by the legislative body of the taxing power. That is true; and while he can argue by analogy to some extent between the British House of Commons and the American House of Representatives, he must remember the distinction between the two. While it is absolutely true that the House of Commons exercised its taxing power for the strengthening and enforcement and execution of the power which it had—a legislative power—it is also true that the British House of Commons had an unlimited and original and inherent legislative power and therefore the exercise of the taxing power in order to execute that legislative power was totally a different and a larger thing than ought to be the exercise of the taxing power by the House of Representatives, which has only a limited power, a delegated power.

Mr. Chairman, it can never happen that the power to tax can give jurisdiction over a subject-matter of taxation when dealing with the subject-matter is neither delegated to the General Government nor prohibited to the States. You must first have the jurisdiction over the subject-matter. Then there follows, as the auxiliary or enforcing clause, the power to tax, not only to raise revenue, but, if actual need be, to enforce the power. If you have the power over the subject-matter, you may tax, not only to bring a revenue, but to execute the power, if that be an obviously proper or necessary means to the end of exercising the power. For example, if the Federal Government has the power to forbid certain things, it may forbid them by taxation, let us say. I do not think the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] intended to leave the impression which he left upon the mind of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], to wit, that the Federal power had any specific, substantive power of taxation independently of all other powers granted or denied in the Constitution of the United States. The power to deal with the subject-matter must be there first. You ought never to form a nexus between a subject-matter over which you have no constitutional power and the Constitution itself by the assertion of it through the taxing power. Taxes are always means to an end, not in themselves an end. The end itself must be constitutional.

Now, I am perfectly aware of the fact there is a little weight in the Supreme Court decisions that would seem to squint the other way if unstudied, but it amounts to nothing if studied. Here is the Supreme Court of the United States stating in effect that it would not undertake to investigate the motives of Congress when exercising the taxing power. In other words, it is a compliment to Congress, to the legislative body from a coordinate branch, stating that it would not attribute to it the bad motive of obtaining jurisdiction simply by the assertion of the taxing power. It takes for granted integrity of motive, intellectual integrity. Now, Mr. Chairman, there are two forms of centralization by the Federal Government, one of which I am afraid we can not help and the other one we can help, I think. That centralization which proceeds from the exercise of clearly delegated power is a form of centralization which, I fear, must go on. In so far as Congress has not already exercised to the full its clearly delegated power it will in the course of history exercise it. Nor is there anything undemocratic in maintaining in full integrity the expressly delegated powers of the General Government. Jefferson said as much.

The other form of centralization, which is always vicious and an usurpation, is to assert Federal jurisdiction by a pretext, whether it be by the mere pretext of interstate commerce where no interstate commerce exists or whether it be by the pretext of the taxing power asserted as a connecting link with the trust that the court will not examine our motive; it is all the same; it is vicious and an usurpation. Now, let us come to this particular question, Mr. Chairman. The Supreme Court has spoken in this case and it has declared that insurance is not commerce of any sort and especially is it not interstate commerce. That disposes of the question as to whether there is any jurisdiction under the rule in the Committee on Interstate Commerce. To what committee it should go I myself am a little in doubt. My opinion was that it ought to have gone to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to investigate the jurisdictional power of the Federal Government and to report to this House, but the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary not having made a fight for the jurisdiction and the committee making none, we are faced with the alternative of sending it to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. MANN. Why can not you let it go without making any special reference of the resolution? Why not let it go according to the rules?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was about to say along that line that perhaps the best of all references would be to refer it to the Committee of the Whole House and let it be thrashed out there and done with, but I have not the power to do that here. I am reduced to this alternative of advocating one of these motions or the other before the House, and if I offered the other motion to go to Committee of the Whole to be there disposed of it would be voted down simply because a Democrat had offered it. I think this ought not to be a partisan question in any sense whatsoever.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have been informed there will be an amendment offered to send it to the Committee on the Judiciary, and on the strength of that statement I declined myself to offer an amendment. I understand such an amendment will be offered by the gentleman from Maine from the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If this motion is coupled with instructions to the committee to examine and ascertain if Congress has any jurisdiction over the subject-matter, it seems to me it would be the proper committee to which it should go.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say, in answer to the gentleman's query about an amendment being submitted to refer it to the Judiciary Committee, that I have such an amendment in my pocket that has received the approbation of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD], who is expecting to be called away before we reach that point of the resolution, and I am going to offer it as soon as opportunity is presented.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it accompanied with instructions to the committee to report upon the question whether Congress has any jurisdiction——

Mr. NORRIS. No, sir; it refers the whole matter of insurance to the Judiciary Committee. Now, if the gentleman will permit a further interruption, I was endeavoring to get the floor in order to explain the situation all afternoon, but have not been able to do so——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can not yield now except for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand, the Judiciary Committee have not taken an active part in it because they thought it would be perhaps out of place to ask that something should come to them, and they would rather the motion came from somebody else.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, if the gentleman will let me finish. If that motion is coupled with instructions to the Committee on the Judiciary to report to this House whether the Federal Government has jurisdiction over the subject-matter, I shall indorse it, but if it is merely generally sent to the Judiciary Committee I do not see much advantage over sending it to that committee. There will arise the suspicion it was sent to the committee merely for the purpose of being smothered. There ougth to be a report upon the question of jurisdiction from whatever committee it comes before, and the proper committee to determine a jurisdictional fact is the Judiciary Committee, and therefore there ought to be instructions to that effect if it goes to the Committee on Judiciary, and I hope the gentleman will amend the resolution by embodying such instructions.

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to suggest to the gentleman, if he will permit me, that I will have no objection to adding to the motion any instruction, as far as securing action is concerned from the Judiciary Committee. I would not want to instruct any specific action by way of bill or anything else, because I want to leave the committee perfectly free, so that they may give us their opinion, as a judiciary committee, as to what the proper course is, or whether we have any jurisdiction whatever.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, that the Members of the House may catch the reason for the distinction I have made, I will say that the Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction for the purpose of reporting to the House whether or not the Federal Government has jurisdiction. But, if they were to report to the House that the Federal Government did have jurisdiction, then the Judiciary Committee would not be the proper committee to deal with the subject-matter, because that would depend upon what ground they placed the constitutional jurisdiction of the Federal Government. If they placed it, for example, on the ground that it was interstate commerce, then the matter would go to that committee; if they would place it upon the ground that the exercise of the taxing power made a jurisdiction—an inconceivable thing for a lawyer to do—then it would go to the Committee on Ways and Means; if they said the Federal Government had no jurisdiction at all, then that would settle the matter. That is the reason why I would not vote for a general committal to the Judiciary Committee, while I would

vote for a committal to the Judiciary Committee with instructions to report upon our jurisdiction. Now, let me proceed.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does not the message itself submit the question to the House simply? I find on page 16 the following:

I repeat my previous recommendation that the Congress should also consider whether the Federal Government has any power or owes any duty with respect to domestic transactions in insurance of an interstate character.

Is not the question submitted by the message, whether or not we have the power, and would a simple reference be a reference of that question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would not. Unless it is a committal requiring investigation and report on the question of jurisdiction, then it is a committal for legislation as well. The President is no lawyer, I will say, in answer further to the gentleman. He admits that he is not. That is one of the things which he is not, which is accompanied by an omission on his part to that effect. There are not many things of that sort. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, to go further in connection with this taxing power nexus between the subject-matter and the Constitution of the United States, just suppose you could have jurisdiction over any possible subject-matter simply because you had the power of taxation, where would it stop? Why, it would be a blanket clause that would cover everything. Congress might to-morrow pass an act ordaining a direct tax upon lands and apportioning it between the States, and then, incidental to the power of taxation (if any power is to be exercised as incidental to taxation, when really taxation is itself only incidental to other and substantive powers, or itself substantive only to raise a revenue), the Congress could go on and in the same act enact the Henry George system of single tax. It could do anything, I do not care what. It could to-morrow tax barrels, and then it could legislate that the barrel should hold only so much, or should not hold less than so much, or should have so many hoops, or should contain nothing but water. The minute that gentlemen, on this side of the Chamber especially, ever surrender the idea that the taxing power can make a nexus between the subject-matter and the Constitution where no other nexus exists, then we have surrendered to federalism, and we might as well go out of business, because we as a party would have no right whatsoever to exist. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a little about the subject-matter, although my friends from New York and Kentucky have left me no opportunity to grow eloquent upon the crimes and abuses of the present conditions, nor the advantages of preserving inviolate the reserved rights of the States as the sheet anchor of individuality and local self-government.

Mr. HEPBURN rose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COCKS in the chair). Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit me an interruption?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman from Mississippi has already spoken with relation to the taxing power and to the power that might be exercised under the commerce clause of the Constitution. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] has suggested that there is another power, lodged in the fourth section of the fourth article of the Constitution, that each State shall be guaranteed a republican form of government. Will the gentleman, before he leaves this branch of the subject, give us his views as to the power that the Government of the United States may have to control an insurance company through its undoubted power to secure to a State a republican form of government?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will reply by saying that a republican form of government does not mean an honest government or incorrupt government, as all of us have ascertained in these latter days, and that the constitutional guaranty of a republican form of government is not a guaranty of honest administration of government. It is a high tribute to my friend from New York, his morals and his high ideals of republican government, that he should have led to an unconscious confusion of the two in that matter. There are a great many sorts of republican governments. Historically we find that there have been democratic republican governments like that of Athens, aristocratic republican governments like that of Sparta, plutocratic republican governments like that of Venice, and a mixed-up republican government like that we have—a republic of lesser republics, with two different sets of republican governments working along different lines with the power of the people over both checked—materially blocked in the Federal Government—by the Senate, and checked by the absolute veto of the Executive, neither of which is consistent with a pure democracy, but both quite consistent with a republican form of government. Undoubtedly what our forefathers meant by the phrase was a government of law and not a government of one-man power—a monarchy, or any arbitrary government—a government in which the people, or at least those of them competent for governing, should be the source of power and law, the form of its expression. They had just come out from under the Monarchy of England.

Mr. COCKRAN. If the gentleman will permit me, I did not discuss the corruption of the Government in regard to that. The point I made was about a trust where the parties to the trust could not scrutinize the methods of administration, and a fund which must grow, without any possibility of distribution, were both elements in conflict with the judicial system established by every State and inconsistent with the security of republican government, which had nothing to do with its growth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me state what I understand by corruption, because your supposition involves necessarily a presumption of corruption controlling or annulling government of the people. It presumes the case of one man, or a few men, who had immense amounts of money, enough to buy everything, that the people themselves had lost their vote and their voting power because that one man or that one corporation controlled everything and voted everybody by influencing or buying the voters, or else by influencing or buying legislators, judges, or juries. That would undoubtedly be corruption, but it would be corruption under "a republican form of government." The republican governmental spirit might have departed, true enough. If there were any law that gave that man or corporation the sole power, that would not be a republican form of government; that would simply be a corrupt monarchical form of government. If you let the State of New York alone; if you leave it to itself; if you carry the government right to the door of her people and let them alone, they will root up and eradicate this evil. They won't have it long. Where you carry responsibility you give experience, and where experience is gained you find ability, and with both you have watchfulness, and with watchfulness virtue, courage, and honesty. That has always been the case. [Loud applause.]

I have forgotten who it was, perhaps it was Lord Macaulay, who said you can not teach your child how to walk by never allowing it to walk; you can not teach it to walk by always making it crawl; and you can not teach a State government fully how to grapple with vice and fraud and cunning greed unless you allow it to exercise the power of attacking and fighting them. They have got it now. Do not deceive them into the belief that the Federal Government alone has it or even concurrently has it. I wish to God they were untrammeled by Federal power to attack and uproot all these trusts. In regard to all these trusts, would that we could let the States at them. If you could let the State at the trusts they would not long exist. What protects the trusts is the shield of the interstate clause of the Federal Constitution and consequent judicial injunction. They would not have undertaken to do the things they do if it were not for the fact they are protected by the existence of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States. [Loud applause.] There would not be one now in Texas, in Arkansas, in Mississippi but for the constitutional inhibition on the action of the State. I thank God that there is no constitutional power now in the Federal Government dealing with insurance iniquities, because if there were I know the iniquities would last forever. [Renewed applause.]

Let the State governments loose at insurance officials; let Jerome begin a prosecution against them in New York and put them in the penitentiary. I believe he will do it. I know he can do it. He could put them in the penitentiary for a malversation of trust funds, or embezzlement of what did not belong to them. The single act of contributing $50,000 to the Republican campaign fund, not of their own money, but money of the widows and orphans, the trustees for whom they act, would lay them liable to criminal indictment and send them to the penitentiary in most States, and I suppose would in the State of New York. I will tell you what is the matter. It is not law. It is public opinion, commercialized and pregnant with condonation of the crimes of "high finance." If Tom Jones is a corrupt State examiner, he would still be a corrupt Federal examiner; and if Tom Jones is an incorruptible man as a Federal examiner he would still be an honest man as a State examiner.

The nearer Tom Jones is to the people the nearer their knowledge of him, whether he be honest or dishonest, bought or unbought. The more indirect their control of his getting in or

toppling out the more apt is he to surrender to the temptations of those ever ready to offer temptation.

As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] said yesterday, and he said it well, law does not make an honest man; God makes honest men. And when you take it in the broad and the proper sense it is true. Heredity and environment, the instrumentalities through which God works, do make honest men. You have got to have the right environment. Public opinion in administrative and financial circles is his environment; and the trouble is with public opinion itself. The trouble is with the American people. Down at the bottom of our hearts, God help us. nearly all of us somewhat respect and envy a fellow who has "financed" a half million dollars. We are like Thackeray's snob was about the nobility when he exclaimed, "I dearly love a lord." The poor devil to whom the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] referred, or some poor darky in striped clothes who had stolen over $25 worth of something to eat and been condemned to the penitentiary, you shrink from as he passes you in his convict suit, drawing your skirt aside because you do not want him to touch the hem of your garment; and yet if you are invited to-day—the membership of this House, and I take this House because it is the average of the American people, not a bit worse and perhaps a little bit better—if every Member of this House to-night should receive an invitation to dine with McCurdy or with McCall nine-tenths of you would cynically say: "Is the wine good? Does he roast his ducks well?" And you would go, the most of you. A great power of social regeneration and moral regeneration in the world, one which your ancestors always exercised, you do not exercise these days. Social ostracism is that power. That is the refusal to associate with men who are not honest. [Applause.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Did the gentleman from Mississippi introduce a resolution——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Did the gentleman from Mississippi introduce a resolution in the last Congress calling on the Attorney-General to prosecute the defendants in the merger case, all of whom were millionaires?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and also the anthracite-coal barons, who were in partnership with the railroads, contrary to the laws of Pennsylvania and of the United States.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Were any of them indicted?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not heard of it if they were. Now, to go ahead, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SIMS. Is it any more immoral for the president of a corporation to contribute to funds for political purposes than it is for the campaign committee that solicits those funds to receive them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, it is; because morals are a matter of how people feel—it is a subjective question to a large extent. When a man goes and solicits a campaign contribution it is on a slightly different plane. Theoretically and technically there is no difference, but practically, of course, you and I know that there is a difference. But I say this: If I was a guardian to-day of three or four helpless children, holding in trust for them a sacred fund which I was instructed by their father to hold together until a certain time and then distribute, with its accumulation, and if I were to take $10,000 out of that fund and give it to the Democratic State or national committee, there could not be found eighteen men on a grand jury, there could not be found twelve men upon a petit jury, who would not say that I was a thief, and they would render a right verdict. [Applause.] Why, the man who solicited the money may not have known whence it was coming. I would not have asked Mr. McCall for a contribution to the Democratic fund, but if I had done it and Mr. McCall had given it to me, I would have taken it for granted not that he was stealing it, but that it was his own money.

Mr. SIMS. Does not that presuppose that the national committees who solicit the funds from those officers imagine that they were getting these large contributions from them as individuals, and is that a supposable case?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know, because I suppose they may have gotten at some time or another a larger contribution from some individual who was giving his own money. I know that in past times I have heard that one great Republican, now dead, gave to the Republican campaign fund a sum larger than $50,000, and these people might have thought that this was being given in that way.

Mr. SIMS. Is it not a remarkable coincidence——

Mr. WILLIAMS. McCall was exceedingly wealthy; McCurdy was exceedingly wealthy, or supposed to be, and, besides that, all of his nephews, his cousins, and his aunts, and all the balance of the family, were drawing immense salaries from his company, and it may have been supposed that these were individual contributions. Anyhow, I do not want to inject that. I only want to go as far as I can go upon a certainty of facts. Mr. McCall knew it was not his money; Mr. McCurdy knew it was not his money, no matter who else did or did not know it. He knew he was taking money from a trust fund. He knew he was doing an act no higher and no more moral than mine would be if I had put my hands into a safe and taken out the money belonging to a sacred trust fund placed in my hands by a father to be kept together for his children. They knew they were taking and giving away that which was not theirs, but mine and yours and our children's. And that is not all. They knew when they put their hands into this fund for the purpose of pensioning all their cousins and brothers and brothers-in-law and nephews that they were doing what they ought not to have done. They may not have been stealing. It was not that; but it was the abuse of a trust, a misappropriation of a fund; and there is some remedy for that, too, somewhere in the world. There is under the Mississippi statute and there must be in New York.

Now, my friends, I decline to believe that the people of New York are corrupt. My friend from New York asked the gentleman from Kentucky if the present jurisdiction has led to the present results, what right did he have to expect any improvement. That was the substance of his question. The answer seemed to me perfectly simple. Every great piece of remedial legislation that ever existed in the world has come about after the revelation of some great abuse. It is one of God's laws that abuses breed remedies. Why, every remedy that has ever come in the physician's practice even, comes about generally after some great trouble with some great disease—trouble directing the attention of all the doctors in the world to that particular question. The great smallpox epidemics on the continent of Europe led to the discovery first of inoculation and afterwards to vaccination. The annual recurrences of yellow fever at Habana, and its danger to us when we went down to take possession, directed the intelligence of scientific men to that particular question, and led to the discovery of the fact that the mosquito was the sole cause of yellow fever epidemic, if not the sole cause of yellow fever itself. And so when you discover a great abuse like this, and when, incidentally, you discover it running all through what they call "high finance," then you awaken every man of intelligence to discern and every man of honesty to execute to the observation and consideration of that particular question and to the attempt to find a cure for it. You will not find anything like that in the State of Mississippi, because ours is a home government of a plain people, leading not a strenuous but a simple life. The environment is different.

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks that when a man receives a check drawn upon the funds of the insurance company he ought not to know that it is the insurance company's funds?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; he may not know it always, because the man signing the check may have money on deposit with the insurance company. I do not want to go into that. I only want to go as far as we can without any possible fear of contradiction.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I understood the gentleman from Mississippi to state that the only medium of protection now existing between the law officers of the various States of the Union and the American people and trusts was the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. Will the gentleman not admit that embezzlement and conspiracy——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say that that was the only one. I said that with that out of the way we could get rid of them. There are two others, railroad rebates and the tariff law.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. You are not discussing those now. The gentleman will admit that embezzlement and conspiracy are both common law and statutory offenses. The punishment of both lies with the courts of original jurisdiction in the city and county of New York. All the courts of original jurisdiction in that city and county, I believe, are under the control of the party which the gentleman from Mississippi so ably represents on the floor of this House. I ask the gentleman if that is true?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will let me finish my question—if that is true, what power is there in exist-

ence in New York or elsewhere to prevent the courts of that county from punishing the very crimes which the gentleman mentions?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to prevent it, and they are going to be punished. The State examiners in New York, who for years refused to report this iniquitous state of affairs, were Republicans. Mr. Jerome, who can prosecute, is an independent. He is an honest man and will prosecute. If Jim Osborne had been elected he too, an honest man, would have prosecuted. Oh, what a fall there is, my countrymen, from the discussion of a great, broad, public question to a partisan fling in the shape of a question like this, to which I might make return in kind if I wished to. I believe the gentleman is from Pennsylvania. Is he also from the city of Philadelphia?

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I hope that the gentleman from Mississippi is not under the impression that exists in some places in Pennsylvania, that the Commonwealth is composed exclusively of the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; the gentleman from Mississippi is not, but the gentleman from Mississippi is under the impression that prevails in many parts of this country that the absolute Republicanism of the State of Pennsylvania has been very largely due to the sardine-packed condition of things in the city of Philadelphia [laughter]; and when the gentleman stoops from the great dignity of this debate to ask whether I am a member of the party which will fail in New York City, in his opinion, to prosecute, and which did not, by the way, elect its district attorney this last time—when the gentleman stoops to that I have a perfect right to ask him if he is not from the same State and of the same party of the notorious Philadelphia stenches now in the nostrils of all men, that have surpassed in gravity of odor anything in the history of Boss Tweed, or anybody else that ever wore the uniform or bore the name of Democrat in New York City, so that these old characters are all farthing rushlights of corruption when contrasted with the great sun of the recent reeking rottenness of Republican Philadelphia. [Applause and laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been betrayed out of the line of my argument, and to get back to it would be of itself a diversion, so I believe I shall thank the House for its attention and sit down. [Applause and laughter.] I reserve the balance of my time.

Several MEMBERS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that the committee rise at this time and that we adjourn until to-morrow. I have no objection to that, reserving my right to the floor.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House resolution 42 and had come to no resolution thereon.

CANADIAN ELECTRIC-LIGHT COMPANY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of Congress, a report by the Secretary of State, submitting a claim of the Canadian Electric-Light Company, of Levis, Quebec, on account of damages caused by the U. S. S. *Essex* to the company's cable on July 17, 1904.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1905.*

SAMOAN CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State concerning this Government's obligation to pay to that of Germany the sum of $20,000 under the convention between the United States, Germany, and Great Britain for the settlement of Samoan claims, signed at Washington on November 7, 1899.

Prompt action should be taken to discharge this conventional obligation.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1905.*

COMPAGNIE FRANÇAIS DE CABLES TÉLÉGRAPHIQUES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of Congress, a report by the Secretary of State, resubmitting a claim of the Compagnie Française des Cables Télégraphiques for damages done to their cables by United States' military and naval authorities during the Spanish-American war.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1905.*

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WATCHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 299. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

An act (S. 1169) for the refund of certain tonnage duties—to the Committee on Claims.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, for five days, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend in the RECORD some remarks which I made this afternoon on the subject of insurance, while in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of H. L. Briscoe, heir of estate of Maria Shirley, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of deficiency in appropriation for the Navy and Marine Corps—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Auditor for the War Department submitting a recommendation for reappropriation for payments of amounts for arrears of pay and allowances on account of the services of officers and men in the war with Spain—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for medals for officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps in the war with Spain—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Department of Justice—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a communication from the President of the Republic of Ecuador thanking Congress for admitting Frutos Tomas Plaza to the Military Academy as a cadet—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill to punish persons who obtain or attempt to obtain fraudulently the title to public lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with

a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill to authorize certain officers to administer oaths and compel disclosures—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill to provide for punishment of special agents for embezzlement—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill to amend the law relating to the compulsory attendance of witnesses before registers and receivers of the Land Office—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill to abolish the office of receivers of public money for land districts—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill for the repeal of the soldiers' additional homestead law—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill to provide for the punishment of special agents for extortion—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill to amend the law relating to perjury—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriations for the establishment of demonstration farms in connection with the various reclamation projects—to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statements of expenditures, and of arms, etc., fabricated and repaired at the Springfield Armory and Rock Island Arsenal during the year ended June 30, 1905—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Humboldt Bay, California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Northeast River, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill for increasing the efficiency of the Medical Corps of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Delaware River at Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, recommending legislation to enable Maj. Cassius E. Gillette to enter the service of the city of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, a draft of proposed legislation to acquire a new roadway to the Chalmette National Cemetery, Louisiana—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the disbursements in aid of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts—to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LEGARE: A bill (H. R. 8410) to authorize the Charleston Light and Water Company to construct and maintain a dam across Goose Creek, in Berkeley County, in the State of South Carolina—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8411) providing for the length of service and date of retirement of clerks to pay officers of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 8412) to regulate the practice in criminal cases in the United States district and circuit courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 8413) for the improvement of Elk River, in Tennessee—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 8414) to supplement and amend the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and the acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 8415) providing for an addition to the public building at Utica, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 8416) for a survey of the waters of New York Harbor opposite Bay Ridge—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 8417) to fix the compensation of light-house keepers and to provide for their retirement on half pay—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8418) making provision for a memorial to Matthew Fontaine Maury—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8419) to pension civil employees of the Government navy-yards when injured in the performance of duty to such an extent as to be incapacitated to earn a living—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 8420) for the erection of a public building at Marion, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 8421) to incorporate the Economic Heating and Refrigerating Company, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 8422) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8423) to amend the immigration laws of the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 8424) to prevent the fraudulent naturalization of aliens—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8425) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States"—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8426) providing for changing the title of warrant machinist, United States Navy, to machinist, for the promotion of machinists after six years from date of warrant, according to law governing the promotion of other warrant officers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8427) relating to the pay of mates in the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8428) to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8429) to amend an act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands"—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8430) amending section 61 of an act entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," approved August 27, 1894, and repealing internal-revenue tax on potato alcohol used in the arts or in medicinal compounds and for light, fuel, and power purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8431) granting to the State of Washington 50,000 acres of land to aid in the continuation, enlargement, and maintenance of the Washington State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, at Orting, Wash.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8432) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in Yakima County, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 8433) to repeal section 38 of an act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the permanent military establishment of the United States," approved February 2, 1901, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 8434) for the extension and

improvement of Massachusetts avenue to Western avenue NW., District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8435) for the opening of Fessenden street NW., District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 8436) to erect a monument in memory of the Union soldiers who are interred in the national cemetery at Fort Scott, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8437) to encourage and promote commerce among the States and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRENCH (by request): A bill (H. R. 8438) to increase the saloon license in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 8439) to amend "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 17, 1902—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 8440) granting 5 per cent of the land sales on military land warrants to the public-land States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 8441) to authorize the Mobile Railway and Dock Company to construct and maintain a bridge or viaduct across the water between the end of Cedar Point and Dauphin Island—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 8442) permitting the building of a dam across the Rock River at Grand Detour, Ill.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 8443) for establishing a light vessel off Nantucket Shoals, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 8444) providing for the recoinage of abraded and uncurrent silver dollars into subsidiary coins—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8445) to encourage private salmon hatcheries in Alaska—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8446) to increase the salaries of rural free-delivery carriers of mail—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 8447) to increase pension for total deafness—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A bill (H. R. 8448) to establish a fish-culture station in the State of Ohio—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8449) to acquire certain ground in the District of Columbia for a Government reservation—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 8450) to regulate postage on pension vouchers and communications relating thereto, and to amend section 4764 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8451) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the State of South Carolina—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8452) repealing an act entitled "An act to extend the time for presenting claims for additional bounties," and its amendments and extensions, so far as they limit the time for presenting claims for additional bounties granted to soldiers by the twelfth and thirteenth sections of the act of July 28, 1866—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 8453) to establish and create the Department of Highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8454) to increase the limit of cost of a public building at the city of Gainesville, in the State of Florida, and to authorize the erection and completion of such building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8455) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Aiken, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8456) establishing regular terms of the United States circuit and district courts at Aiken, S. C.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 8457) to set aside certain Federal revenues for the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 8458) to establish a court of patent appeals, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8459) to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 8460) to amend the immigration laws and regulations approved March 3, 1903, entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States"—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 8461) to amend chapter 1495, Statutes of the United States, entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Flathead Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment," as amended by section 9 of chapter 1479, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 8462) to amend section 1 of chapter 538 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 8463) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States courts and other Government offices at Greenwood, Greenwood County, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 8464) prohibiting the issuing of special-tax stamps to retail and wholesale dealers in liquors in prohibition districts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8465) requiring collectors of internal revenue to give information in certain cases—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8466) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Beaufort, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts (by request): A bill (H. R. 8467) providing for certain changes in the pension laws relating to the time of paying pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 8468) establishing an additional recording district in Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 8469) to extend the provisions of section 21 of the act of July 24, 1897, to the produce of the forests of Minnesota—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8470) to extend the provisions of section 21 of the act of July 24, 1897, to the produce of the forests of Minnesota—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 8471) to provide for the education of the blind—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 8472) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 8473) to authorize the recovery of the value of unlawful rebates and discriminations and penalty therefor, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 49) to amend the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved February 3, 1905, relating to the contingent fund of the House—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 50) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize the United States to insure the lives of citizens thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 12) fixing the time for the adjournment of Congress from December 21, 1905, to January 4, 1906—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: A resolution (H. Res. 99) providing a stenographer for the journal clerk—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8474) to correct the military record of Daniel Graeher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 8475) granting a pension to John F. Tathem—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8476) for the relief of Mrs. R. N. Pharr and Mrs. H. B. Faut—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 8477) granting an increase of pension to Fannie L. Edgerton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 8478) for the relief of Joshua T. Reynolds—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8479) granting a pension to Nellie A. Batchelder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 8480) granting an increase of pension to Laura C. De Vane—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 8481) granting an increase of pension to Richard Callaghan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 8482) for the relief of the estate of John W. Gregory, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8483) for the relief of the Masonic lodge of Bexar, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8484) for the relief of Ransom Day—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8485) for the relief of Thomas J. Naugher, jr., administrator of Thomas J. Naugher, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8486) for the relief of the surviving heirs of Isaac Hulse, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8487) for the relief of the heirs of Davis Knight, of Fayette County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8488) for the relief of Dora Terrell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Andrew J. McWhirter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8490) granting a pension to Janie Atnip—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8491) granting a pension to Oliver Owen Ball—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8492) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8493) granting an increase of pension to Sallie F. Sheffield—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8494) granting an increase of pension to David A. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8495) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Hardin P. Cochrane, Louisa Cochrane, and William G. Cochrane—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8496) for the relief of W. J. Meadows—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8497) for the relief of Travis Stull—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8498) for the relief of Delilah Dobbins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8499) for the relief of James R. Pennington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8500) for the relief of Thomas Columbia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8501) for the relief of Francis McGuire—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8502) for the relief of W. J. Flanery, jr.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8503) granting an increase of pension to David C. May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8504) granting a pension to James H. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8505) granting a pension to James T. Holcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8506) granting a pension to Andrew E. York—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8507) granting an increase of pension to Kate Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8508) granting an increase of pension to James S. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8509) granting an increase of pension to Horace Applegate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8510) granting an increase of pension to William Crawford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8511) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bierly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8512) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8513) granting an increase of pension to William Warden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8514) granting an increase of pension to Susan Hardin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8515) granting an increase of pension to Benjamine Puckett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8516) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Cordell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8517) granting an increase of pension to John A. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8518) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Meadows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8519) granting an increase of pension to John E. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8520) granting an increase of pension to Alfred F. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8521) granting an increase of pension to Andrew W. Grimes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8522) granting an increase of pension to Byron Rudy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8523) granting an increase of pension to David S. Trumbo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A bill (H. R. 8524) to correct the naval record of John Rohrer—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8525) removing the charge of desertion against the name of John Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8526) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Schultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8527) for the relief of George Rushberger—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8528) for the relief of Pacific Pearl Mullett, administratrix of the estate of the late Alfred B. Mullett—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8529) for the relief of Pay Inspector E. B. Rogers, United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 8530) granting a pension to Benjamin Q. Ward—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8531) granting a pension to John Calhoun Greathouse—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 8532) granting an increase of pension to Retta M. Fairbanks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8533) for the relief of Alfred H. Rose—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 8534) for the relief of the estate of William Burgess—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8535) for the relief of Onesiphor Delahoussaye, sr., of St. Martin Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8536) for the relief of E. H. Flory—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8537) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Piernas, deceased—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8538) for the relief of the estate of Louisa Breaux, deceased, late of Lafayette, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8539) to fix the grade on the retired list of Col. James W. Powell, United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 8540) for the relief of Thomas J. Spencer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 8541) granting an increase of pension to E. H. Pinney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8542) for the relief of the estate of William Rose Proctor—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 8543) granting an increase of pension to Orville S. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8544) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Korn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCKS: A bill (H. R. 8545) for relief of Gottlob Schlecht and heirs and legal representatives of William Bindhammer and Valentine Brasch—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8546) granting an increase of pension to James W. Dixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8547) granting an increase of pension to John W. Madison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8548) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin H. Howell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8549) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Howell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8550) granting an increase of pension to John Bierer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8551) granting a pension to Jane K. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8552) granting an increase of pension to Elisha G. Horton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 8553) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Aylesworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8554) granting an increase of pension to John B. P. Shannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 8555) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James Baldwin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 8556) granting an increase of pension to Ethan Blodgett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 8557) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius W. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 8558) granting an increase of pension to Elias Riegle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8559) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon L. Angle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8560) granting an increase of pension to Francis Sanderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8561) granting an increase of pension to Comfort M. Slawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8562) granting an increase of pension to William Ostermann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8563) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hays—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8564) granting an increase of pension to Edward Creech—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8565) granting an increase of pension to Andrew La Forge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8566) granting an increase of pension to Margaret C. De Cow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8567) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim A. Bard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): A bill (H. R. 8568) for the relief of Samuel L. Landers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8569) granting a pension to Oscar F. Renick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8570) granting an increase of pension to William Conoway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8571) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Drummond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENBY: A bill (H. R. 8572) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record William Berry—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8573) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Callon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8574) granting a pension to Elymas F. Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 8575) for the relief of Justus M. Curtis, of Monroe, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 8576) granting an increase of pension to Martin Funk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8577) granting an increase of pension to William C. Robins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8578) granting an increase of pension to Franklin G. Mattern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8579) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8580) granting an increase of pension to W. W. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8581) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Coplin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 8582) to correct the record of Joseph Clark—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8583) to correct the record of William T. Mefford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 8584) granting an increase of pension to John Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8585) granting an increase of pension to Arthur McGuigan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 8586) granting an increase of pension to Milton J. Timmons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 8587) granting an increase of pension to William J. Mull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8588) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8589) granting an increase of pension to Michael W. Hoerauf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8590) granting a pension to Albert E. Lackey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8591) granting a pension to Della S. Easton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8592) granting a pension to Joseph Brandle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8593) granting a pension to Rutherford M. Beetley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8594) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the name of Thomas Rainey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8595) granting a pension to Oscar J. Bigelow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 8596) granting an increase of pension to John C. Messerschmidt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 8597) for the relief of Thomas Monteith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8598) for the relief of D. C. Cunningham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8599) for the relief of John T. O. Wilbar—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8600) for the relief of W. N. Hedden—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8601) granting a pension to David Wadkins, John Wadkins, and Jacob Shope—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8602) granting a pension to Robert Byrd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8603) granting a pension to Robert Garrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8604) granting a pension to Elijah P. Hensley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8605) granting a pension to Thomas J. Bradshaw—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8606) granting a pension to Alfred M. Hooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8607) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Haire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8608) granting an increase of pension to John L. Ward—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8609) granting an increase of pension to Robert Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8610) granting an increase of pension to William A. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8611) to complete war record of B. R. Trull—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 8612) for the relief of D. Froneberger—to the Committtee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8613) for the relief of the personal representatives of Horace L. Bradley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8614) to do justice to the survivors of the shipwreck of the *Sultana*—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8615) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Derious O. Bibee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 8616) granting an increase of pension to Delia A. Honey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8617) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. F. Joslyn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 8618) granting an increase of pension to John G. Rowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 8619) granting a pension to Susan Welsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8620) granting a pension to Thomas B. Lucas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8621) granting a pension to J. H. Pershing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8622) granting a pension to Jacob Lybarger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8623) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Cormany—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8624) granting an increase of pension to John L. Beatty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8625) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Snively—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8626) granting an increase of pension to William Ralston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8627) granting an increase of pension to David Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8628) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8629) to correct the military record of Aaron Loughner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Br. Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8630) for the relief of Simon W. Scott—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8631) for the relief of James M. Darling—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8632) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James B. Boyd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8633) for the relief of George F. Schild—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEPPER: A bill (H. R. 8634) granting a pension to Jacob Leobo—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8635) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8636) granting a pension to John Carrol—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8637) granting a pension to Eri B. Mullen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8638) granting a pension to Allen Place—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8639) granting a pension to Thomas Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8640) granting an increase of pension to Marion H. Motsinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8641) granting an increase of pension to Elcania McClure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8642) granting an increase of pension to Henry Crandall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8643) granting an increase of pension to William A. Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8644) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Park—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8645) granting an increase of pension to William T. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8646) granting an increase of pension to George A. Mick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 8647) granting an increase of pension to William Kress—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8648) granting an increase of pension to Solomon R. Ruch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOPF: A bill (H. R. 8649) granting an increase of pension to William Bode—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 8650) granting an increase of pension to Sewell F. Graves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 8651) granting an extension of Letters Patent No. 436073—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8652) granting an increase of pension to Egbert J. Olds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LE FEVRE: A bill (H. R. 8653) granting an increase of pension to Fannie A. McKee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8654) granting a pension to Esther Miner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEGARE: A bill (H. R. 8655) for the relief of the legal heirs of Raphael L. David, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8656) granting an increase of pension to Francis N. Bonneau—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 8657) granting an increase of pension to Henry Prame—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8658) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Willard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 8659) granting an increase of pension to James Powers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 8660) granting a pension to William Mabery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 8661) referring the claim of Arthur W. Kelley, of Jamestown, N. Dak., for damages for personal injuries sustained, to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MINOR: A bill (H. R. 8662) granting an increase of pension to E. F. Paramore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 8663) granting an increase of pension to Frederick A. Amende—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8664) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wuescher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8665) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8666) granting an increase of pension to William Shoup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8667) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Larick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8668) granting an increase of pension to Stephen H. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 8669) for the relief of Joseph H. Curran—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8670) for the relief of the Davison Chemical Company, of Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8671) for the relief of the heirs of Nicholas Stonestreet, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8672) granting a pension to Waters A. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8673) granting an increase of pension to Marcena C. S. Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8674) granting an increase of pension to Peter E. Little—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 8675) granting a pension to Anarintha M. Clarke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8676) granting an increase of pension to John H. Hair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8677) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Hyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8678) granting an increase of pension to Andrew McInturff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8679) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Stipp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8680) granting an increase of pension to Joel Maxwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 8681) granting a pension to A. L. Armstrong—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 8682) granting an increase of pension to James P. Bledsoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8683) granting an increase of pension to William D. Voris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8684) for the relief of the heirs of Richard Reynolds, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8685) for the relief of Charles E. Danner & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8686) for the relief of Sadie Thome—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8687) granting a pension to William I. Lusch—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8688) granting a pension to Elizabeth Charlesworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8689) granting a pension to Frank P. Haas—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8690) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8691) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Horn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8692) granting an increase of pension to Charles Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8693) to remove charge of desertion from military record of John Lucid—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8694) to authorize the President to appoint John J. Washburn assistant quartermaster with rank of captain and to place him on the retired list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8695) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the Massachusetts and Pennsylvania soldiers whose organizations were the first to tender their services and the first who arrived in Washington in response to President Lincoln's call, April 15, 1861, for 75,000 volunteers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 8696) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Walters—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 8697) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8698) granting a pension to Stephen Tibbetts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 8699) for the relief of James A. Carroll—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. REID: A bill (H. R. 8700) granting a pension to Clarence E. Haney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8701) for the relief of William H. Roach, of Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 8702) for the relief of John W. Gummo—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8703) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shoup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8704) granting an increase of pension to Levi Kegg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8705) granting an increase of pension to Dison Ramsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8706) granting an increase of pension to James H. Sparks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8707) granting an increase of pension to John F. Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8708) granting an increase of pension to Henry Brant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8709) granting an increase of pension to George B. Hotchkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8710) granting an increase of pension to J. Levi Roush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8711) granting an increase of pension to James F. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 8712) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 8713) granting an increase of pension to P. S. Lynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8714) granting an increase of pension to George Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8715) granting an increase of pension to W. O. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8716) granting an increase of pension to J. L. Coffey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 8717) for the relief of Jacob Pickens—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 8718) granting a pension to William T. Rowe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8719) for the relief of Sophronia E. Ramm, formerly Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8720) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Kraaz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8721) granting an increase of pension to George R. McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8722) granting an increase of pension to Arthur M. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8723) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 8724) granting an increase of pension to Curtis C. Whittier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8725) granting an increase of pension to Moses B. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8726) for the relief of James A. Chamberlain—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8727) for the relief of James W. Kenney and the Union Brewing Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8728) for the relief of William R. Boag—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8729) for the relief of John Quigley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8730) for the relief of Robert J. Faulkner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8731) granting a pension to Clara L. Mecuen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8732) granting a pension to Ellen S. Gifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8733) granting a pension to Moses E. Angell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8734) granting a pension to Mary Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8735) granting a pension to Clara D. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8736) granting an increase of pension to Lowell Mason Maxham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8737) granting an increase of pension to Horace A. Manley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8738) granting an increase of pension to Ernest A. Billings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8739) granting an increase of pension to Frank N. Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8740) granting an increase of pension to Charles I. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8741) to correct the military record of Reuben D. Terry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8742) to correct the naval record of Stephen Shorthill—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8743) granting a pension to Flora T. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8744) granting an increase of pension to C. J. Humanson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 8745) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Susan C. Warren, late of Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 8746) granting a pension to Satira Perry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1766) granting an increase of pension to John T. Stone—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7218) granting an increase of pension to Laura Kohlhase—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Phebe Anna Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, favoring power of Interstate Commerce Commission to fix railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of the American Bar Association and others, favoring retention of present bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Nellie A. Batchelder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert McCoy—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of Laborers' Protective Union of Middletown, N. J., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Oxisville, N. Y., for suppression of liquor traffic in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Rockland County, N. Y., for a monument to Commodore Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of citizens of Port Jervis, N. Y., relative to "fraud order" of the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Highland Council, No. 5, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Newburgh, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Hudson River Council, No. 86, of Newburgh, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 818, Painters, Paper Hangers, and Decorators of America, of Suffern, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Elmer E. Smith and others, for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of F. G. Tenney and others, against repeal of the Grant law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the American Bar Association and others, of New York, favoring present bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Orville S. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Bierer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, against tariff revision—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of joint executive committee on improvement of the harbor of Philadelphia, for a 35-foot channel in the Delaware River at Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of senate and assembly of the State of California, favoring parcels-post legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Alonzo S. Whitley, of Jermyn, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DARRAGH: Petition of twenty-sixth annual encampment of the Michigan Grand Army of the Republic, asking for better dormitory at the National Soldiers' Home—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Austin Grange, of Mecosta County, Mich., and S. P. Lapp and 76 others, for no change of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Sunday School Convention of Isabella County, Mich., against repeal of the anticanteen act—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of N. C. Mason and other merchants of Blanchard, Mich., against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of Federation of Women's Clubs of Muscatine, Iowa, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Conoway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of George Muldoon and 50 others, of the Iron Molders' Union of Wheeling, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of Modisto Irrigation Association of San Francisco, against San Francisco obtaining reservoir site in Yosemite Valley—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Morse & Rodgers, for removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Humane Society, against any change in the law now governing live stock in transit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLACK: Petition of W. D. Brennan Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Malone, N. Y., for a service pension and a minimum pension of $12 per month for soldiers' widows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph D. Tate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Rutherford M. Beetley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph Brundle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas J. Pavy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Sallade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of George Washington Council, No. 423, of Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of the Shipping Society of America, against suspension of coastwise laws between Philippines and the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of the Municipal Art Society of Hartford, Conn., against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Municipal Art Society of Hartford, Conn., for preservation of American forests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, against revision of the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Cate E. Cobb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of W. L. Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John G. Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William O. Gillispie—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David L. Horton—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. D. Bollard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of the city council of Sioux City, Iowa, relative to atrocities upon Russian Jews—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry C. Willard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Prame—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Carpet Workers' Union No. 332, of Amsterdam, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Washington Council, No. 62, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Woodbury, N. J., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MACON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of J. William Mabery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Frett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of citizens of Kansas, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Milwaukee, favoring power of Interstate Commerce Commission to fix railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Iron Molders' Union No. 121 of North America, of Milwaukee, and Richard Sexton and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James P. Bledsoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sterling Rose—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Washington Camp, No. 507, and Washington Camp, No. 112, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Shenandoah, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of the Young Men's Christian Association mass meeting at Oil City, against liquor selling in Capitol of the United States—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Nathaniel N. Winslow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Bremer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Elam Skivers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the American Mining Congress at El Paso, Tex., for a national Department of Mines and Mining—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. WEEMS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John H. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James L. Rector—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: Petition of Montgomery Division, No. 98, Order of Railway Conductors, against Interstate Commerce Commission having power to fix railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ———: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Wilford Troyman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *December 16, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

HENRY C. HANSBROUGH, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. TILLMAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

SPRINGFIELD ARMORY AND ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, statements submitted by the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, of the expenditures at the Springfield Armory, Springfield, Mass., and at the Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EFFICIENCY OF THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, in connection with a letter submitted from the War Department on the 7th instant, relative to the enactment of legislation to increase the efficiency of the Medical Corps of the Army, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper,

was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MAJ. CASSIUS E. GILLETTE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from Hon. John Weaver, mayor of Philadelphia, requesting that Maj. Cassius E. Gillette, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, be permitted to accept the appointment of chief of engineers of the bureau of filtration in that city, and recommending that the Secretary of War be authorized by Congress to issue a leave of absence for one year to Major Gillette; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ENDOWMENT OF AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the disbursements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, made in the States and Territories under the provisions of "An act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862," approved August 30, 1890; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, December 21, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Thursday, January 4, 1906; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Congressional Temperance Society and International Reform Bureau of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. SIMMONS presented a petition of 40 citizens of the State of North Carolina, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the legislature of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation consolidating third and fourth class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Office of the Secretary.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January session, A. D. 1905.

Resolution concerning the consolidation of third and fourth class mail matter.

Resolved by this assembly, That the consolidation of third and fourth class mail matter, as proposed in the United States Senate amendment to the postal appropriation bill, and in House of Representatives bill No. 15983, is of the highest importance to the interests of the public, and the Senators and Representatives from this State in the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to exert their influence to secure the immediate enactment into law of the propositions embodied in said amendment and House of Representatives bill.

Passed house of representatives February 23, 1905.
Senate concurs February 23, 1905.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the Municipal Art Society of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the Municipal Art Society of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a forest reserve in the White Mountains of New Hampshire; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. FRYE presented a memorial of the Shipping Society of America, remonstrating against the suspension of the coastwise laws of the United States in the trade between this country and the Philippine Islands after July 1, 1906; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLICITY OF ELECTION EXPENDITURES.

Mr. TILLMAN. I send to the desk an article by Mr. Perry Belmont, from the North American Review, on publicity of election expenditures, and ask that it be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina that the article referred to by him be printed as a Senate document? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1244) to amend section 605 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to corporations, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 54) to provide a public park on Georgetown Heights, in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HEYBURN, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to whom was referred the bill (S. 93) to amend section 2326 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to mining claims, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1373) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from Washington to the Arlington estate property, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BURROWS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1881) to acquire certain ground in Lanier Heights for an addition to the National Zoological Park, District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1882) granting an increase of pension to John Broad;

A bill (S. 1883) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Raymond;

A bill (S. 1884) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Swift;

A bill (S. 1885) granting an increase of pension to Elijah J. Goodell; and

A bill (S. 1886) granting an increase of pension to Annie B. Jackson.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1887) to restore the name of California avenue, in the city of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1888) granting an increase of pension to George W. Patton; and

A bill (S. 1889) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Thompson.

Mr. MILLARD introduced a bill (S. 1890) to correct the military record of H. J. Rowell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1891) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. M. Morgan (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1892) granting an increase of pension to Edward Yarton.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 1893) to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. NIXON introduced a bill (S. 1894) for the relief of P. S. Corbett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FULTON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1895) granting a pension to William P. Arble; and

A bill (S. 1896) granting a pension to Smith Bledsoe.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1897) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Patch;

A bill (S. 1898) granting a pension to Albert A. Daniels;

A bill (S. 1899) granting a pension to Thomas Magee;

A bill (S. 1900) granting an increase of pension to Elihue Wiley;

A bill (S. 1901) granting an increase of pension to Ahimaoz E. Wood;

A bill (S. 1902) granting a pension to John Stokes;

A bill (S. 1903) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Hoover;

A bill (S. 1904) granting an increase of pension to Scotha Whitlock Bennett;

A bill (S. 1905) granting an increase of pension to Edgar Tibbits;

A bill (S. 1906) granting an increase of pension to John M. Garrett;

A bill (S. 1907) granting an increase of pension to Martin Russell;

A bill (S. 1908) granting an increase of pension to Francesco Del Gindice;

A bill (S. 1909) granting a pension to David D. Jones;

A bill (S. 1910) granting an increase of pension to Theodore McClellan; and

A bill (S. 1911) granting an increase of pension to Gunnerus Ingebretson (with accompanying papers).

Mr. KNOX introduced a bill (S. 1912) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Zell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1913) granting a pension to Clara F. Leslie; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 1914) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against the military record of Oliver Jackson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 1915) to provide for filling in the United States quarantine station at Honolulu, Hawaii; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1916) to provide for filling in that portion of the naval station at Honolulu, Hawaii, known as the Reef; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced a bill (S. 1917) for the relief of the representatives of M. F. Merritt, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1918) granting an increase of pension to William C. Beebe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1919) granting an increase of pension to Louise M. Wynkoop;

A bill (S. 1920) granting an increase of pension to George E. Smith; and

A bill (S. 1921) granting a pension to Helena A. Edic.

Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1922) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Cameron;

A bill (S. 1923) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Joseph D. Campbell;

A bill (S. 1924) granting an honorable discharge to George W. Casey;

A bill (S. 1925) granting an honorable discharge to Peter Fleming (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1926) granting an honorable discharge to Charles Coburn, alias Adolphus Gobell;

A bill (S. 1927) granting an honorable discharge to John Holderby;

A bill (S. 1928) granting an honorable discharge to John Kinchlow;

A bill (S. 1929) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Frank A. Land;

A bill (S. 1930) removing the charge of desertion from the name of George A. McKenzie, alias William A. Williams (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1931) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles L. Thompson.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 1932) for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Hale; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1933) for the relief of George T. Pettengill, lieutenant, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced a bill (S. 1934) increasing the pay of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service who served creditably with the regular and volunteer forces during the civil war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced the following bills; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1935) granting an increase of pension to Charles Church;

A bill (S. 1936) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo W. Smith;

A bill (S. 1937) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Worthington; and

A bill (S. 1938) granting an increase of pension to David Hanna.

Mr. ALGER introduced a bill (S. 1939) for the relief of Celia Ford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1940) granting a pension to George G. Greusel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1941) granting an increase of pension to Elvira A. Kelley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1942) to correct the military record of George A. Winslow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1943) to correct the military record of Edward R. Vanderslice; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 1944) granting an increase of pension to Frederick O. Graffam; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1945) granting an increase of pension to Gideon F. Pond; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced a bill (S. 1946) to amend the military record of Ephriam P. Evans; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1947) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Snyder;

A bill (S. 1948) granting an increase of pension to William J. Conrad;

A bill (S. 1949) granting a pension to Edward T. White; and

A bill (S. 1950) granting an increase of pension to Ransom L. Harris (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 1951) to correct the military record of Talton T. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 1952) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Alderman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

CHARLES L. EATON AND OTHERS.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Charles L. Eaton, Alonzo B. Eaton, and Edward H. Eaton, only children of Alonzo J. Eaton, late a member of the Capitol police force, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 15th instant, approved and signed:

S. 410. An act to authorize the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct bridges across Ouachita River and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas.

TRANSPORTATION OF COAL AND MINE SUPPLIES.

Mr. TILLMAN. I send to the desk a resolution calling for certain information, for which I ask immediate consideration. It will not cause any debate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be directed to send to the Senate the records and testimony and opinion of the Commission in the matter of alleged unlawful rates and practices in the transportation of coal and mine supplies by the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, decided February 1, 1905.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, December 21, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Thursday, January 4, 1906.

GREAT NORTHWESTERN TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a report by the Secretary of State, submitting a claim of the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, of Canada, on account of losses sustained through the fouling of their telegraph cable by the U. S. S. *Essex* on July 17, 1905.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 16, 1905.*

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 299) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PANAMA CANAL APPROPRIATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 480.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. I ask that the Secretary may read the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the bill the following as a new section:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury, within ninety days from the passage of this act, and thereafter at the beginning of each regular session, shall submit to Congress estimates in detail covering all salaries and compensation for all persons, except laborers, employed in the construction of the Panama Canal, or in connection with the same, by the Isthmian Canal Commission, including all officers and officials of said Commission.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, it will be noted that my amendment requires these estimates to be submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury. That is, as I understand, in accordance with the general law, which requires that all estimates for expenditures, for whatever Department they may be, shall come from the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress.

I do not intend, Mr. President, to detain the Senate with any extended remarks upon this subject, but it does strike me that this is a most important matter. As the law now stands there is no requirement for the submission of estimates in such detail as would enable the Congress to deal with the question as to whether any particular salary is or is not exorbitant. In other words, the estimates can be made in a more general way and still comply with the present requirement of law; and if they are made in the general way in which they were submitted during the progress of this bill in either House, and after the measure was under consideration, the opportunity is entirely lost to the House of Representatives or the Senate to properly scrutinize the question of the propriety of the allowance for salaries made in any particular case or in regard to any particular class of officers.

Now, Mr. President, that is more necessary in the case of the appropriations for the canal than it is for appropriations for any of the regular branches of the Government, for the reason that in the regular Departments of the Government the officers to be compensated are specified by the law, and being thus specified by the law it is entirely competent and practicable for Congress to fix what shall be the salary of each officer. But it is impracticable to specify in advance all the officers who shall be employed in this gigantic work with all its varied details and changing conditions and developments. That must be left largely to the discretion of executive and administrative officers. Therefore it is necessary that some method should be adopted by which Congress may still keep its hand upon the important matter of determining whether allowances for salaries are exorbitant or whether they are of proper proportion.

That can only be done, I repeat, when the question of appropriations comes up. The estimates are then made for so many Commissioners, so many officers in the engineering department, and so on; and then it is perfectly practicable for Congress in making the appropriations upon these estimates to fix the amounts which are to be paid.

I do not suppose that it is the intention of Congress to be extra critical upon the subject, because much must necessarily be left to the discretion of those who are on the ground and by whom the conditions are probably better known and more accurately appreciated than they can be by those of us at this distance. But it is not only proper, but I will say necessary, that there should be the opportunity for Congress to correct anything in the matter of expenditures which is exorbitant.

The necessity for that, I think, is clearly disclosed by the salaries which are being paid now—many of them, not all of them. I have not the list before me. I am sorry I have not. If any Senator has it I wish he would let me have it. Speaking generally, I may be in error, but I think that the general scale of compensation, not with exactitude, but approximately——

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator means the list used in the debates in the House?

Mr. BACON. The one that gives the salaries of the officials.

Mr. TILLMAN. Here it is. [The paper was handed.]

Mr. BACON. I was saying that I think the general scale of compensation which the Government observes in the payment of its civil officers, while not exactly followed, should be largely a guide to those who have the fixing of salaries in this important work.

Now, what is a fact with reference to the salaries which have already been fixed and which are now being paid? We have, in the beginning, the man who is put at the head of the Commission with a salary which, outside of ambassadors to foreign countries, is twice as large as that of any civil officer of the United States except the President of the United States. If I recollect aright, the salary of the Chief Justice of the United States is $15,000, and it has only been raised recently to that amount; it was much less than that up to a few years ago. The salary of $30,000 is paid to the head of this canal work.

As I was saying yesterday, Mr. President, I do not think that the salaries which are paid by large corporations to their officials ought to be the guide by which is to be determined the scale of salaries to be paid to these officials. I repeat what I said yesterday or the day before, that we have every reason to believe as to these corporations—and I am no man to inveigh against corporations, and my record in the Senate will show it—we have every reason to believe that the salaries paid by these corporations are largely matters of favoritism and are not measured by the proper scale of the value of those services. In my humble judgment, the man does not live whose personal services are worth $150,000 a year for any work. I mention that salary as an extreme one. I might say the same thing of a great many other exorbitant amounts which are being paid by these large corporations to their officials, very far in excess, in my humble judgment, of the value of any man's personal services in any capacity.

It is very easy to be liberal in the expenditure of the money of other people. And these particular corporations which of late have had such an amount of public advertising in this regard have been dealing with the money of other people—people of every class, scattered all over the United States—and they have squandered these trust funds to the point of criminality in heaping these vast sums upon themselves and their favorites. The immense salaries thus paid by them have been far in excess of the value of the services rendered by these favorites.

Whether that be true or not, the policy of this Government is well known. It has been settled by more than a hundred years and is shown in the salary lists of the officials of the Government of the United States. While it may not be necessary to strictly conform to it, still the general policy of the Government in the payment of moderate salaries to its officials ought to be observed as a guide in the fixing of these salaries, at least approximately.

Why, Mr. President, what is the salary paid to the auditor of the canal expenditures? I have forgotten. Some Senator here will tell me.

Mr. TILLMAN. For the Canal Commission?

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. Ten thousand dollars.

Mr. BACON. Ten thousand dollars is paid to the auditor, and his work comes here for supervision and correction and ap-

proval by an auditor in the War Department, an officer who gets $4,000 per annum under the Government. The auditor of the canal expenditure gets $10,000. The Secretary of War, at the head of all this business, gets $8,000; and the clerks in the auditor's department, who are ready to do the work and whose knowledge and skill and experience is that upon which the head auditors in the Departments rely in determining as to the correctness of expenditures—the clerks, more competent or fully as competent as the man in Panama to do the work, are men who get from twelve hundred to fourteen hundred dollars and sixteen hundred dollars, and in rarest of instances $2,000 a year.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is not any evidence that this auditor has been at Panama, or that he stays there.

Mr. BACON. That may be true, but I am stating the case in the most favorable light in which it can be stated for him and for those who allow him this exorbitant salary. I say even if he is on the Isthmus, and that is stating it as strongly as it can be stated for him. The Secretary of the Treasury, the man at the head of the great financial interests of this Government, the man to supervise all, the man to control all beneath him, gets $8,000, and, forsooth, an unknown man, the appointment not confirmed by the Senate or required to be confirmed by the Senate, is to receive more money than the head of the financial Department of the Government.

So I might go on through, Mr. President. I am not niggardly in my ideas as to salaries. I would be perfectly willing to pay the salaries which I see are paid, if I recollect correctly, to the Commissioners, $7,500. I would be perfectly willing to do that. I am quite frank to say that I think the officials of the Government are largely underpaid. When I say "largely," I mean a great many of them, using the word "largely" not as to the amount but as to the classes.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BACON. With pleasure.

Mr. SPOONER. Would the Senator fix the salary of the chief engineer, the officer who is to reside upon the Isthmus, upon whose skill and knowledge of the profession depends very much the successful——

Mr. BACON. What is it?

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know what it is.

Mr. GALLINGER. Thirty thousand dollars.

Mr. BACON. The chief engineer? I certainly do think it is too high.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator would limit it?

Mr. BACON. I certainly would.

Mr. SPOONER. How would the Senator limit it?

Mr. BACON. I would not pay any official connected with that business more than is paid the Chief Justice of the United States—not one of them. That is the highest salary paid to any civil officer of the Government outside of foreign ambassadors.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will permit me a moment, the commission feature of the canal act was, as the Senator from Georgia stated yesterday, his amendment. The original proposition, as I drew it and introduced it, contemplated the construction of the canal without the intervention of a commission. On the passage of the bill the Senator offered the amendment providing for the commission, and it was adopted. I think I voted for it.

Mr. BACON. The Senator signified his acquiescence in it before I offered it.

Mr. SPOONER. One reason why I voted for it was that the Senator's amendment left the matter of salaries within the power of the President, in order that he might be able to adjust the compensation which he could pay to engineers and others of a professional character with reference to the sum which might, in view of the competition of great corporations needing such services, be necessary to procure the men.

Now, does the Senator think that it would be in the interest of the public, that it would be wise policy, to limit the salary of the chief engineer of the canal to the salary of the Chief Justice? Upon what theory? What similarity in conditions exists between the two propositions? The railway corporations of this country make a great market for engineering talent. They bid against each other for great civil engineers. Every few days you will find a successful, scientific, and talented chief engineer leaving one corporation with which he has long been, and going to another because he will draw a better salary.

Mr. BACON. The Senator, I understood, asked me a question. He does not let me reply to it.

Mr. SPOONER. I think the President of the United States, in choosing a chief engineer to take charge of this great work, so far as the plan is concerned, and to conduct the operations, ought to be permitted to get the best talent that can be found in the United States, and to pay the necessary price to induce such a man to go there and do that work. Does not the Senator think so?

Mr. BACON. Now, will the Senator——

Mr. SPOONER. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BACON. Will he please give me his question. The Senator did not state his question.

Mr. SPOONER. I asked the question in the first place.

Mr. BACON. One question at a time.

Mr. SPOONER. Then I thought I would explain the question to the Senator.

Mr. BACON. I am very much obliged to the Senator. I am sure I would not have understood it otherwise.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Georgia draws an unfair inference from a joking remark.

Mr. BACON. Perhaps the Senator from Georgia rejoined in the same spirit.

Mr. SPOONER. My question is whether the Senator is sure that he would limit the salary of the chief engineer to $12,500.

Mr. BACON. I did not say that.

Mr. SPOONER. Or limit it at all?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator has accompanied his question with a considerable statement, and therefore it is necessary that I should do more than give him a categorical answer.

As to the amendment which is now found in the seventh section of the Spooner Act, the Senator correctly states what occurred with reference to that amendment. The bill as originally introduced by him and which was pending in the Senate did not contain any provision for the Commission or for any machinery by which the President should proceed with the execution of the work.

Mr. SPOONER. It was to be done under the War Department.

Mr. BACON. Yes; it simply devolved the duty upon the President, and the only limitation was that he should do it through the War Department. I became satisfied, Mr. President, that machinery would be required, and I thought it was better that machinery should be prescribed by Congress and have somewhat of a legal status and something permanent in its nature rather than that the machinery should be left to the construction entirely of the Executive Department, with the liability to constant changes.

I drafted the amendment, and having every confidence in the judgment of my distinguished friend, the author of the bill, I submitted it to him before I introduced it. If he will remember, the amendment as originally drawn by me contained specifications as to the salaries of the Commission.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. BACON. So I am not taking any position now which I did not originally occupy. Upon the suggestion of the Senator, however, that that should be left open, I yielded to his judgment in the matter for two reasons. In the first place, as it was his measure and one the success of which would redound to his honor and his credit and the want of success of which would be to his disadvantage, I felt it was due to him that in putting an amendment upon the bill which should contain this somewhat radical change there should be such provisions as would meet with his approval. That was one reason. The other reason, possibly a more practical one, was that I did not think in the face of his opposition I could secure the adoption of my amendment.

For those two reasons, Mr. President, the amendment was changed to conform to the view of the Senator from Wisconsin, the number of commissioners and their character simply being prescribed, and the right to fix their salaries being left to the President of the United States.

Then the amendment further provided, and it is now a part of the law, that the Commissioners should appoint all the subordinate officers, subject to the approval of the President, which was manifestly correct. In framing the amendment, leaving the salaries unfixed, it was never in my contemplation, nor do I suppose it was in the contemplation of the learned and distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, that Congress would entirely surrender its right to determine whether the salaries fixed were proper or whether they were exorbitant.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator is partly right about that. I supposed, of course, and the language of the Senator's amendment contemplated it, that the salary to be paid to the members of the Commission would later, when it could be intelligently dealt with, be fixed by Congress.

Mr. BACON. Exactly; I recollect that now.

Mr. SPOONER. I supposed, also, that the salaries of the employees of the Commission in Washington would be fixed by Congress. But if the Senator will pardon me a moment I will say that I preferred his plan, although with some misgivings as to the Commission, to my original proposition to have this work done under the War Department, for the reason that it gave to the President greater freedom in obtaining what obviously was needed and will be needed—the highest talent in various directions for utilization on the Isthmus—and I did not suppose at all that at any time, at any rate not until the plan had been adopted and the work was well along, that Congress would attempt to limit the salary or compensation to be paid to such officials as the chief engineer. You can not get the best men at a low price. Men who can make $50,000 a year in the employ of great corporations will not put that behind them. They will feel that they can not in justice to their families and to themselves work for the Government in the Tropics at $12,000 a year. This very elasticity of the Senator's amendment, so far as it applied to the men who were to be employed on the Isthmus, was what commended it to me as very much superior to the proposition which I had made, that the work be done under the War Department, where the salaries would be fixed and the President would be tied down by the limited number of people whom he could select for the work of the engineering department, and so forth.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I had not finished my reply to the interrogatory of the learned Senator, and, while I am always delighted to hear from him, I will resume where I left off.

I desire to say that so far as this question is concerned I regard the question of the payment of salaries, which some may think to be exorbitant to the higher officials, as the least important one in the question of exorbitant salaries. I repeat what I said, that I think any officer connected with this gigantic work ought not to be paid higher than the amount of the salary of the Chief Justice. While I repeat that, I say in this connection that I regard that as the least important one in regard to the matter of salaries, because there are only one or two of them, and they stand out clear and distinct from the others; and there may be reasons such as those which have been so forcefully presented by the learned Senator from Wisconsin, which will obtain in their case which do not apply to others.

I think nevertheless, Mr. President, that the question of the salary of the chief officer in charge and of the chief engineer is influenced very largely by the same considerations which influenced the learned Senator from Wisconsin to accept a salary of $5,000, when he can make ten times as much at the bar. It is because it is an honor to him to sit in this body which, if you please, he also honors by serving as one of its members. So it is an honor to these men to stand before the world as worthy to be in charge of the execution of such a work, the accomplishment of which is to be for them through all the ages an imperishable monument.

It is not merely a matter of dollars and cents. It may be said that is not a correct argument, that that is not a legitimate argument, but it is the argument upon which the Government proceeds when it fixes the salary of the learned Senator from Wisconsin; when it fixes the salary of the Chief Justice of the United States; when it fixes the salary of the Cabinet officer, and even that of the President of the United States. Why, Mr. President, should we abandon it in this important work, and why should we make an exception to it?

I repeat, I do not desire that it should be held down to exact figures or that we should be niggardly; but as to these chief officers there is something else besides the mere matter of money. It is a matter of imperishable fame and honor to the man who is the chairman of that Commission if he shall be retained, if he can go through in the successful prosecution and ending of this work; and it is a matter of only less fame and honor imperishable in its character to the engineer who, under his chief officer, shall successfully prosecute that work to a favorable termination. It is not simply a question of the money he is receiving. He is not simply getting compensation in money, but he is getting it in that which is worth more than money to every man of honorable and exalted ambition.

Do you say the Government seeks to get services for less than they are worth on the ground that the honor of such services is compensation? My only answer is that is what the Government does year after year. It does it as to the other departments, and this work is equivalent to a department of the Government, and it ought to be governed in a large measure by the same considerations.

But, sir, I repeat I will not stickle on the question of the compensation for the chief officer or for the chief engineer. I yield on that if it is necessary, although I abate in no particular the view I have to-day expressed. But the alarming thing with which we are confronted is the fact that the most exorbitant salaries have been paid and provided for for men of only such capacity that there are hundreds and thousands of others of equal capacity whose services can be had. That is the point. We have one—I do not know the gentleman, and I do not desire to do him an injustice—we have one of them right here in this town to whom we pay $10,000 a year for a very indefinite kind of work that he is to do and has done in the capacity of a press agent.

But leaving that out as an exceptional case, if you please, we come down to the more important matter of compensation of this army of officers—because there must be an army of them—all upon a scale absolutely disproportioned to the payments made by this Government to other officers performing the same character of services and services of greater responsibility, because while these canal officers have only a subordinate responsibility, their work is supervised by these Government officers in Washington for approval or for condemnation—in the simple fact that the man who holds a subordinate position gets $10,000, while the auditor, who is to supervise his work, gets but $4,000, and so on in proportion. I only mention that because that is right at hand and within touch; but you may go through the scale, and it is the same way. I have no doubt that it is true, although I have not the figures before me, that the subordinate officers of the auditor of the canal work receive just as great a disproportion in salaries paid to the subordinate officers of the auditors here as the auditor of the canal work receives in proportion to the salary paid to the auditor here.

The statement is perfectly monstrous that an officer who is not only subordinate, but doubly subordinate, should get 250 per cent more than the Government officer who supervises him and 25 per cent more of salary than the head of the Treasury Department of the United States or of the War Department, each of which has to deal directly or indirectly with this work.

Mr. President, it is not simply a matter of squandering the public treasure. When I say "squandering" I do not mean any offense to those gentlemen who have fixed these salaries, because I have said twice, and I will say a third time, that I do not attribute any improper motive to those who have fixed these salaries, and therefore I will modify the word which sounds harshly and say "improvidently spending the public money." I think it was an error of judgment upon their part, a difference of judgment between them and ourselves; but, Mr. President, I venture the suggestion that there is not a Senator in this Chamber who will rise in his place and say that he thinks these salaries are proper and should be continued. If there is one, I pause to give him an opportunity to say it. [A pause.] Well, Mr. President, nobody answers. When in this body, clothed with our high trust to see that the public money is properly expended, no man arises in his place and says that he thinks these expenditures are just and proper, is it true we are to pass the matter over without taking some measures to correct it?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not propose to say, in response to the Senator's interrogatory, that in my opinion all those salaries are proper, because I am not clear on that point; in fact, I am inclined to agree with the Senator that some of them are unreasonable; but I think if the Senator will read the testimony of Secretary Taft, on pages 54 and 55 of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations in reference to the purchasing agent and the auditor, he will find that there were very good reasons for employing men that ought to be paid a much larger salary than an auditor in the War Department should be paid. Secretary Taft goes on to show that it is impossible to get an audit in one of these Departments in less than six months; and he ought to know, being at the head of one of the Departments. The Canal Commission desired to have their accounts audited up to date. He also states that, after investigating the matter, he found that he could not get a man who could do that work satisfactorily for less than the amount of money that is being paid.

After the Senator is through I will put in the RECORD precisely what Secretary Taft said about all these large salaries.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me a moment further, in the matter of the chief engineer, Secretary Taft shows that Mr. Wallace, although he received a salary of $25,000 a year, resigned, and Mr. Stevens, who was selected to succeed Mr. Wallace, refused to go to the Isthmus for less than $30,000 a year. Possibly they could have found some other engineer who would have gone for a less amount, but the Commission thought in their wisdom that Mr. Stevens was the best equipped man, and they selected him at that salary.

Then, again, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me a moment further, the Senator makes a comparison between the salaries paid the Secretary of War and these officers. The Congress of the United States fixed the salary of the Secretary of War and the Chief Justice of the United States. May we not have fixed those salaries too low? Is it not a fact that the heads of these Departments ought to receive more than $8,000 a year if we dealt with them as justly as we ought to do?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I repeat what I said in an earlier stage of my remarks, that I think many of the salaries paid by the United States Government are on too low a scale; but I will say that is the policy of the Government; and if it is the policy of the Government in one Department, there is no reason why there should be an exception in this case.

Mr. President, I do not believe that there is any scarcity of competent men in the United States to do this work, as I have suggested, but I repeat that the payment of the two principal officers is a minor consideration to me, because I am more concerned about the subordinate positions. There is where I say the evil is shown.

But before I pass from the subject suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], I desire to say this: At the time the Spooner Act was passed we already had a Canal Commission. It was presided over by a naval officer. When this amendment was drawn there was not only a permission, but a requirement that both Army and Navy officers should be upon this Commission. I am very frank to say that I think it was not only my contemplation, but the contemplation of other Senators, that possibly it might be continued in the future as it had been in the past, and that the Commission would be presided over by an Army officer or by a naval officer; but no requirement was made in that regard. I am confident, however, of the fact—I will say that I will not permit myself to doubt the fact—that there are engineering officers in the Army of the United States fully competent to occupy the position of chief of this Commission; but whether or not a naval officer is equally competent, by reason of the different character of his work upon the sea, I am not prepared to say. It may be that a naval officer would be equally competent for the chief position as chairman of this Commission. I am equally confident that there are engineering officers in the Army of the United States who are fully competent to occupy the position of chief engineer of the canal.

Mr. President, it was intended by this law that the Army officers and the Navy officers, when they were appointed upon this Commission, should not be limited to their regular salaries. It was intended that they should have just as much as civil officers should have in similar positions. But while that is true, it was never the intention or the contemplation, so far as I know, of the Senate that the salaries should be exorbitant, whether enjoyed by military and naval men or by civilians.

But I am constantly brought back to the proposition that the thing which presses upon me is not so much the compensation of these higher officers, for there are very few of them, but the scale of compensation for men in subordinate capacities.

I was saying, Mr. President, when I was interrupted by one of the learned Senators, that it is not simply a question of dollars and cents. It is more than a question merely of money. In my humble judgment there is nothing which has done more to debauch the public conscience and to demoralize the young men of this land—and not only the young men, but some of the older men, also—than the knowledge of the fact ever present before them that while they have to dig and delve and toil for a pittance there are other men who do not do half the work they do who are enjoying each year what would be to them a princely fortune for all life. Therefore we have these irregularities, these defaultings, these efforts to get rich by gambling of one kind or another to acquire quickly large wealth.

Sir, these depraving and debauching influences are destructive of the high ideals and beneficent designs upon which our Government was founded. This was a Government in its inception designed for the happiness and peace and content of a simple and a frugal people. It was not designed for the aggrandizement of officials, much less was it designed for the enrichment of officials; and in the scale of compensation of its officers the door was shut in the faces of those who would seek public preferment in high places with no higher motive than to gain money thereby. And these same exalted considerations should not be entirely ignored in fixing the salaries of these higher canal officials, upon whom a great and an honorable public trust is devolved, and who are to win imperishable fame and honor if they succeed in their great undertaking. And as to the officers of less rank their salaries ought to be measured, approximately, at least, by the scale of salaries that the Government pays to its officials of corresponding grade and responsibility. If conditions in that tropical climate make it proper to do so, then let the salaries of such officials be higher by a certain per cent than corresponding salaries of Government officials at home, as is done in the case of officers serving in the Philippines. But let not these differences in conditions cause all considerations of economy to be thrown to the winds.

Sir, we have no control over the question as to what salaries some profligate corporations shall pay to their officers, except so far as the authority having jurisdiction shall see that certain things which trench upon the domain of dishonesty are not permitted to pass with impunity. Nevertheless their example is debauching and demoralizing upon the public in witnessing the riotous prodigality with which unearned luxury and wealth is lavished upon their favorites. And, sir, it does not become us to follow in the same track, and it does not become us, when we have entered upon a great physical and material enterprise, to be establishing a scale of salaries for its officials which shall have a demoralizing and debauching influence upon the young men of this country when they contemplate the pitiful amounts they receive for their labor in comparison to what these men enjoy.

Mr. President, we are at the beginning of this great work. It has to continue for years—how many years we do not know—and right in the inception of it, right at the first stages of it, we are met with these startling facts. Now, imputing no improper design to anybody, what has been developed shows to us the absolute necessity that Congress shall lay its hands upon this matter.

It is the contemplation of our Government that all expenditures shall be only such as are authorized by the Congress, and whenever you fix it so that the executive department has no check upon the amount which it can undertake to pay and which it can contract to pay you at once surrender the purse to the Executive. Therefore, while we must of necessity in this case leave the matter largely to the Executive, at the same time it is our duty, so far as we can practically do so, to arrange the progress of this work in a manner that Congress shall keep its hands upon the question of expenditure and shall determine what shall be the scale of wages, of salaries, and of other disbursements.

The amendment, Mr. President, which I have introduced has been suggested to me by what fell from the lips of the learned Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] two days ago as to the propriety of estimates being made and submitted to Congress at the beginning of each session showing what officers are to be employed and what amounts of money are estimated to be required for their compensation. I said then that the suggestion of the Senator from Maine was an eminently practical one and that unless the amendment was introduced by some other Senator I would introduce it myself.

There is in this bill language under which the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to make that which this amendment more specifically requires, but it is not necessary under the language of the bill, as I construe it, that he should do so. He might do so and he might not do so; in other words, the estimates might be such as they are at this time. I will read the language of the bill as it stands:

> The President shall annually cause to be made—

I am reading from the third page of the bill, section 2—

> The President shall annually cause to be made, by the persons appointed and employed by him in charge of the government of said Canal Zone and the construction of said canal, estimates of expenditures and appropriations, in detail as far as practicable.

That, I say, is language under which the estimates might be made with the particularity which we require or they might not be; and it is for the purpose of setting it at rest and, furthermore, of putting these estimates upon the same ground that other estimates are put, which the law requires shall come through the Secretary of the Treasury, that this amendment is offered.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. HALE. I think the intention is to cover everything; but, as the Senator says, it might not be so construed. Suppose that in line 14, after the word "estimates," we should insert "shall cover all salaries and compensation paid to persons employed in this work, excepting laborers, and such estimates" shall be submitted to Congress, etc.

That, I think, is substantially the language of detail in the Senator's amendment—"which estimates shall cover all salaries and compensation paid to persons employed in this work, excepting laborers."

Mr. BACON. The suggestion of the Senator from Maine thoroughly accomplishes what this amendment proposes to accomplish in every respect, except one. The concluding language, as I understand it, in lines 16 to 19, refers to the provisions of the law which requires these estimates to come through the Secretary of the Treasury. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly; all do come through him.

Mr. BACON. That is what that refers to?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. BACON. So that that provision of the amendment is also met; but there is one other provision which is not met, and that is this: The Senator will observe that the requirement of the language which he just read is for a report and estimate annually. That also might be covered by the subsequent provision that it should be in accordance with the act of June 30, 1902.

Mr. HALE. The fundamental act declares that these estimates shall be sent in to Congress at a certain time before each regular session.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. HALE. That is covered.

Mr. BACON. I am simply sifting this out and coming down to the point. There is still one other provision in the amendment which would not be met by the amendment suggested by the Senator from Maine, and that is the one which requires that in this year there shall be an estimate made within ninety days from this time. The reason for that requirement is that we have already been put upon notice that within ninety days we are to have another deficiency bill, when this very question is to come up again; and the purpose of the ninety-day provision is to put us in a position where, when that bill comes up before us, we will have the information necessary for us to deal with it, information which it was confessed in the other House and admitted in this House we have not.

Of course I recognize the fact, Mr. President, that in the emergency it is our duty to go forward and make this appropriation without waiting for that information, because the work of the canal requires that the appropriation should be made at once. Therefore I recognize the propriety of pretermitting this question of salaries, so far as this bill is concerned, because of the impossibility of dealing with it. I would not pretermit one or two items, in regard to which the information is within our possesson. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] ought to be adopted as to any other salary we may appear competent to deal with; but it is manifestly impossible for us now to take up this subject and properly scrutinize all these thousands of salaries and fix them without delaying beyond the proper time the appropriation, which the immediate, prompt progress of the work requires. Therefore, I say, with possibly these two or three exceptions, we should pretermit the question of salaries and go on and make this appropriation.

I have stated to the Senator from Maine the reason why I think the amendment suggested had possibly better stand, but, of course, I would yield to the superior wisdom and judgment of the gentlemen in charge of the appropriation bill if they seriously object to this amendment and prefer that there should be that interlineation as suggested by the Senator from Maine. But I think the importance of it and the necessity that we should have this information within ninety days, and not simply at the beginning of the next session or at the beginning of the fiscal year, would justify that there should be this separate amendment. However, I will yield to whatever the gentlemen in charge of the appropriation bill may say so long as there is accomplished substantially the purpose of the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I think there is no dissent from the opinion suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] as to the importance of having annual detailed estimates of proposed expenditures, but if the Senator will carefully examine the text of the bill as it came to us from the House, I think he will be satisfied that the provisions in the bill are amply sufficient to cover his desire as respects this question. I think the House provision, which was left in the bill by the Senate committee, is ample, and, I think, more effective than the suggestion made by the Senator from Georgia. Now, I wish to read the provision as it stands in the bill:

> The President shall annually cause to be made—

This is directed to the President because he is the responsible person in charge of the construction of the Panama Canal—

> The President shall annually cause to be made, by the persons appointed and employed by him in charge of the government of said Canal Zone and the construction of said canal, estimates of expenditures and appropriations, in detail as far as practicable, which estimates shall be submitted to Congress in the manner provided in section 5 of the act entitled "An act making appropriation for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes."

That requires the President to cause to be made, as far as practicable, a detailed estimate of every expenditure, in accordance with the fifth section of the act of 1902. I wish to read the fifth section:

> SEC. 5. That hereafter it shall be the duty of the heads of the several Executive Departments, and of other officers authorized or required to make estimates, to furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury, on or before the 15th day of October of each year, their annual estimates for the public service, to be included in the Book of Estimates prepared by law under his direction, and in case of failure to furnish estimates as herein required it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to cause to be prepared in the Treasury Department, on or before the 1st day of November of each year, estimates for such appropriations as in his judgment shall be requisite in every such case, which estimates shall be included in the Book of Estimates prepared by law under his direction for the consideration of Congress.

This provision requires the President to cause to be submitted annually estimates under this clause. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall, within ninety days, make such estimates. I submit to the Senator from Georgia that it is impossible for the Secretary of the Treasury, under his phraseology, to make the estimates as proposed. It is the duty primarily of those having these expenditures in charge to make the estimates, and this bill provides that the President shall do it. So, under the existing law, and under the provisions in the pending bill, these estimates must be made in absolute detail, not only with respect to salaries, but with respect to every other item that is practicable.

The Senator criticises the words "as far as practicable," and has fear that the President, in the execution of this provision, will not estimate for the salaries. That is the easiest and the most practicable thing for the President to do in connection with this matter; and is it required of us that we shall go beyond the provisions that are here and specify a particular salary or particular salaries in order to get this information and secure the estimates under the provisions of the fifth section of the law? So, Mr. President, as I understand, this provision is ample to accomplish every purpose that the Senator from Georgia, and the Senate as well, have in mind.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ALLISON. I yield.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to ask the Senator if he understands the language of the bill which we are considering to mean that before we appropriate regularly for the next fiscal year for the construction of the canal we shall have the estimates of which he speaks? The language employed there is "annually," and under it I imagine the President, if he were indifferent, might defer the estimates until the next session of Congress. We have already met, and have had this measure brought in as an emergency appropriation, but I now have reference to the regular appropriation which will come in later, as I understand the Senator, either from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, if the Senate shall give it to that body, or on the sundry civil bill; and I wish to know from him now whether or not he expects to get any estimate for the coming year.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly, Mr. President. These estimates are not included thus far in the Book of Estimates. They were not included because they were not fully prepared under the conditions that surround the construction of the canal, but appropriations must be made for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and in order that they shall be made under the provisions of the fifth section, estimates therefor must be made to the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. TILLMAN. Immediately or as soon as practicable; certainly before we pass the bill?

Mr. ALLISON. Immediately, I should say.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is all I want.

Mr. ALLISON. Within a very few weeks or months.

Of course the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, if it has any power at all, is a limitation, it seems to me, upon the law as proposed by the provisions of the pending bill. It says there shall be an estimate within ninety days, but that is wholly

unnecessary, because there may be an estimate within ninety days for the additional deficiency of the current year, as appears from the testimony of the Secretary of War. Surely there will be an estimate—whether we make it imperative or not—for the next fiscal year. That will come in as soon as it is possible to prepare it.

So, Mr. President, while sympathizing with the Senator from Georgia in everything he suggests, and believing that it is necessary for Congress to have these detailed estimates, I think they are amply provided for in the bill as it stands, and I regard the amendment proposed, except that part requiring the Secretary of the Treasury within ninety days to make the estimates, as rather restrictive than enlarging the present provision. Therefore, while I do not object to the suggestions made by the Senator from Georgia, I think his amendment is wholly unnecessary, and I shall be glad to have him withdraw it, as I think its purpose is clearly covered by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to say one word and one word only as respects the salaries to which the Senator from Georgia has alluded. I do not think the canal can be constructed on the basis suggested by the Senator from Georgia as to this higher class of service. I happen to know two men who had an opportunity, or at least it was suggested that they had an opportunity, of securing the position of chief engineer. Neither of them would accept the position because they were doing better in other employments as engineers. I think I am not mistaken when I say that this place was offered or suggested to a distinguished engineer who is now the chief engineer of the great work that is going on for the Pennsylvania Railroad in the city of New York, and though I do not know what he receives, I have no doubt he gets a larger compensation than is paid to Mr. Stevens, the chief engineer of the canal. It was said by some Senator that he absolutely refused to accept the place at a salary of less than $30,000.

I do not know how many engineers there are in this country who are fit to take charge of that great work as an engineering problem; but I do not believe there are many, and I believe that an engineer of the experience and with the qualifications of Mr. Stevens can earn for his engineering work in this country an amount equivalent to the salary he is now receiving from the Panama Canal Commission.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to interrupt the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. What is needed in the building of the canal is not an engineer; it is a man of executive ability. First, you want your engineers to determine what the canal shall be, determine all the facts connected with it, and which an engineer must necessarily determine before the work begins. Then you want a man who is accustomed to handling men. There are plenty of men in this country who are not engineers who would fill that bill. But first of all you now lack data that can only be furnished by engineers.

For the time being, at least, we must have a first-class engineer, and not only one, but several. I feel somewhat like the Senator from Georgia. I do not object to men of high talent receiving high salaries. It is the men who do work that might be done by any one of ten thousand men. There are few men who are fit to be engineers in charge of such a work. We had better pay one of them $50,000 a year than an inferior man $10,000 a year. I am not going to complain of that. If I were President, I would pick the best engineer; then I would pick his associates, and let them go to work, and then I would look around for a man who has ability to command men and organize. He will have all the facts before him. He will have his engineer with him. That is the kind of man you want for superintendent and general manager of the canal.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Colorado has said, in much better form than I could, what I was trying to say as respects the engineering work.

Mr. TELLER. I beg pardon for interrupting the Senator.

Mr. ALLISON. When we enter upon the construction of the canal, it may be we can employ at a smaller salary an engineer who has not the skill and experience and genius of a great engineer, but I apprehend that even in the course of the construction of the canal very great and new engineering questions will arise as to the disposition of water, the construction of dams, and all the intricate problems that are involved in its construction.

And the Senator from Colorado is exactly right when he says what we want is a high-class man, familiar with construction work, in giving direction to it in a business way. I undertake to say that that was just what the President had in mind when he employed Mr. Shonts as director of the canal.

Mr. GALLINGER. He is not an engineer.

Mr. ALLISON. He is not an engineer, but he has had large experience.

Mr. GALLINGER. In business matters.

Mr. ALLISON. In business matters, and particularly in construction work. He knows how to handle men and how to dispose of the questions that arise in connection with the employment of men. I believe that Mr. Shonts is eminently qualified for that work, both from the experience and the opportunities he has had in similar work. It is easy for us to criticise the salaries of these two gentlemen, who receive large sums, I admit, but they are engaged in a very important work, each in a separate and distinct branch of it.

Now, as to salaries, I said the other day, and I believe, that as to the salaries of the people who are employed here and only here in the departmental work of the Commission, they should not be paid as large salaries as some of them are being paid now. I have no doubt that, attention being called to it, the matter will be disposed of very soon in a manner satisfactory to Congress.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask a question for information. I have been glancing over the report of the expenses paid by the Commission. I do not find such a division of expenditures as will enable me to ascertain just what I wish to know.

There are practically three items of expense—salaries, the purchase of material, and labor. Can the Senator inform me approximately what proportion of the expenses so far incurred is for salaries, what proportion is for material, and what proportion has been paid for what we understand to be common labor? In these reports the labor seems to be included in the salaries, but a glance at the whole thing upon the face of it would indicate that there are about $3 paid for salaries where there is a dollar paid for actual labor; and if that is true, it seems to me about three-fourths of the expenses paid for constructing the canal will be for salaries rather than for the actual labor in digging the ditch.

I appreciate the fact that the large expenses for material as indicated in this report are for such material as can be used in the entire period of the construction of the canal, but there does seem, upon the face of it, to be a great disparity between the enormous amount for salaries and what would seem to indicate the amount paid for labor.

Mr. ALLISON. There is in the testimony a statement subdividing the expenditures, perhaps not quite in as much detail as the Senator would desire. But as to salaries, there is an estimate in the testimony on page 10 which shows the salaries of the Commissioners and the employees at the Washington office, etc.; and salaries, incidental expenses, rent, etc.; inspecting materials and supplies.

Mr. McCUMBER. But I will say to the Senator that it always includes something else with the salaries, such as the incidental expenses. So far as I can find, the item of labor is always considered as a part of and in connection with salaries.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will turn to page 8, he will see an estimate first of the expenditures already made, amounting in the aggregate to $4,000,000, which is stated, I think, in as much detail as is possible under the circumstances. That is wholly for material.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; I understand that is wholly for material.

Mr. ALLISON. Then the second provision is for "Equipment purchased or contracted for delivery," amounting to $3,350,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. And most of that will be something that will not have to be duplicated.

Mr. ALLISON. Most of it is equipment for the purposes of the canal.

The next item, about $2,300,000, is in detail, and is chiefly for articles of a miscellaneous character necessary in conducting the work. I do not see in that estimate any special item referring to labor.

Mr. McCUMBER. Nor do I see, if I may disturb the Senator further, anything that divides the salaries in such a way that we can tell just what the amount of the continuing salaries will be per month or per annum, so that we may get some estimate of it.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think there is any estimate of the salaries separate and distinct from the labor, although it is easily ascertainable, I believe. I was trying to find the three-fourths for salaries and the quarter for labor which the Senator suggested.

I find another estimate of $800,000 in the aggregate, which includes transportation of labor and local transportation, hotel

and hospital supplies, miscellaneous supplies and service, including lumber, etc. There seems to be very little labor in any of these items.

Then comes the estimate of the amount due through the Panama Railroad Company for material and services. That, of course, does not include labor. Then there is another one of the amount due the Panama Railroad Company from December to June, 1906.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say to the Senator that I do not think he will find it. I have looked and I can not find it, and I merely asked the question because I did not know but that the Senator had the facts at hand, independent of the report.

Mr. ALLISON. I understood the Senator to say that he had discovered that a very small amount of this money was for labor.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I have not discovered the amount.

Mr. ALLISON. The pay roll on the Isthmus is estimated at $600,000 a month. That is chiefly labor. There may be a few salaries included in it, but very few. So the labor cost in this appropriation will average about $600,000 a month. I believe there are 17,000 persons employed.

I think we will be able to secure a reasonably fair estimate of the amount of labor——

Mr. McCUMBER. I call the attention of the Senator to an item which reads:

Estimated Isthmus pay rolls from December 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906.

I suppose that includes the entire pay rolls, as well as labor, does it not?

Mr. ALLISON. I presume it does. The greater portion, of course, is for labor or for the pay of persons who are to supervise the labor.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, on page 14 of the testimony Secretary Taft testifies that the pay roll amounts to between six and seven hundred thousand dollars a month.

Mr. ALLISON. Very good.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that includes the entire pay rolls, including labor and salaries.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt it does, but the chief portion is for labor.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I fear I may repeat some of the questions asked by the Senator from North Dakota, because I did not clearly hear the colloquy, but I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa whether the item of $4,875,000 covers all of the pay rolls, both for labor and salaries, and whether or not any itemized statement was given of the salaries allowed the different classes of officials—engineers, topographers, etc.?

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, the Senator from Nevada will find that in detail on pages 270 and 271 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. ALLISON. Those statements are in the RECORD.

Mr. GALLINGER. Pages 270 and 271 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was submitted to the House of Representatives.

Mr. ALLISON. That covers all of the salaries. If the Senator will turn to the RECORD of December 6 he will find a complete statement of all the salaries.

Mr. GALLINGER. December 11.

Mr. ALLISON. December 6. It was put in the House by a Member.

Mr. KEAN. I find it on page 270.

Mr. ALLISON. So I think we have pretty full information on the question of salaries.

Mr. NEWLANDS. May I ask the Senator what salaries are particularly criticised here? I find, for instance, that the salary paid to a physician is from $2,400 to $3,000. Is that regarded as excessive?

Mr. ALLISON. I think not. I have not heard any criticism of it. The criticism, I should say, is of salaries of $10,000 or more.

Mr. NEWLANDS. May I ask how many salaries of that kind there are?

Mr. ALLISON. There are three or four salaries of $10,000. The purchasing agent receives $10,000 per year, the auditor receives $10,000, and the secretary receives $10,000.

Mr. BACON. May I ask the Senator from Iowa from what page of the RECORD he reads?

Mr. ALLISON. Page 138 of the RECORD, beginning on page 137.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. CULBERSON. While the Senator is on the question of salaries, I noticed in the celebrated interview with the Secretary of War at the Manhattan Hotel, in New York, that the distinguished lawyer, Mr. William Nelson Cromwell, was present as an adviser of the Commission. I should like to ask the Senator, if he has information on the subject, what the duties of that gentleman are in connection with that matter, and what salary he receives?

Mr. ALLISON. Is he regarded as the attorney of the Commission?

Mr. CULBERSON. He was present at this interview between the Secretary of War and Mr. Wallace, and represented, as I understood, the Commission.

Mr. ALLISON. Oh!

Mr. CULBERSON. What I desired to know is his real relationship to the Commission and what compensation he is paid and whether it is included in this appropriation we are to make.

Mr. ALLISON. It is not, as I understand. Mr. Cromwell, I understand, is one of the directors of the Panama Railroad Company. The directors consist of the seven members of the Commission and six other persons, of whom Mr. Cromwell is one. I see by reference to their reports that Mr. Cromwell is the attorney of the Panama Railroad Company, and I have no doubt if he was present in New York at the time stated it was in his capacity as director and adviser of the Panama Railroad Company.

Mr. STONE. In some correspondence between Mr. Shonts and Mr. Brown, who was the agent through whom the ships *Havana* and *Mexico* were purchased, Mr. Shonts refers to Sullivan and Cromwell as the counsel of the Commission.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well; I do not know how that is. He may also be the counsel of the Commission.

Mr. STONE. I wish to know how much he receives as salary.

Mr. ALLISON. But I would hardly think that the Commission needed counsel, unless in some special matter.

Mr. CULBERSON. I beg the Senator's pardon for interrupting him again, but my attention was diverted for a moment and I did not catch his answer to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ALLISON. I stated that if it appears in the record he signed himself as counsel of the Commission he must at the moment have been the counsel of the Commission, but I suppose it was for some special employment. I do not understand that he is the counsel of the Commission, as I do not think they would have a great amount of legal business to do which could not be done by their own counsel.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator, if I understood him correctly a moment ago in reply to the question which I asked him, stated his understanding to be that the compensation of Mr. Cromwell was not included in this appropriation. If that be the correct statement I will ask the Senator out of what money he is then paid?

Mr. ALLISON. If he is the counsel of the Commission undoubtedly he will be paid out of this appropriation. My statement was that he was the counsel of the Panama Railway Company, as I understood, and, if so, I suppose that as such counsel he will be paid by the railroad company. But if he is the counsel of the Commission, of which I have no evidence other than the statement of the Senator from Missouri, which was that he appeared in New York when this particular transaction occurred and was the counsel for the Commission in drawing up some contracts—is that the statement of Mr. Brown?

Mr. STONE. He was the counsel in drawing up contracts, and I understood that the whole subject-matter was in a measure to be submitted to his discretion.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well; I have no doubt he was paid for that service. I did not know he rendered that service.

Mr. CULBERSON. Can the Senator give us any information as to the amount of compensation, as we are on the question of salaries?

Mr. ALLISON. Of Mr. Cromwell?

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLISON. I could not. I have no information on that subject. I was not aware that he was counsel for the Commission until it was suggested to me now by the Senator from Missouri. But if he is the counsel I suppose he receives pay, and he would have to receive it out of this appropriation, if he has not already received it.

Mr. STONE. I do not wish to be understood as asserting that he was general counsel. I limit my statement.

Mr. ALLISON. To the particular transaction?

Mr. STONE. To this particular transaction, as it appears in the minutes of the Commission.

Mr. ALLISON. I see no statement here of compensation to counsel.

Now, I want to say a word about the salary of Mr. Magoon, who receives a compensation of $17,500. I believe a part of that compensation is $10,000 as governor of the Canal Zone, and he receives a salary of $7,500 as commissioner. He is minister to the State of Panama, for which an appropriation of $10,000 is annually made in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill.

Mr. BACON. In addition, making $27,500?

Mr. ALLISON. Not in addition to it. I was about to place to his credit that previous appropriation of $10,000.

So it seems that even in the judgment of Congress, which is always careful about such matters and inquires into them particularly, they thought it worth while to pay $10,000 to a minister at Panama.

Mr. BACON. I will state to the Senator——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. BACON. When that appropriation was under consideration and it was fixed at $10,000 instead of $7,000—$7,000 being what the minister to Morocco gets, or something of that kind, if I am not mistaken. I recollect distinctly it was fixed at that sum in view of the disorganized condition of affairs down there, the climatic conditions, etc., but with no possible contemplation of the fact that the minister to Panama was to receive nearly an equal amount in addition from some other source.

Mr. ALLISON. I was only calling attention to it by way of illustration, that even in the judgment of Congress it was thought worth while to give a man a salary of $10,000 for the mission to Panama. Now it turns out that the President, with a view to economy, of course—I suppose so—has appointed Mr. Magoon our minister to Panama as well as governor of the Zone.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. Judge Magoon, it seems to me, is holding a number of offices down there. He would seem to be rather a versatile man. I ask the Senator if he is the same gentleman who wrote the two celebrated opinions, one on one side and the other on the other side of the colonial question?

Mr. ALLISON. Very probably. I know of a great many lawyers who have expressed different opinions on topics at different times.

Mr. BACON. This was on the same topic though.

Mr. ALLISON. It does show that he is versatile, if that be true. I am told also that he is a very accomplished man and the author of some books upon law questions, and is recognized as one of the leading lawyers upon questions of international law that we have in our country.

So, Mr. President, I am merely illustrating this matter of salaries to show how easy it is to criticise without a full knowledge of the situation and of the subject. Now, take Mr. Benson. He is the auditor, I believe, of the Canal Commission. Mr. Benson was made the auditor of the Commission. I do not know precisely what is the nature of his duties except to audit these accounts, and I understand they are very voluminous accounts. Here are 13,000 or 15,000 people on the Isthmus at work. They are in the employ of the Commission, and each one of them of course must sign a pay roll once a month or once in two weeks. That requires a great deal of detail in auditing accounts. The man who preceded Mr. Benson, I believe, as auditor received a salary of $5,000, but Mr. Benson had a special qualification for this work, because of his large experience in auditing railroad accounts, for which I think he received a much larger salary. When he was made auditor, the Government of the United States having some little interest in the Panama Railroad Company, he was made auditor also of the Panama Railroad Company, and as auditor of the Canal Commission and auditor of the railroad company he receives practically a salary of $10,000. I do not know whether that is too large a salary or not. It seems to me to be large, and I appreciate the observations of the Senator from Georgia and I sympathize with him in his effort to reduce salaries, if they be excessive, to a just basis.

Therefore, I am in favor of making such a provision as will secure an absolute and detailed estimate of all these salaries, and as far as practicable of every expenditure necessary to be made on the Isthmus. I am in thorough sympathy with that purpose, and I believe it is amply provided for now in the bill as it came to us from the House, with the amendment we made following that provision, so as to read:

> And no money shall be expended for any of the purposes of constructing and maintaining said isthmian canal except in accordance with appropriations made by Congress.

I think, taking the two clauses together, we are very certain to secure a detailed estimate of what they need in the way of appropriations.

Mr. CULBERSON obtained the floor.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Iowa does not recognize the propriety of the incorporation of this amendment upon the bill. The Senator is entirely in accord with the purpose which I seek to accomplish by this amendment, and his only objection to it is that he thinks it is surplusage, that the language of the bill as it is now before the Senate is sufficient to accomplish the purpose. I submit to the learned Senator that if that is the only reason, in the interest of certainty and for the purpose of satisfying the doubts of some of those of us who do not agree with him in that particular, it would be the better part to incorporate the amendment, or something which would be tantamount to it.

If the Senator does not object to what the amendment calls for, but that it is simply a matter of surplusage, that consideration is not so material as that by leaving it out it would put the matter in doubt, at least in the minds of some of us; and I shall endeavor to show the reason why I think there is doubt upon that subject.

I will say, Mr. President, that while I was very strongly impressed with the necessity of some distinct and definite requirement of law which would insure complete information to Congress, I was in doubt as to what particular shape it should take. But in the debate yesterday the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], than whom there is no more careful legislator and than whom there is no one more familiar with all the requirements upon appropriation bills and the things which are politic and proper to be done in the consideration thereof, in the course of his remarks suggested that the difficulty with which we were contending and which everyone was entirely sensible of, to wit, the lack of detailed and proper information relative to expenditures in the canal work, would be met by requiring, whenever we had to deal with a bill making appropriations for the isthmian canal, that there should be a detailed estimate from the Secretary of the Treasury, whose duty it is to present the estimates for all the Departments, if I understand correctly, with a view to having each office specified and the amount of salary to be received by each officer specified, so that when we came to make the appropriations we could deal as certainly and as definitely and as accurately with the amount to be appropriated as if it were an officer provided by law for whose compensation we were thus appropriating money.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. I agree to that statement by the Senator from Maine. Perhaps I made a similar statement yesterday. The Senator from Maine suggested language this morning which I do not object to.

Mr. BACON. Very well; I am perfectly willing to have that amendment made in the language suggested by the Senator from Maine. It is substantially the same as the amendment offered by me.

Mr. ALLISON. But I think it is unnecessary.

Mr. BACON. I stated to the Senator, he will remember, that if the Appropriations Committee desire, in place of this amendment, to insert in that clause the language which was suggested by the Senator from Maine, I would yield to the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLISON. I am willing to put in that language, except I think we ought not to restrict the President of the United States by including certain things. We ought to say that he should make this estimate as far as practicable. He will not play upon the words of this amendment.

Mr. BACON. I understand that. We are making a law not for President Roosevelt, but we are making a law for the entire time of the construction of this canal. So there is nothing personal in it as to him.

Now, I want to call the attention of the Senator to this. It can not possibly be a restriction. There is no limitation of words. It says that while it shall be done as far as practicable, we particularize that whatever difference in judgment there may be as to what is or is not "practicable" it must include this and as much more as the President may deem to be covered by the language.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. With pleasure. I wish, however, to make a further statement in that connection.

Mr. HALE. Then I will wait until the Senator concludes.

Mr. BACON. No; I will hear the honorable Senator.

Mr. HALE. I did not propose to strike out that part, "as far as practicable."

Mr. BACON. Not at all.

Mr. HALE. My proposition was to make it read, "which estimate shall cover all salaries and compensation to persons employed in said work except laborers, and shall be submitted to Congress."

Mr. BACON. I stated that that would be simply a change of position. It is exactly the same language as the amendment, and I am perfectly willing to have it inserted.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, Mr. President, if the Senator will indulge me a moment, as we are coming to an agreement upon this subject, I suggest that that is too restrictive. Take the employment on the Isthmus. It may be that for three months or six months there will be needed fifty engineers or overseers, if you please, or machinists. They are not laborers, but skilled mechanics and machinists.

Mr. BACON. I suggest that the Senator enlarge the language then.

Mr. ALLISON. I think you should not say he should make an estimate for everything except laborers, because it is in the nature of things that the people employed there will vary in number from time to time and vary in salary from time to time. They will be skilled people. So I think all you want to do is to provide for the people who are in this statement here, who are really the salaried people.

Mr. HALE. That is the purpose I had in view.

Mr. BACON. Certainly, that is the purpose.

Mr. HALE. Really to get at the salaried people. I thought the exception of laborers would include, as it undoubtedly would, skilled laborers too. But whether the language is broad enough or not, I have no objection to adding to it, to include laborers, skilled laborers, or any force required from time to time for any emergency.

Mr. ALLISON. I only called attention to the fact that you will require perhaps an impossibility. Now, if Senators think I am not right about that——

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will insert the words "other than skilled or unskilled laborers," it seems to me it would cover the ground. That would limit it, then, to the salaries named, other than those of skilled or unskilled laborers.

Mr. ALLISON. Perhaps that would limit it.

Mr. HALE. That would cover it. I think it is very important that they should be excepted, because it is impossible for the President to estimate for that salaried force.

Mr. ALLISON. I know there are, or have been, employed there temporarily engineers and other people. They may be on a monthly salary, but they are employed temporarily, and when the particular thing that was required of them has been accomplished they pass away.

Mr. BACON. Those will be simply matters of estimate, I will say to the Senator, and those matters in contemplation——

Mr. HALE. This will cover it—"which estimates shall cover all annual salaries for persons in the employment of said Commission, excepting laborers and skilled laborers."

Mr. BACON. "Excepting skilled and unskilled laborers."

Mr. HALE. Their classification is "laborers and skilled laborers." They do not say "unskilled laborer."

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. HOPKINS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Maine whether it would not be advisable to suspend any legislation of this character until some regular bill comes in. The bill that is now under consideration is an emergency deficiency bill, and one where it is not supposed that legislation should exist at all. The understanding is, both in the Senate and the House, I think, that at this session of Congress there will be a bill that will cover this entire subject, and at that time these questions which have now not received adequate consideration can then be maturely considered not only in the committee but in the Senate after the bill has been reported.

Mr. HALE. That is precisely what I said. It is to provide generally that when the estimates are made it shall be for these salaries, but the question of what the salaries shall be in the meantime has got to be dealt with not by the Committee on Appropriations, but by the Committee on Interoceanic Canals. All this requires is that the President, through the Secretary of the Treasury, shall submit estimates covering all annual salaries of persons employed, excepting laborers and skilled laborers; but how much they shall receive and the fixing of salaries, that neither the President will have to do with hereafter nor the Committee on Appropriations, but the Committee on Interoceanic Canals must make a complete schedule and fix salaries. Then it will all be subject to the general provision of estimates covering salaries. That is all it is intended to do here, and it ought to be done now, because whatever work the Committee on Interoceanic Canals does will blossom out in the form of needing money at the time the next appropriation is to be made. This is only intended, as I understand the Senator, to cover just that; it is only the process.

Mr. HOPKINS. If the Senator will allow me just a word there, I wish to——

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CULBERSON. I understood that I had the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. I had the floor. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Oh, no; I simply inquired as to what time I might say a word or two about the amendment which I proposed.

Mr. BACON. We have not disposed of this amendment. As soon as we have I will yield the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that the Senator from Texas had the floor, but yielded to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, sir.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia now has the floor.

Mr. BACON. The Chair is mistaken in that. I followed the Senator from Iowa, and I have never yielded the floor. I have submitted to interruptions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair did not refer to the moment, but to the yielding some half hour ago.

Mr. BACON. If I understand that the modification suggested by the Senator from Maine is acceptable to the Senator from Iowa I will have nothing further to say.

Mr. HALE. Let that be put in then.

Mr. SPOONER. Let it be read, so that we may know what it is.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment as proposed will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 14, after the words "which estimates," insert the following:

shall cover all annual salaries for persons in the employ of said Commission excepting laborers and skilled laborers and.

Mr. HALE. There is no classification by the Department of unskilled laborers. It is "laborers and skilled laborers."

Mr. SPOONER. Who has the floor, Mr. President?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BACON. I said if that was acceptable I had nothing further to say.

Mr. CULBERSON rose.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Texas kindly yield to me to ask a question, to see if I can obtain a little information from the Senator from Maine? I only ask as to the custom of the Appropriations Committee. The estimates are the limit of appropriation, as I understand it.

Mr. BACON. We can not hear the Senator here.

Mr. SPOONER. Are the estimates the limit of the appropriation? That is, whatever is estimated the committee either appropriates for or it goes under the estimate?

Mr. HALE. Yes; that is the general rule. There are cases where before the final passage of a bill the heads of the Departments have come in and have said that exigencies require something even beyond the estimates, but those are exceptional cases which only prove the rule. It is, as stated by the Senator, that the estimates are considered as the limitation.

Mr. BACON. That refers to the aggregate of the estimates, not to the details of the salaries?

Mr. HALE. Of course each estimate is by itself.

Mr. SPOONER. The estimate is composed, I suppose, of the aggregate of all the salaries?

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. The appropriation is to cover the same salaries that are considered in making up the estimate?

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. Now, what was the theory upon which the Committee on Appropriations reported this language, "in detail as far as practicable?"

Mr. HALE. That is the language of the House. The discussion arose afterwards about these salaries, and the estimates have come in, if you call them estimates. We have been proceeding, as the Senator knows, under his bill in rather—I will not say an indefinite way, perhaps, but without the particularization that there will be after the thing gets started as a running machine. Because of that and the necessity for more itemization of course the suggestion arose to put in something more. The general machinery that this shall be done through the Secretary of the Treasury is provided for in the bill itself in the House proposition. We did not put in that language in the committee; it is the House language.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not want to take the time of the Senator from Texas, but I think it is very much better language than the proposed amendment, and I wish to say a word on that subject when in order.

Mr. HALE. The amendment does not change the language. It only makes it a little more in detail.

Mr. SPOONER. It changes the language in a restrictive way, as I understand it. It strikes out practically, as I understand it, the words "in detail as far as practicable."

Mr. HALE. No.

Mr. SPOONER. Do you leave that in?

Mr. BACON. That is left in. It does not strike out anything.

Mr. HALE. We do not want to strike out anything. The Senator from Iowa raised that same point, and I stated it.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not understand it.

Mr. HALE. Then I suggest, if there is no objection, that the amendment the Secretary has just read, to come in after the word "estimates," be agreed to.

Mr. HOPKINS. I desire to call the attention of the Senator to the langauge. On page 3 of the original bill the language is "the President shall annually cause to be made, by the persons appointed and employed by him in charge of the government of said Canal Zone and the construction of said canal, estimates," and so forth. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine speaks of "said Commission." The word "Commission" does not precede in the section; it is the President. I suggest that instead of the word "Commission" it ought to read "the President."

Mr. HALE. In the words I suggested I did not say "Commission," but "employed in said work."

Mr. HOPKINS. The language, as I gathered it, given by the Senator to the Secretary, used the word "Commission." What has the Secretary?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read it.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 14, after the word "estimates," insert:

shall cover all annual salaries for persons in the employ of said Commission, excepting laborers and skilled laborers, and.

Mr. HOPKINS. The point I am making is that the Commission does not employ them.

Mr. HALE. In the memorandum I have (it was my lapse undoubtedly) it read "employed in said work." That is the proper suggestion, and I see no objection to that.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment which I submitted yesterday be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed yesterday by the Senator from Texas will be read.

Mr. HALE. Will not the Senator let us get this amendment out of the way?

Mr. CULBERSON. Certainly; I was about to ask if we could not have have a vote on it.

Mr. FRYE. Let the amendment be again read, as the Senator from Maine has now amended it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read by the Secretary as now proposed by the Senator from Maine.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, after the word "estimates," line 14, insert:

shall cover all annual salaries for persons employed in said work, excepting laborers and skilled laborers.

Mr. HALE. That is it.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President, before that amendment is adopted, I desire to submit only a word or two upon it. I wish to call the attention of Senators to the fact that when this bill was sent from the other House to the Senate, it was thought by a number of the members of the Senate that it should go to a committee which could provide for legislation as well as for appropriation. That position was combated by the honored Senator who is in charge of the bill [Mr. ALLISON], and by his associates upon the Committee on Appropriations, on the theory that no legislation could be had at this time on this subject, but that the committee would be limited in the Senate to the question of appropriation alone. It was apparent to some then, as it is apparent to all now, that in order to make these appropriations, in order to properly protect the Government and to safeguard the interests of all concerned, in addition to the appropriations themselves which were contemplated in the bill as it came from the House, there should be legislation of the character which is now proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. It emphasizes the position which was taken when this bill was presented here from the other House, that it should have originally gone to the committee where all of these questions could have been embodied in the bill without the patchwork procedure which is now necessary, where the bill is reported, as it is, by the Committee on Appropriations and the legislation comes by various amendments from individual Senators upon the floor.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, has the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] been agreed to?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It has not yet been agreed to. The question is on that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, while the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] is entitled to the floor, he has kindly consented to let me occupy five minutes, or thereabouts, as I have an engagement outside of the Chamber.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I want to submit a few very brief observations in reference to the matter of salaries, a subject that was discussed so thoroughly and earnestly by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], to whom I listened with a great deal of interest.

I have been of opinion that there are a few salaries in this list which are excessive, and yet I am not quite sure on that point. When the matter was before the Committee on Appropriations I thought that $30,000 was a very large salary for the chairman of the Commission. I also thought that $17,500 was a very large salary for the governor of the Canal Zone, who is likewise, I believe, a member of the Commission. I was very clearly satisfied that $10,000 for the secretary, who has been denominated a press agent, is entirely beyond reason, from the showing that he made before the committee when he was heard the other day; and I hope in due time that gentleman will either perform more work for the $10,000 he is receiving, or else that the salary will be reduced to, say $5,000, which Mr. Murphy received as secretary of the Commission before he was superseded by the gentleman who now holds the place. But in looking over the entire list of salaries, as it will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in two different places, I do not see that, as a rule, the salaries are excessive.

The salaries of the general purchasing officer and the general auditor have been somewhat criticised. They each receive $10,000 a year. Secretary Taft gave very important testimony concerning those officers, which will be found on pages 54 and 55 of the printed testimony. He likewise gave testimony concerning the salary of Mr. Stevens, the engineer in charge. The chairman of the committee asked this question of Secretary Taft:

Is there any explanation that you want to make about those details that would be useful to us?

Secretary TAFT. Well, I ought to say this: As to the fixing of the salary of the chief engineer, that was originally, with Mr. Wallace, $25,000. Then, after Mr. Wallace left us, we conferred with a man who we thought could follow him and take the responsibility, and he would not go to the Isthmus unless we paid him $30,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is Mr. Stevens?

Secretary TAFT. That is Mr. Stevens; and it seemed to me that that, under the circumstances, was a reasonable salary. I conferred with the President about it. Mr. Shonts approved, and he and Mr. Shonts employed him at that price.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the criticism, so far as I have noticed it in the RECORD, was rather toward the employees here.

Secretary TAFT. Of the Commission?

The CHAIRMAN. The employees under the Commission who are not on the Isthmus at all.

Secretary TAFT. Yes, sir.

Senator WARREN. The auditor and so on.

Secretary TAFT. With respect to the auditor and the purchasing agent, Mr. Shonts came to me and said that he desired to get as good a man as he could get from the railroad service of the country to do the auditing and to do the purchasing. The purchasing of five or six or seven millions of dollars of supplies a year involves a skill and integrity and high character on the part of the purchaser that it seemed to me justified without any question the payment of $10,000. But an investigation was made as to what was paid for that service by the large railway systems of the country; and Mr. Shonts said that he had an opportunity to employ a gentleman who was in the Wabash system that he thought he could get for $10,000.

Mr. SHONTS. The Burlington system.

Secretary TAFT. I thought it was the Wabash. At any rate, whichever the system, he offered it to him; and the result was that the gentleman was employed at $12,000 a year and became a second vice-president of the company. I met him in St. Louis a few weeks ago, and he thanked us for the opportunity that our offer gave him to secure a better position. I think he is now a second vice-president of the Wabash.

Mr. SHONTS. That is it; he went from the Burlington.

Secretary TAFT. And he is getting $12,000 a year. The same thing is true of the auditor. The railway companies pay quite that price for auditors who are skilled in the matter of keeping railway accounts.

I observe that there has been a good deal of criticism of the fact that we have an auditor at all; that we do not rest on the Auditor of the War Department; that the Auditor of the War Department gets $4,000, and that the Secretary of War gets $8,000, and that there ought to be a uniform charge. All I have to say about that is that I do not think the Secretary of War gets enough, and I do not think that the Auditor, if he does his duty, gets enough. Still, there are people who are willing to serve the Government at that price, though you probably do not get as good as you would if you paid better salaries. But this was a great enterprise of construction, equivalent to the building and maintenance of a railroad, and I thought the standard of railroad salaries was a fair standard, and we found that we could not get the men unless we did.

With respect to the auditor, it is said that we can have an audit for nothing by the Auditor for the War Department. That is true; we can. But, gentlemen, there has not been a disbursing officer's account, there has not been a single account, passed by the Auditor of the expenditure of money for this canal since its beginning. That is the system of Government audit that we have; and those of us that were responsible for the carrying on of this great financial business were not willing not to have an audit closer to the time of expenditure and more of a business character than that which we get from the Government auditors. That is the truth of it; and that is the reason why we have an auditor that it costs $10,000 to have.

The CHAIRMAN. He keeps this audit up to date, as it were?

Secretary TAFT. He brings it down within six weeks, and after we get organized it will come down more closely. You can not get a statement from your auditors in the Government service here short of six months.

Senator PERKINS. A paymaster in the Navy informed me a few days since that his accounts had not been audited for eighteen months.

Secretary TAFT. You will hear that in all the Departments. Now, we can not carry on, or at least I should not be willing to carry on business at the risk of having accounts subject to examination eighteen months after the expenditure of the money.

Senator WETMORE. Do you mean that the auditing officials are incompetent, or that there is an insufficient force?

Secretary TAFT. I do not know the reason. I think it is because of the lumbering character of the methods of doing Government business. They require too much paper work and too great deliberation.

Senator HALE. Are those accounts afterwards sent to the Auditor for the War Department?

Secretary TAFT. Yes, sir.

Senator HALE. What does he do with them?

Secretary TAFT. He goes on, and in the course of time he will approve them; and some poor fellow who has been disbursing will find out three years afterwards that there are a few hundred dollars that he has disbursed, supposing they were a legal disbursement, that were not; and then he will either have to go down in his pocket and pay the amount, or he will have to come to Congress to have it adjusted in some way.

I speak of this because I know what happens in the Army. I know what the disbursing officers of the Army have to do in reference to delay in auditing. So we need, in a business matter like this, an auditor who keeps up to date.

Later on, in speaking of the purchasing agent, Mr. Shonts made this observation:

Mr. SHONTS. If you will permit me, I will say that he saved $193,000 on one purchase from the lowest bidder after he had the bids in and opened.

Senator TILLMAN. Will you explain that, please?

Mr. SHONTS. He did that by pointing out to them where they were charging us more than they should for different items entering into the construction of the cars and engines that were concerned.

Senator HALE. So that they changed their bid?

Mr. SHONTS. That was the lowest bidder. Now, mind you, he had the lowest bid; he did not change it. We go on the theory that it is beneath the Government's dignity to play one man against another; but after he had the lowest bidder in, he talked him out——

Senator HALE. And the bidder changed it?

Mr. SHONTS. The bidder himself—the lowest bidder—came down in his bid, and saved the Government $193,000.

Senator HALE. Which you would have spent if you had simply taken the figures of the lowest bidder as they came in?

Mr. SHONTS. That is it exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. In case an unskilled man had been purchasing agent?

Secretary TAFT. Yes, sir; in case an unskilled man had been purchasing agent.

Mr. SHONTS. Or a skilled man, if he had not known all those items and the relations that they should bear to each other. In three items, in three purchases, we have saved, according to an account I have kept, over $240,000.

Those were the reasons which the Secretary of War and Mr. Shonts gave for the payment of $10,000 salaries to the general auditor and to the general purchasing officer; and I confess that as a member of the committee it struck me that those salaries were warranted under the circumstances.

A single further observation. I have looked over the list of——

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me right there to interrupt him?

Mr. GALLINGER. I am speaking in the time of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], but I will allow a question.

Mr. HOPKINS. If I understand the testimony just read by the Senator, the saving of one hundred and ninety thousand and odd dollars came from the making of an entirely new contract.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not at all. They advertised for bids, and the lowest bidder was persuaded by this auditor that his bid was too high, and he reduced it.

Mr. HOPKINS. Suppose the auditor had also undertaken to persuade some of the other men who had bid for the contract, is there any evidence to show that they might not have gone below that?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no evidence on that point.

Mr. HOPKINS. Then, it resolves itself back to this, that after the bids were submitted, feeling that they were all too high, he went to negotiating personally and privately with one of them, and got him to make an offer $190,000 less than he had originally made.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. HOPKINS. Now, I want to know if it would not have been better to have rejected all of the bids, if it was the opinion of the party that they were too high, and to have given everybody an opportunity to make new bids?

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, perhaps that might be so; but I am not going to discuss that, because I know nothing about it.

Mr. HOPKINS. Then, as a matter of fact, nobody can say that $190,000 was saved by that procedure. If the usual course had been pursued and if the bids had been rejected upon the ground that they were too high, instead of $190,000 being saved, there might have been a quarter of a million dollars saved.

Mr. GALLINGER. Possibly so; but I think the point the Secretary of War meant to make, and which impressed the committee, was that if this matter had been left in the hands of the Auditor for the War Department, a $4,000 officer who is probably overworked, he would have accepted the lowest bid beyond a question. That is the ordinary way in which those things go; but this technical man, this skilled man, thought these bids were too high, and in three different instances saved, not only $190,000, but $240,000 to the Government. I think that was good administration. It seems to me so. It is barely possible that the other bids might have been $50,000, $75,000, or $100,000 higher than this man bid—I do not know anything about that—so that it might not have been worth while to have bothered further with those gentlemen.

Now, I want to say but a word or two further. I have counted these different officers and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission who are receiving salaries of more than $2,000 per annum, according to the statement set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I find there are 226 of them. Thirty-five of them get $5,000 a year and over, and that includes the members of the Panama Canal Commission, as well as the highly salaried officials to whom I have made allusion. Fifty-eight of them get over $3,000 a year and less than $5,000, and 133 of them get less than $3,000. I have taken the trouble to count the men who get what I think is a very small salary, and out of that list of 226, 53 of them get $2,100 annually, or less than is paid to the clerks of the committees of this body.

I think the criticism is not well taken that these salaries are, as a rule, too high. It seems to me that some of them are too low. These 53 men occupy very responsible positions, as Senators will see if they will take the trouble to examine the character of their work on the Isthmus; and they are paid $2,100 a year—less, I repeat, than is paid the young men who are doing clerical work for the committees of this body and living comfortably here in Washington.

As I said in the beginning, I think there are a few salaries that perhaps are higher than they ought to be; but even in those few instances I would not feel like voting to reduce them, if I had the opportunity, without having more information than I have at the present time concerning them. These men perform exceedingly important duties.

I was impressed with the great responsibility that the Government has placed upon Mr. Shonts, a man whom I never saw until he appeared before the committee. He is not an engineer, but he is a man of great affairs, a man who has been in the habit of doing large things in the business world, a man who, beyond question, possesses exactly the qualifications which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] said a man in that position ought to possess; that is, the power to keep men at work, to organize them, to control them, and to bring results as a consequence of his great executive ability. I do not know but that the Government could find a man equally as good for less money; but there are few such men in the world—few men of that type—who can take control of a great manufacturing enterprise or a great railroad corporation or the construction of a great canal like this and get the best results out of it. If Mr. Shonts is that kind of man, $30,000, of course, is not worth discussing for a moment.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say. I simply wanted to call attention to the fact that when this list is analyzed it will be found that there are very few men in the entire list who are paid salaries that would warrant us in adversely criticising the Commission or the President for employing them at the rate of salary which is paid. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask that the amendment which I submitted yesterday be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used to pay the expenses of a literary bureau connected with the Isthmian Canal Commission or pay the salary, compensation, or allowance, by whatever name called, of any person who may be engaged in such work for or in behalf of said Commission.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, while the purpose of this amendment is fairly obvious, a word or two about it may not be inappropriate. Prior to the selection of the present secretary of the Commission that place was held by another, who, so far as I know, was thoroughly competent, and who was paid a salary of $5,000. On account of the inhospitable climate of Panama, the occupant resigned the position of secretary and the present occupant of that office was employed and the salary of the office increased from $5,000 to $10,000. The salary was increased because, in addition to the ordinary duties of secretary, he was constituted the historian or the chief of the literary bureau, or the literary secretary of the Commission. In the hearing before the Committee on Appropriations he stated what his duties were with far greater frankness, in my judgment, than did the Secretary of War or the chairman of the Canal Commission.

This amendment has no personal feature. It is aimed at the innovation; it is aimed at the unhealthy policy which is attempted by these proceedings to be ingrafted upon government in this country. I repeat, Mr. President, though it is hardly necessary to do so, that the amendment is not aimed at a personality. I never heard of this gentleman before, but he seems to be a gentleman of education and intelligence, and, what is of far greater consequence in these times, an honest and a candid and straightforward man.

Now let us see what he says. I shall not weary the Senate with a long extract from these papers. When other witnesses undertook to befog the situation, to lay stress on his duties as secretary, and to minimize his duties as literary secretary, or chief of the literary bureau, this gentleman was frank enough to say:

Senator HALE. As you said a while ago, in answer to my question, it was understood you were the literary secretary?
Mr. BISHOP. Yes.
Senator HALE. Now, the keeping up of communication, the receiving of those newspapers, and so on, the seeing that clippings are made of criticisms upon the Commission, seeing that they are kept on file, and the furnishing of information to newspapers, and the interviews and speeches of the Secretary of War and members of the Commission, and keeping the general run of the relations of the Commission to the public, that is the main part of your duty?
Mr. BISHOP. It is the main part.

Now, Mr. President, I have thought that much was necessary in explanation of the purpose of this amendment, and I would have more to say about it and about the impolicy of this innovation except for the fact that the lack of wisdom in it, to go no further, is recognized by the Administration, and I am assured by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] that this gross abuse, as I believe, of the use of public funds will be corrected in the administration of that office, and that no legislation is necessary. I understand that the assurance comes directly from the Administration that the impropriety of this attempt to create or to control or to direct public opinion with reference to one of the governmental agencies has been recognized, and that it will be done away with and eradicated without legislation. With that understanding, at the proper time I will withdraw this amendment, but only, Mr. President, in consideration of that assurance.

Mr. HALE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. CULBERSON. I have not concluded.

Mr. HALE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield with pleasure to the Senator now.

Mr. HALE. I think it is entirely fitting that I should say something in relation to this matter brought out by the suggestion of the Senator from Texas. There is a difficulty in dealing with this situation by any legislative provision. The Senator has found that difficulty in framing any legislation or language that will meet the real evil. The real evil is recognized by everybody. As was stated in the debate yesterday, the Committee on Appropriations was a unit that this was an improper thing—that the duties of the secretary of this Commission should be changed from an actual secretary dealing with the business of the Commission to the work of building up a press bureau to deal with the newspapers; to collect information and select information and then disseminate it. That is not the business of the Government or any bureau of the Government.

The Committee on Appropriations was united upon this subject. It believed it to be an unfortunate, unjustifiable, and inexcusable innovation. The establishment and continuance of this office is an administrative measure. It is difficult to frame language that will reach this; but I am authorized to state here that the view taken by the Senator in offering his amendment, the view of the Committee on Appropriations, and of, I think, perhaps every Senator here, that it is an improper thing and a useless thing, and leads not only to no good result, but may be greatly abused, is recognized by the Administration; and hereafter the duties of this secretary, who, as the Senator says, personally appeared well—he did not attempt to dodge or in any way get away from the responsibility of answering questions plainly, but disclosed the whole situation—hereafter, as an administrative measure, the secretary of the Canal Commission is to be given administrative duties relating to the work of the Commission, and the whole form and machinery of what is called this "press bureau" is to be discontinued and abandoned. That will be done as an administrative measure, and there is no objection by anybody in the Administration to its being done. So I am glad that the Senator, seeing this and recognizing that what he seeks to accomplish will be accomplished, is ready to withdraw his amendment, so that we shall not be embarrassed with the difficulty of putting into words something that can be better done by administration.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I wish to add, with reference to the amendment, that I trust this assurance carries with it also the idea that this salary will be readjusted as well as the duties of the place.

Mr. HALE. All questions of salaries are to be settled afterwards by another committee. I can not say to the Senate, as I did about the other essential part, that I considered or brought up the matter of salary, but when the Committee on Interoceanic Canals takes up the question of salaries it will deal with this as with all other salaries. We did not propose on this bill to deal with salaries.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, while I have the floor I desire to speak briefly to the pending bill itself, without regard to any amendment.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CULBERSON. Unless it is very important I trust the Senator will not ask me to yield any further.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas declines to yield.

Mr. CULBERSON. I will yield, if it is an important matter.

Mr. HOPKINS. It is touching the salary matter, and it can be taken up at another time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, it is well known, at least to a number of Senators, that my preference was the Nicaragua as against the Panama route. Nor was I able to bring myself to support the treaty made between the United States and the sham Republic of Panama. It was my opinion then and it is my opinion now that the course of the Administration in that matter was indefensible in law and infamous in morals. Notwithstanding that, in spite of that, because it has become the law of the land and we ought to construct a canal somewhere, I intend to support this appropriation. While that is true, it is well to keep before the country the situation as to the finances of the canal. It is well to remind the people and the Senate now and then what was originally proposed and what is now being done.

The original estimate for the construction of the Panama Canal, Mr. President, was $184,000,000. We have already spent $76,500,000, and practically not a lick has been struck toward excavation. Practically all that has been accomplished there is in the line of sanitation. Now, of what does the $76,500,000 consist? In the first place, we gave to the bogus Republic of Panama $10,000,000, which was no more or less than a payment to the intrigants and conspirators there who organized in this city under the very shadow of the Capitol. In addition to that we have spent $10,000,000 in the last year or two at Panama in the high, if not extravagant, salaries and in work which Mr. Shonts tells us, in his testimony before the Committee on Appropriations, was ill advised and improvident. In addition to that, we spent in a lump $40,000,000, paid to the Panama Canal Company; and what did we receive in return therefor?

Let me itemize the $40,000,000 for a moment, if you please. We gave $2,000,000 for the plans and specifications and maps of the old company, extending over a period of twenty-five years, which the Commission in its report to the President, in 1904, declared to be utterly worthless and useless, unsuited to the character of canal that the Government of the United States contemplates constructing. We gave $4,000,000 of the $40,000,000—and I speak only in round numbers—for machinery, and the Commission tells us in the report of 1904, as well as in the report of 1901, that it is largely unsuited to present conditions and will be of no great service to the Government at all. We gave $6,888,000 for the Panama Railroad stock, and there was a

mortgage at the time of $3,490,000 upon the road and its property; and consequently we have lost at least the latter sum. We then gave $27,500,000 for what had been done in the way of excavation, and all the witnesses tell us—I mean all of the reports and data which we have here upon the subject—that a large proportion of that work will be of no service to us hereafter.

Now, in addition to all that, with reference to the $40,000,000, in estimating that the property was worth that sum, the Commission added about 30 per cent for contingencies. They added, therefore, to what they regarded as the real value between ten and twelve million dollars, and brought the amount up to $40,000,000, which we paid to the canal company.

So I say, Mr. President, if you take the $40,000,000 in itself and dissect it and analyze it, you will find that we have paid somewhere between fifteen and twenty million dollars for property which is utterly worthless, and the money might as well have been thrown into the sea at Panama.

What is the other item constituting the $76,500,000 we have either spent or contracted to spend on the Isthmus? It is the $16,500,000 which is estimated for by the Secretary of War in his report to Congress. At this hour of the day I shall not attempt to go into that in detail, but I wish to make two fundamental criticisms, because I shall vote for the bill, notwithstanding it is subject to this criticism. I will vote for it because I will not have my motives misjudged, and because I want to see the canal constructed if it can be. I say I offer two fundamental criticisms upon this estimate of sixteen and a half million dollars.

The first is that we propose to spend now within several months this extraordinary sum of money when we have not yet determined the character of the canal we propose to build. Now, it is true the Secretary of War tells us that in his judgment eleven millions of it may be wisely spent, notwithstanding we have not yet determined the type and character of the canal. If it were a question of law, if it were a question of governmental policy, I would accept the opinion of the distinguished Secretary of War, but I dare say that he is a very indifferent engineer.

The second criticism, Mr. President, that I would offer to this appropriation of $16,500,000 is this: It is proposed to spend or contract for the expending of this enormous sum of money, when it has not yet been determined whether we will do the work there directly by the Government or by contract, and the question is under debate and under discussion now in Administration circles, as I understand.

With reference to the salaries, I wish to say while some of them seem to be too large, approaching the extravagant and the exorbitant, the conditions at Panama are different from what they are here and may in a sense justify larger salaries there than under ordinary conditions here. At the same time, it ought to be borne in mind that these salaries are higher than are paid or have been paid by the Government in any other of its Departments at any period of its history; and the committee ought to give due heed to that fact.

There are no Government salaries with which they can be compared. It was intimated here the other day that these salaries could only be compared with the salaries received by missionaries and philanthropists and retained lawyers in the insurance business. But, Mr. President, I have too much respect for the distinguished gentlemen who are engaged in this great governmental work in Panama to institute such a comparison.

The higher officers and some of the directors of the three largest insurance companies in this country constitute, in my judgment, the greatest aggregation of lordly thieves and unconscionable perjurers this age of graft has yet developed. They reach in every direction, lay hold of every class of men, and invade every party. They traffic, sir, in political influence as they would in the wares on the merchant's shelf or in the market place. They have invaded the sanctity of legislatures, State and National, and to me one of the deeply humiliating things is that they found a Democrat upon whom they fastened their graft at 25 per cent of what they paid a Republican of similar commanding position in his party. But enough of that. At some later time during the progress of this session I hope to take occasion to pay my respects at length to some of these insurance methods.

I said, Mr. President, that I intend to vote for this appropriation. In doing so I do not abate in the slightest my contempt for the robber diplomacy which acquired Panama and established there this miserable mock Republic. I shall support this appropriation because, among other reasons, I do not intend that my vote—and I hope no other vote on this side of the Chamber—shall hereafter be used as an excuse by the Administration for the disaster which may follow this undertaking. So far as I am concerned, the Administration must go right on with all reasonable funds that may be necessary until the feasibility of building the canal at Panama is either established or refuted.

The course of the Administration in this affair in the beginning was characterized by intrigue and lawlessness. It has since been marked by favoritism and extravagance, if not profligacy, and it will probably end in utter and disgraceful failure.

My sympathies, Mr. President, go out to the American people who have been deceived—deceived as to the cost of the canal; deceived as to the engineering and climatic difficulties in Panama. It is to be hoped—I do hope, Mr. President, although I believe the canal, if built at all, will cost hundreds of millions of dollars as against $184,000,000 which was originally estimated—I say I do hope the American people will be spared further disappointment and humiliation. But, Mr. President, there are indications that a retributive justice is laying the weight of its hand upon conduct which grossly discredited and dishonored the nation in the beginning.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, on Thursday I propounded an inquiry to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] concerning the purchase of ships by the Canal Commission for service between New York and Panama. That inquiry led to a colloquy between the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] and myself. Since then I have looked a little further into the matter, following his suggestion that I should, and I desire now to add something to what was said at that time.

On Thursday I stated that during the spring and early summer months it had been declared by the President, Secretary of War, and the Canal Commission that it was their settled policy, in procuring ships and material for the canal, to go into the open market and buy whatever was needed wherever it could be bought the cheapest.

That declared policy was widely exploited through the press. I have taken occasion to have copied some extracts from one of the leading papers of the country, the Washington Post, and I desire now to read them, because they show what the policy was and are samples of the way in which it was exploited.

From the Post of May 16, 1905, I read:

A new and very important policy was entered upon yesterday by the Isthmian Canal Commission, when members of its executive committee decided to purchase both materials and ships in the markets of the world. This was approved by Secretary Taft.

* * * * * * *

This decision with regard to the canal was reached with some reluctance, because it was appreciated by Secretary Taft and the executive committee that there would surely be a great outcry from two great interests in this country—the producers of material and the shipowners—if the purchases were not limited to the American product.

But it was decided that the money consideration was so great that it could not be ignored, for it was held that in cases fully 50 per cent more would be charged for material needed in canal construction than the same goods could be procured for in Europe.

Chief Engineer Wallace, for instance, showed that two ships, in addition to those running between New York and Colon and owned by the Panama Railroad Company, were absolutely necessary to carry the food supply and material needed for the work. No American ships could be bought at any reasonable price, and when it came to building such ships it was found, according to Secretary Taft's statement, that while you could buy two 6,000-ton ships in Europe for $750,000, it would cost $1,400,000 to build such ships here. And, in addition, while the European ships could be had at once, it would take at least eighteen months to secure American boats. Therefore it was decided to buy the ships in Europe, or, rather, in any port where they could be had the cheapest and obtained the quickest.

* * * * * * *

Secretary Taft explained yesterday that he felt obliged to indorse this decision. * * * And in this connection he called attention to the following recommendation contained in the first report of the Isthmian Canal Commission:

"An important question of policy is yet to be determined. If the Isthmian Canal Commission is not bound by any restriction of Congress as to where it shall purchase machinery, material, and supplies, then it would seem to be its duty to construct the canal as cheaply as possible, and buy what it needs where it can get it cheapest."

Again, from the Post of May 17, 1905:

In his report to the President on the 12th of last January, Secretary Taft said:

"If the Isthmian Canal Commission is not bound by any restrictions of Congress as to where they shall purchase machinery, material, and supplies, then it would seem to be their duty to construct the canal as cheaply as possible, and so to buy what they need where they can get it the cheapest."

Again, in the Post of May 20, 1905, Mr. Theodore P. Shonts, the chairman of the Commission, is quoted as saying:

The Commission has simply been forced to take this position in the matter of purchase of supplies and ships. * * * The Commissioners must, in keeping their oaths, build the canal as cheaply, not as possible, but as cheaply as practicable. With regard to the ships we are to buy, it is necessary to go abroad for them. We simply can not get them in this country, and so what are we going to do?

And the Post added:

The Canal Commission has had in view two 6,000-ton vessels, which could be purchased abroad immediately. The necessity of having these ships and the impossibility of securing American bottoms caused the decision of a few days ago to buy foreign steamers. Whether the char-

tered vessels will be foreign or domestic bottoms depends upon the prices asked.

Again, the Post of May 27 published what purports to be an extract from a speech delivered by Secretary Taft at Cincinnati, Ohio, on the evening of the 26th of May, which is as follows:

If the Panama Canal were inside the territory of the United States, of course all material used on the canal would pay duty or be bought in the United States, but as the construction of the canal is a number of days' journey from the tariff wall of the United States it presents exactly the same case as is presented in the case of the Philippine Islands. Now, if Congress wants to pay more than France was willing to pay, then they are welcome to do so, but in the absence of a rule we feel we must carry out the rule that applies. That law requires that, prices and qualities being the same, we must buy American goods. In the absence of a rule we feel bound by our trust to build as cheaply as possible. We submitted the question to Congress on this line, asking Congress to lay down a rule. If there is no rule, we must build as a business man would build. No; there is no question of protection or free trade; it is merely our duty under the law as it stands. If the rule is changed, then we must change.

These things were printed in the Post, and simultaneously similar things were printed in practically all the leading journals of the country. This shows that the Secretary of War and the Canal Commission, of course with the approval of the President, had, after mature deliberation, determined upon the policy of buying ships and material in the open markets of the world, giving preference to American products where quality and prices were substantially the same. There can be no doubt that that policy was determined upon and declared.

Mr. President, I approved of that policy in the main, and was delighted—"dee-lighted"—when I saw that the President of the United States and his subordinates had declared for it. I know of course that Republicans, I mean orthodox Republicans, did not approve of it. They did not approve of it because a policy of that kind was a direct blow, or would have been if carried out, at our navigation and tariff laws. These laws are the twin pets of the Republicans of the country—that is, of orthodox, stalwart Republicans. They are responsible for enacting them and boast of the fact. They are written in their confession of faith. But they are laws which have not and do not commend themselves to me or to those with whom I act in the world of politics, for under the operation of one of them our merchant marine has been destroyed, and the effect of the other is not only to impose grievous burdens upon the great mass of Americans, but it is to-day shadowing our foreign commerce with gravest danger. And so believing, when it was announced that the President and his subordinates would force the special beneficiaries of these laws into some sort of reasonable competition in furnishing canal supplies, the announcement received my instant and hearty approval. I supposed it was sincerely made. It was boldly declared and repeated everywhere and in many ways—in interviews, in public speeches, and in official utterances. But my rejoicing was of brief duration. For some reason a retreat has been sounded. The President has backed out. His oft-declared policy has been abandoned. There was tremendous thundering in the index, but a pitiable fizzle at the finish.

On Thursday I asked why this policy as to the purchase of ships had been abandoned. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] made answer, and, among other things, suggested that I might inquire of the Department. I did so. I received a printed copy of the minutes of various meetings held by the Isthmian Canal Commission. I wish to read the part of the minutes of one of those meetings which was marked, as I understood, by the secretary of the Commission when he kindly sent the book to me. I read as follows:

The chairman presented to the meeting the matter of acquiring steamers to be operated between New York and Colon, especially for the carriage of the material and supplies in the construction of the canal. He reported that the steamers at present employed by the Panama Railroad Company were entirely inadequate to meet the increased freight movement occasioned by the shipments of supplies for use in the construction of the canal; that also the passenger movement to and from Colon had greatly increased, due to the transportation of employees to the Isthmus for work in connection with the construction of the canal; that it was necessary to secure steamers especially adapted for the transportation of cargo and passengers and approximating 5,000 tons burden, with a speed of at least 16 knots and with an economical coal consumption, and also with exceptionally large hatches and between decks. He also reported that the railroad company had sent abroad its general agent, Mr. Farnham, to visit the principal shipping ports of Europe and to report upon vessels of the requisite capacity and size and adapted to the requirements of this trade that might be there acquired; that Mr. Farnham has covered the whole field of inquiry abroad in the most thorough fashion, and the chairman had exchanged with him frequent cables concerning the progress of his inquiries and the nature and character of vessels that might thus be purchased; that several ships abroad were thus offered, but that they were considerably less in speed—

How much he does not say—

than 16 knots, and the passenger accommodations were not well adapted to tropical service; that the chairman had opened negotiations with the Ward Line for the purchase of the two steamers *Mexico* and *Havana*, owned by that line and in operation between New York and Cuba; that the asking price was $700,000, and that two lower offers had been refused until a few days ago, when an offer of $650,000 each by the chairman had led to acceptance; that these vessels are 5,500 tons each, and capable of sustaining a speed of 16 knots, and accommodate 100 first-class and 50 second-class passengers; are provided with large hatches and side ports, enabling the shipment of heavy cargoes; can be immediately turned over for use; that the increased speed of these vessels will save four days on each round trip, giving five round trips a year more than any foreign vessel available; that these vessels were built for the tropical trade, and therefore are specially adapted for the New York-Colon service; that accordingly and after full discussion of the subject with the Secretary of War the chairman has authorized the purchase of these vessels at the price mentioned.

I read the whole of it, for it is fair that it should go in the RECORD. I suppose, Mr. President, that the preparation of these minutes constitutes a part of the work of that ornamental, Argus-eyed purveyor and dispenser of canal literature known as the "historian," who has been employed at an annual salary of $10,900 to guard the Commission against the machinations of the wicked world outside. But though it comes, as I presume it does, from his pen and is a creation of his genius, it is in the nature of an explanation and bears the tone of apology; and well it might, for to my thinking it approximates an absurdity to say that in the ports and shipyards of England, France, and Germany no two ships could be purchased that would answer the needs of this Commission. To me it is absurd to say that in those countries, whose merchant ships are swarming all over the world and whose flags are mirrored in every sea, two ships could not be found suitable for the service desired, but could be found only in the United States, whose merchant marine has been so far destroyed that it ranks at the very foot among the great nations of the world.

Besides, Mr. President, only shortly before these ships were purchased and this record made, and when this policy of buying ships in the open market was still alive and afoot, the chairman of the Canal Commission and other officials declared that they were forced to go abroad to buy because the ships could not be had at home. That was one reason they gave for buying abroad and in justification of that course. Certainly no change occurred in this respect between the month of May, when these declarations of their purpose were made, and the month of July, when the purchase was made. The reason given now for buying at home is wholly at variance with the reason given in May for buying abroad.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], replying to my inquiry on Thursday, said:

The Secretary of War did attempt to buy ships abroad, but I think if the Senator from Missouri will make careful inquiry of the Department he will find that the Secretary failed to find any foreign ships that met the requirements of the Department. After exploiting that matter abroad, in England particularly, he turned his attention to the United States, and he found the Ward Line had two ships that exactly suited the purposes, and he purchased them for $650,000 apiece, which, it has been stated by experts, was a very reasonable amount. There are now being built, I will say to the Senator, in the United States shipyards two ships to take the place of those the Ward Line sold to the Department.

Mr. President, it is stated in one of the extracts I read in the beginning, as upon official authority, that there were two 6,000-ton ships in England suitable to this trade that could be bought for the sum of $750,000 for the two. Now, we find that the Commission two months later paid $1,300,000 for the *Havana* and *Mexico*. But the Senator from New Hampshire says that this much larger price was paid and that they were bought because they were suited to the use they were to be put to and because no foreign ships so well adapted to that use could be had. It appears from the minutes of the Commission, from which I have read, that one of these ships at the time of its purchase was undergoing repairs or alterations. How good these ships were I do not know. This I do know, that they were built by the Cramps, in Philadelphia, in 1898 and 1899. So they are 6 and 7 years of age. I have been told, Mr. President, by gentlemen who are qualified to speak on the subject by reason of their practical experience in the ship business, that it is the universal custom among the owners of ships to write off 5 per cent of the value of a ship every year it is in use. If that be true, then on that account these ships have depreciated 30 and 35 per cent, respectively, on their original value, or on their value as new ships.

In addition to that, I am told by the same gentlemen that the life of a ship's boilers is about eight years, on the average, and that when the boilers have become exhausted it will cost about 15 per cent of the original cost of the vessel to replace them. There are Senators sitting before me now very familiar with this subject, and I ask them to correct me if my statements are not predicated on the facts.

If the data I have given be correct—and I have no doubt that it is—then it is clear that the two vessels we have bought were at the time of the purchase worth little more, if any more, than half what they were worth when new.

Again, I call attention in this connection to the statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire, that there are now being built in shipyards in the United States two ships to take the place of those the Ward Line sold to the Canal Commission. We bought those ships in July. It requires but eighteen months, or about that, to build ships of that description. Why has it become necessary within two or three or four months—I am indefinite because I do not know when the commission was given for the construction of the new ships—but we bought the old ships in July, and since then the Senator from New Hampshire says the Government has entered into contract with American shipyards to build new ships to take their place.

Mr. SPOONER. The Government?

Mr. STONE. I said the Government, but the Senator from Wisconsin corrects me, and properly, for the Senator from New Hampshire did not say that the Government was building new ships, but that they were being built to take the place of the old ones. Mr. President, are they being built by the Ward Line or by the Government, does the Senator know?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know, but I infer from the observations of the Senator from New Hampshire that the Ward Line was building those two ships to take the place in their service of the ships they had sold; but I may be mistaken.

Mr. STONE. For use in their own services?

Mr. ALLISON. In the Ward Line. That is what I suppose.

Mr. STONE. I did not so interpret the statement.

Mr. SPOONER. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from New Hampshire is not present.

Mr. GALLINGER entered the Chamber.

Mr. SPOONER. Here he is now.

Mr. STONE. Of course if that is what the Senator from New Hampshire meant, I have no wish and there can be no object in pressing that further.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator refer to the two ships purchased by the War Department?

Mr. STONE. Yes. I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire just what he meant when he said on Thursday that two ships were being built to take the place of those sold by the Ward Line to the Government? Who is building them, and for what purpose?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have an impression that they are being built in the Cramp shipyards, of course for service in the Cuban trade, where the Ward Line runs.

Mr. STONE. For the Ward Line?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes. I so understand. If the Senator will permit me a moment, it has been suggested to me that the Senator has been discussing the matter of the purchase of those two ships. I think I have accurate information when I say to the Senator that the Secretary of War sent an agent to Europe—in fact, that was well known to some of us—for the purpose of buying two ships for this service. He found two ships that could be bought for $750,000—$375,000 each. They belonged to a concern that had failed, and it was a bargain-counter affair; but before he closed his contract for those ships, they were sold to other parties, and hence could not be secured. I can not definitely say that they would have been accepted even if other parties had not stepped in and taken the ships; but that is the presumption.

This agent then looked around for other ships and failed to find ships that could be purchased which answered the requirements of the Department. He came home and so reported; and the Department purchased the Ward Line steamers. That is the information in regard to that matter I get, and I think it is entirely authoritative.

Mr. STONE. That is what the Senator said on a former occasion.

Mr. GALLINGER. Except that I did not say that other parties had purchased the ships, which I do now, as it has been shown to me to be a fact.

Mr. STONE. I do not question the statement of the Senator; but I did and I do question the statement put forward as the excuse or reason for abandoning the policy entered upon of purchasing ships abroad if they could be purchased there for vastly less money—namely, that suitable ships could not be had in Europe and could be had only in the United States. I remarked, and without meaning to be offensive I repeat, that that statement under all the circumstances seems to me to be wholly unreasonable, if not positively absurd.

I have wondered, Mr. President, and do yet, what influence operated to induce the Secretary of War and the Canal Commission, and the President himself, to change their policy, and to beat an inglorious retreat.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say that I am not in the confidence of the Secretary of War or of the President concerning this matter. I will say to the Senator that I am one Member of this body who has felt, and who now feels, that so far as the Panama Canal construction is concerned, we ought to give our patronage to Americans rather than to foreigners, and I think it would have been a reproach to this great nation of ours, in view of the fact that we are now carrying only 9 per cent of our imports and exports in American ships, to have British ships carrying our supplies to the Panama Canal. That is my judgment; but I do not speak for the Secretary of War or for the President. I do not know what influenced them. I have been told that after those two ships, which were partly bargained for, escaped the vigilance of the gentleman who was sent over there by the Department and they failed to find in the British market two other ships that would answer the requirements, he came home and the Department made this purchase.

Mr. STONE. I know, Mr. President, without being told, that the distinguished and able Senator from New Hampshire is in favor of the policy he has announced, that all of the supplies for the Panama Canal should be purchased in the United States, and that without regard to the difference in the prices here and in foreign countries.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes, Mr. President, unless our tariff duties could be applied to those purchases abroad, I am in favor of purchasing in the American market; and I was exceedingly gratified the other day to have the Secretary of War say to the Committee on Appropriations that they were purchasing 98 per cent of such supplies in the American market. I am glad they do it.

Mr. STONE. I know the Senator is glad, but that is not the point. The President and the Secretary of War were not glad, so they said, as the Senator is glad, at least not so glad that they were willing to pay from 40 to 80 per cent more for supplies, enormous in quantity, than they could buy them abroad for, for the mere privilege of getting them at home. I am speaking of this Republican Administration. On the contrary, they said that they esteemed it their duty, that they were under a public obligation "to purchase where they could buy the cheapest." True it is asserted by some newspapers, as coming from these officials, that this declared policy of buying abroad was made as an admonition or threat for the purpose of coercing American manufacturers and shipowners into selling to the Government at lower prices. But I can hardly believe that the President would make a false play for the purpose of coercion. If so, it failed, and the coercers were coerced. In any event, the views held by the Senator from New Hampshire are not in accord with those projected by the Administration. The Secretary of War and the chairman of the Canal Commission as late as May were unwilling to pay $1,300,000 for two ships the like of which they said they could buy abroad for practically half that sum. The President is reported in one interview as denouncing as outrageous any proposition that such enormous prices should be paid.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, I wish the Senator would put that interview into the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. With the Senator's permission, I should like him to read that interview. I have heard no suggestion from any source that the price paid for these ships was an exorbitant price.

Mr. STONE. I did not say that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understood the Senator to say it was an outrage.

Mr. STONE. I said that the proposition or demand that $1,300,000 or $1,400,000 should be paid for ships in the United States, which could be bought abroad for substantially half that sum, was an outrage.

Mr. GALLINGER. It would have been an outrage if they demanded an exorbitant price for their ships; but that is the very thing I have never heard questioned, that $650,000 was an exorbitant price.

Mr. STONE. I have seen no statement of that nature since these ships were purchased. All such statements were before the purchase, and naturally so.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will again permit me, if his contention be that the Government, regardless of the interests of the American people, ought to have gone abroad and bought everything for this canal, this great amount of material that has been brought in here, evading the payment of our tariff duties, is a correct contention, why, Mr. President, we might as well go to free trade now as at any time.

Mr. STONE. I have not said that I favor going abroad to

buy the materials for this canal. On the contrary, I have said, and say now, that I would esteem it to be the duty of the administrative officers to buy the material and ships at home if they could be purchased at substantially the same prices and of substantially the same quality. But I am opposed, Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will not interrupt the Senator, Mr. President, in the middle of a sentence.

Mr. STONE. But I am opposed to the Government buying at home, tariff or no tariff, navigation laws or none, materials or ships, and paying 40 or 50 per cent more for them than they can be had for abroad, and paying also very largely in excess of the prices at which American goods are sold for export.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, with the Senator's permission——

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator knows that American ships can not be bought as cheaply as ships can be bought in England, France, Germany, Norway, or any other of the maritime nations of the world. The Senator knows—I am sure he knows—that we are paying a much higher price for labor in this country in shipyards than is being paid in any other country in the world, that it costs a great deal more to build ships here than it does to build ships abroad. The Senator knows that we can buy woolen goods for the American people much cheaper in Great Britain than we can in this country, but the policy of our Government has been not to take foreign goods simply because they are cheaper, but it has been to compel those nations to pay a tariff duty that will practically put these goods, so far as cost is concerned, on an equality with those manufactured in our own country, so that we can pay our laborers, our wool-growers, and others a better rate of wages than is being paid abroad. I do not think the Senator means that we ought to buy British ships simply because they are cheaper——

Mr. STONE. I did not say so.

Mr. GALLINGER. And close up our American shipyards and dismiss our American workmen and simply depend upon foreigners to furnish us with what we consume in our country. That has been argued by some, but I do not think the Senator from Missouri would argue it.

Mr. STONE. That, of course, Mr. President, is the old argument in favor of maintaining our tariff schedules and navigation laws. I do not care at this time to enter into that discussion to the extent the Senator indicates; but I will say, while it is true that the cost of building a ship in the United States is larger than that of building one in Europe, the difference is not so great as the Senator would have us believe. The difference is not so great that it is necessary to sell an American ship for double, or practically double, the price of a similar foreign ship in order to save the American owner from loss. The difference in the cost of building ships here and in Europe consists chiefly in the higher labor cost and not in materials. Primarily I favor free ships, but I will not go into that now. I am as anxious as the Senator can be to restore our merchant marine, but I will not go into that now. However, I will say that we can not put our flag on the sea, we can not rehabilitate our maritime interests by selling old ships or new ones at exorbitant prices, and we do that whenever they are sold at practically double the price of foreign ships. Whenever that is done it is an outrage, whether the President said so or not. Possibly it was just such arguments as that now made by the Senator from New Hampshire which prevailed with the President and the Secretary of War to change their policy.

When that policy was announced many distinguished Republicans, among them the Speaker of the last House of Representatives, a distinguished Member of that House from Pittsburg, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], and others, cried out against it; and many publications devoted to the protected interests cried out against it; and some were so emphatic that they declared that they would resist the policy. Pressure, enormous pressure, was brought to bear upon the President and the Secretary, and I believe they were forced, for political reasons, to abandon the policy they had entered upon.

Mr. President, I have accomplished the purpose I had in view. I wanted to call attention to these facts, for they afford a most interesting and instructive object lesson, so far as our navigation and tariff laws are concerned. I am only sorry that the President surrendered to pressure.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I must confess that the short study which I have given to the various reports upon the subject has rather confused my mind. I find many plans which have been evolved in the different stages of this construction—three, four, or five, I believe—varying according to the determination as to whether it shall be a sea-level canal and varying according to the number of locks employed. But during this debate certain impressions have been made upon my mind regarding the administration of the work of this canal which I should like to present to the Senate.

Whilst, of course, we should be critical of this work in its early as well as in its later stages, I think that we should also be tolerant in the earliest stages, for the Government has been suddenly thrown into a work of construction of great magnitude under legislation which contemplates the speedy construction of this canal, backed by a public sentiment which is impatient of delay.

It is not to be wondered that there should be some impulsive and even hysterical work done in the early stages. The people wished to see dirt fly, and the Administration doubtless wished to meet the views of the people, and perhaps too much haste has been made. We have an evidence of it in the fact that $500,000 has been expended in removing dirt which later on will have to be removed to another place.

It is also clear that the work of construction should not have been entered upon until the work of sanitation was complete. The Administration has seen its error in that particular, and of late the entire effort of the Administration has been applied to the question of sanitation. But there is a consideration which I should like to present to the Senate, and that is as to whether we are not responsible in part for defective administration thus far.

I think it is conceded by all men connected with great corporate enterprises that the responsibility of a great work must be individualized; that it must be put upon one man; that that man must appoint his assistants for the different branches of the work and hold them responsible to him, and that these assistants in their various areas of control shall pursue the same method.

At the very start we did not individualize this responsibility. It is true we intrusted the work to the President, but instead of giving him a free hand in organization we instructed him that he should do this work through a commission, and we ourselves designated in great part the personnel of that commission. We provided for a commission of seven. I think that was a mistake. I think we should have put upon the President of the United States the responsibility for this work; that we should not have permitted him to share that responsibility with any commission of this kind. We should impose upon him the duty of appointing his own subordinates, individualizing responsibility everywhere as far as possible.

It is not to be wondered at that we should make mistakes in organization at first, for the United States Government has not been accustomed to great works of construction. We are now entering upon an era of construction, and I believe the area of our work in that particular will increase until it finally embraces governmental public utilities which are not now dreamed of.

The only other great work of construction upon which we have entered was entered upon under a law passed almost simultaneously with the act under which the President is acting, and that was the irrigation law. There we individualized responsibility. We shaped a most comprehensive bill; provided a fund from the sale of public lands through which construction should be conducted, and provided a revolving fund so that the money could be used over and over again as the lands reclaimed were sold.

But he gave the Secretary of the Interior full power to execute the law, and he placed no limit upon that power except that he should not make a contract for construction unless the money for its payment was actually in the fund.

What did the Secretary of the Interior do under that act? He referred the administration of the act to the Geological Survey, a scientific branch of the Government which for years has been engaged not simply in geological research, but in the study of everything that relates to the topography and resources of the country, to our mineral deposits, to the measurement of streams, to the control of streams for navigation as well as irrigation, and which, during the formative process of the irrigation agitation, had been engaged in making plans for the great work that was subsequently to be entered upon.

The Director of the Geological Survey has demonstrated administrative capacity of a very high character. Although his special scientific specialty was the examination of fossils, yet the expanding area of his bureau had turned him gradually into a great administrator. His capacity has been recognized by Congress, by our Appropriations Committees, and by all who have been brought in contact with him by a prompt acquiescence in

almost everything he has asked. He has been termed in this body the greatest getter of appropriations in the service of the Government, and he has procured these appropriations simply because he has been direct and straightforward, has presented his plans clearly, and without urgency, and has placed upon the committees of the Senate and the House themselves the responsibility of their acceptance or their rejection.

Under him is Mr. Newell, a graduate of the Boston School of Technology, a man who entered the service when he was very young, an enthusiast on the subject of irrigation, and who during fourteen years' patient investigation and patient work has been preparing for this great work of construction. Those are the two men upon whom the responsibility for this work centered.

Now, what did they do? Select commissions to divide responsibility as to administration? Not at all. They drew into the force gradually the men who had distinguished themselves all over the country as topographers, as hydrographers, as hydraulic engineers, as constructing engineers, and the result is that today we have in the employment of that service a number of scientific men of large practical experience, a body that is unsurpassed by that in the employ of any other government in the world.

Now, let me say right here that it seems to me that the Panama Canal involves the same problems that are involved in the construction of irrigation works. You may call it a simple problem as compared with the construction of all the irrigation works that are contemplated in this country. The work of investigation and planning now embraces fourteen States in this Union. The topography of the country has been studied, stream measurements have been made, surveys of canals and ditches have been made, dams have been planned, reservoirs have been provided for, and they are almost ready for construction, and some are already commenced, and some have been finished. The Panama Canal involves the same work. What have you there? A line only 47 miles long. The irrigation work embraces the entire arid region, consisting of thirteen States and three Territories. The canal is 47 miles long. As you proceed from Colon, the canal runs through a flat country for 15 or 16 miles, the Government availing itself for a part of that distance of the Chagres River as a part of the canal. Then comes the Bohio dam, 80 feet above the surface of the land, and about 150 feet down to bed rock. Then you have this artificial lake as the result of the dam, which is to receive the flood waters of the Chagres and hold them, so that they will not tear the banks of the canal below.

Then we have the reservoir reenforced by other reservoirs upon the Chagres River, intended to control the violence of the stream. The Bohio reservoir is about 14 miles long. With 15 miles of the canal through the almost level plain to Bohio and the 14 miles of the Bohio reservoir you have a distance of 29 miles of the 47 miles completed. Then, farther to the south, you have the Culebra cut of about 10 miles, which is to be cut to a depth of from 66 to 80 feet, according to the number of locks employed. Then you have another level space, or almost level space, to the Pacific Ocean, about 8 miles, making in all about 47 miles.

Now, this service involves exactly the same problems on which the employees of the irrigation service have been engaged for fourteen years. It involves study of the geological formations, careful stream measurements through a series of years, so as to ascertain the extent of possible floods and prevent the destruction caused by such floods. It involves dam construction, ditch construction, and canal construction, just as in the arid region, and it involves protecting canals.

Now, let us see whether it would not have been wise for the President to have had a free hand to take hold of this scientific branch of the Government, which is an evolution of fourteen years, which had an administration already accomplished whose experience covered these various problems, instead of reaching out for a new administration, to be accomplished not by the aid of hydraulic engineers, but to be accomplished by the aid of railroad engineers inexperienced in hydraulic engineering.

The Bohio dam is about 80 feet high above the surface, though its foundation is to go down 150 feet to bed rock. Its length is 3,800 feet. That is a very long dam, of course, but at the Salt River in Arizona the United States Government is now constructing, under the reclamation service, a dam 270 feet high and 800 feet in length. It is also constructing the Shoshone dam, 310 feet high, with a length of 200 feet. It is constructing the Rio Grande dam, 255 feet high, with a length of 1,150 feet. That dam is to be constructed at a total cost of $5,115,000, whilst the Bohio dam at Panama will cost about $6,000,000.

Now, I ask, would it not have been better to have intrusted this work to that branch of the Government which has been built up through the slow process of evolution and which has now in its corps, either by direct appointment or as consulting engineer, every man in the country who has distinguished himself in hydraulic engineering.

Then as to tunnels. The irrigation service is now constructing the Gunnison tunnel, of a length of 6 miles—a tunnel 10 by 12 feet—and of that tunnel a mile is already completed. Recollect that the irrigation act was passed almost in the same month that the Panama act was passed. The irrigation committees of the Senate and the House visited the various projects during the last summer, and we had opportunity of observing the quickness and extent of the work, and we were amazed at the progress that had been made in the short space of three years.

At the same session of Congress a bill was passed for the construction of a post-office building, to cost fifty or sixty thousand dollars, in the city of Reno, Nev. That building is not yet constructed—the foundations are not yet laid; and yet the Reclamation Service has during the intervening period expended over $2,000,000 in reclamation work in Nevada; has diverted the Truckee River, a stream of floods during certain seasons of the year, a distance of 30 miles by a new river over into the Carson Valley; has constructed dams and locks and all the hydraulic machinery that was necessary to make that enterprise effective, and the water is now being turned out upon the soil.

Now, what salaries are paid these men? Mr. Walcott receives $6,000 a year. He could, in my judgment, because of the value of his services as an administrator, get a very much larger sum in outside employment, but he feels, as I observe most Government employees do, and particularly those relating to the scientific branches of the Government, a personal pride in his work. The commercial spirit does not entirely possess the men who are in the employ of the Geological Survey. They are content with reasonable compensation, and you could not tempt them from Government employ by the offer of larger compensation.

I know one distinguished engineer who has been employed in the great private enterprises of the West in irrigation construction who accepted from the United States Government a salary about one-third that which he earned in private practice, and he accepted it because he wished to identify his name with a great engineering work in which he was interested. The esprit de corps of this particular branch of the service is most marvelous. We men of the West have had opportunities of observing it. We have every year in the West an irrigation congress, composed of about a thousand men, deriving its membership from each one of the arid and semiarid States. The last congress I attended was in El Paso. The one previous to that was at Ogden. This convention of a thousand men was attended also by the engineers and hydrographers and the expert men of the Reclamation Service. They have annually a congress of their own, in which these engineers, coming from various parts of the country and engaged in different projects, present to the judgment of their associates in the congress their several projects, invite criticism, and ask judgment. To these conferences members of the irrigation congress were invited, and the result is they have been a great educational power in the West. Forty or fifty delegates from every State who attend that congress go back to their States familiar with the plans of the Government. They become informed through these expositions that take place and they form an educational force in every State, and, so far as the engineers are concerned, they feel the sustaining power of the people themselves in that great work.

Now, this demonstrates that the Government can get men for much less compensation than obtains in commercial life. Mr. Walcott gets $6,000 a year; Mr. Newell gets $5,000, and he is chief engineer, and no one of the noted engineers under him gets, I believe, more than $4,000 or $4,500. The salaries of the engineers range from $2,200 up to $4,500. The only exception is Mr. Grunsky, formerly of the Canal Commission, who has been assigned by the President to the position of consulting engineer, at a salary of $10,000 per annum.

It would have been very easy, simply by an extension of this service, to have taken the Panama Canal within the area of its work, involving exactly the same problems that this Bureau has been devoting itself to for fourteen years, and in which it has accumulated an experience that no set of men, however great their capacity, can acquire in a short time.

I do not question the ability of the engineers who have been employed in this work, but I do contend that almost all of them—I may say all that have been brought to my attention—have been engaged in railroad construction and not in hydraulic construction. Railway engineering is comparatively easy. It consists simply in surveys of the right of way, in adopting a certain standard of grade, in constructing tunnels and bridges across streams, whereas hydraulic engineering, as

conducted in the West, involves not only those things, but many other things, and involves all the things that are embraced in the construction of the Panama Canal, except possibly the question of sanitation.

Now, let me show what the reclamation service has done during these three years. It has built 77 miles of main canals. These main canals have the size of rivers. You would be amazed at the magnitude of some of those works. It has built 50 miles of distributing canals. It has built 186 miles of irrigating ditches, 150 miles of telephone, 125 miles of road in canyons, involving deep rock cuts; 3½ miles of tunnels. It has excavated 10,000,000 cubic yards.

In one of their works, at the great Salt River dam, a dam which is to be constructed of cement and stone, they found they were held up by the cement trust. What did they do? They set their geologist to work, and the geologist discovered very near the site of the dam material admirably suited to make cement. And so they put up, at a cost of $100,000, a Portland cement mill, and there they are making cement at a great saving to the Government. I can not recall exactly the figures, but it is a very large sum.

Work is now going on in eleven different projects in as many different States, and they are now constructing the Shoshone dam, the Pathfinder dam, the Roosevelt dam, the Laguna dam, the Belle Fourche dam, the Gunnison tunnel (6 miles long), and 12 miles of ditches on the Colorado River.

So this service is moving along quietly, unobtrusively, in a businesslike way, under this system of individual responsibility. Mr. Newell, the chief engineer, is responsible to Mr. Walcott, the Director of the Geological Survey, and Mr. Walcott, the Director of the Geological Survey, is responsible to the Secretary of the Interior; and I believe that this work will be one of the crowning glories in the history of this Republic.

But even if the service of the irrigation survey should not be employed, even if its accumulated experience and information should not be tapped in this way in this work of identical character, it does seem to me that we should give the President of the United States a free hand, so that he can, if he chooses, turn over this work to the Geological Survey, or so that he can, if he chooses, adopt the system of individual responsibility to which I have referred.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill is in the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there be no further amendments, the bill will be reported to the Senate as amended.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill making an appropriation to continue the construction of the isthmian canal, and for other purposes."

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 18, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 16, 1905.

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

Thomas Lee Moore, of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia. A reappointment, his term expiring January 31, 1906.

Harry Skinner, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina. A reappointment, his term expiring January 31, 1906.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

William H. Devos, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for the district of Milwaukee, in the State of Wisconsin. (Reappointment.)

Gad Smith, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Superior, in the State of Michigan. (Reappointment.)

William W. Sewall, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Aroostook, in the State of Maine, to succeed Thomas H. Phair, whose term of office will expire by limitation December 19, 1905.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Edward F. Woodward, of California, to be surveyor of customs in the district of San Francisco, in the State of California, to succeed Joseph S. Spear, jr., whose term of office will expire by limitation December 19, 1905.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Zenas Y. Coleman, of North Kakima, Wash., to be register of the land office at North Yakima, Wash., vice Henry V. Hinman, deceased.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John G. Church to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Albert L. Norton, promoted.

Gunner William J. Foley to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 10th day of April, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Quartermaster's Department.

Maj. Robert R. Stevens, quartermaster, to be deputy quartermaster-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, from December 15, 1905, vice Martin, retired from active service.

Capt. Richmond McA. Schofield, quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major, from December 15, 1905, vice Stevens, promoted.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Hugh M. Watson to be postmaster at Clifton, in the county of Graham and Territory of Arizona, in place of Arthur J. Hudson, resigned.

ALABAMA.

George W. Griffin to be postmaster at Tuskegee, in the county of Macon and State of Alabama, in place of John S. Webb, removed.

James B. Washington to be postmaster at Tuskegee Institute, in the county of Macon and State of Alabama. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

CALIFORNIA.

Norman Ashcroft to be postmaster at Hollywood, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, in place of Herve Friend, resigned.

James G. Ferguson to be postmaster at Clovis, in the county of Fresno and State of California. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

George W. Humphreys to be postmaster at Dunsmuir, in the county of Siskiyou and State of California, in place of George W. Humphreys. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1905.

James T. Negley to be postmaster at Alturas, in the county of Modoc and State of California, in place of Sarah Laird, removed.

GEORGIA.

W. Y. Atkinson to be postmaster at Newnan, in the county of Coweta and State of Georgia, in place of Robert F. Milner. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1906.

John W. Bohanon to be postmaster at Eastman, in the county of Dodge and State of Georgia, in place of William S. Waite, removed.

John M. Duff to be postmaster at Tifton, in the county of Tift and State of Georgia, in place of John M. Duff. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

ILLINOIS.

Fred A. Busse to be postmaster at Chicago, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois, in place of Fred E. Coyne. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1905.

John F. Donovan to be postmaster at Kinmundy, in the county of Marion and State of Illinois, in place of John F. Donovan. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

Augustus H. Helple to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Tazewell and State of Illinois, in place of Augustus H. Helple. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

William W. Wagner to be postmaster at Hospital, in the county of Kankakee and State of Illinois, in place of Clarence E. Holt, removed.

INDIANA.

Fletcher W. Boyd to be postmaster at Covington, in the county of Fountain and State of Indiana, in place of Fletcher W. Boyd. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

John J. Brown to be postmaster at Rockport, in the county of Spencer and State of Indiana, in place of Elias E. Wesseler. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

Calvin F. Brown to be postmaster at Pendleton, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana, in place of Calvin F. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

Weldon A. Finch to be postmaster at Elwood, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana, in place of Weldon A. Finch. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

Robert P. Grimes to be postmaster at Anderson, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana, in place of Robert P. Grimes. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

William W. Kennedy to be postmaster at Martinsville, in the county of Morgan and State of Indiana, in place of Alfred M. Bain. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

William Miller to be postmaster at Nappanee, in the county of Elkhart and State of Indiana, in place of Charles J. Swezey, resigned.

Marvin W. Pershing to be postmaster at Tipton, in the county of Tipton and State of Indiana, in place of Marvin W. Pershing. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

Arthur P. Twineham to be postmaster at Princeton, in the county of Gibson and State of Indiana, in place of James H. Warnock. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

IOWA.

George L. Robb to be postmaster at Albia, in the county of Monroe and State of Iowa, in place of Daniel M. Anderson, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George T. Bailey to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in place of George T. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Richard J. Considine to be postmaster at East Whitman, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts, in place of Richard J. Considine. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Clarence W. Daugherty to be postmaster at Huntington, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts, in place of Clarence W. Daugherty. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Henry A. Pease to be postmaster at Edgartown, in the county of Dukes and State of Massachusetts, in place of Henry A. Pease. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Leonard R. Smith to be postmaster at East Northfield, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts, in place of Leonard R. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Charles L. Scranton to be postmaster at Cottage City, in the county of Dukes and State of Massachusetts, in place of Charles L. Scranton. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

MINNESOTA.

Mark D. Flower to be postmaster at St. Paul, in the county of Ramsey and State of Minnesota, in place of Andrew R. McGill, deceased.

Charles M. Johnson to be postmaster at Cass Lake, in the county of Cass and State of Minnesota, in place of Frederick W. Smith, removed.

MISSISSIPPI.

George L. Holley to be postmaster at Booneville, in the county of Prentiss and State of Mississippi, in place of George L. Holley. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

Thomas I. Keys to be postmatser at Ocean Springs, in the county of Jackson and State of Mississippi, in place of Thomas I. Keys. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

William B. Martin to be postmaster at Indianola, in the county of Sunflower and State of Mississippi. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Fred H. Powers to be postmaster at Starkville, in the county of Oktibbeha and State of Mississippi, in place of Fred H. Powers. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

MONTANA.

P. M. Worthingham to be postmaster at Townsend, in the county of Broadwater and State of Montana, in place of Job Thompson, removed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

William A. Patterson to be postmaster at Contoocook, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

NEW YORK.

George H. Brown to be postmaster at Kinderhook, in the county of Columbia and State of New York, in place of George H. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

John T. Davis to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Herkimer and State of New York. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

George E. Drumm to be postmaster at Chatham, in the county of Columbia and State of New York, in place of George E. Drumm. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

August F. Funk to be postmaster at Philmont, in the county of Columbia and State of New York, in place of August F. Funk. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Emmett B. Hawkins to be postmaster at Huntington, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York, in place of Emmett B. Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

William H. Hill to be postmaster at Lestershire, in the county of Broome and State of New York, in place of William H. Hill. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

David C. Inglis to be postmaster at Spring Valley, in the county of Rockland and State of New York, in place of David C. Inglis. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

William G. Laidlaw to be postmaster at Ellicottville, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York, in place of William G. Laidlaw. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

Seth T. Lyman to be postmaster at Pelham, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in place of Seth T. Lyman. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

John McNally to be postmaster at Ossining, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, in place of John McNally. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905.

George H. Roberts, jr., to be postmaster at Brooklyn, in the county of Kings and State of New York, in place of George H. Roberts, jr. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1905. 17, 1905.

Vine M. Seagers to be postmaster at Endicott, in the county of Broome and State of New York. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Harry C. Wanamaker to be postmaster at Suffern, in the county of Rockland and State of New York, in place of John I. Traphagen, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Stephen A. White to be postmaster at Mebane, in the county of Alamance and State of North Carolina. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

OHIO.

W. P. Shepard to be postmaster at Nelsonville, in the county of Athens and State of Ohio, in place of James T. Sheppard. Incumbent's commission expires December 19, 1905.

OKLAHOMA.

Frank W. Hungate to be postmaster at Hydro, in the county of Caddo and Territory of Oklahoma. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

John C. Morphis to be postmaster at Cleveland, in the county of Pawnee and Territory of Oklahoma. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

PENNSYLVANIA.

David Kaye to be postmaster at Monaca, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania, in place of John H. Glassner, removed.

Harry B. Klingensmith to be postmaster at Ellsworth, in the county of Washington and State of Pensnylvania. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Samuel C. Seaber to be postmaster at Lititz, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Samuel C. Seaber. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1905.

J. Clayton Whitby to be postmaster at Rosemont, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Howard S. Stillwagon, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Sherman C. Denham to be postmaster at Clarksburg, in the county of Harrison and State of West Virginia, in place of Sherman C. Denham. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1905.

WISCONSIN.

W. G. Walker to be postmaster at Odanah, in the county of Ashland and State of Wisconsin. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 16, 1905.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Charles E. Magoon, of Nebraska, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Panama.

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSIONERS.

Theodore P. Shonts for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and its chairman, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to pro-

vide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans."

Col. Oswald H. Ernst, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans."

Rear-Admiral Mordecai T. Endicott, United States Navy, for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans."

Charles E. Magoon for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans."

Benjamin M. Harrod for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans."

Brig. Gen. Peter C. Hains, United States Army (retired), for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans."

Civil Engineer Mordecai T. Endicott, United States Navy, for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by act of Congress approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans."

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Lincoln Avery, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Huron, in the State of Michigan.

Frederick W. Collins, of Mississippi, to be collector of customs for the district of Pearl River, in the State of Mississippi.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Herman F. Cellerius, of Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Ohio.

INDIAN AGENT.

Dana H. Kelsey, of the Indian Territory, to be agent for the Indians of the Union Agency, in the Indian Territory.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

T. N. Allen, of Olympia, Wash., to be receiver of public moneys at Olympia, Wash.

Frank W. Cockburn, of Devils Lake, N. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Devils Lake, N. Dak.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Sylvanus M. Ferris, of Medora, N. Dak., to be register of the land office at Dickinson, N. Dak.

Thomas H. Bartlett, of Grangeville, Idaho, to be register of the land office at Lewiston, Idaho.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Robert G. Boyd to be postmaster at Glenellyn, in the county of Du Page and State of Illinois.

Fred A. Busse to be postmaster at Chicago, in the State of Illinois.

Hibben S. Corwin to be postmaster at Peru, in the county of Lasalle and State of Illinois.

Fritz Dorries to be postmaster at Breese, in the county of Clinton and State of Illinois.

George H. Forster to be postmaster at Tonica, in the county of Lasalle and State of Illinois.

Americus Gasaway to be postmaster at Herrin, in the county of Williamson and State of Illinois.

William H. Gilliam to be postmaster at Vienna, in the county of Johnson and State of Illinois.

Herrick Houghton to be postmaster at Gilman, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois.

Edward A. Jeffers to be postmaster at Kankakee, in the county of Kankakee and State of Illinois.

Malcolm T. McIntyre to be postmaster at Ladd, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois.

Mary McLaughlin to be postmaster at Lake Forest, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois.

Edward J. Meyer to be postmaster at Des Plaines, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

Sidney B. Miller to be postmaster at Cairo, in the county of Alexander and State of Illinois.

George J. Patterson to be postmaster at Genoa, in the county of Dekalb and State of Illinois.

Schuyler C. Rutherford to be postmaster at Watseka, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois.

Elbert C. Stanley to be postmaster at Downers Grove, in the county of Dupage and State of Illinois.

Walter Stickney to be postmaster at Warren, in the county of Jo Daviess and State of Illinois.

Cornelius Sullivan to be postmaster at Riverside, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

William M. Swingle to be postmaster at Athens, in the county of Menard and State of Illinois.

William H. Voelpel to be postmaster at Morton, in the county of Tazewell and State of Illinois.

Loren E. Wheeler to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Sangamon and State of Illinois.

Abraham L. Williams to be postmaster at Edinburg, in the county of Christian and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

Lawrence V. Buskirk to be postmaster at Bloomington, in the county of Monroe and State of Indiana.

John W. Emison to be postmaster at Vincennes, in the county of Knox and State of Indiana.

Samuel E. Gray to be postmaster at Terre Haute, in the county of Vigo and State of Indiana.

Archer R. Orr to be postmaster at Carlisle, in the county of Sullivan and State of Indiana.

Taylor Reagan to be postmaster at Plainfield, in the county of Hendricks and State of Indiana.

Joseph A. Yockey to be postmaster at Plymouth, in the county of Marshall and State of Indiana.

IOWA.

Edwin N. Bailey to be postmaster at Britt, in the county of Hancock and State of Iowa.

William W. Boylan to be postmaster at Hubbard, in the county of Hardin and State of Iowa.

H. E. Deater to be postmaster at Shenandoah, in the county of Page and State of Iowa.

Frank C. Downey to be postmaster at Dexter, in the county of Dallas and State of Iowa.

Rodney G. Hawkins to be postmaster at Wapello, in the county of Louisa and State of Iowa.

Charles V. Hoffmann to be postmaster at Oskaloosa, in the county of Mahaska and State of Iowa.

Elmer E. Johnston to be postmaster at Rockwell City, in the county of Calhoun and State of Iowa.

John Morrison to be postmaster at Hedrick, in the county of Keokuk and State of Iowa.

Jacob Mummert to be postmaster at Prairie City, in the county of Jasper and State of Iowa.

William H. Nolte to be postmaster at Holstein, in the county of Ida and State of Iowa.

C. H. Smith to be postmaster at Rock Rapids, in the county of Lyon and State of Iowa.

MINNESOTA.

Mark K. Flower to be postmaster at St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota.

NEBRASKA.

Josiah Coombs to be postmaster at Spencer, in the county of Boyd and State of Nebraska.

Samuel G. Pheasant to be postmaster at Osceola, in the county of Polk and State of Nebraska.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Daniel L. Grier to be postmaster at Watsontown, in the county of Northumberland and State of Pennsylvania.

William S. Schlichter to be postmaster at Sellersville, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania.

Robert M. Swisher to be postmaster at Mount Jewett, in the county of McKean and State of Pennsylvania.

William E. Wade to be postmaster at Saegerstown, in the county of Crawford and State of Pennsylvania.

TENNESSEE.

Robert H. Hayes to be postmaster at Lewisburg, in the county of Marshall and State of Tennessee.

David A. Munn, jr., to be postmaster at Halls, in the county of Lauderdale and State of Tennessee.

William S. Raulston to be postmaster at Chattanooga, in the county of Hamilton and State of Tennessee.

Frances D. Robertson to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Robertson and State of Tennessee.

Euclid W. Smartt, jr., to be postmaster at Manchester, in the county of Coffee and State of Tennessee.

James W. Taylor to be postmaster at Lafollette, in the county of Campbell and State of Tennessee.

Zada Wade to be postmaster at Kenton, in the county of Obion and State of Tennessee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *December 16, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted—

To Mr. COLE to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Lanson Zane, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

To Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of S. C. Chamberlain, Fifty-eighth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

To Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of William B. Kimball, Fifty-eighth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

To Mr. MILLER to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Thierman & Frost, no adverse report having been made thereon.

HOLIDAY ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Ways and Means to report back the accompanying concurrent resolution favorably.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Concurrent resolution No. 12.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, December 21, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian Thursday, January 4, 1906.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 71. An act requiring the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare a report upon the improvement of the Anacostia River flats.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1905, on the 20th day of said month.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 71. An act requiring the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare a report upon the improvement of the Anacostia River flats—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House resolution No. 42, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania in the chair.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address myself directly to the proposition that is immediately before the House for consideration, which, as I understand it, is, To what standing committee of this House should we refer that part of the President's message dealing with insurance? Before I proceed, however, I want to offer a few observations on the question of national supervision, as opposed to State supervision, which has been suggested to my mind mainly by the argument made by the gentleman from Kentucky. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the argument made by the gentleman from Kentucky is the most logical and concise of any that I have ever listened to in favor of State regulation as against national regulation. Notwithstanding that, however, I am still firmly of the opinion that Congress should have the power to regulate life insurance. As to whether it does have jurisdiction I confess I have great doubt in my mind. The gentleman referred with a great deal of eloquence to what he called the ancient landmarks, defining the difference between State and national control. I presume, Mr. Chairman, that at the time our Constitution was framed no one of our forefathers had the remotest idea that insurance would assume the great importance that it has assumed in recent years. At that time I presume there was no one who had the remotest idea, or who could have possibly conceived, that insurance would spread away beyond the bounds of State control and would assume the proportions that it has assumed at the present time. I can remember the time when a man who had his life insured was a curiosity in the neighborhood where he resided, and he was supposed to be surrounded by a sort of halo of providential protection that was denied to the ordinary citizen. The time has come that a man who does not have his life insured, unless he is prevented from securing such insurance by some physical disability, is almost a curiosity. Life insurance, to which I refer, has spread and taken within its folds all the civilized world. It reaches out its helping hand to millions of beneficiaries all over civilization. It carries succor to the humble home after the hand which had provided for it is cold and helpless. It carries comfort and peace to the fireside of the poor and needy. It drives the wolf from the door of those who hunger. It carries assistance and support to the widow and fatherless and clothes with the mantle of protection the trembling form of the innocent child. Those who have charge of insurance moneys are charged with a duty not only to the State, but to all humanity. The man who misappropriates those sacred funds not only commits an offense against the law of the land, but he steals from the dead and robs the unborn child of its lawful inheritance. It is a subject, therefore, in which not only all people are interested, but one which should be guarded and protected by the strong arm of the law in order that its beneficent influences may be felt to the widest extent possible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] must remember, and he can not help but observe, that all of the evils that have been disclosed by the recent insurance investigation, and which have been so eloquently pictured here on the floor of the House by those who have preceded me, all came about in every instance by the violation of State law. Every failure to carry out the sacred trust—every one of them—has come about under State regulation of insurance. There is no instance to which we have been cited, there is no occurrence that has been developed by this investigation, but what discloses truly and forcefully that, so far in our history, State regulation of insurance has been a failure. But, Mr. Chairman, there are other reasons than this why we should try some other remedy. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] very truthfully said that that people were governed best who were governed least. It is true, Mr. Chairman, but to my mind it is an argument in favor of national supervision rather than State supervision.

Why, sir, insurance companies have been governed by the laws of more than forty States. There has been too much government of insurance, none of which has been effective. I do not mean to say, Mr. Chairman, that if we had national supervision of insurance everything would be always right. I do not claim that that would make men pure. There would be crime, and there would be disregard of duty then. There has always been, and I presume there always will be, in this world men who commit crime, men who will violate the trust that is placed in them by their fellow-men. Yea, it has been true of heaven itself. We are told in Holy Writ that the devil was once an angel in good standing in the holy city. If he had committed no crime or done no wrong, I presume he would be there yet, and as a result we would have no hell to frighten us into the path of duty. But, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that all of these different States, passing different laws in regard to the regulation of something in which all of the people have a common interest, is one of the great arguments why we should have national supervision and a law of Congress that would control alike all insurance companies in all of the States in the Union.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not only our duty to legislate, if we can constitutionally do so, for the benefit of the insured, but we ought to protect all honest insurance companies. There is no conflict of interest between the people who hold policies of insurance and the insurance companies themselves, provided the companies are honestly and rightfully administered. We ought to protect insurance companies as well as the insured. We ought to protect all honest endeavors to carry out, in the best of faith, the best kind of insurance. Under present conditions insurance companies are subjected to all of the different laws of all of the different States of the Union. One State will require one condition before it will admit a company to do business within its limits. Another State will require an entirely different condition, and it is possible for one State to require some thing or condition for admittance within its borders that another State may regard as an absolute bar to admission into their State. So that the only way to get out of the controversy and avoid all of the difficulties that follow under the present regulation would be to give Congress the power to legislate.

Mr. Chairman, I believe as a rule people have a greater respect for the law of the nation than they do for the law of a State, and that men frequently violate laws of a State with impunity, but hesitate to violate the laws of the nation, where punishment is swifter and surer.

Mr. Chairman, there is a question that arises in my mind as to whether Congress has the constitutional right to pass any act that will be effective. And, coming now to the immediate question before the House, the question arises as to which committee we shall refer those parts of the President's message speaking of insurance. It is argued by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that the only way we can reach insurance companies is by virtue of the taxing power of the Constitution. It is argued by the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee that the right way to reach it is to pass some act under that clause of the Constitution giving us control of interstate traffic.

It is argued by others that the only way we can reach it is to pass some law that will limit the use of the mails in the United States to insurance companies, and require them, as a condition for the use of the mails, that they shall comply with certain rules and regulations. Mr. Chairman, there is in all of these propositions a doubt expressed. The Supreme Court has emphatically said, in a unanimous decision, gentlemen, that insurance is not interstate commerce, and the only hope of those, as I understand it, who believe that we can regulate insurance by virtue of that clause of the Constitution is that the Supreme Court will reverse its decision. It seems to me that this is not a safe rule by which we ought to be guided in our legislation here. I doubt very much whether we could secure adequate regulation by virtue of the taxing power. I doubt very much whether we could secure adequate regulation by virtue of the rule requiring them to conform to our regulations before they are entitled to the use of the mails. Therefore, all through, gentlemen on one hand are claiming one thing and gentlemen on the other hand claiming another, but all agreeing that there is great doubt as to whether we have any jurisdiction, and if we have the jurisdiction under one or other of these parts of our Constitution whether it is sufficient to give us power to properly and adequately remedy the evils that recent investigation has disclosed now and for some time have existed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, has stated that it is the custom of the Speaker to refer to the different committees the various bills in accordance with the nature of the proposed legislation contained within the bills themselves, although some of the bills may contain provisions that would be proper to refer to another committee, yet that uniformly they are all referred to one committee having general jurisdiction of the subject. I believe that wherever we have a committee upon a given subject that the rule has always been adhered to; but you must bear in mind that this House has not a committee on insurance—another evidence of doubt as to our jurisdiction. Those who framed the rules undoubtedly thought the Congress had no jurisdiction of insurance.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS] has shown us conclusively that it has been the custom to refer bills to different committees than the committee on the subject-matter, so that there is no reason on that ground that we should refer it to the Committee on Ways and Means. There is no reason on any of these grounds that we should refer it to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The same objection applies to referring it to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads. All through there is a doubt; and there can be no question but what every man who has given the matter consideration, every lawyer who has investigated the subject, although he may himself have definite ideas on the question, is compelled to admit to himself that on account of the decisions of the Supreme Court he must at least doubt what would be the result of legislation along any of these lines.

There is another reason, Mr. Chairman, why we should not refer this matter to any of these committees, and that is that we do not want to commit ourselves to any particular line of policy. We want, as I understand it, to do that which will bring the most effective, righteous regulation of the insurance question; and we do not want to confine ourselves to the taxing power if we have any other power. We do not want to confine ourselves to the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution if there is a doubt about it, or any other power under the Constitution.

It seems to me the only way for this House to get out of this difficulty, and take away all possibility of doubt is to be advised by a committee whose duty and whose business it is to advise us on such subjects, and that we ought to refer the matter in the President's message in controversy to the Committee on the Judiciary. I submit, gentlemen, that that will do away with any idea of committing ourselves to any particular line of policy. It will give us information by a body of men qualified to judge as to just what our difficulties are in the premises. It may be found possible, after that investigation, that they will come to the conclusion that in order to get adequate jurisdiction to regulate the matter properly it will be necessary that an amendment to the Constitution of the United States should be adopted. I know that this is a difficult proposition ordinarily; but, Mr. Chairman, the people are aroused on this subject and I believe if the Congress of the United States, at the beginning of this session should pass a proper amendment it would be ratified by enough States to make it a law before this Congress adjourns. So that before our adjournment we could properly legislate and properly act to give relief to a suffering people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, every one, as I stated, who has considered this matter has had a doubt. Let us read what the President has said in regard to it; what he has so courageously and ably stated in his message. I find he quotes with approval what he said in a former message to Congress:

> I said in my last annual message I recommended that Congress carefully consider whether the power of the Bureau of Corporations could constitutionally be extended to cover the case of transactions in insurance.

Further along, in summing up his able argument, he recommends that—

> Congress should carefully consider whether further legislation can be had.

He is not committed to any particular line of policy that he wants us to follow. He is not committed to the one idea of giving the Bureau of Corporations additional power on this subject, but in every line he has submitted you will find that he wants effective legislation on this subject without regard to the particular executive branch whose duty it shall be made to enforce the law. Through all his argument, however, it is clearly to be seen that he has a doubt as to just what jurisdiction we have or whether in fact we have any.

He wants us to "consider" whether we have power to enact any further legislation on this subject. That is the question he has submitted to us. That is the question that we are going to refer and to which we want an answer. Now, where is it to be referred?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow me?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I desire to ask a question or two, and I will preface my question with the statement that I do not altogether agree with the gentleman in relation to the functions of the Committee on the Judiciary. I understand that committee simply has charge of matters pertaining to the judicial branch of the Government, and that it is no more the duty of that committee to instruct us upon constitutional questions than it is our duty to instruct it. Now, suppose the subject of insurance should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that committee should decide that there is no power in Congress to regulate the subject of insurance under the commerce provision of the Federal Constitution. Would the gentleman expect that decision to conclude the balance of the Members of the House?

Mr. NORRIS. Not necessarily.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Then what is the use of sending it to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. NORRIS. Because we have to send it to some committee. I will admit, if the gentleman please, that when the committee report we will then have its report before us for action and determination, but it is through the instrumentality of sending it to that committee that we can rightfully consider the question here. We would not be bound by the report of the committee, although we might be influenced a great deal by the mature deliberation of the members of that committee.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Now, one other question. If it be the judgment of Congress that the Federal Government ought to have power to regulate the subject of insurance under the commerce clause of the Constitution, and if there still be some doubt about the existence of that power, would it not be better to enact a proper law and have it go to the final tribunal of arbitrament, the Supreme Court of the United States, finally to determine whether that power does exist, and then the country would be in shape to know whether the Constitution needs amendment in that respect?

Mr. NORRIS. In answer to the gentleman's question I will say that I do not believe that that would be the proper course to pursue, and I will briefly give my reasons for my belief. If we refer it, as he says, to the Committee on Interstate and

Foreign Commerce and let them enact a law and then let that go through all the details of traveling up through the different courts until it reaches the Supreme Court and a decision is finally rendered, we have lost several years of time, and the difficulty is going on all the while. Then there is another reason. The Supreme Court has already decided the matter, and the only hope is that the Supreme Court will reverse itself. So if that is the policy that we should pursue in such cases, and we should always adopt the same rule, we should never reach a conclusion. Why, sir, if it went to the Supreme Court and that court sustained its former decision, which I believe it would do, and the question came back again to us, the same argument would be good then as now, and gentlemen could argue, "Let us pass another bill and give the Supreme Court another chance to reverse itself."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. One other question. I agree with the gentleman in the view that the question seems to have been definitely settled by the Supreme Court of the United States; but in view of the changed character of insurance now as compared to what it was in the time that the case of Paul *v.* Virginia was decided it may be that the court would take a different view of it. But I want to correct the suggestion that the gentleman made that I favor referring the subject to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am opposed to referring it to any committee, and would allow the Speaker a free hand to refer bills to the different committees according to their character. That is my attitude.

Mr. NORRIS. If the gentleman will pardon me, as far as referring the bills with a free hand by the Speaker is concerned, that is what I want, and referring this to the Judiciary Committee will in no sense be an instruction to the Speaker that he shall refer insurance bills to the Judiciary Committee. Not by any means; but, on the other hand, if it was referred to some other committee it might be taken by the Speaker as the opinion of this House that he should refer all bills to such committee.

In further reply to the gentleman from Indiana, I want to say that one of the reasons why I advocate the reference of this matter in the President's message to the Judiciary Committee is that we may not at this time go on record ourselves as to just what committee shall have the proper jurisdiction. We are called upon to answer a legal question. It ought to go to the committee having jurisdiction of such matters.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I will.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not wish to embarrass the gentleman in his remarks, because I consider that he is making a very good argument on this question, and has given it considerable thought; but if he will permit me just a moment, I should like to ask a question, but in doing so would like to repeat some things that have been said.

Mr. NORRIS. All right; I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yesterday and the day before, during the discussion of this matter—and I consider that the House has exceeded the rules in so doing—the President and his message have been drawn into the discussion. There seems to be a difference of opinion as to what the President intended. And now the gentleman himself, in discussing it, is trying to make plain, if possible, what the President did intend in his message. The gentleman also stated in the beginning that he wished to confine himself strictly to the question at issue, and that apparently is to what appropriate committee shall this question be consigned. Now, I wish to read a portion of section 2 of Rule XXIV of this House.

Messages from the President shall be referred to the appropriate committees without debate.

I would like to ask the gentleman how he will interpret that, and if, in view of that rule, the two or three days of discussion, which has taken the form of debate upon the meaning of the message itself, is proper. Should not the matter be left to the Speaker of this House to refer it to what he considers the proper committees, without debate, and especially without debate upon what is contained in the message?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman's inquiry I want to say, in the first place, that if we have been violating the rule of the House I am not to blame for that; the discussion, if the gentleman's contention be true, is going on regardless of that rule. It has nothing to do, as I look at it, with the question now before us; but I believe there is no violation of that rule. The President's message was referred without debate; it was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and this committee is trying to subdivide it and refer it to different appropriate committees under a special resolution that has been introduced.

Now, I do not care to discuss that proposition, because, as I look at it, it is immaterial now whether we are violating a rule or not. It is a question that might come up in a different way, but I do not see how it can affect us here at the present time. We are discussing it, we have discussed it, even if there is a rule against it, and if it be true that we are violating a rule we are in the position of the man in jail whose lawyer said that they could not put him in jail for the alleged offense, but he found himself there just the same.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If the gentleman will pardon me just a moment, I think the gentleman is in error in that he says we are following the rule strictly, because it has been referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The language of this portion of the rule I have referred to is peculiar: "Messages from the President shall be referred to appropriate committees without debate." You are attempting to refer it to appropriate committees, and I should judge you were debating some of the substance of the President's message, as, for instance, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] particularly debated and drew some just and some unjust criticisms upon that message. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], in an elaborate and eloquent speech, did the same. The gentleman from Nebraska is trying to give his version of the President's message, and to my mind it is a distinct violation of this rule.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not understand that that can make any difference even if it is a violation; but I do not believe it is a violation of the rule. We are now in a committee; we are now a committee. This is not the House, but the Committee of the Whole House. It has been "appropriately" referred to this committee, and "without debate," and we are trying to refer from this committee to subcommittees the different portions of that message.

Now, I was not quite through with my answer to the gentleman from Indiana. He said he did not agree with me that it ought to go to the Judiciary Committee; that he did not think it was their duty. Now, Mr. Chairman, it may be that in these specific terms the duty under the rules of the Judiciary Committee is not defined in the way I have interpreted it, but it has been the custom of the House to refer questions of law to the Judiciary Committee, that has jurisdiction of legal matters, and when that committee reports it comes back to us and we then pass upon it, and pass upon it effectively. We must refer it to some committee. It can not reach a conclusion without some reference. We can not reach the judgment of this House in any other way. The proper course would be to let the Judiciary Committee investigate it and report to us in the light of their wisdom and ability.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said, it seems to me that the President himself, in his message, as clear as can be, expresses a doubt; every man who has had anything to do with that subject has expressed a doubt, and I believe if we want to get right we should refer the matter to the Judiciary Committee, and thus relieve ourselves of any position taken in favor of any particular line of legislation. I do not think we should take any particular line before that committee has properly investigated and passed upon the matter. I have incorporated in a motion, which I shall offer at the proper time, an instruction to the Judiciary Committee to report to us, giving their idea as to what jurisdiction, if any, we have upon the subject of insurance. And I want to give notice now that at the right time, when the place in the bill is reached, I shall offer that amendment. It strikes me, therefore, that we ought, if we agree with this idea, vote down every amendment that may be offered referring it to any other committee and adopt an amendment that shall refer it properly to the Committee on the Judiciary. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, which I reserved yesterday, to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish, as briefly as possible, to call attention to the practical results of the assumption of control of insurance companies by the Federal Government. In the first place, I am firmly of the opinion that if the Federal Government takes jurisdiction of insurance companies it will multiply the evils that it means to cure, and instead of rendering these companies more liable to the law will grant them a practical immunity from the responsibility they are now attempting to shirk. In the first place, it is a rare and an unusual spectacle that the thief, caught red handed with his plunder about him, confessing his guilt almost without a blush, should himself suggest to us that the best means of punishing him is by placing him under Federal jurisdiction, where his punishment may be more speedy and more severe. No man

knows better than the insurance company itself where the danger lies. Long experience has convinced us that no one knows better how to evade the law than they. The only hope that I entertain of ever seeing these predatory bands of organized marauders, who play like harpies upon the helpless and the dead, brought to justice is by the awakened energies of State legislatures and the awakened conscience of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You must remember that the assumption of Federal jurisdiction means the destruction of State control. It is inevitable. There is no lawyer upon either side of this Chamber who will question or doubt it. The ground upon which the Federal courts refuse to the State courts jurisdiction of common carriers is that the common carriers are engaged in interstate commerce. The principle upon which the Federal courts and the Supreme Court of the United States have again and again refused to take jurisdiction of insurance companies is that they are not engaged in interstate commerce and are not subject to Federal control. In the case of Hooper *v.* California and in the case of Crutcher *v.* Kentucky, one being the corollary of the other, this question is undoubtedly settled. Says Justice White, in the case of Hooper *v.* California:

> The principle that the right of a foreign corporation to engage in business in a State other than that of its creation depends solely upon the will of such other State has long been settled, and many phases of its application have been illustrated by the decisions of this court.
>
> While there are exceptions to this rule, they embrace only cases where a corporation created by one State rests its right to enter another and engage in business therein upon the Federal nature of its business, as, for instance, where it has derived its being from an act of Congress, and has become a lawful agency for the performance of governmental or quasi governmental functions or where it is necessarily an instrumentality of interstate commerce, or its business constitutes such commerce, it is therefore solely within the paramount authority of Congress.

In the case of Crutcher *v.* Kentucky, the legislature of Kentucky passed a law by which it forced express companies to give a bond with approved security that they had in assets subject to execution at least the sum of $150,000, for the protection of persons intrusting valuables in their charge, and in that case the Supreme Court of the United States held that they could not be forced to make any such disclosures to the State governments, nor could they be forced to give any such bond, because they were engaged in interstate commerce. Now, apply that rule to insurance companies, and every provision of every State legislature in the United States requiring insurance companies to deposit bonds or to give evidence of their solvency before doing business in the State must fall to the ground under the rule in Crutcher *v.* Kentucky the minute they become interstate carriers. The jurisdiction of Federal courts and of State courts are not concurrent. The assumption of jurisdiction by the Federal court is the death of the last vestige of authority by the State courts.

The evil is worse than that. The minute the Supreme Court of the United States treats insurance companies as common carriers every individual case between an insured and the insurer where the amount in controversy exceeds $2,000 can, upon a petition of the insurance company that it is a foreign corporation, be immediately transferred to a Federal court, just as damage suits against railroads are transferred to-day. My God! what a haven of rest and protection it will be to these people if they can not only prey upon you collectively but can, after you have paid these enormous premiums through all your life and at last, using your burden as a pillow you sink to sleep, come and answer your widow and your orphan with the statement that the contract was obtained through fraud, or some other invalid defense, and carry them helpless and penniless some 500 miles to a Federal court of their own wise selection. [Applause.]

The evil is more deep seated than that. I wish in all solemnity and in the deepest earnestness of my soul to sound a note of warning to every Democrat on this side of the House, and I say this in no partisan sense—I wish to sound a note of warning to every man upon either side of this House who believes in a government composed of an autonomy of sovereign States indissolubly bound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. STANLEY. I ask for ten minutes, in order to conclude my remarks. I do not think I will need as much as that.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the gentleman be allowed ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is moved that the gentleman from Kentucky have ten minutes additional time to complete his remarks. Has any gentleman any objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STANLEY. I wish to say this to this House, that the greatest danger that menaces this Government, that ever menaced it from any source, is not from internecine strife or from foreign invasion. It is from the gradual and insidious assumption of unwarranted powers by the Federal judiciary. The founders of this Government wisely chose in balancing the executive, legislative, and judicial, one against the other, to avoid those rocks upon which all other ships of state had broken from the days of Pisistratus and the thirty tyrants until the revolution of 1688. There is no instance, so far as I know, in all history of the destruction of the liberties of the people by an autocratic government that has not arisen either from the executive having assumed the powers of the legislative or the legislative having assumed the powers of the executive. In order that the three coordinate branches of the Government might be safely, wisely, and perpetually balanced one against another, this Government tried an experiment which was in its form unique in all the history of the world. They placed the supreme authority, the right to check encroachments, the right to check the assumption of unwarranted powers, both on the part of the executive and on the part of the legislative, in the hands of the judiciary. In answering the question raised at the time as to the danger of giving this unusual and unprecedented power to the judiciary Alexander Hamilton used this language:

> This [i. e., the safety of delegating this power] may be inferred with certainty from the general nature of the judicial power, from the objects to which it relates, from the manner in which it is exercised, from its comparative weakness, and from its total incapacity to support its usurpations by force.

More than that, the high character of the judiciary, their freedom from the storms and tumult, the wild ambition that fires the blood of executives and of legislators, made it appear only the more safe. The founders of this Government assumed that the judiciary, secure for life in their serene retreats, with all the fairness, all the wisdom, all the placid composure that mark the august wearers of the ermine, might safely be made the monitors of the rulers of the nation; that they might stand both as censors and, if need be, as masters when the commanders of armies and when dignified legislatures assumed powers not lawfully their own. I want to show to you that the danger of giving to the judiciary this tremendous power escaped not the prophetic voice of him who has been pictured by the eloquent leader of this House as the wisest mere man who ever graced the earth. Even at that time, a hundred years ago and more, Thomas Jefferson saw the danger of the insidious undermining of the whole fabric of government by the assumption of unwarranted power on the part of the judiciary. He declared:

> I am sensible of the inroads daily making by the Federal into the jurisdiction of its coordinate associates, the State governments. The legislative and executive branches may sometimes err, but elections and dependence will bring them to rights. The judiciary branch is the instrument which, working like gravity, without intermission, is to press us at last into one consolidated mass.

Now, let us see what will be the effect of this. Suppose the Government takes control of insurance companies. It means that the Government shall take cognizance of an insurance contract. Now, I submit that a contract of insurance is among the simplest contracts ever made. It is simply an agreement by one party to indemnify another against loss in a given contingency. No contract of insurance need even to be in writing. It has nothing like the solemnity of a deed to 3 acres of land. It is a very complex affair, I know. It has been made complex by the red tape and the cunning of men who have made thievery a profession and plunder a business. [Applause.]

If the Federal Government can take cognizance of a simple contract of that kind because of the complexity of the contract, and not because in its nature it is interstate commerce, but because of the amount involved, then our liberties must decrease as our wealth accumulates. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the Federal Government can take cognizance of a simple contract of insurance it can then take cognizance of any business and every business transacted between individuals or corporations in different States. It is the death knell of the old circuit court. It is the death knell of the rights controlled by juries of your peers of the vicinage. It is the destruction of that fabric, save as to the method of penitentiaring a few thieves who do not engage in interstate plunder. Our courts are gone. You had better a thousand times call the President of the United States an autocrat, and make him one; better a thousand times give to this body authority of which its founders never dreamed and keep intact your courts at home. Keep pure, undefiled, its jurisdiction unassailed, that court which takes congnizance of your liberty, your property and your life, than destroy the autonomy of the courts and preserve the tinsel of a free government and of a republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Assume this jurisdiction, destroy the last vestige of the autonomy of the State, give to the Federal Government the right at will to take cognizance of any contract made with any individuals of different States, and all business will immediately

go into the Federal courts, because we are tied together to-day by a literal plexus of rail and wire. There is no business that is not interstate. Few, indeed, are they who are engaged in any business so small, so poor, that it does not extend beyond the boundaries of the Commonwealth in which it is conducted. Give them authority over insurance companies, and all business, all transactions, pass to the Federal courts, and to that court we all must go, poor and rich alike, with its costs and its delays. Take cognizance of insurance, with all its attendant evils, and I say to you that from that hour that fair and faultless fabric, that exqusite temple created and guarded by the wisdom, the patriotism, yea, the inspiration of Washington and Madison, Jefferson and Jay, is a myth and a memory. We may have a good Government—I pray God that we may have a free Government—but we cease to possess, we cease to enjoy, we cease to know that government founded by the wisdom, the courage, and the patriotism of our forefathers, and bequeathed by them as a priceless heritage to their posterity. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. YOUNG having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bill of the following title:

S. 410. An act to authorize the Rock Island, Arkansas and Louisiana Railroad Company to construct bridges across Ouachita River and other navigable rivers in the State of Arkansas.

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that it has been the custom of Chairmen in presiding over the Committee of the Whole to alternate between the two sides of the House. Inasmuch as one of the gentlemen on the right has been extremely obliging to his colleagues in affording time to speak, the Chairman will break the rule in this instance and recognize the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON].

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, in the course of his remarks yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] gave as one reason why he might not favor the reference of that part of the President's message regarding insurance companies to the Committee on the Judiciary was that the chairman of that committee had not during this debate contended for jurisdiction over the subject. The spirited controversy that has occurred between the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means as to which of these committees should have this subject for consideration and the silence of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary furnish a very potent reason why this matter should go to the Committee on the Judiciary. As an unpretentious member of the latter committee, I might say that its chairman is not anxious to have to undertake the arduous duty of making a special investigation of the regulation of life insurance companies. It is well known to the Members of this House that the Committee on the Judiciary has, in the ordinary course of legislation, at every session of Congress to deal with many questions of constitutional law, and that it spends much time in study and discussion. Undoubtedly the chairman and the Committee on the Judiciary would examine into every phase of the so-called insurance question and report back to this House if such duty should be imposed upon that committee.

This debate on the President's message will prove to be helpful in the determination of public questions, and it also furnishes substantial evidence that the Members of the House have not forgotten the limitations of the Federal Government, and that they have not been unmindful of the responsibility imposed by their oaths to support the Constitution of the United States. Good thought and excellent arguments have been adduced. In this connection it might be invidious to point out the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and his colleague [Mr. STANLEY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. They all made valuable contributions to a correct exposition of our scheme of government. Renewed attention has been called to the fact that we have a dual system of government, State and Federal, each independent and powerful in its own sphere, but utterly without authority when it undertakes to trespass upon the domain of the other. The Federal Government is vested with delegated powers, and every power not specially granted or fairly and necessarily implied for the exercise of a power granted is reserved to the States or to the people. So anxious were the fathers to emphasize this interpretation that they deemed it wise to embody it in the tenth amendment. We are compelled to ask ourselves what authority has the Federal Government for the regulation of insurance business. The highest court in the land has declared that such business is not interstate commerce. The ingenious argument is made that the taxing power furnishes a peg upon which to hang Federal jurisdiction. No Democrat ought to subscribe to that doctrine. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Federal Government has ample power to tax for revenue for the maintenance of the Government honestly and economically administered, but it can not rightfully and it ought not, as a mere pretext to conceal an unauthorized ulterior design, resort to the subterfuge of putting into the body of a measure which would otherwise certainly be held unconstitutional a provision for taxation for the purpose of conferring some sort of doubtful jurisdiction where otherwise there would clearly be no jurisdiction on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, as important as the regulation and control of insurance companies may be, we can console ourselves with the reflection that there resides power in the State to punish those who steal from the policy holders, to punish those who are intrusted with a great fund for the maladministration of their trust. These companies, the creatures of the State, are amenable to State laws, to home rule. And, further, it may be said that the public who deal with them can rebuke their conduct by withholding future business and by patronizing those who are honest and correct in their dealings and administrations. Already it seems that the State of New York has investigated and exposed the rascality practiced in the administration of the three greatest life insurance companies in the United States. The offending officials have been held up to public contempt, have been driven from their places of power, honest men have been put in control of the affairs of the companies, and we are not without hope that further punishment will be visited upon the offenders.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to indulge in any extended remarks about that feature of the President's message which refers to insurance companies. While the message is before us for consideration I desire within the hour which belongs to me under the rule of the House to discuss what I consider and the country believes to be a more important and urgent question, and one of which the Federal Government has undoubted jurisdiction, and one which has been urged upon the attention of Congress year after year—the regulation of the public carriers of the country engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. Chairman, public thought upon the question of Federal regulation of the great corporations engaged in interstate transportation has been divided. There are those who believe that the great transportation companies should be at perfect liberty to conduct their traffic without any regulation by Federal or State government. They indulge in the erroneous assumption that the business of these quasi-public corporations is analogous to that of a storekeeper or an individual engaged in some private enterprise. Those who entertain such thought are for the most part the railroad magnates and those who have allied interests. They are forgetful that these corporations are given extraordinary power, and that this power is given to them because of the service they owe to the public. These corporations may by condemnation proceedings take the land upon which the home of the citizen is situated—aye, more than that—they may even condemn for their purposes a cemetery where sleeps in sacred dust one's kin, or departed citizens of great renown. No individual, for the exploitation of any private enterprise, can exercise or invoke the exercise of such power. It is needless to dwell upon the many features that render these corporations the servants of the public and not the masters of the people. And, Mr. Chairman, there is another class, perhaps not very large, who believe that the Government should own and operate the great transportation companies. They seem to be unmindful of the fact that this would be of most doubtful authority; a most stupenduous undertaking, and one the administration of which would be most preplexing if not disastrous to the Government and to the people.

The ownership of 212,000 miles of railroad, to say nothing of the millions for equipment and maintenance, would cost more than $14,000,000,000. The Government could not purchase these railroads except by issuing bonds, and such a bond issue would amount to a monstrous interest-bearing public indebtedness necessarily perpetual—an indebtedness that could never be paid. The great multimillionaires would then have an ideal scheme upon which to build up and perpetuate from generation to generation a plutocracy—an aristocracy founded upon inherited and transmitted everlasting interest bearing public indebtedness. Such an aristocracy would be more hateful than that which the

fathers sought, by the abolishment of the law of primogeniture, to forever exclude from American soil. Besides, the scheme would nullify some of the most salutary laws of the States. There would be no more separate-coach statutes, which have proven in the South of so much benefit to the safety, convenience, and peace of the races. The evils wrought by the carpetbaggers of the reconstruction period would perhaps be excelled in enormity by the evil practices of carpetbag Federal railroad officials. But I must hasten on with the remarks that I wish to make in regard to proposed legislation. There is another division in the public thought. There are those, and I believe they constitute a majority of the American people, who believe that the Government of the United States ought to and must control by regulations the corporations engaged in interstate traffic. To this class and to those who entertain this view I believe a majority of the Members of this House belong. On several occasions in the past Congresses during my service here and before many of us became actors here the Members of the House have voted with practical unanimity for regulation of these transportation companies. The authority of Congress to enact such legislation as will effectually regulate and control such corporations is undoubted.

To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes is not only the power of Congress but one of its highest duties, and one now more urgent and pressing than at any period in the history of our country. In view of the public utterances of the President, and the fact that he has put his hand into the shirt collar of his party, particularly that part of it which sits in this House, and I hope that part of it which sits at the other end of the Capitol, and dragged it up by the force of his great personality to the advocacy of remedial legislation, I may now, without being accused of partisanship, congratulate the Republican party upon what I believe, or hope at least, is its determination to obey the popular demand. I may also refer to the attitude of the Democratic party. In 1896, after decisions of the Supreme Court emasculating the interstate-commerce law of 1887, the Democratic party took prompt and decisive position upon the interstate-transportation question, and suggested specifically the medium through which these corporations should be regulated or controlled. The Democratic platform of 1896 was in these words:

> The absorption of wealth by the few, the consolidation of our leading railroad systems, and the formation of trusts and pools require a stricter control by the Federal Government of those arteries of commerce. We demand the enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and such restrictions and guaranties in the control of railroads as will protect the people from robbery and oppression.

And again four years later, in 1900, the Democratic platform was in these words:

> We favor such an enlargement of the scope of the interstate-commerce law as will enable the Commission to protect individuals and communities from discriminations and the public from unjust and unfair transportation rates.

And last year, 1904, the Democratic platform was in the following language:

> A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. Individual equality of opportunity and free competition are essential to a healthy and permanent commercial prosperity, and any trust, combination, or monopoly tending to destroy these by controlling production, restricting competition, or fixing prices and wages should be prohibited and punished by law. We especially denounce rebates and discriminations by transportation companies as the most potent agency in promoting and strengthening these unlawful conspiracies against trade.
>
> We demand an enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the end that the traveling public and shippers of this country may have prompt and adequate relief from the abuses to which they are subjected in the matter of transportation. We demand a strict enforcement of existing civil and criminal statutes against all such trusts, combinations, and monopolies; and we demand the enactment of such further legislation as may be necessary effectually to suppress them.

So, Mr. Chairman, it may be said in truth that the great historic party to which I owe allegiance has been consistent, insistent, and persistent in its demand that power be conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to the end that these great corporations may be bridled, regulated, or controlled, with due, lawful, and proper recognition of the rights of the people who are compelled to pay the toll. I am led to make these remarks because one hears on every side of the President's position in favor of conferring these additional powers on the Interstate Commerce Commission. Such position on his part is creditable to him, but it was the position of the Democratic party long before he appeared in the national arena. In no platform of any national Republican convention has demand ever been made for conferring additional powers upon the Interstate Commerce Commission, and even in the late platform of the Republican party of the State of Ohio, that of 1905, the Republican party ran away from this position. That convention, presided over by Judge Taft, a member of the President's official family, refused to recommend such a remedy. They knew that the development of our country and the combination of the railroads have been such that in the railroad traffic we can no longer say competition is the life of trade, for there is no competition. That has been destroyed. Practically all the railroads of the country are now in the hands and under the control of six great combinations, who are in turn controlled by perhaps half a dozen multimillionaires. After competing lines have been absorbed there is no competition with which to fight onerous exactions or unjust discriminations or other evil practices——

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAYTON. Oh, I have not very long to speak.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, I only want to ask a question.

Mr. CLAYTON. I have not many minutes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Would it not be the necessary result of a systematic fixing of rates by a board that all competition is thereby destroyed?

Mr. CLAYTON. Competition has been destroyed by agreements and combinations. I am not sure that I understand the gentleman's question. The proposition that I apprehend will be brought before Congress is that Congress shall declare that interstate transportation rates shall be just and reasonable and that discrimatory practices and special privileges to particular shippers shall be unlawful, and in any given case complaint may be made to the Interstate Commerce Commission that provisions of this legislative standard have been violated, and that the Commission may then hear the case and if the complaint is sustained order that the unlawful practice shall cease, and that it may then fix a substitute rate reasonable and just or forbid the practice complained of, and that such order and decree shall become operative at once and shall remain in force and effect until set aside by the courts, if the court should ultimately decide the findings in the case to be unlawful. [Applause.]

It is proposed to give to the Commission the power to substitute a reasonable rate and a just practice for an unreasonable rate and an unjust practice.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman one question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Even if the enlarging of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission should destroy competition, is it not better that competition between railroad companies should be destroyed by the Interstate Commerce Commission fixing a rate that is reasonable than by their destroying competition themselves by fixing a rate that is extortionate? [Applause.]

Mr. CLAYTON. Undoubtedly. And yet we hear it said in this day and time that Congress ought not to control the railroads—ought not to enforce its power of control over them. Well, Congress has this power specifically confided to it in the commerce clause, and shall Congress in this day, when evils are complained of on every hand and of unjust practices, of discriminatory wrongs, of unreasonable exactions—shall Congress abdicate its power to control these gigantic corporations and let the corporations control themselves and a helpless public? [Applause.] The power and duty to regulate these railroads has been imposed upon Congress by the Constitution, and we can not rightfully surrender this power of regulation to the railroads.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Especially when the States have no power.

Mr. CLAYTON. The States have no power over interstate commerce, but they have the power to control them in local traffic, and some of the States have done that and other States are doing it more and more. I am glad that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] interrupted me a few minutes ago. I want to again advert to the fact that the last Republican platform in the State of Ohio this year ran away from the proposition to confer this additional power upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] That great party which has boasted of its courage was too cowardly in the State of Ohio when it came to write its last platform to stand up and declare for enlarged powers to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to interrupt?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. After the Republican party in Ohio had run away from that question, did not the Republican voters in

Ohio run away from the party? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CLAYTON. They seem to have, and seem to have elected a Democratic governor.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The only candidate upon the Republican ticket in Ohio this year who boldly spoke in favor of the proposition the gentleman is advocating was beaten by 40,000, while every man who did not do it was elected by over 40,000.

Mr. CLAYTON. Well, he was advocating a virtue and he must have had a very bad record. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] And the great Secretary of War, Mr. Taft, did not advocate in his speech before that convention this specific remedy, and the great Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] has never advocated it. Read his long controversy with one of the shipping associations at Cincinnati on this subject and read the bill that he has introduced during this session at the other end of the Capitol. He wants some sort of doubtful compromise machinery or court somewhere in the effort to delude, misguide, and fool the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This determination to give larger powers to the Interstate Commerce Commission since the act of 1887 was emasculated has been contended for in every Democratic convention, and when we pass an effectual act, a Democratic act by the aid of Republican votes, an act which is approved by the Republican President, who on that proposition is Democratic, we on this side of the aisle can joint in your congratulation. You Republicans have sometimes accused the Democrats of camping this year where you camped last year. In this matter you can not deny that your President is camping and is trying to make his party camp where the Democratic party has been camping from 1896 down to this good hour. [Applause.]

We can congratulate the country and the Republican party for coming to our position. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You have come to our position. Now do not run away from it; stand up to your President. We are going to stand by him. He is maintaining our doctrine, and we are going to uphold his hands. We are going to help him put these laws upon the statute books, if he and his party be as brave as he promises. Do not bring here from your committee, and I appeal to you, some other new court, some other new machinery, some other long and windy measure—doubtful and requiring judicial construction. Take some of these simple propositions offered by the gentleman from Mississippi or by the gentleman from New York, or any good, simple bill offered by any Member, and report it to this House. Give whatever name you please to it. This is one time when if a measure of that sort comes here branded the "Grosvenor bill" or the "Hepburn bill" or with any other name we will vote for it cheerfully. We will be glad to help you put it through, but do not arrogate to yourselves all the virtue of such legislation. You came to our position. Why? Your President knew. He was wiser than most of you on that side. The President has recognized the fact, I think, in some of his public utterances that the time has come in this country when you must choose between government control and government ownership. The President has taken the Democratic position of government control under the ample power of the Constitution without resorting to any doubtful power of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the country is to be congratulated upon what I hope is about to happen in Congress. Let academic discussions that are indulged in by champions of the great corporations against this proposed legislation now be relegated to the past. Congress undoubtedly has the power to regulate to the full extent now demanded by the public the corporations engaged in transportation between the States and with foreign countries. The State governments have ample authority under their reserved powers to deal with questions and evils of intrastate or local nature. Many of the States have exercised and are now exercising to their rightful extent under their own appropriate State legislation the regulation of local traffic and local rates, and those States that have not exercised such power have this duty resting upon them. The power of the State to legislate is without limit except the limitations imposed by the Federal Constitution or the State constitution.

It will be remembered that the interstate-commerce law was passed in 1887. For ten years the railroads or transportation companies of the country yielded respect to that law. They obeyed almost without exception during those ten years the mandates of the Interstate Commerce Commission; but since 1896, when that law was emasculated by the decisions of the courts, they have defied the Commission. During the time of their acquiescence in the act of 1887, the through or interstate rates of the country were regulated by the Commission and for the most part accepted by the transportation companies, and the tendency was then to make railroad rates lower and lower, but since that act was impaired by the courts the tendency has been to make the rates more unreasonable and more extortionate, and so extortionate and high in many cases that a suffering public has aroused the indignation of the country and has appealed to Congress, and I am glad to say that the Congress and the President seem not to be deaf to this appeal. [Applause.]

Now, perhaps it would be useless to refer further to the power of Congress to deal with this question. The Granger cases decided that there is a governmental power authorizing the establishing of rates. And since the Granger cases the Supreme Court has decided that the States have the power to authorize the fixing of rates of railroad companies by and through a commission in local or State traffic, and the principle of confiding such a power to a commission by the State is the same principle that upholds the authority of Congress to confer a like power upon a commission to regulate rates in interstate traffic.

The line of demarcation between the powers of the Federal Government and of the State governments have been clearly laid down and observed in a number of railroad cases, just as in other cases not railroad cases. When we had the trust question under consideration, perhaps the best exposition that was found in any case of the power of Congress to deal with combinations or conspiracies against interstate commerce was what is known as the Addyston Pipe case, where a combination of iron pipe companies made agreements in restraint of trade, affecting trade in different States, an agreement to control the markets and to regulate prices. The Supreme Court declared that to be unlawful and contrary to the antitrust act.

The same reasoning applies in these railroad cases, where the power of a State to deal with local matters is differentiated from the power of the Federal Government to deal with interstate traffic.

Now, let me further refer to the necessity for this legislation. That Congress should deal with this question has been apparent for a number of years. The necessity for it became so strong in 1887, ten years before the gentleman from Georgia, my friend Mr. GRIGGS, now listening to me, and I made our advent here. Congress then passed an act conferring the power to regulate this traffic upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. What were some of the reasons why this legislation was necessary? Why, rebates was one of the reasons, where railroads gave to certain favored shippers and withheld these rebates from other shippers. Manifestly the shipper thus discriminated against could not long compete with the shipper thus favored. But the evil of rebates has to some extent been remedied. The morning press to-day shows that under what is known as the "Elkins law," the act of 1903, for which all of us who were here then voted, the present Administration, through its subordinate officers, is now engaged in the laudable undertaking of prosecuting railroads and individuals for giving and receiving rebates. That law penalized rebates, and the fruits of that wise legislation are now being reaped.

But that is not all nor was not all of the necessity for conferring additional powers upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is proposed by this side of the House, and I believe by the other side now, to confer upon the Interstate Commerce Commission these additional powers. I hope that the majority party at this end of the Capitol at last have abandoned the idea of creating some sort of court, of creating some sort of new machinery, or some doubtful method of remedying public evils. I believe they have come to the position of conferring a few more simple powers upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. [Applause.]

And what else? Not only rebates, not only discriminatory and unjust and unreasonable rates to be revised, but the private car evil is to be abated. The terminal-facility evil is to be abolished. You can read the reports and the testimony and complaints of the shippers against the private car wrongs and abuses. You can read of the favors that are shown to some and denied to others. They need not be enumerated. Why, a gentleman in this city a few days ago, a commission merchant that does a large business, told me that his business in the sale of butter had been well-nigh ruined and that he was helpless. He said that the private car system as now operated and used by all the large combinations and corporations of the country was one of the greatest evils connected with our present railroad traffic.

The only reason a man can have for desiring private cars is to gain some undue advantage over smaller shippers. To illustrate: Say the cost for shipping a car of butter from Chicago to Washington is 70 cents per 100 pounds, or $140 for a car,

minimum weight of 20,000 pounds, and 10,000 additional pounds are loaded in this car. The small shipper must pay an additional amount of $70 on this car. Why? Because the small shipper using the regular public car, the railroad company will be sure to weigh his car and force him to pay the additional charges, while large combinations and corporations who use their own private cars load them in the West themselves and unload them in the East themselves, and the only time the railroad company sees them is when the engine backs into the siding to hook onto these cars to haul them away, and therefore never weigh them. Thus the great advantage to the large corporations in having and using their own private cars. Another illustration: Say a large beef company having their own private refrigerator cars can hang up in these cars 20,000 pounds of beef and then shove in a hundred tubs of butter or a hundred cases of eggs or 50 boxes or dressed poultry under the hanging 20,000 pounds of beef, and thus bring the butter, eggs, or dressed poultry east without additional charge because their cars are not weighed, but come through at the minimum weight of 20,000 pounds. The railroads will say these private cars are weighed just like those of the smaller shippers, but this is not true. These are only a few of the wrongful practices of these large trusts, combinations, and corporations through the assistance of the railroad companies and show a just reason for the abolishment of the private car system. All shippers, large and small, should be treated alike in railroad traffic. All cars should be weighed, and there should be a penalty for not weighing.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose at this time to make a legal argument in regard to railroad rate legislation. Congress ought not to shirk its duty of regulating interstate commerce, a part of which is the transportation of passengers and freight between the States. According to adjudicated cases, Congress has the power to provide for reasonable and just rates and against discriminatory practices, and can confer the administration of this law upon a commission. No constitutional objection can be interposed against such a law for the exercise of such administrative power. The courts have the power to prevent such administration from becoming confiscatory. No one need be disturbed by the refinements of lawyers who oppose the proposed legislation. To give these enlarged powers to the Interstate Commerce Commission is in accordance with the recommendation of the President and in harmony with the demand of the country, and ought to be enacted into law without delay. [Applause.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, my colleague [Mr. GOULDEN] from New York addressed the House briefly yesterday. He is absent to-day and has requested me to ask unanimous consent that he may have the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his colleague [Mr. GOULDEN] may have opportunity to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to entertain the House, or to attempt to do so, by any speech on the general subject of insurance or on any of the other questions that have been principally talked about in this debate. Without apology, I venture to call the attention of the committee back to the question which is under discussion. This is a debate about the proper reference of a particular portion of the President's message. It seems to me that unless the House of Representatives is to refuse to give consideration to the President's view in this matter it must necessarily, by reason of the language itself, make one reference, namely, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It seems to me that the very language of the message itself settles beyond question the propriety of its reference. Whether bills might come before the House dealing with the subject-matter and properly referable to other committees is something that I do not prospose to discuss, because it does not now arise. But the language of the President's message bears reference solely to two things—commerce and regulation. And I repeat, it seems to me that the language of the message settles conclusively the propriety of the reference.

Let us see what the language is, the reference of which we are now talking about. In the first place, the message says:

> The great insurance companies afford striking examples of corporations whose business has extended so far beyond the jurisdiction of the States which created them as to preclude strict enforcement of supervision and regulation by the parent States. In my last annual message I recommended that the Congress carefully consider whether the power of the Bureau of Corporations can not constitutionally be extended to cover interstate transactions in insurance.

The language we are talking about has reference to the regulation of commerce. Gentlemen have cited the Supreme Court of the United States to show that, in their opinion, the Government of the United States may not regulate insurance companies under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution because insurance is not commerce. Whether it is or is not, whether those decisions are controlling or are not controlling, whether they are in point or not, is not a subject pertinent to this discussion. The question is, What reference shall be made of that part of the President's message in which the President of the United States asks Congress to consider the question of the regulation of these insurance companies?

But let me go, Mr. Chairman, a little further into this language. I read:

> But much can be done by legislation which is not only drastic but practical. There is need of a far stricter and more uniform regulation of the vast insurance interests of this country. The United States should in this respect follow the policy of other nations by providing adequate national supervision of commercial interests which are clearly national in character.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to discuss the question as to whether that is right or wrong. I do not propose to discuss the question whether under the Constitution we may or may not do that; but the question before the House, and the only one, is of the proper reference of this language. Clearly it should be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Again, the President says:

> During the Administrations of Presidents Cleveland, Harrison, and McKinley the State Department exercised its influence, through diplomatic channels, to prevent unjust discrimination by foreign countries against American insurance companies. These negotiations illustrated the propriety of the Congress recognizing the national character of insurance, for in the absence of Federal legislation the State Department could only give expression to the wishes of the authorities of the several States, whose policy was ineffectual through want of uniformity.

In one case the President speaks of the regulation of insurance as among the States, and in the next place of the regulation of insurance in the relations between this country and foreign governments.

Again, the President says:

> I repeat my previous recommendation that the Congress should also consider whether the Federal Government has any power or owes any duty with respect to domestic transactions in insurance of an interstate character.

Again:

> The inability of a State to regulate effectively insurance corporations created under the laws of other States and transacting the larger part of their business elsewhere is also clear.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while we have been greatly entertained, perhaps also instructed, by the speeches which have been made in this debate on the general subject of insurance and by the speeches which have been aimed at graft, by the argument which was made yesterday on the general question of the powers of the Federal Government and the States, my purpose in arising is to call the attention of the House to the fact that those speeches, eloquent as they were, able and instructive as they were, had no relation whatever to the question now before the committee, that question being whether we will give a consideration at all to the President's recommendation that the Congress of the United States examine into the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States with reference to the regulation of insurance under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. Neither do I understand those arguments which have tended to maintain that wherever a question of the jurisdiction of the House is up for consideration we should refer the matter to the Judiciary Committee. Every committee of this House has constantly to determine its own jurisdiction and the jurisdiction of the House of the matter referred to it. I admit the great legal ability—I assert, I would rather say, the great legal ability—of the distinguished gentlemen who compose the Committee on the Judiciary, but the subject of the jurisdiction of the Government under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution has been more considered by, and is more in the line of determination of, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce than of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I shall submit, Mr. Chairman, but one consideration further in this matter. It has been argued that the Committee on Ways and Means have jurisdiction of this subject through the taxing power of the Government. If the Government of the United States would propose to tax insurance companies in order to raise revenue, I should agree, possibly, to the proposition; but nobody wants to tax insurance companies. The President of the United States has not referred to it at all with reference to raising revenue. The truth is, that this whole contention comes about, this whole subject is in the minds of the people of this country to-day, not because they want the insur-

ance companies taxed, but because the insurance companies have been taxed too much already by means of "graft." The purpose of the President of the United States, the real purpose of the people of this country, and the object of Members of this House, is not to tax insurance companies, but to preserve the great insurance companies from being pilfered by those who have their management and control. We wish to save their funds, and not to tax them. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I have uniformly voted against any proposition to take jurisdiction of a subject and regulate it under the taxing power, when the raising revenue was a mere pretext. When the proposition was made in this House to tax oleomargarine, believing that it was not the real intention to raise revenue, but that the purpose of the measure was to get jurisdiction of the subject-matter, and if possible tax oleomargarine out of existence, or at least discriminate against one agricultural product in favor of another, deeming an affirmative vote—I am not criticising the position of anybody, but speaking for myself—deeming an affirmative vote on that subject was an abuse of our constitutional power, I voted in the negative.

I wish to raise no question or express any opinion on this question of jurisdiction under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. I hope to give that question study in the future, untrammeled by any expression of opinion beforehand; but there is one subject upon which I have made up my mind sufficiently to say what course I would pursue. If it is attempted under the pretext of the taxing power of the Government, revenue not being the real object, to take jurisdiction of these insurance companies, I should vote against it. The only hope for Federal regulation of this subject is to refer this question to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Members in this House will not vote to take jurisdiction of the question under the taxing power of the Constitution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said on the subject of the centralization of power. Something might be said on the general subject of the centralization of power in this House. The Committee on Ways and Means is a great committee; under the rules of the House it is made so; its traditions make it great; its personnel in the present House makes it a great committee. But the Committee on Ways and Means should not attempt, when at particular times interest in the country in special questions gives to some other committee a prominent position, to deprive that committee of its just opportunity and proper jurisdiction of measures that come before the House.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising was to call attention of the committee to the fact that in my opinion the very language of the President's message itself determines the proper and the only proper reference of this subject in this House. [Applause.]

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday in this House, when the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] was describing the decadence of legislative bodies in our country, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DRISCOLL] interrupted and asked him this question:

> Is it not true that gentlemen from Southern States, Democrats from Southern States, have marked tendency to yield up their idea of States rights in order that their State and that their district may get some benefit or emolument out of the United States Government?

Later on during the day this same gentleman from New York, in some remarks he made, made the statement that—

> There is a marked tendency on the part of gentlemen, Members of this House, Democrats from Southern States, to surrender the doctrines which they inherited from Calhoun and to abandon their ideas of States rights in order that they may get a little pork in the barrel or that they may get some benefit from the Central Government for their several States or districts.

I confess to a fondness for this gentleman from New York—a friendship for him. I shall be charitable to him, and express the belief that in this utterance he had no malicious sectional feeling, no intention to fling at the character of southern Democratic representation in this House, but that in an effort to express his contempt for rare instances observed in this House where pelf played its part—not confined by any means to this side of the House—he stated his question so broadly as to suggest inferences not intended by the genial gentleman.

And this view is reenforced, in my mind, by the fact which I know, that he is both a good lawyer and Republican, and logically he would not have taken that position—being a good Republican and a good lawyer—for he must know that in any system of bribery the briber is meaner than the bribed; that if it were true generally of southern representation here that there was a marked tendency to surrender their convictions and their principles for "pork," the idea at once would be irresistible that that side of the Chamber controlled the "barrel," and were willing to put in the "pork" in order to debauch principle and conviction, and the reflection upon the committees and their chairmen and the Speaker himself on that side, by that sort of a contention, would be far greater than any fling at character here. And this inclines me to offer some observations to this House along this very line.

During the four years that I have been a Member of this House my service here has made me more of a Democrat than ever, but far less of a partisan. I have come to deprecate seriously and earnestly the constant tendency, which I see more or less exhibited on both sides of this Chamber, to drag every character of question arising in the whole domain of governmental legislation into the field of bitter partisan political debate and action. There is no sense in it, there is no justice in it, there is no wisdom in it, and the people do not approve it. These questions of public buildings, of river and harbor improvements, of agricultural appropriations, of the necessary supplies for those functions of government the exercise of which all men agree to, ought not to be made the means of any partisan advantage by anybody in this House. Nothing could be more foolish and pernicious than that we should drift into a line of procedure by which a public building in a district, or a river and harbor appropriation in a district, or an agricultural appropriation touching an agricultural district should be made the means of coercing the Member from that district into a course that his conscience did not approve of, or restrain him from following the course that his conscience dictated. We have divisions clear and well defined. We should adhere to these where each party man deems the doctrine of his party best for the public good. Let us fight it out on those lines like honorable men, and like honest prize fighters shake hands before and after the fight and accept the decision of the referee as final in the case.

In my judgment the true course, dictated by sound business sense and wise statesmanship as well, for each of us and for our party leaders to pursue in the discharge of our duties here is this: While on the one hand we recognize the value of party and loyalty to it, on the other hand constantly endeavor to approach any question from a nonpartisan point of view, with patriotic common sense, and only allow the question to enter the field of party politics when party principles or policies of necessity force its admission. Such a course universally adopted by those who control here on both sides would raise the dignity of this body, and make impossible its polution by such tendency.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that there has been any marked tendency of the character indicated in that statement on this side of the House. I like the word "tendency." It is a good word. I like the word "marked." It is a good word. Down in our section we mark our hogs to restrain the tendency among certain classes fraudently to appropriate them. And if we can mark now and then an incident on either side of this House of the character indicated and check the tendency to destroy our individual force and power here, I am heartily in favor of having it done. [Applause.]

I have no word of complaint against the President or the Speaker or the chairman of a committee in any legitimate and honorable way aiding what he believes for the best interests of the country. But sometimes the line is not sharply drawn, and the boundary beyond which the power of these great positions ought not to be exercised to coerce the conscience or the will of any representative of a free constituency under our republican form of government is crossed, much more to the discredit of those who corrupt than he who may be corrupted.

But I wish to say a few words, Mr. Chairman, about the particular matter now pending before this House. The latitude of debate has extended far away from the real question, which I regard as one of vast importance. To what committee of this House shall be referred that portion of the President's message which treats of Federal control of insurance in this country? To my mind it strikes me as irresistible that this debate logically forces the House, if it would maintain its ancient usages, its precedents, and if it would act in accord with the proprieties of the occasion, to refer this matter to the Judiciary Committee of the House, with instructions to report to the House our power in the premises. Here we find all shades of opinion; some who believe that under the commerce clause of the Constitution this subject may be handled legislatively; others who believe that under the taxing power of the Constitution this subject may be handled constitutionally. So far as I am concerned individually I agree with neither view. I have not the slightest idea that this House has any power over this great subject upon either proposition; but regardless of that I shall vote, if I get an opportunity, to refer this subject to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report to this House as to the powers of the House in the matter, so that it may be determined according to correct usages as I see them.

Mr. Chairman, no man in this House is more earnestly in favor of the exercise of the power of Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution to control and regulate the great transportation agencies of this country than myself. I made the first speech in this House in approval of the recommendation of President Roosevelt's message upon the rate question at the last session of Congress. I said then, and I repeat now, that in the face of utter silence on the subject in the national platforms of his party, and in the absence of any such legislation being recommended favorably by any committee of either branch of Congress, both in control of his party, that President Roosevelt was to be commended for indorsing a thrice-repeated national-platform demand of Democrats, and of right could count on their support of his recommendation to confer the power on the Commerce Commission to substitute a just rate on investigation for one found unjust.

I have no doubt of our constitutional power to do that. But, Mr. Chairman, that is as far as I am willing to go. I am not willing by judicial construction, by a strained and unnatural view, to extend the power of Congress under the commerce clause so that we can draw under the control of the Federal Government every business on the face of the earth that is transacted between residents of various States. If under that clause of the Constitution Congress may assume control over the insurance companies of the land, then I ask you where will you draw the line, where will you stop in the exercise of such a power as that? You could by the same construction control the cotton brokers of the land and the wheat and grain merchants of the land, the iron-ore and coal dealers of the land. You could control almost every one of the great businesses, corporate and individual, that are so wrought into the very fabric of our Republic. If we begin this forced construction to satisfy the public clamor, there will be no end to the pushing of that power further and further in legislation.

I am also unalterably opposed, Mr. Chairman, to Congress assuming control over this matter by use of the taxing powers of Congress under the Federal Constitution. I am an old-fashioned Democrat. I am not ready yet to surrender that ancient, time-honored doctrine that the taxing power was granted for no purpose except to raise revenue to run an honest and economical Government. [Applause.] I do not care whether the issue be protection, ship subsidy, insurance, or any other that may arise under the stress of public clamor; I am opposed to using the taxing power for any other purpose than that for which it was originally designed by the framers of that immortal instrument itself.

There can really be no contention in the light of the debate which occurred at the time of its adoption in the light of the early history of this country, when statesmen talked about the power of the Constitution in section 8; there can be no question of its purpose. If we take Federal control of insurance by virtue of the taxing power, as the distinguished gentleman from New York argued, although it might produce the wise result he desires of confining insurance companies to the States of their origin—and I am not prepared to say it would not or that it would be a bad result—it would involve a method destructive to every Democratic position upon every other great question in the land. It would be a clear perversion of the taxing power beyond all question. I am not willing, for myself, to subscribe to this doctrine.

I fully agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], that this House could and should arrest its decadence and assume the dominance intended for it by the framers of the Constitution by an unfaltering assertion of its powers under the Constitution. I remember listening with a fascination that lingers still to an eloquent and profound address, beautifully adorned after his own manner by historical illustration, delivered by the gifted gentleman on this subject in the Fifty-eighth Congress. Then he pathetically portrayed the deep decadence of the House and proudly pointed the way to attain absolute control in the Government. He said the House, under the Constitution, holds the purse strings of the nation, that it could dominate by simply saying, "We will neither raise nor appropriate revenue for such a purpose." With that view I am in full accord. But, Mr. Chairman, much as I long to see this House rise to the place in our plan of government intended for it by the framers of the Constitution, much as I deplore its abject submission to other departments of the Government, I am not willing it shall attain the one and escape the other by a perversion, a misuse of the taxing powers it possesses, nor can such method in the long run attain those ends. An unwarranted extension by the House of its powers would only react on its standing and augment rather than check the decay of powers. Strength can not be improved by straining the muscles. The powers of the House should be continually, firmly asserted, but care should ever be exercised that none of our powers are sought to be extended beyond the legitimate scope of their functions.

I know that in my State a vast interest is felt in this question. I presume, without having had occasion to look up the statistics, that, in proportion to population and wealth, there are more policy holders in Texas in the three great insurance companies than in any other State in the land. We are first in nearly everything else, and I will assume that we are first in that. [Laughter.] I feel very certain that many men there interested in this question would be willing to have anything done on earth that would protect the policy holders. But here the question is not one of yielding to the clamor of any individuals, it is a question here of the wise exercise of the powers of the Constitution under our oath of office.

Nor have I any doubt, Mr. Chairman, of the complete and ample power of a State to control this whole subject beneficially to the policy holder. Every lawyer who has had occasion to look into the subject knows not only that the Supreme Court has knocked out the commerce clause applying to the question, but it is held that each State has absolute power over the question. It can regulate the companies in it and fix the terms upon which foreign insurance companies shall do business in the State. The Supreme Court has gone so far as to say that a State may absolutely prohibit any insurance company doing business in its State, and it would not be in violation of the Constitution or of any law of the land. So that we come at last to the question so ably discussed by my friend, the distinguished and eloquent gentleman whom I expect will have a bright career, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], when he said that the power of the people existed and need only to be aroused, and that the farther the exercise of power was put from the people the more dangerous to the people.

There are many instances in our history to verify that great truth. It ought not to need much discussion either by Democrats or Republicans. Our theory of government, which our fathers loved, and which now and then some of us have come to sneer at, was that we founded a government in which we put under our feet all other forms of government in which any of the power travels down to the people, and we founded one in which all the power was vested in the people and traveled up from the people through their officers, working automatically, as the great tides ebb and flow, and at last returns to the people, the source of all power, to be exercised more wisely if they see fit. Keep the exercise of power as close to the people as possible is a political position the wisdom of which is illustrated by all history. It is not so much a question of "State rights," the right is conceded; it is a question of State duty and of the wisdom or folly of removing the discharge of duty farther from the people.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that these insurance companies have skinned the country to the limit. It is true that a lot of their officers ought to be in the penitentiary. It is true that there can be no defense in law or morals to the squandering of the trust funds and the contributions of it to members of their own families and to political parties and to every other sort of chicanery and devilment that ingenuity, intelligence, and opportunity could afford. But who has been to blame? If the people in the States had been active and energetic, if their representatives had been intelligent and active, who will say that the power is not sufficient in the States in which these companies are doing business to have prevented occurrences like these? Now, because we have drifted along with the tendency to supineness—and people have been aroused to the importance of the question now that these things have occurred—shall we apply at once to the Federal power and confess our impotence to protect ourselves by the exercise of our conceded State powers?

For one, I am not willing to do that. For one, I believe that on this subject, as on the subject of Government ownership of railroads, the strongest argument that can be made against all these false theories tending toward socialism, communism, and nationalism, is that if in a representative form of Government we can not elect officials who will enact good laws and enforce them so as to protect the people, then we are helpless under our form of government, and it can be accomplished in no other way. If we can not pass good laws to regulate and control and supervise, for instance, the great transportation agencies of the country, who can expect that we will elect officers under whom they will be adequately and efficiently managed by Government ownership? If our public servants can not be trusted to enact and enforce laws which supervise, restrain, and control these corporations, how can they be expected to elect officers who will efficiently and honestly operate them if the Government owned them. Supervision along national lines on the transportation

question is a necessary concurrent remedy, and it grows out of the fact of the nature of transportation, which must be interstate, and in all other questions the same proposition holds with reference to state, county, and municipal control and regulation. You tell me that in a great city like New York, for instance, there is no power to elect honest officers and enact and enforce wise and just laws which shall control the municipal corporations of the city, but that the city could turn around and elect a set of men who, if it owned those utilities, could economically and honestly administer them, and I tell you that no man can believe that.

Supervision and control at the first doorstep where it can be exerted is a remedy for all these evils of which the country is complaining. Wise laws and their strict enforcement along the line of regulation and control are the things we need. We only go on from the State governments and State railroad commissions to the Federal Government and Federal commissions upon the transportation question because of the fact that interstate-transportation laws are without the pale of control of States and State boards, and for no other reason could a Democrat for a moment tolerate the doctrine. I welcome this whole discussion, Mr. Chairman, I will say by way of conclusion, because, being a Democrat, I am one of those who believe every discussion in the land, in Congress and out of Congress, which points the minds of the people to the Constitution of the United States, to the Declaration of Independence, to the glorious early history of our country, to our traditions and fundamental principles must at last inure to the benefit of the only party that has been able always to survive wreck and ruin and come out of desolation and despair and march in solid phalanx again to victory because of agreement on fundamental principles. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, I can offer little excuse at this time for occupying the attention of the committee for a moment. Early in this discussion I had thought I might say something on the question before the committee which might serve as a suggestion for its correct disposition, but it seems to me that everything has been said which ought to have been said and much has been said which ought to have been left unsaid. I have, somehow or other, as a new Member, been impressed with the idea that we ought in this Congress to heed the injunction of the Speaker in his inaugural, when he said that we should proceed to the business of the Congress and dispose of it at an early date. It seems, however, to have been the custom whenever a question is up before the Committee of the Whole to grant the widest latitude of discussion, and very frequently the pending matter is not touched upon at all.

I believe if we had a rule that would confine all discussion to the real question at issue it would conserve the best interests of the country and would save many of the Members from themselves. Much of the discussion that has occurred here has been uttered for the purposes of home consumption, and I submit that if a rule such as I have suggested had been adopted at the beginning of the session it would have been of great political value to certain gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate, and, besides, would have saved the Democratic party much humiliation and would have left the country with a more exalted notion of the character and dignity of the American Congress. The country cares little for what we say here unless declaration is the certain promise of doing. It is deeply interested in what we do here. It must be that an intelligent constituency understands why irrelevant speeches are made and will not be satisfied with words, however eloquently spoken, when great national needs require action.

The question which has been pending before the committee for now nearly a week is that of submitting to a committee of the House that part of the President's message which relates to insurance, and I submit that if that subject had been submitted to the Speaker without any amendment and without any discussion there would have been no question but what he would have been sustained if he had referred it to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Every sentiment, nearly, in the statement which the President makes in his message on insurance pertains to matters akin to interstate commerce. Insurance is so intricately woven and interwoven into commercial relations that it can not be separated from them readily, and to the committee having charge of interstate commerce the mind naturally turns in referring the matter. But the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee presents an amendment to refer to his committee. Why specify this committee if it belongs there? The Speaker would refer it there. But the gentleman went further; he foreclosed the possibility or probability of any remedy except by taxation, and refused to commit himself to any plan under which even that method could be worked. Other gentlemen have suggested that the judiciary was the proper committee of reference. It might be proper to ask the judiciary if there is any constitutional relief possible, but in the meanwhile Members may present bills on the subject of regulation, and they should be considered by some committee other than the judiciary, and then, if it is thought best by the Congress, it can submit these bills or any of them to the Judiciary Committee for its legal opinion. It seems to me it would be premature to remit the whole subject to a really nonlegislative committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I do not care to occupy the attention of the House except to call its attention to the fact that these questions are largely artificial which have been raised here. The main question is simply to dispose of it, and if we should defeat the amendment and let this message take its regular course there could be no complaint on the part of any Member of this House, and every individual Member would be entitled to present such a bill as seems to meet his views on this question, and when his bill was put up then there would be time for some of these speeches which have been made here, and some of them, at least, would be pertinent to the question under discussion. So I say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, without taking any more of your time, because I believe that we ought to be about the business of this Congress, it seems to me that the proper place naturally would have been to refer this matter to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but now the solution of the problem, in my humble judgment, is to let it take its regular course and allow the Speaker, who is wise enough to deal with, to place it where, in his judgment, it seems best it should be placed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is next on the list, but as he is not present the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] will be recognized.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the parliamentary situation we are now in, we are discussing a motion made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to refer the President's message, and the different subjects suggested by it, to the various and appropriate committees of this House for consideration by those committees. That being true, we are necessarily embarked upon a somewhat general discussion of that message, and I want to say, in answer to the suggestion last made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], that I do not think this House is wasting any time which it could otherwise utilize at the present juncture, while its committees are taking no action on pending bills, when it undertakes a general discussion of questions of state suggested by the President's message. In this body for years, under the old leaders like Calhoun and Clay, when the President of the United States in his message to the Congress undertook to set out the great questions of state which were before the public mind there was a general and free debate in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States upon the recommendations made by him. That being true, I desire to call the attention of this committee, in a few words, to one particular part of the President's message, which will be referred, of course, to the Committee on Ways and Means. On the subject of revenues, on page 17 of the President's printed message, we find an abbreviated discussion of the tariff question. Hardly half a page, as the printed document comes to us, is devoted to that discussion; just about the same amount of space the President of this great country devotes to the discussion of the Jamestown Exposition. He devotes just about the same amount of space to the discussion of this great tariff question that he devotes to the discussion of "national parks," and just about one-half as much space as he devotes to the consideration of the Indian question. The President says:

> There is more need of stability than of the attempt to attain an ideal perfection in the methods of raising revenue; and the shock and strain to the business world certain to attend any serious change in these methods render such change inadvisable unless for grave reason. It is not possible to lay down any general rule by which to determine the moment when the reasons for will outweigh the reasons against such a change. Much must depend, not merely on the needs, but on the desires of the people as a whole; for needs and desires are not necessarily identical. Of course no change can be made on lines beneficial to, or desired by, one section or one State only. There must be something like a general agreement among the citizens of the several States, as represented in the Congress, that the change is needed and desired in the interest of the people as a whole; and there should then be a sincere, intelligent, and disinterested effort to make it in such shape as will combine, so far as possible, the maximum of good to the people at large with the minimum of necessary disregard for the special interests of localities or classes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there never was a plainer gage of battle thrown down by an Executive of this Republic than this declaration of the President. It is apparent that his idea of dealing with the great question of raising revenues for this Government by means of tariff legislation is based on the idea that the people of this nation ought to have only so much general relief as can be afforded them without too great injury to special

localities and special classes already favored by the existing law and as will keep them from open and serious revolt, for it is indeed true that what he considers their "needs" and what he knows are their "desires" are not identical in this matter.

In contradistinction to this doctrine of the Republican party that favored localities and classes are not to be disturbed, so truly and accurately stated by him, I desire to invite the attention of this body to the first national Democratic platform, adopted sixty-five years ago. It is a real exposition of genuine democracy, for it declared, among other things, that "justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another or to cherish one part to the injury of another part of our common country; that every citizen has a right to demand and insist upon an equality of right and privilege." In my judgment that is the battle cry which the real opposition to the Republican party in the future will raise. It is a standard about which those forces will assemble—equal rights to all and special privileges to none. No man will dare deny the absolute fairness and justice of that proposition, as an abstract question, and yet when we come to a practical application of the doctrine there are few who dare to stand by it. We find some of the most glaring, some of the most remarkable instances of inequality in rights and privileges in those laws by which our revenues are raised for the support of this Government, in high protection "for protection's sake," and I want to invite the attention of this House, as briefly as I can in the short time I shall occupy its attention, to some of those inequalities. In the first place, let us inquire what this system means, where did it originate, and where does it lead? It means that one class of people of this great Republic—to wit, the manufacturing class—shall be allowed by law to levy a heavy, binding, unjust, and unjustifiable tax on all the balance of the people, the great body of the American consumers. It means by law we are building up a class of multimillionaires. It means that by the operation of your tariff laws you shut out foreign competition, and by combinations and consolidations, usually for the control of the transportation facilities, you throttle domestic competition. To-day we have more multimillionaires in this Republic than we had poor, poverty-stricken millionaires a few short years ago, and there are to-day in this country hundreds of men who could buy many great cities and even many sovereign States of this Republic. The great State of Georgia, in which I live, has about $500,000,000 of taxable values. Rockefeller could buy it twice over, and his fortune has been built up to this dangerous extent by the use of these two agencies—a high protective tariff and the control of transportation facilities.

How did the protective tariff originate? Why, you would think, to hear the discussion in this Chamber and on the other side of this Capitol, that the Republican party was born of a gold-standard father and a high-protective-tariff mother. On the contrary, the Republican party was born of a great moral issue, of oposition to human slavery and of a determination to prevent its extension. When it acquired possession of the Federal Government in 1861 it was forced, in order to conduct one of the bloodiest and costliest wars that ever devastated this earth, to raise large revenues by heavy import duties and many other taxes to carry on that struggle. When its first platform was framed, and when its second was issued to the people, on which it won at the polls in 1860, it declared no policy on the tariff. When the war was over there were three reasons that induced the Republican party to continue the high protective tariff policy forced upon them by war expenses. The first was because they had to meet the large expenses that grew out of the war, including the expenses of an enormous pension system, and the second was their natural opposition to all the doctrines of the Democratic party, including the historic doctrine of that party in favor of a tariff for revenue only. The third reason was the specious plea of great business interests, who always take an ell when you give them an inch, and who insisted that by the high war tariff their interests had become "vested," and that it would be unfair to change the schedules and to ruin those interests. They were doubtless well able, as they were surely well willing, to enforce that argument with arguments of a more practical character in the shape of huge campaign contributions to the various Republican campaign funds.

I imagine that this practical argument must have had more effect on the old leaders of the Republican party even than the purely theoretical argument of "vested interests," for it is reported that those gentlemen were not entirely unfamiliar with the old but homely adage, "It is money that makes the mare go." In the early days of the Republic the proposition was never advanced by any statesman or by any political party that any more revenue ought to be raised by tariff legislation—by import duties—than was absolutely necessary to run this Government economically and honestly. Of course it was conceded by everybody—by all parties and all statesmen—that while you were raising this amount of revenue, incidental protection ought to be given to our infant industries, which at that time were struggling with the powerful and jealous competition of Europe. But it was never contended by any party or statesman that the "protection" given should be determined mainly by the needs, necessities, or greed of the favored and protected classes rather than the necessities of governmental revenue, or that protected industry ought to receive continued, unending, and eternal protection long after it was no longer infantile, but had grown to giant size and strength. It has remained for latter-day—Republican—statesmanship to make this contention.

There are certain tendencies that grow out of this tariff system which you have built up, sustained, and perpetuated to which I wish to call attention. In the first place I want to inquire, What effect does this system have upon the foreign policy of our Government? it leads to land grabbing, to "world powering," to imperialism, and colonialism, with all their attendant evils. Do you imagine that the strenuous President who sits at the other end of this avenue could ever have successfully swung his mighty whip over the rebellious backs of his party chieftains, or used his big stick to club them into lamb-like line, if he had pursued a foreign policy which was against the will and wishes of his party? Oh, no; he succeeded because he personified and exemplified the real wishes, the real purposes, the real ambitions of the Republican party. What do "world powering," land grabbing, colony holding, and imperialism lead to? What do they require to support them? Large armies and larger navies; large in time of peace and larger still in time of war. What does that mean? It means more Government contracts, more ships, Congress after Congress, and more money. And how are you going to get the money except by more taxation, and by more tariff taxation every time? So what better foreign policy do the protected interests of this country desire than the policy of the President, with all of his imperialistic and land-grabbing ideas? What do they care if he should keep open some canal zone in some Colombian republic of the future by sending his war ships down and keeping the ships and forces of the sovereign country from reasserting a sovereignty which he himself had guaranteed by solemn treaty? What do they care if he does continue to "civilize" Filipinos at the cost of one hundred millions a year? What do they care if he does enforce upon the republics of South America not the strenuous life of the great that he practices himself, but the simple life of good, as he becomes the debt collector from those peoples for all European nations?

It simply means more taxation, more tariff, more money to be taken from the consumer to be poured into the laps of the favored classes.

The system leads also to governmental extravagance and dishonesty. The President of the United States, in his message to the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, said it was a matter of common knowledge that bribery and fraud and corruption honeycombed the Government service everywhere. Are you surprised at that? How can it be strange? Are you surprised that the individual officeholders of a party that is based on public plunder do not abstain from acts of personal piracy themselves? Suppose they do steal a few millions; what does it mean? It means more taxes, more tariff, more protection to the favored classes of this Republic. The system also leads to the wholesale corruption of the electorate. All over this Republic there are great "vested" interests that have been built up under this tariff; that are grateful for past favors and have a lively appreciation of future benefits, but who realize that they get their unfair privileges from the law; who hope to retain those privileges by the favor of the parties and men who control the Federal Government and the various State and municipal governments, and are willing to pay thousands and millions for that favor, and who do pay it.

On this subject I wish to call the attention of this committee to the very recent words of Prof. Charles W. Mixter, of the University of Vermont. He said:

> Protection leads to things that are manifestly unfair. It leads to the debauchery of the electorate and to the lowering of the whole tone of our civic life.

Right here I wish to call public attention to the brazen shamelessness with which this is virtually confessed. Yesterday they had a field day in New York before the legislative committee investigating the insurance scandals, and one of the witnesses was one of these great "captains of industry" who really control and really govern this land. He went on the stand to testify, and I want to read to you just one little colloquy that he had with Mr. Hughes, the attorney representing

the investigating committee. The gentleman that I refer to was Mr. E. H. Harriman. He testified in this way. Mr. Hughes asked him this question:

It has been openly charged that you get your political influence through your relations with Mr. Odell?

When Mr. Harriman was asked this question, what did he say? He said:

I should say that Mr. Odell gets his political influence through his relations with me.

[Laughter.]

Shameless, brazen! This man, apparently, gloats in the confession and when he went into the explanation of his language the more he floundered the deeper he got into the mire, and finally he said: "Well, I expect, maybe, that Mr. Odell may not exactly like the way I put the thing."

Even about that he was not certain, but he thought possibly Governor Odell might not like it!

This great tariff system of ours, as operated at present, is the hotbed of class favoritism and the prolific source of corruption, and yet the President says that whenever we do reform the tariff he wants it done with as little disturbance as possible to favored localities and favored classes. That is a fine doctrine, a fine theory, on which to run a great democratic country, whose proudest boast has been in the past that it was the land of the "square deal."

Now, there are one or two other subjects to which I desire to refer, and then I shall have finished. I want to call your attention to what I believe is another notorious instance of special privilege, in which justice is denied to the plain people of this Republic, and that is the national banking system. Under our existing laws we permit $450,000,000 of the currency of this Republic to be controlled and contracted at will by the national banks, and absolutely we are so much pleased at their generosity, their philanthropy, and their disinterestedness in undertaking to handle this money for us and to control this currency for us that we give them $13,000,000 a year for their philanthropy in doing so—$13,000,000 a year in interest. And yet I want to say to you that the national banking currency is nothing more nor less than fiat money. Why? Because back of it and behind it there is nothing more nor less than the bond of the Government; and what is the bond of the Government except the written promise of the Government to pay? And I say to you if the written promise of the Government to pay can and does indirectly float this much money, it can do it directly, and we can save the $13,000,000 a year and let the Government control her own currency and issue it directly to that extent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

At the bar of the world's progressive thought it has long since been adjudicated that one of the fairest and most equitable ways of raising revenue for the support of the Government is by an income tax. And what is the Republican position upon that question? You say the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that an income tax is unconstitutional, because of that provision in our Constitution that direct taxation shall be apportioned among the several States in accordance with population. I say to you that if that is true you ought to give the people of this country some relief on this question by joining us in amending the Constitution of the United States so that we can have an income tax. Surely the Republican conscience can not revolt at a plain proposition to amend the Constitution. It has not hesitated on other questions to amend it, even at the point of the sword. Besides, in the Fifty-eighth Congress there were many measures pending looking toward the enactment of an income tax, measures always introduced by Democrats, according to my recollection, with the idea of giving the Supreme Court another opportunity to pass upon that great question. Since the former decision was rendered the personnel of the Court has changed, and as it has already changed its mind on this income-tax question once or twice, perhaps with the present personnel of the court it might change it again. If you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are really the friends of the plain people of this Republic, you ought to help us on this matter and let us get it where the great question can be passed upon again by the Supreme Court.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have heard much talk on both sides of this Chamber, and there has been much talk in the country about radicalism and conservatism. In my judgment, both terms have been both misused and abused. In my judgment, the most radical of all radicals is the ultra conservative, and the most conservative of all conservatives is the moderate and liberal radical. A little more radicalism or liberalism, as you please, and a little less conservatism would have saved the throne and the head of the first Charles and averted the French Revolution. A little less radicalism and a little more conservatism and our fathers would never have shaken off the yoke of Great Britain and established this glorious Republic. When you speak to me about conservatism and radicalism, I want to know what you mean. If to protest against existing inequalities, if to favor the righting of vested wrongs, if to demand that all men shall have equal rights and that none shall enjoy special privileges makes a man a radical, then I for one glory in the title, and I believe the day is not far distant when a vast majority of the people of this Republic will welcome the appellation, when the Democratic party, not grieving over spilled milk, with past differences forgotten, with its face to the future, will get together and insist on a plain, fair, square, honest deal being given to every man in this country. And when they make that the slogan, when they apply the fundamental doctrine of equality to all and special privilege to none, with logical fairness, to every public question, whenever that day comes, the Democratic party will again come into power, whether our leader shall be that great Democrat from the wheat fields of Nebraska, whose every heart beat is in sympathy with the needs and desires of the plain people of the Republic, or whether it shall be that young giant from the great State of Missouri, who is engaged in a great work for civic righteousness in this Republic, or whether New England or the North or the South or the West is called upon to contribute a leader whose record and life shall proclaim him fair and just to all, we will at last succeed when we get back to the great fundamental principle of equal rights to all and of special privileges to none. [Great applause.]

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I confess I have no sympathy with the impatience manifested by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TOWNSEND] at the failure of this House to readily submit without question the jurisdiction of this subject to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have not come to regard this House, much as I esteem it, as a body that is fitted to provide a remedy for every disease in the body politic. In my own brief experience I have seen several signal failures. I have observed the consumers of the United States begging at the doors of the Ways and Means Committee for relief from heavy tariff burdens, and I have observed that it turned a deaf ear to the popular clamor. I have observed others asking for remedial legislation that haven't met with that success which the gentleman from Minnesota seems to think will follow upon the submission of this question to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Nor do I agree with him that the question raised in this discussion is an artificial and useless question. I believe it is a proper question, such as is developed always in the orderly discussion of a case before a legal tribunal or of a subject of legislation before a legislative assembly, and I would much prefer that a competent body of this House should declare that this House had no jurisdiction over the proposed subject of legislation than that it should, in response to popular clamor, hastily frame legislation which subsequently could not be sustained on constitutional grounds before the Supreme Court of the United States. I believe that no time is wasted in this discussion. I heard yesterday a matchless exposure of the sinister methods of the life insurance company presidents that I believe will have a wholesome effect on the people of the United States.

I heard a vigorous and exhaustive discussion of the old-fashioned Democratic doctrine of individual initiative and of the right of States to govern in their local affairs which I believe will have a salutary effect upon the country, and I heard the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] sum up both of those discussions in his usual able manner, for he touches no subject that he does not adorn. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I believe that not one moment has been wasted in the discussion of this question. I believe it would be folly to enter rashly upon a consideration of the method of dealing with an acknowledged abuse before we first determine our jurisdictional right to deal with the subject at all. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I trust that this question will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, a body of competent and trained lawyers, to settle the first question that arises, the jurisdictional question, and report back to this House whether there is jurisdiction at all for this proposed subject of legislation.

I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to any further weakening of the powers of the States of this Union by increasing the power of the Federal Government, except in one single class of cases, and that is where it becomes necessary for a community, by lack of power to protect itself against depredation and aggression, to appeal to the power of the Federal Government. Whenever it is discovered from the nature of the proposed subject that local legislation is inadequate to deal with it, then it is proper to turn to the Congress of the United States for relief,

and whenever we deal with a subject that local legislation may deal with properly, I say that that subject should not be removed from the sphere of State legislation until it has first been ascertained definitely that the State legislature, by reason of the nature of the subject or for any other reason, is absolutely incompetent to deal with it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt, I believe, of the wisdom of the original grant to the Federal Government of the power to deal with the subject of taxation. Neither can there be any question raised to-day of the wisdom of the grant to the Federal Government of the power to deal with interstate and foreign commerce, the exercise of which power has resulted in that uniformity of regulation which it was the intention of the framers of that instrument to accomplish. But I take it also that there may be great doubts in the minds of many as to the wisdom of the application of the taxing power in particular instances. I take it also that there are grave doubts in the minds of many students of public questions as to the wisdom of the extension of the power to deal with foreign and interstate commerce over new subjects of legislation, which subjects were not and could not have been in the contemplation of the framers of the immortal instrument. Now, one of the reasons advanced on the floor yesterday for dealing with this subject through the taxing power was that it would help to restore the fallen power of this body itself. I for one, Mr. Chairman, would not use the taxing power for that purpose, much as I regret the lost prestige of this body. I believe the taxing power was given to it, as to all governments, for a single, specific purpose—namely, to raise revenue sufficient to run the Government honestly and economically. Whenever that reason fails to exist, the reason which justifies taxation in any form fails to exist at the same moment. Now, I believe that the power of this House may be restored without abusing the power of taxation. The power of the House has been lost through the rules which the House itself has adopted. The remedy may be found in the same way. We may alter those rules. I would not like to see appropriation bills loaded down with items of legislation. I would not welcome a system that would compel the tired and jaded lawyer to search in the haystack of Federal appropriation items for the needle of legislation. I prefer a more orderly system of legislation than that. I would prefer that appropriation items, and those alone, be contained in appropriation bills, and that legislation be dealt with only upon legislative measures. I believe that the House has the power to bring back its own prestige by an amendment to the rules which have enslaved the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, with this preliminary statement of general principles, I come to a discussion of the question, and I must remark in the beginning that I am not one of those who believe that the President of the United States, honored as he is by all of us, is infallible either in his law, in his judgment of State policies, or in his recollection of conversations with distinguished visitors. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] He states in his message that—

> The great insurance companies afford striking examples of corporations whose business has extended so far beyond the jurisdiction of the States which created them as to preclude strict enforcement of supervision and regulation by the parent States.

I for one do not agree with that proposition, humble lawyer though I am. I believe there is sufficient power in the legislature of each State in the Union to govern the administration of the business of companies that it has created by its own charter, and also to govern the conduct of foreign corporations that do business within the confines of that State. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Nor do I agree with the statement of the Chief Executive that the inability of the State to regulate effectively the insurance corporations created under the laws of other States and transacting the larger part of their business elsewhere is also clear. I do not believe that the proper effort has been made to regulate the business of foreign corporations in those States in which the scandal occurred which led to the desire for this legislation. Nor do I agree with the statement—or suggestion rather, because it does not take the form of a direct statement—that because Congress has given power to publish statistics concerning the business of insurance it follows that Congress has the power to deal with the subject of insurance itself.

Now, then, the question before this Congress is, To what committee shall the subject of the President's message relating to insurance matters be referred? The committees mentioned are the Ways and Means, Interstate and Foreign Comerce, and the Judiciary. First let us consider the propriety of the Committee on Ways and Means taking jurisdiction of this question. If they the Ways and Means, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the tax upon the business of insurance. Now, it seems to me that there is a decisive objection to that in the very beginning in that there is no necessity for raising additional revenues in the United States. The maddest jingo in the country would not base his support of the proposition to tax insurance policies upon the ground that there is a necessity to raise larger revenues in order that we may build more ships of war. The maddest advocate of a ship subsidy would not base his advocacy of a tax upon insurance upon the ground that additional revenues must be created in order to grant bounties to avaricious shipowners. Not a single public man, not a man upon the floor of this House upon either side, not a newspaper, so far as I have been able to discover, has even hinted that there is a necessity of adding a single dollar to the revenues of the United States. Why, then, should this proposition be submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means? It ought not to impose a tax unless there is a necessity for revenue, and no man yet has dared to state in this House that there is a necessity for an additional dollar of revenue. Now, then, suppose we pass that question and assume that the Committee on Ways and Means decides that they do not exercise jurisdiction because of their desire to increase the revenue, but simply for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance. I think the decisive answer to that is that the business of insurance can be better regulated by the legislatures of 45 States of this Union, widely scattered and far more removed from corrupt and sinister influences than by a single legislative body which sits in its deliberations in the city of Washington. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But suppose they go so far as the consideration of the imposition of that tax. What kind of a tax, pray, would they impose? Would it be a tax for the destruction of the business of these companies, such as was imposed upon the circulation of State banks? I take it no man would assert here or elsewhere that the business of life insurance ought to be destroyed by taxation. Then let us ask what is the need of imposing a tax at all if there is no revenue necessity and the business is not such an infamous one as to invite destruction by means of the taxing power? In this connection, I will call the attention of the House to this point, that while it is not proper in the discussion of tax measures to consider whether the imposition of the tax will encourage or discourage an industry at the expense of or to the enrichment of others, yet when we consider a new departure in our system of government, then it does become us to inquire in what manner this tax will bear upon the class that will be obliged to sustain it. No one will think it desirable to impose a tax upon those virtues which have helped to create and maintain in its glory the American Republic. It would be a tax upon economy, a tax upon frugality, a tax upon self-denial, because the premiums that maintain these policies are taken weekly or monthly out of the earnings of the breadwinner who hopes to create a fund by his self-denial which will insure his family against want when he leaves the scene of his mortal career. I will not willingly inflict a tax upon that class of persons, Mr. Chairman.

Now, then, we come to the next question, and that is whether it shall be submitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and here, it seems to me, the decision becomes more difficult. For while there have been a number of decisions by the courts which indicate that insurance can not be properly classed as a subject of commerce, the belief is growing that if the Congress of the United States should deal with that subject in the exercise of the power over interstate and foreign commerce, in some manner the Supreme Court might follow the Administration as it did in the insular cases. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But let us ask, Is it wise to submit it to that committee? I, for one, Mr. Chairman, would not like to see the definition of the term "commerce" broadened by a decision of the Supreme Court. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Commerce, in my judgment, is a term that never was framed to include such operations as the writing of insurance. I believe that "commerce" ought not to include the ordinary business contracts between individuals, and I trust that the day is far away when the word "commerce" shall be so defined as to include every possible business transaction between citizens of different States. I shall regret very much, as an attorney, to find that the Congress of the United States is legislating as to the size of my fee if I undertake to try a case in a court in the State of Missouri for a citizen of that State. I think it will be sad indeed if the Congress of the United States should go into the business of regulating the fees of a Rhode Island physician who might come to cure a citizen of Massachusetts of a cancer. But if the Supreme Court declares that commerce is insurance, I do not see why the reasoning of that decision may not be carried to the regulation of fees of physicians and attor-

neys who happen to practice in States other than those States in which they are domiciled themselves. I believe that the Supreme Court has gone far enough in extending the definition of the word "commerce" in the lottery cases—the case of Champion *v.* Ames—and I, for one, would not desire to see it carried further. I wish to add that I for one was in harmony with the views of the four justices who were in a minority in that case.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is really sought by this proposed legislation is the redress of legal and moral wrongs. I say, in answer to the demand for that legislation, that the legal wrongs may be fully dealt with by the legislatures of the States in which those legal wrongs are practiced. I say also that if this is an attempt to remedy a moral wrong that there is no power in the State legislatures or the national legislature to reach that kind of an abuse. You can not legislate morality into a board of directors of high finance sitting in Wall street any more than you can legislate thirst out of a citizen of Iowa or Kansas or Maine. [Laughter.] No power in this Government is adequate to accomplish moral ends. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is sufficient power in the great State of New York to deal with this form of abuse of trust funds. The investigation which has disclosed the scandals to us is not yet terminated. We have no right to predict that the legislature of the State of New York can not deal adequately with the abuses with which this investigation has made us familiar.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed, as I said in the beginning, to any extension of the Federal power over presently recognized subjects of State legislation, except in self-defense. I do not believe this constitutes one of those cases. I for one will never subscribe to government ownership of any public utility until it is first demonstrated that abuses have crept in which can not be dealt with in any other way than through the medium of government ownership. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When that comes I will be ready to accept it, but will do it with a full knowledge that I am departing from a fundamental doctrine of the Democratic party, which is that individual initiative should be encouraged, that the domain of private enterprise should be enlarged, and that the domain of government action should not be increased at the expense of individual enterprise. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think that the House is to be congratulated that history is repeating itself somewhat in that, as in the days of old, the questions dealt with in the President's message are referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration and general debate. In the message that has been sent to Congress by the President he has dealt with many subjects, and I think in the main he has handled them with great ability. Some fifty-odd propositions are treated by him in his message. The debates in the committee have been of wide latitude. Briefly referring to some of the matters treated by the President, I think it is to be conceded that he had in mind the safety and welfare of the laboring classes when writing his message. He deals with the subject of safety appliances on our railroads, showing his solicitude for the safety and individual welfare of those engaged in this hazardous business. He also treats of the hours of employment for railroad employees. For this I applaud him, for the reason that these people need the protection of the law, and when the highest official in all the land speaks for their welfare he is to be commended in the highest terms.

But the subject of debate here, while it has been wide in latitude, has been mainly confined to the proposition of controlling insurance. I have listened to this debate with a great deal of interest, and have been hoping and endeavoring to enlarge my knowledge, limited as it is, upon this subject.

I have waited in vain for some one to come forward with a definite, a clear, and a fixed proposition, one which would solve this question and give to this House and give to the people of the United States relief from the evils which they suffer to-day in the matter of insurance abuses. It has been urged that this is a question for consideration by various committees. It seems that there is no agreement as to the proper committee. I remember the able argument of the gentleman from Iowa, that the subject is one to be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The House was told that the questions involved were so great, they were so immense, that notwithstanding the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled time and again that insurance is not interstate commerce, that notwithstanding this, that possibly if the Supreme Court had another opportunity and the matter was presented to them as a question of "immense interest" they might—perhaps they might—change their minds.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believe in law and order. I prefer to believe that when courts of this country correctly construe the Constitution that it stand. I believe that the Supreme Court decisions that have been given to us, holding that insurance is not interstate commerce, will always be, as now, the law of the land. I do not think the question open to disscussion. However, if it is, it can only be in this way, as has been suggested here—that the Congress pass an act treating insurance as interstate commerce and give the court another chance. But if the Supreme Court is going to stand by the decisions they have made to the effect that insurance is not interstate commerce, then I submit that the only remedies are, first, for the party in power to pass the act as suggested, and then amend the Supreme Court to decide the law in accordance with the wishes of the majority.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is no man in this House who would dare to take that stand. It is revolutionary and one not to be contended for a single instant. So that I submit it is not a proper subject for reference to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for the reason that the question involved is not one of interstate commerce. But it is argued that it might be referred to the Post-Office Committee, for the reason that insurance companies use the mails.

As to this I want to say briefly that perhaps there would be no serious objection to a law being passed by Congress providing that all insurance companies using the mails of the United States should submit to an ample, complete, and full investigation by the Department of Commerce and Labor whenever it was deemed necessary. That might give some publicity at times when otherwise we would not have it. This is about as far as Congress should go. I want to state frankly that I am opposed to Federal control of insurance. I do not believe that the States that created and gave life and being to insurance companies should be deprived of supreme control of insurance companies. Is there any necessity for it? I see none. Why, it is said we have had great revelations—and they are great—of fraud, of thieving, of rascality, of knavery on the part of the great insurance organizations of this country. This is true.

But I wish to ask the committee, is it possible that the American people have reached a point in the downward scale when they are neither able nor willing to right wrongs that they suffer from at home, when they have the power in the States to correct the abuses there? Will they not do it? I submit that they will. Take the State of New York to-day, the home of the three greatest life-insurance companies in the world. The life-insurance commissioner of that State has, in my opinion, for years and years neglected his duty in a shameful manner, in a manner that is practically criminal. Had he performed his duty in the years that have gone, the question to-day so much agitating this country, and being debated in this House from day to day, would not be heard of, in all probability. But notwithstanding the fact that he did not investigate and keep up with the wrongdoings of these companies, light has come on their evil deeds, and to-day we find a Republican State legislature in New York State—that is, Republican in majority—have appointed a committee, which committee is now investigating this matter, and they have for attorney a prominent Republican of the city of New York. That committee is doing its full duty, and bringing to light the wrongdoing of life-insurance companies. That committee has shown to the world that the Hydes, the McCalls, and the McCurdys are not what they pretended to be. That, on the contrary, when their dues are meted out to them stripes will be in order.

But something has been said here about the courts of New York City, where if any prosecutions are to be had they must be had. In that city the chief prosecuting officer is Mr. Jerome, the most fearless, the most independent, and, I believe, one of the most patriotic men in the United States, and he has promised the country that he will give to these people a day in court, and that if he is able to do it he will put stripes upon each and every one of them. So I say there is no great and crying necessity for Congress to be unduly excited, or for the people of the country to come here and knock at the doors of Congress and demand relief on the ground that they can obtain it in no other place. On the contrary, the relief is at home. So I submit, Mr. Chairman, that when this question is considered in its broadest sense and in its narrowest sense after all it is a question for the States. It is one that the States can deal with. It is one that the States should deal with, and, in my opinion, the Congress has no right to say that they will take supreme control of insurance. We all know what that means.

Congress, for instance, has supreme control in the matter of taxation for the support of the National Government. Taxation carries with it the power to destroy. There is no reason, as I stated before, why insurance should be taxed, and I believe

that the majority of this House feels that we can not support the taxing of insurance companies as a general proposition. Insurance is no more interstate commerce than is the case of a man in Maine borrowing money from a bank in the State of Iowa. So that while we may consider this matter here, while we may provide for more extended examinations and publicity, I think that is as far as Congress should go; I believe it is as far as it can go. There is no power anywhere to make insurance a matter of interstate commerce. The country will never demand or submit to making it a subject of taxation.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he thought Congress has the power to make insurance commerce?

Mr. FINLEY. No; I did not say that. I said I did not think it could.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Can Congress make commerce out of that which is not commerce?

Mr. FINLEY. No.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then my friend was really making fun of the proposition?

Mr. FINLEY. I supposed I was treating it with some degree of seriousness. So, Mr. Chairman, if it is contended here that something must be done, in addition to the powers held and exercised by the States, I believe it might help to a limited extent to give additional publicity to the acts and doings of the insurance corporations. But where does this demand for Federal control come from?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. We have a bureau here that has the power of going around and begging for information.

Mr. FINLEY. Yes; the Bureau of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is practically what Mr. Garfield's bureau does.

Mr. FINLEY. Yes; I so understand.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Just exactly as I contended here when we established that little concern without any teeth. I think I used that expression at the time.

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, he goes around and he asks for this information, and they give him such as they have——

Mr. FINLEY. Such as they wish.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Such as they wish; and they give out the gilt-edged information, as it were, and put that into his hands, but they do not let him into the rottenness, if there is any. The result is that he publishes what you might term the golden pages of their history; and thus the community is lulled into a state of false security by not having all the facts, which facts we can not obtain because insurance is not commerce.

Mr. FINLEY. I suggest to my friend that it would be against human nature for them to unveil their rascality to Mr. Garfield or anybody else.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But when we undertake to publish the information we should publish the whole of it.

Mr. FINLEY. Yes; all of it. I stated that in my judgment that was as far as Congress could go or should go, to provide that insurance companies that use the mail should be subject to an examination by the Bureau of Commerce and Labor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, who is it that comes here and demands this all-powerful Federal control in the matter of insurance? Is it the people of the United States? I have heard no clamor in my part of the country to that effect. Is it the business men of the country? I do not remember that one of any prominence or that any combined interest has made any such demand. But we have a demand, Mr. Chairman, and that demand comes from the insurance magnates themselves. It comes from the McCurdys and the McCalls. They are the people who wish for it, and why? They think and they know that with one supreme control, and that control Federal, removed as far from the people as possible, they would not stand one chance in a hundred of being exposed in their wrongdoing, in their rascality.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. FINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. On page 13 of the Garfield report he says:

A long line of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, commencing with Paul *v.* Virginia (8 Wall., 168), established the legal proposition that insurance was not interstate commerce in any of its forms—fire, life, or marine—as presented to the court. This line of decisions has been further supported by the uniform holdings of State courts.

If this legal proposition is irrevocably settled, the powers of the Commissioner relative to insurance are purely of a statistical, voluntary, noncompulsory nature. He may collect, compile, and publish such information as may be voluntarily furnished to him, but he can not compel the production of such information, nor would he be justified in recommending any Federal legislation directed at Federal control of insurance.

Now, I forget exactly when the Bureau of Corporations was formed.

Mr. FINLEY. About three years ago, as I remember.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, the Commissioner states that he has visited several States, and among others the State of New York. And yet he did not find a single McCurdy or McCall, nor did he find any of the rottenness that has been exposed in those companies.

Mr. FINLEY. Oh, there is no question about that. I am clear in my own mind that the term "commerce" as used in the Constitution of the United States relates to trade of commodities as a general proposition. But before giving supreme control of insurance companies to the United States, depriving the States of that power, I think we should hesitate. When I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania yesterday to what extent an act of Congress could take away from the States the control of insurance companies, I hoped for an answer and he has promised to give it to us, but, Mr. Chairman, in all the debate that has taken place, no one has undertaken to answer that proposition.

I am unwilling to take from the States any of the powers reserved to them; on the contrary, these powers should be emphasized on every proper occasion.

It seems to me that we are in a wide field where there is ample room for discussion in a general way, but when it comes to doing something, when it comes to putting your finger on the exact and proper relief, no one has come forward in this House to offer it. I believe that Congress should do practically nothing; at least, no more than I have intimated. Now, in addition to the fact that insurance is not commerce—consequently the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is without jurisdiction—I may add that if this committee performs all the work cut out for it at this session of Congress, not only by the President of the United States, but by the American people in demanding relief in the matter of regulating the railroads in transportation charges, it will have all the work it can possibly do, and when that work is well done, as I confidently hope and expect that it will be done, I believe that committee will not have the time to even investigate this matter and report back to the House, as I believe it would report, that they had no jurisdiction of the subject, because insurance is not interstate commerce.

So that, Mr. Chairman, if this matter is to be investigated at all by a committee of this House, if the President's message is to be referred to any particular committee, I think it should be referred to the Judiciary Committee for investigation and report. The President of the United States himself raises the question whether or not Congress has the power to legislate. He does not state specifically that Congress can legislate. It is a question whether or not it can do anything. There is no bill before the House; only the President's message. As I see it, the proper course would seem to be, if this part of the message is to be sent to any committee, send it to the Judiciary Committee for report. That will not prohibit the introduction of bills. Bills of various character on this subject, as I understand, have already been introduced into the Senate and House.

So that I think the debate here has served a wise and useful purpose, and I for one am glad to see the House of Representatives return to the old practice of placing the President's message on the Calendar, and then when the House is in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to debate it and consider it, and I am sure that good will result. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The resolution was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House resolution 42 and had come to no resolution thereon.

DIRECTORS COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of the following Members as directors of the Columbia Hospital for Women:

Mr. BARCHFELD and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. CAMPBELL to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Patrick Conlin, Fifty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS BY COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Insular Affairs be authorized to have printed and bound such papers and documents for the use of said committee as it may deem necessary in connection with subjects considered or to be considered by the said committee during the Fifty-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution which has just been reported? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

CLERKS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE AGE OF SEVENTY YEARS OR MORE.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to cause to be prepared, as soon as may be practicable, and to communicate to the House, information as to the number of clerks and other civil employees in the classified service, male or female, in each of the Executive Departments of the Government, and in the Government Printing Office, and under the Smithsonian Institution, and in the aggregate in the city of Washington, who have reached the age of 70 years or more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution which has just been reported?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but I suppose that resolution would ordinarily go to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say that I have consulted with my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, whom I could not see before offering the resolution. This information is desired for the information of the subcommittee having in charge the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill before commencing the preparation of that bill.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] if he has any objection to adding to that the request that we obtain information as to what States the different employees referred to are from?

Mr. TAWNEY. That information the committee will obtain from the heads of the departments when they are before the committee.

Mr. FINLEY. And the State they are from?

Mr. TAWNEY. The committee will obtain that information, but what we want to get at first is the number in each department. Then the Committee on Appropriations will investigate the matter further when the heads of the different departments are brought before it in the preparation of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether this is a matter that can be answered within the time necessary to prepare the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill?

Mr. TAWNEY. I have no doubt that it can be.

Mr. MANN. Well, I understand that we issue a Blue Book once in two years, because it takes a very long time to issue it, and my information has been to the effect that the Blue Book just about to be issued for the year 1907 has just been made up. That is a very long document if that is what we want.

Mr. TAWNEY. No; we do not ask for the Blue Book. We are simply asking the President of the United States to inform the House, or to cause information to be collected by his Cabinet officers and the heads of departments, as to the number in the service who have reached the age of 70 years or over. It is limited to those who are 70 years of age and over.

Mr. MANN. I did not understand that. We have had that several times, and I would say to the gentleman that if the Committee on Appropriations waits to make up its bill for that information it will be chasing rainbows sure, because that information has been before this Congress repeatedly, and no action ever has been taken upon it and no action will be taken now.

Mr. TAWNEY. I think the gentleman is mistaken about its ever having been presented to the House, except in the Dockery Commission report some twelve years ago.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon, it has been presented to the House recently. The Committee on Reform in the Civil Service reported a bill into the House for the purpose of taking up this very question, which never has been acted upon in past Congresses and probably never will be acted upon, and while I am very glad to have the gentleman get the information I trust he will not delay the House in passing appropriation bills in order that something may be done about superannuation.

Mr. TAWNEY. There will be no delay on that account.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman why he wants this information?

Mr. TAWNEY. We want this information for the purpose of knowing to what extent Congress is obliged to appropriate for the payment of salaries of clerks who have reached the age of 70 years and over. Under our civil-service laws there is ample opportunity for getting into the service, but none apparently for getting out of it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, does the gentleman propose to report here or discuss here a proposition to pension these people in order to get them out?

Mr. TAWNEY. Not under any circumstances.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do we not already know how much we pay people of 70 years of age and over?

Mr. TAWNEY. The only question involved here, I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee, is whether or not the House and the country should have this information. After the information has been obtained it will then be a matter for the committee and the House to determine what use shall be made of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be considered as agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed:

The Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a report by the Secretary of State submitting a claim of the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, of Canada, on account of losses sustained through the fouling of their telegraph cable by the U. S. S. *Essex* on July 17, 1904.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 16, 1905.*

REPRINT OF HOUSE BILLS NOS. 285 AND 286.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROBERTS requests that House bills Nos. 285 and 286, relating to the gypsy and brown-tail moths, be reprinted, the original print having become exhausted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet on Monday, December 18, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for rent of quarters for shipping commissioner at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for support of the military prison at Fort Leavenworth—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting estimates of appropriation for furniture, etc., for public buildings—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting papers, including draft of a bill, relating to the relief of Capt. William N. Hughes, United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting resolutions of the Association of Military Surgeons, relating to the canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a favorable recommendation, a communication from the Surgeon-General of the Army relating to amendment of the law as to contracts for medical and hospital supplies—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a

letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Buffalo breakwater, New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BRICK, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 99) to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 6); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 8747) providing for the construction of the extension of the breakwater of the harbor of refuge, Delaware Bay, Delaware, and making an appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 8748) relating to the band of the United States Marine Corps, and to competition of naval and military bands with civilian musicians—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 8749) to refund a fine of $200 imposed upon and paid by Charles H. Marsden, owner of the tug *Owen*—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8750) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Hinton, in the State of West Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 8751) to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery in the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8752) to provide for the enlargement of Fort Bliss, near El Paso, Tex.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 8753) to appropriate $60,000 for necessary expense of investigation of methods of dry-land farming suited to the arid and semiarid regions—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8754) providing for a site and building for a custom-house in the city of Philadelphia, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 8755) to erect a monument on the Chalmette battle ground, in St. Bernard Parish, La.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 8756) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue duplicate gold certificates in lieu of ones lost or destroyed—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 8757) to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLETT of California (by request): A bill (H. R. 8758) to amend sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act to determine the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of the United States, and to regulate the removal of causes from State courts, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1875, as the same is amended by an act approved March 3, 1887, as amended and reenacted by an act approved August 13, 1888—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8759) to establish a fog signal on one of the jetties at the entrance to the harbor at Humboldt Bay, California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8760) to establish at Cape Mendocino, California, quarters for the light keeper—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 8761) to amend section 1 of the act approved March 3, 1905, providing for an associate justice of the supreme court of Arizona, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 8762) to finally adjust the swamp-land grants, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 8763) to provide for the safety of American coasting sail vessels and barges and their crews by providing a load line, increasing number of crews, and requiring gasoline or steam engines for relieving leaking vessels, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 8764) to amend an act entitled "An act in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents,' approved June 27, 1890," approved May 9, 1900—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 8765) to enlarge and make additions to the public building at Mobile, Ala., known as the custom-house—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8766) for the establishment of an automatic signal at Bakers Island, Salem Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 8767) to regulate commerce with foreign nations, to make preference for the use of American freighting vessels, to extend the postal service by American steamships, and to promote American trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 8768) to aid the States in the enforcement of their liquor license laws—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 8769) to define who are and who are not fellow-servants of railroad corporations, and defining the defense of said corporations on account thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 51) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the succession to the Presidency in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A resolution (H. Res. 100) requesting the Secretary of the Navy to take testimony and use all efforts to suppress hazing at the Naval Academy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A resolution (H. Res. 101) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to appoint a janitor to said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PEARRE: A resolution (H. Res. 102) to investigate the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 8770) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Burgess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8771) granting an increase of pension to Florence Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDRUS: A bill (H. R. 8772) to amend the military record of James C. Howard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 8773) granting an increase of pension to William H. Joslin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 8774) granting an increase of pension to David B. McCreary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8775) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Dieffenbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8776) granting an increase of pension to E. Ella Bevis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8777) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8778) granting an increase of pension to George Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 8779) granting a pension to Elizabeth Marshall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 8780) granting an increase of pension to Abraham M. Barr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEDE: A bill (H. R. 8781) for the relief of Anna F. Williams—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 8782) granting an increase of pension to William W. Gates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 8783) granting a pension to John Parish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8784) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Fessenden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8785) granting an increase of pension to John Finch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8786) granting an increase of pension to John Nolan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 8787) granting an increase of pension to Alfred M. Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8788) for the relief of W. W. Hipolite, of Prairie County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 8789) granting an increase of pension to Levi Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 8790) granting an increase of pension to A. M. Hizar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8791) authorizing the Secretary of War to recognize William Mitchell, deceased, as having been a member of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK (by request): A bill (H. R. 8792) granting a pension to Frederick W. Drought—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8793) granting an increase of pension to William W. Thornton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 8794) granting an increase of pension to Stout Sherer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8795) granting an increase of pension to O. A. A. Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 8796) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George A. Crisel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 8797) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8798) granting an increase of pension to Henry Briedy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 8799) granting an increase of pension to Bartholomew Morairty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 8800) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hibbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8801) granting an increase of pension to George W. Currier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8802) granting an increase of pension to James Britton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 8803) granting an increase of pension to Allison M. Munn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8804) granting an increase of pension to William O. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8805) granting an increase of pension to William C. Niles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8806) granting an increase of pension to George Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8807) granting an increase of pension to David Herren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8808) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Brazee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8809) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Freeland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8810) granting an increase of pension to Emory A. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8811) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Antcliff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8812) granting an increase of pension to Byron Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8813) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Ellison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8814) granting a pension to Chloe Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8815) granting a pension to Margaret Kenney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8816) granting a pension to Mary Schoske—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAWES: A bill (H. R. 8817) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Latham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 8818) granting an increase of pension to Levi M. Stephenson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8819) granting a pension to William East—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8820) granting a pension to Inez Talkington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8821) granting a pension to Hattie Rinearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8822) granting an increase of pension to James D. Everett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8823) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Briant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8824) granting an increase of pension to Matilda J. Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 8825) for the relief of Thomas H. Kent—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 8826) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 8827) to correct the military record of John F. Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 8828) to correct the military record of Charles A. Wilkin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 8829) granting an increase of pension to George Dolaway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 8830) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of James R. Romeyn—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 8831) granting an increase of pension to Enos Douglass—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8832) granting a pension to William F. Heed—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8833) granting a pension to Edna M. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 8834) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 8835) for the relief of Albert V. Conway, trustee—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 8836) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8837) for the relief of T. J. Coagar—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8838) for the relief of Joseph Loudermilk, of Monroe County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8839) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Frenchcreek, Upshur County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8840) for the relief of the widow and children of William Burchard, late lieutenant, Battery A, First Virginia United States Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8841) granting relief to the trustees of Allegheny College, at Blue Sulphur, Greenbrier County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8842) for the relief of Lucy L. Bane—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8843) granting a pension to Benton C. Radabaugh—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8844) granting a pension to L. G. McAvoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8845) for the relief of the trustees of the Gauley Bridge Baptist Church, of Fayette County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8846) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Todd—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8847) granting an increase of pension to Phil. B. Thompson, sr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 8848) granting a pension to James Kightlinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of California: A bill (H. R. 8849) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8850) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Dennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8851) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Harlow L. Street captain and commissary in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8852)

granting a pension to Frederick W. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr GRONNA: A bill (H. R. 8853) granting an increase of pension to Gunnerus Ingebretson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8854) granting an increase of pension to Martin Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8855) granting a pension to David D. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 8856) for the relief of Thomas M. Kuykendall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also a bill (H. R. 8857) granting a pension to W. J. Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8858) granting a pension to W. K. Dockery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8859) granting a pension to Zebulon A. Shipman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8860) granting a pension to Joseph H. Bryson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8861) granting a pension to Moses F. Reese—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8862) granting a pension to J. B. Hoyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8863) granting a pension to Zebulon A. Shipman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8864) granting a pension to James A. Sams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8865) granting a pension to Claude E. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8866) granting a pension to J. F. Cisson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8867) granting an increase of pension to George Stillman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8868) granting an increase of pension to J. L. Welshaus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8869) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Coward—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8870) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8871) granting an increase of pension to Charles McAllister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8872) granting an increase of pension to Edward Carr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8873) to correct the military record of Thomas McKee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8874) to complete the military record of James A. Sams and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8875) to pay B. R. Trull for money advanced and services rendered the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8876) for the relief of the heirs at law of Robert D. McCombs, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8877) for the relief of Harriet C. Livingston—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8878) for the relief of Samuel C. Liner—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8879) for the relief of J. A. Reagan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8880) for the relief of Jesse M. Sheppard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8881) for the relief of the estate of Joseph W. Green, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8882) granting a pension to Sarah J. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8883) granting a pension to J. Joseph Grasty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8884) granting a pension to Adolphus Erwin Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8885) granting a pension to Thomas L. Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8886) granting a pension to James F. Mace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8887) to correct the military record of Joseph S. Penland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8888) to correct the military record of James A. Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8889) to pay D. J. Hunsucker $218.54 and interest thereon from August 1, 1893—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 8890) for the relief of certain officers of the Second Louisiana Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8891) granting a pension to Mrs. R. C. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8892) granting an increase of pension to Malek A. Southworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8893) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Gage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8894) granting an increase of pension to James C. Strong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8895) to correct the war record of Thomas Cox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8896) to cancel charge of $26.26 against Lieut. John W. Ward—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 8897) granting an increase of pension to James G. McNett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8898) granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Hollett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 8899) granting a pension to Ezra G. Bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 8900) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8901) for the relief of Martina Nieto—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 8902) for the relief of Harry Hobson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8903) granting an increase of pension to John W. Dawes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOAR: A bill (H. R. 8904) for the relief of the L. S. Watson Manufacturing Company, of Leicester, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 8905) granting an increase of pension to James M. Harrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 8906) granting a pension to Louisa Lindley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 8907) granting a pension to Cornelia A. Hine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLEPPER: A bill (H. R. 8908) granting an increase of pension to George A. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8909) granting a pension to H. R. Crecelins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8910) granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Noah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 8911) granting a pension to Rosanna Cash—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8912) granting a pension to Anson Greenwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8913) granting an increase of pension to Myron E. Billings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8914) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8915) granting an increase of pension to Susan Woolley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8916) granting an increase of pension to Reuben H. Howser—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8917) granting an increase of pension to James Hines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8918) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8919) to remove the charge of desertion against Ernest Brockelman, and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8920) granting a pension to Andrew J. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8921) granting a pension to Maria D. Gray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8922) granting an increase of pension to Chalkley Milbourne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8923) granting an increase of pension to Carey Zeppernick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8924) granting an honorable discharge to Henry G. Thomas, Company C, Second Kentucky Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 8925) granting an increase of pension to Chester Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 8926) granting an increase of pension to John Keller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 8927) granting a pension to Thomas J. Waldron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8928) granting an increase of pension to William Major—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 8929) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Gaal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8930) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Becker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8931) for the relief of Citizens' Bank of Louisiana, in the city of New Orleans—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8932) for the relief of Samuel W. Evans—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 8933) granting an increase of pension to Martin Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8934) granting an increase of pension to Wesley A. J. Mavity—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 8935) granting a pension to Posey Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8936) granting a pension John R. Abanatha—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8937) to correct the military record of F. M. Rineheardt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8938) granting an increase of pension to Benedict Ellis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8939) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Chauncey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8940) granting an increase of pension to James P. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8941) to remove charge of desertion against Henry H. Walker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 8942) granting an increase of pension to Marquis L. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 8943) for the relief of Arthur Cowsill—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 8944) granting an increase of pension to William H. Lorance—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 8945) for the relief of William C. Watts—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8946) for the relief of John Riley, of Campbell County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8947) to correct the military record of James Lebar, late of Company C, Sixty-first Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 8948) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hammond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8949) granting an increase of pension to Albert Richard Clark—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 8950) for the relief of the estate of Ransom Cunningham, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8951) granting a pension to Raymond O. Fatheree—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8952) for the relief of the trustees of Weir's Chapel, Tippah County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8953) granting an increase of pension to Letullius Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8954) granting a pension to George Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8955) granting a pension to Mary C. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8956) granting a pension to Anna L. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8957) granting a pension to Achsah Barnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8958) granting an increase of pension to David Bowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8959) granting an increase of pension to Alfred B. Chilcote—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8960) granting an increase of pension to John Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8961) to correct the military record of W. F. Barr—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8962) to correct the military record of John Bolling—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 8963) granting an increase of pension to George Ramsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBBER: A bill (H. R. 8964) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Florence Alsdorf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8090) granting a pension to Emma H. Benham—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5721) for the relief of the estate of William E. Ward, deceased—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5722) for the relief of the estate of Cornelius H. Evans, deceased—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8045) granting a pension to Wilmot Stevens—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Congressional Temperance Society, for fulfillment of covenant with Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. AIKEN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. R. N. Pharr and Mrs. H. B. Faut—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of West Elizabeth Lodge, No. 442, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Eastern Oklahoma Miners' Association, against grant of mineral lands to Oklahoma—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BATES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Carrie Diefenbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Daniel L. Horton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petition of citizens of Colorado, against reduction of tariff on sugar coming from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN: Petition of the Congregational Temperance Society and others, for fulfillment of covenant with Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alfred M. Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Eastern Oklahoma Miners' Association, against grant of mineral lands to Oklahoma—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, favoring reciprocity with other nations for extension of foreign trade—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Maine, for a parcels-post and a postal-currency law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Maine, against any amendment of the Grant law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Mitchell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petition of Seth K. Cordon and others, for separate statehood for Indian Territory and Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Modesto Irrigation Association, against granting San Francisco reservoir sites in Yosemite Park—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of the National Bank of America, Salina, Kans., favoring amendment to the national-bank act—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the American Bar Association and other associations, for retention of bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Local Union No. 836, Carpenters and Joiners, of Janesville, Wis., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of George Washington Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction

of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Laurel Crown Commandery, A. H. J. O., Knights of Malta, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Mount Washington Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pennsylvania, for a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of the Retail Merchants' Association of Muscatine, Iowa., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Levi M. Stephenson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Congressional Temperance Society, for fulfillment of covenants with Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, favoring the President's position relative to railways—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOYD: Petition for the establishment of a Soldiers' Home at Eureka Springs, Ark.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petition of the Indian Association of Morristown, N. J., for purchasing small land holdings for Indians of northern California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Helena M. Turner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James E. Likins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Elm Grove Council, No. 65, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Columbian Council, No. 101, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of United Council, No. 2, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GARNER: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 7637) for relief of Floyd L. Frisbie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David D. McKnight—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 1552) for relief of Annie M. C. McGeary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of the Board of Trade of New Orleans, for passage of the Merchant Marine Commission bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of citizens of Chillicothe, Ohio, for reduction of tariff on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Hemlock, Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAYES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Matthew Token—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of the Hartford Municipal Society, for a White Mountain land reservation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Hartford Municipal Art Society, for protection of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of citizens of Acton, Iowa, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of the Municipal Art Society, of Hartford, Conn., for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Municipal Art Society, of Hartford, Conn., for a forest reserve in the White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Hiram B. Hollett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ezer W. Edwards—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Chadkley Milbourne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Cornelia A. Hine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of W. J. Lee—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Oswego County, N. Y., against sale of liquor in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LEVER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Powers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill (H. R. 8122) for erection of a public building at Sumter, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the American Humane Society, against any change in the law governing live stock in transit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Modesto Irrigation Association, against granting San Francisco reservoir sites in Yosemite—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, against revision of the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Bar Association and other associations, for a permanent bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Chester Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Benedict Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah A. Chauncey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry H. Walker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of the Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, favoring extension of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission relative to freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Marquis L. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sterling Rose—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. C. Watts—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of trustees of Weirs Chapel, Tippah County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John A. Layton—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 18, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

SHELBY M. CULLOM, a Senator from the State of Illinois, appeared in his seat to-day.

THE JOURNAL.

The Secretary read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I am not sure that I correctly heard what the Secretary read. Does the Journal state that I withdrew an amendment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Yes; that the amendment was withdrawn by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. No; that is not the fact. I acquiesced in the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] as a substitute for it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would then ask what became of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. BACON. The amendment of the Senator from Maine was acquiesced in as a substitute for it. It was not in the nature of a withdrawal of the amendment. A withdrawal of the amendment would indicate an abandonment of the purpose. I do not think the phraseology is correct. There was no withdrawal of the amendment. There was the modification proposed by the Senator from Maine in practically the same language, inserting it in a different place. The RECORD will show that in the debate the attitude assumed was simply this: I acquiesced in the suggestion of the Senator from Maine that practically the same amendment in the same language should be inserted by interlineation.

Mr. HALE rose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. There is so much noise——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HALE. There is so much noise and confusion that none of us on this side can hear the Senator.

Mr. BACON. I will state the question which has arisen.

The Journal states that I withdrew the amendment which I had offered. I say that puts me in an improper attitude. The amendment was not withdrawn, but I acquiesced in the suggestion of the Senator from Maine that language practically the same should be inserted in an existing section. That was done by him, with my consent, and my amendment was, therefore, no further pressed. But there was no withdrawal of it; and the statement that it was withdrawn indicates an abandonment of the purpose, which is not true. In other words, the same end was accomplished, in my opinion, by the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine, and it was more acceptable to the Senator from Iowa, and for that reason I yielded to what I said was the superior judgment of the committee. It is more a matter of form than of substance.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The fact is that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine was adopted in lieu of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. I am perfectly willing for that so to appear.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The fact is that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia was not adopted.

Mr. BACON. And was not withdrawn, but the amendment of the Senator from Maine was accepted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment was accepted as a substitute for it, in fact.

Mr. BACON. Yes, sir; that is the fact.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal will so show the fact.

DELAWARE RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, in response to a resolution of March 3, 1905, relative to the estimate of the cost of deepening the channel in the Delaware River, Pennsylvania, from Allegheny avenue, Philadelphia, to deep water in Delaware Bay, stating that in accordance with section 2 of the river and harbor act of March 3, 1905, no estimate for a 35-foot channel in the Delaware River has been ordered by Congress and no such estimate has ever been made, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SUPPLIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Surgeon-General of the Army recommending that section 3732 of the Revised Statutes be amended so as to include medical and hospital supplies in the excepted clause; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of facts filed by the court in the cause of James M. Stephenson *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

THE ARMY CANTEEN.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a certified copy of resolutions adopted by the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States regarding the reestablishment of the Army canteen; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HEPBURN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. LIVINGSTON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1905, on the 20th day of said month, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented memorials of Rock Island Division, No. 106, of Moline, and of Jay Gould Division, No. 127, of Danville, all of the Order of Railway Conductors, in the State of Illinois, and of the Southeastern Millers' Association of Nashville, Tenn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Fox River Valley Manufacturers' Association, of Aurora, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the United States praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of Local Unions Nos. 8, 495, 839, 199, 157, 2, 697, 841, 904, 204, 2087, 10877, and 63, of Champaign, Streator, Reeves, Chicago, Bloomington, Alton, East St. Louis, Carbondale, Jacksonville, Coffeen, Kinmundy, Springfield, and Marengo, all of the American Federation of Labor, and of sundry citizens of Chicago, Streator, and Kinmundy, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit the admission into the United States of Chinese visitors and travelers not of the cooly class; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented a memorial of Passumpsic Division, No. 163, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Newport, Vt., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. DRYDEN presented the petition of Charles C. Jauntry, of Camden, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to prisoners of war; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Local Division No. 491, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Union Hill; of Local Division No. 170, Order of Railway Conductors, of Camden; of the Trades and Labor Federation of New Brunswick, and of Iron Molders' Local Union No. 81, American Federation of Labor, of Elizabeth, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit the admission into the United States of Chinese visitors and travelers not of the cooly class; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Club of Orange; of the Current News Club of Morristown, and of the New Jersey State Federation of Women's Clubs, of Hoboken, all in the State of New Jersey, and of the National Food Manufacturers' Association, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Indian Association of Morristown, N. J., praying that an appropriation be made for the purchase of small land holdings for the landless Indians of northern California; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Improvement Association of Montclair, N. J., and a petition of the Woman's Club of Westfield, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Elizabeth, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a corps of commercial attachés to promote and extend American trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Postal Progress League of Pacific Grove, Cal., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hackensack, N. J., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the public school officials of Montclair, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the duty on works of art; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the National German-American Alliance of the United States of America, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the reestablishment of the Army canteen; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DUBOIS presented a petition of sundry homestead settlers of Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation permitting all settlers upon lands withdrawn under the Payette-Boise reclamation project to be temporarily absent from their homes when necessary for the support of their families and themselves; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. STONE presented a petition of Urich Lodge, No. 527, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Urich, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Eliot School Association, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the preservation of the old frigate *Constitution;* which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Movaney Council, No. 58, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of East Sullivan, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Portland, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation providing 1-cent letter postage on all mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition of the Educational Division of the Dubuque Women's Clubs, of Dubuque, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate child labor in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of the Minnesota State Association of Builders' Exchanges, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. ANKENY presented a petition of the legislature of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the proposed recognition of services rendered by certain old soldiers; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
Office of the Secretary of State:

I, Sam H. Nichols, secretary of state of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 7, relative to proposed recognition of services rendered by certain old soldiers, with the original enrolled copy of said joint memorial filed in this office on the 8th day of March, A. D. 1905, and now remaining on file herein, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original, and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington. Done at the capitol, at Olympia, this 8th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.]

SAM H. NICHOLS,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial No. 7.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the ninth legislative assembly of the State of Washington:

Whereas the legislative assembly of the Territory of Washington memoralized Congress by joint resolution passed January 24, 1857, and instructed therein their Delegate in Congress to exert his influence to procure the passage of an act by Congress, granting to Sergt. Mathew Kelley, Privates William Houser, Mathew Roach, Jeremiah Sheridan, Frederick Bernaur, Hiram Smiley, and Robert Williams, of Company H, Fourth Infantry, as a mark of commendation for their efficient aid in protecting the citizens who escaped the massacre at the Cascades, Washington Territory, on the 26th–27th of March, 1856, and their gallant conduct in defending the blockhouse at that place against the combined attacks for three days of several hundred Indians, the extra pay of $2 per month as was allowed during the Mexican war to such noncommissioned officers and privates as received certificates of merit for distinguished services; and

Whereas many valuable lives were saved by the successful stand made there, and the recapture of the portage was also aided by this defense; and

Whereas said Delegate in Congress failed to exert his influence, as instructed by the legislative assembly, to procure the passage of an act by Congress granting to each of the gallant men herein named a certificate of merit for their gallantry and distinguished services; and

Whereas said service received merited recognition in paragraph 4 of General Orders, No. 14, of 1857, of the Army, as follows, to wit:

General Orders,
No. 14. HEADQUARTERS, NEW YORK, *November 13, 1857.*

Paragraph 4. In March, 1856, Sergeant Kelley, Company H, Fourth Infantry, with eight men gallantly defended a small blockhouse and protected the public property at the Cascades, Washington Territory, for two days against a body of fifty Indians. He had one man—Private L. Rooney—killed, and two privates—F. Bernaur and O. McManus—wounded, the latter since dead of his wounds.

By command of Brevet Lieutenant-General Scott:

IRVIN MCDOWELL,
Assistant Adjutant-General.

And whereas more than forty-eight years have passed without granting any substantial recognition of the services of these courageous and patriotic soldiers, it in no wise lessens or changes the merited obligation on the part of the Government toward said named gallant soldiers: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the State of Washington (the house of representatives concurring), That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to exert their influence to secure the passage by Congress of an act granting to Robert Williams, sergeant of ordnance, United States Army, retired, and his other comrades named herein, if surviving, a certificate of merit for distinguished services and heroic conduct on that memorable and historic occasion referred to by the Lieutenant-General of the American Army, and that the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish a certified copy of this concurrent memorial to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress. And your memorialists will ever pray.

Passed the senate February 24, 1905.

CHARLES E. COON,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house March 4, 1905.

JOSEPH G. MEGLER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(Indorsed:) Filed in the office of the secretary of state this 8th day of March, A. D. 1905.

SAM H. NICHOLS, *Secretary of State.*

INTERNATIONAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CULLOM. I present a letter from Mr. Hinton Rowan Helper, of Washington, D. C., relative to the construction of an international railway through the three Americas. I move that the communication be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Railroads.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED RECIPROCITY POLICY.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I see by the morning papers that I am deluged with petitions on the question of reciprocity. That is not true. The fact is that I have no petitions on that subject. A further fact, however, is that I have received a very large number of personal letters, which I did not think it proper to file in the Senate, although they were on the general subject and proper letters.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 312) to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across the Missouri River at Yankton, S. Dak., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 955) authorizing the city of Nome, a municipal corporation organized and existing under chapter 21, title 3, of an act of Congress approved June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," to construct a free bridge across the Snake River at Nome city, in the Territory of Alaska, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1160) to correct the military record of John McKinnon, alias John Mack, to request that the committee be relieved from the further consideration of the bill; and they recommend that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. It refers to a man who has served in both the Navy and the Army, but I understand the alleged desertion to have been from the naval service.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming asks that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 51) to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 55) for the widening of Bladensburg road, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 68) for the widening of a section of Columbia road east of Sixteenth street, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. ALLISON. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably, without amendment, the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives providing for a holiday recess, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, December 21, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Thursday, January 4, 1906.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

CHARLES L. EATON AND OTHERS.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. LODGE on the 16th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Charles L. Eaton, Alonzo B. Eaton, and Edward H. Eaton, only children of Alonzo J. Eaton, late a member of the Capitol police force, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 1953) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Benson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 1954) granting an increase of pension to Palmer Atkins (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1955) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Arsnall (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1956) granting a pension to Evans Blake;

A bill (S. 1957) granting an increase of pension to John H. Barton;

A bill (S. 1958) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan J. Boyer;

A bill (S. 1959) granting an increase of pension to William L. Baldwin;

A bill (S. 1960) granting a pension to John C. Besier;

A bill (S. 1961) granting a pension to Cyrus Bryant (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1962) granting an increase of pension to Julia Baldwin;

A bill (S. 1963) granting an increase of pension to Newton T. Burnett;

A bill (S. 1964) granting an increase of pension to William K. Collins;

A bill (S. 1965) granting a pension to Charles M. Clark;

A bill (S. 1966) granting an increase of pension to Lovel E. Cropper (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1967) granting an increase of pension to Fred A. Cimeran;

A bill (S. 1968) granting an increase of pension to John H. Cocanower (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1969) granting a pension to Thomas W. Coe;

A bill (S. 1970) granting a pension to Jennie C. Curtis;

A bill (S. 1971) granting a pension to John Donnelly;

A bill (S. 1972) granting a pension to Thomas W. Dickey;

A bill (S. 1973) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Dixon;

A bill (S. 1974) granting an increase of pension Landy C. Daily;

A bill (S. 1975) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dugger;

A bill (S. 1976) granting a pension to William N. Dickey;

A bill (S. 1977 granting an increase of pension to Ira Bacon;

A bill (S. 1978) granting a pension to Thomas Edsall (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1979) granting an increase of pension to George H. Eastman;

A bill (S. 1980) granting an increase of pension to Mary Foster;

A bill (S. 1981) granting an increase of pension to Camel L. Farmer (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1982) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon B. Greathouse;

A bill (S. 1983) granting an increase of pension to Carlton R. Gatton;

A bill (S. 1984) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ginnett;

A bill (S. 1985) granting a pension to Virginia Hawley (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1986) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Harris (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1987) granting a pension to Ella T. Hapeman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1988) granting an increase of pension to James Hill;

A bill (S. 1989) granting an increase of pension to Joel R. Harvey;

A bill (S. 1990) granting a pension to Anna M. Hawes;

A bill (S. 1991) granting an increase of pension to Valentine B. Hummel;

A bill (S. 1992) granting a pension to Mary C. Hughes;

A bill (S. 1993) granting an increase of pension to John Judge;

A bill (S. 1994) granting a pension to Lewis Jones;

A bill (S. 1995) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Kitzmiller (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1996) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Kilburn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1997) granting a pension to Caroline C. Kuhn;

A bill (S. 1998) granting an increase of pension to James T. Kent;

A bill (S. 1999) granting a pension to Charles A. Kraaz;

A bill (S. 2000) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Lively (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2001) granting a pension to Jane Lewis;

A bill (S. 2002) granting an increase of pension to Edward Leahy;

A bill (S. 2003) granting a pension to Charles C. Leach;

A bill (S. 2004) granting a pension to David Lanpher (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2005) granting a pension to George B. Lighter;

A bill (S. 2006) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Lookingbill;

A bill (S. 2007) granting an increase of pension to James B. Logan (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2008) granting a pension to Virginia A. McKnight;

A bill (S. 2009) granting an increase of pension to Nancy M. McCutchen (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2010) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Morris;

A bill (S. 2011) granting a pension to Lucinda McCorkle;

A bill (S. 2012) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Mayhew (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2013) granting a pension to David P. Mering;

A bill (S. 2014) granting an increase of pension to John R. McCullough;

A bill (S. 2015) granting a pension to Samuel Miller;

A bill (S. 2016) granting a pension to Franklin L. Mead;

A bill (S. 2017) granting an increase of pension to Phillip L. Moore (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2018) granting an increase of pension to George R. McColpin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2019) granting a pension to W. A. McMillan;

A bill (S. 2020) granting an increase of pension to Mattie J. Phillips;

A bill (S. 2021) granting a pension to Juliet K. Phillips (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2022) granting an increase of pension to John Nichols;

A bill (S. 2023) granting a pension to Amanda M. Richey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2024) granting an increase of pension to John Rencher (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2025) granting an increase of pension to Arnold Rodgers (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2026)) granting a pension to John Roye;

A bill (S. 2027) granting an increase of pension to Nannie L. P. Schmitt (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2028) granting an increase of pension to James Stull (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2029) granting a pension to Anne Spoor;

A bill (S. 2030) granting a pension to Thomas Summers;

A bill (S. 2031) granting a pension to Daniel B. Stone;

A bill (S. 2032) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Stevens;

A bill (S. 2033) granting an increase of pension to David Trimble (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2034) granting an increase of pension to William G. Taylor (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2035) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Taylor (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2036) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Davidson Hoppin;

A bill (S. 2037) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Rice;

A bill (S. 2038) granting a pension to Margaret Wilkins;

A bill (S. 2039) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Weakly;

A bill (S. 2040) granting a pension to Charles A. Wheeler;
A bill (S. 2041) granting an increase of pension to Martha Anne Walker;
A bill (S. 2042) granting an increase of pension to William F. Windle;
A bill (S. 2043) granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Wolf (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 2044) granting a pension to Solomon F. Wehr;
A bill (S. 2045) granting an increase of pension to Delos Van Deusen;
A bill (S. 2046) granting an increase of pension to William Alexander (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 2047) granting an increase of pension to Andrew T. Brewer (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 2048) granting an increase of pension to Snyder H. Osborn;
A bill (S. 2049) granting a pension to Emma Henson (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 2050) granting an increase of pension to J. Tilden Moulton.

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:
A bill (S. 2051) for the relief of James D. Vernay;
A bill (S. 2052) to amend an act fixing the grade of veterans of the civil war;
A bill (S. 2053) placing Hugh T. Reed on the retired list with rank of captain;
A bill (S. 2054) authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of Joseph F. Ritcherdson on the rolls of Company C, One hundred and twenty-second Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and issue him an honorable discharge;
A bill (S. 2055) to correct the military record of Isaac W. Reed (with accompanying papers);
A bill (H. R. 2056) to correct the military record of David Horner;
A bill (S. 2057) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Fesenmeyer;
A bill (S. 2058) to correct the military record of Stephen W. Coakley; and
A bill (S. 2059) to correct the military record of Clayton H. Adams (with accompanying papers).

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:
A bill (S. 2060) for the relief of William B. Payne;
A bill (S. 2061) for the relief of Lina Hennig;
A bill (S. 2062) for the relief of John M. Follett;
A bill (S. 2063) for the relief of James C. Burke; and
A bill (S. 2064) for the relief of William H. Blades.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2065) providing for the establishment of a district court of the United States for China and Korea; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2066) to renew and extend certain letters patent; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 2067) authorizing the issuance of a certificate of merit to Mathew Kelley, William Houser, Mathew Roach, Jeremiah Sheridan, Frederick Bernaur, Hiram Smiley, and Robert Williams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 2068) to increase the limit of cost of the fog signal at the light and fog-signal station at Battery Point, Puget Sound, State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2069) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2070) to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2071) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Anshutz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 2072) to provide for the erection of a statue of Gen. Nathanael Greene on the battlefield of Guilford Court House; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:
A bill (S. 2073) for the relief of Jeanie R. Bartlett, widow of the late Rear-Admiral John Russell Bartlett, United States Navy;
A bill (S. 2074) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Peter O'Neill; and
A bill (S. 2075) to restore to the active list of the Navy the name of Homer Lycurgus Law.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 2076) granting a pension to Jane Rivers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2077) granting an increase of pension to Alice A. Arms; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2078) for the relief of Willard H. Greene; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 2079) granting an increase of pension to Frances Antonia Emmons;
A bill (S. 2080) granting a pension to Ruth F. Bennett;
A bill (S. 2081) granting an increase of pension to Susan Watts Kearny Selfridge;
A bill (S. 2082) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth T. Carpenter;
A bill (S. 2083) granting an increase of pension to Asa K. Harbert;
A bill (S. 2084) granting a pension to Joseph L. Herron; and
A bill (S. 2085) granting an increase of pension to Seeley Earnest.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced a bill (S. 2086) for the relief of the Stevens Institute of Technology, of Hoboken, N. J.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2087) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Jersey City, N. J.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2088) for the relief of Clotilda Freund, assignee of Frank W. Freund; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 2089) granting an increase of pension to John P. Campbell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CRANE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 2090) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Adams;
A bill (S. 2091) granting an increase of pension to John P. Bambush;
A bill (S. 2092) granting an increase of pension to James J. Lowden;
A bill (S. 2093) granting a pension to Thomas O'Connor;
A bill (S. 2094) granting an increase of pension to Rodney W. Torrey; and
A bill (S. 2095) to increase pension for total deafness.

Mr. ALGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 2096) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel R. Kent; and
A bill (S. 2097) granting an increase of pension to John Broad.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:
A bill (S. 2098) authorizing the extension of Second street NW. north to Trumbull street, and W street westward to Second street NW.; and
A bill (S. 2099) authorizing the extension of W and Adams streets, NW.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a bill (S. 2100) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Packman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 2101) to permit second homestead entries in certain cases, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2102) granting an increase of pension to George W. Lucas; and

A bill (S. 2103) granting an increase of pension to Lorin R. Bingham.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2104) granting an increase of pension to Moses Feyler; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 2105) to encourage telegraph communication between the United States, Alaska, the Aleutian Islands, Siberia, Manchuria, China, the Japanese Empire, and the Philippine Islands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 2106) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Vanburen, Ark.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2107) to correct the military record of Andrew J. Wilhoit; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2108) for the relief of the heirs of the late Jennie Hunter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2109) granting an increase of pension to E. T. Arnold; and

A bill (S. 2110) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Maple (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. GORMAN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2111) granting an increase of pension to Louis N. Frank;

A bill (S. 2112) granting an increase of pension to John Heck;

A bill (S. 2113) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Zentz (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2114) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Schroeder;

A bill (S. 2115) granting a pension to Carrie E. Costinett;

A bill (S. 2116) granting an increase of pension to Junius T. Turner; and

A bill (S. 2117) granting an increase of pension to George W. Weidman (with accompanying papers).

Mr. GORMAN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2118) for the relief of the trustees of the African Methodist Episcopal Church of Washington County, Md.;

A bill (S. 2119) for the relief of Richard T. Gott, administrator of Thomas N. Gott, deceased;

A bill (S. 2120) for the relief of Mrs. Sara C. Mitchell;

A bill (S. 2121) for the relief of the estate of Alexander F. Dulin, deceased;

A bill (S. 2122) for the relief of the estate of James R. D. Morrison, deceased;

A bill (S. 2123) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Richard, deceased;

A bill (S. 2124) for the relief of Polly Jackson;

A bill (S. 2125) for the relief of the heirs of William P. Elliot, deceased;

A bill (S. 2126) for the relief of the trustees of the German Reformed Church of Boonsboro, Md.;

A bill (S. 2127) for the relief of the estate of William Y. Dulin, deceased;

A bill (S. 2128) for the relief of the legal representatives of Michael M. Clark, deceased, late of the United States Army;

A bill (S. 2129) for the relief of the vestry of St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, situated near Point of Rocks, Md.;

A bill (S. 2130) for the relief of Urias D. Ramsburg;

A bill (S. 2131) for the relief of the heirs of Henry N. Harris, deceased;

A bill (S. 2132) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund Wolf;

A bill (S. 2133) for the relief of the estate of Richard Lawson;

A bill (S. 2134) for the relief of the heirs and representatives of William G. Burke, deceased, late of Harford County, Md.; and

A bill (S. 2135) for the relief of the heirs of Washington Dorney.

Mr. GORMAN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 2136) for the extension of Seventeenth street NW. from Florida avenue to Columbia road;

A bill (S. 2137) for the opening of R street NE. to Twenty-eighth street and of Twenty-eighth street NE. from R street to M street; and

A bill (S. 2138) for the relief of the estate of William B. Todd, deceased.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 2139) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Anton Ernst; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 2140) to authorize the Postmaster-General to dispose of useless papers in post-offices; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompaying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2141) granting a pension to Charlotte Atkinson;

A bill (S. 2142) granting an increase of pension to Adella D. Irwin;

A bill (S. 2143) granting an increase of pension to Angelina Hernandez; and

A bill (S. 2144) granting an increase of pension to James A. M. Brown.

Mr. FRAZIER introduced a bill (S. 2145) granting a pension to Lillie P. Hinman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2146) for the relief of Mary D. Murfree, executrix of the estate of Fanny Priscilla Murfree;

A bill (S. 2147) for the relief of the estate of George P. Carmichael, deceased;

A bill (S. 2148) for the relief of the estate of David C. Hamill, deceased;

A bill (S. 2149) for the relief of the estate of F. A. De Georgis, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2150) for the relief of the estate of Robert B. Smith, deceased.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 2151) for the relief of Mrs. Louise E. O'Connor, executrix of the estate of Mrs. Mary O'Connor, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2152) for the relief of the estate of G. W. Click, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2153) granting an increase of pension to Helen Read (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2154) granting a pension to James R. Ward; and

A bill (S. 2155) granting a pension to W. M. Morgan.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 2156) for the relief of Pacific Pearl Mullett, administratrix of the estate of the late Alfred B. Mullett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 2157) for the relief of Lewis Metz; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. STONE introduced a bill (S. 2158) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Maryville, in the State of Missouri; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CULBERSON introduced a bill (S. 2159) authorizing the Jasper and Eastern Railway Company, its successors and assigns, to construct and operate a railroad bridge across the Sabine River, in the States of Texas and Louisiana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. OVERMAN introduced a bill (S. 2160) for the relief of Samuel H. Alexander; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2161) granting a pension to Joseph B. Voris; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 2162) to create in the War Department a special roll to be known as the "volunteer retired list," to authorize placing thereon, with pay, certain surviving officers of the United States Volunteer Army of the civil war,

and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2163) to provide for site and public building at Meadville, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Building and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2164) granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Bland;

A bill (S. 2165) extending the provisions of the pension laws of the United States to persons engaged in the operation and construction of military telegraph lines during the war of the rebellion;

A bill (S. 2166) granting a pension to James H. Kirkpatrick;

A bill (S. 2167) granting an increase of pension to James B. O. Horbach;

A bill (S. 2168) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Hewitt;

A bill (S. 2169) granting a pension to Margaret M. McPherson;

A bill (S. 2170) granting a pension to Isabel Tait Borthwick (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2171) granting a pension to Ida L. and Clara H. Winters (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 2172) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to cause to be erected monuments and markers on the battlefield of Gettysburg, Pa., to commemorate the valorous deeds of certain regiments and batteries of the United States Army";

A bill (S. 2173) to correct the military record of John C. Webb; and

A bill (S. 2174) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the members or the legal heirs of the deceased members of the Worth Infantry and York Rifles, who were the first fully armed and equipped soldiers to do active service in response to President Lincoln's call for 75,000 volunteers, and for other purposes.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2175) for the relief of Daniel Joseph Holland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2176) for the relief of F. X. Smith, Son & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALLEE introduced a bill (S. 2177) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to rehear and render judgment in the case of William Donnelly and Patrick Egan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2178) granting a pension to Susan A. Vantine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2179) granting an increase of pension to S. Annie Gregg; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 2180) granting an increase of pension to Diedrick Mangles; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 2181) granting an increase of pension to Mary G. Potter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2182) granting an increase of pension to John J. Buffington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2183) granting an increase of pension to George P. Trobridge; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2184) to refer to the Court of Claims the State war claims of the State of California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2185) to establish probate courts in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (S. 2186) providing for free homesteads in the Ute Indian Reservation in Colorado;

A bill (S. 2187) to validate certain certificates of soldiers' additional homestead right; and

A bill (S. 2188) granting to the city of Durango, in the State of Colorado, certain lands therein described for water reservoirs.

Mr. DUBOIS. I would ask that the title of the homestead bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado may be again read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again read the title of the bill.

The SECRETARY. A bill providing for free homesteads in the Ute Indian Reservation in Colorado.

Mr. DUBOIS. Has that bill been referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs or the Committee on Public Lands?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It has been referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. TELLER. I think that is the proper place for the bill to go, but if the Senator desires that it shall go to the Committee on Indian Affairs I have no objection.

Mr. DUBOIS. If the question of Indian title is involved, I think the bill should go to the Committee on Indian Affairs, but I have no special desire about the matter.

Mr. TELLER. I will say that there is really no question of Indian title concerned. The Indians will get a dollar and a quarter an acre whether the people who go in shall take the homesteads by homestead or by preemption. That is the treaty with them. The bill does not affect the treaty, but it is only a question of whether the Government will buy these lands and pay the Indians for them and give them as homesteads to actual settlers. That is all there is about it.

Mr. DUBOIS. Very well; let the bill go to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. TELLER. I think that is the correct reference.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reference heretofore ordered will stand.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2189) to extend the term of certain letters patent of the United States issued to David H. Foreman; which was read twice by its title; and referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2190) to amend "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their cars with automatic couplers and continuous brakes and their locomotives with driving-wheel brakes, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1893, as amended April 1, 1896, and March 2, 1903; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2191) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct experiments in the noncorn-growing States and Territories in the breeding and feeding of the various classes of live stock for market and in growing crops for forage plants adapted to these purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2192) providing for the purchase of Mathews's portrait of Lincoln; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2193) for a public building for the United States Geological Survey at Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2194) granting a pension to William H. Sweeney, jr.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DANIEL introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2195) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Rixey, deceased;

A bill (by request) (S. 2196) for the relief of Pickrell & Brooks;

A bill (S. 2197) for the relief of Charles A. Newlon;

A bill (S. 2198) for the relief of William Mason;

A bill (S. 2199) for the relief of James W. Nickens;

A bill (S. 2200) for the relief of Sallie R. Walton;

A bill (S. 2201) for the relief of C. A. Sprinkel;

A bill (S. 2202) for the relief of the estate of Dr. Bailey Shumate;

A bill (S. 2203) for the relief of Lettie Myers; and

A bill (by request) (S. 2204) for the relief of Emma C. Franner, George W. Seaton, Hiram K. Seaton, Howard Seaton, Mary Seaton, Blanche Seaton, George W. Taylor, Edward Taylor, and Catharine Pomeroy.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 2205) for the relief of the

estate of Mary A. Gough, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HALE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

A bill (S. 2206) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the Hospital Corps of the Navy of the United States, and to define its duties and regulate its pay;

A bill (S. 2207) for the establishment and organization of a nurse corps of trained women nurses in the United States Navy; and

A bill (S. 2208) authorizing the appointment of dental surgeons in the Navy.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 2209) granting a pension to Milford W. Oxley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 2210) granting a pension to Cynthia L. Allen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 2211) for the relief of Mitsul Bussan Kaisha; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 2212) for the relief of Francisco Krebs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 11) relating to the wearing of badges by military societies; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 12) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a condemned cannon to the board of regents of the University of South Dakota, at Vermilion, S. Dak., to be placed on the campus of said institution as a memorial to students of said university who served in the Spanish-American war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 13) authorizing the Secretary of War to award the Congressional medal of honor to Roe Reisinger; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WILLIAM HARRINGTON—PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. PENROSE, it was

Ordered, That papers inadvertently referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, to accompany the bill (S. 1589) to correct the military record of William Harlan, be withdrawn and referred to the Committee on Pensions, to be filed with the bill (S. 1632) granting an increase of pension to William Harrington.

NATIONAL FOREST RESERVE IN WHITE MOUNTAINS.

Mr. GALLINGER. There are numerous calls for the bill (S. 34) for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the White Mountains, and the present supply is exhausted. I ask that 1,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the document room of the Senate.

There being no objection, the order was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That 1,000 additional copies of the bill (S. 34) for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the White Monutains, to be known as the "National White Mountain Forest Reserve," be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the assistant clerk to the Committee on the Judiciary be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $2,000 per annum until otherwise ordered.

ELIZA A. LEMON.

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Eliza A. Lemon, widow of H. H. Lemon, late a member of the Capitol police force, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral allowances and all other allowances.

UNITED STATES DEPOSITORIES.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate the name and location of each and every national bank designated as a United States depository, together with the total amount of money deposited in each of said banks by the United States during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, and 1905.

PANAMA CANAL APPROPRIATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Vice-President was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. ALLISON, Mr. HALE, and Mr. TELLER were appointed.

STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. HALE. Are resolutions now in order, Mr. President?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no other bills or joint resolutions, the introduction of concurrent and other resolutions is in order.

Mr. HALE. I offer the order which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Ordered, That so much of Rule XXIV of the Senate as provides for appointment of the standing and other committees of the Senate by ballot be suspended.

Mr. HALE. I ask that that order be passed on at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order proposed by the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none.

The order was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Now let the accompanying resolution be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the standing and select committees of the Senate of the Fifty-ninth Congress:

STANDING COMMITTEES.

On Agriculture and Forestry.—Mr. Proctor (chairman), Hansbrough, Warren, Dolliver, Burnham, Perkins, Long, Money, Simmons, Latimer, Frazier.

On Appropriations.—Mr. Allison (chairman), Hale, Cullom, Perkins, Warren, Wetmore, Gallinger, Elkins, Teller, Berry, Tillman, Daniel, Gorman.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.—Mr. Kean (chairman), Warren, Millard, Money, Patterson.

On Canadian Relations.—Mr. Crane (chairman), Dryden, Hale, Bulkeley, Piles, Tillman, Bailey, Clark of Montana, Clarke of Arkansas.

On the Census.—Mr. Long (chairman), Hale, McCumber, Hopkins, Dick, Carter, ———, McEnery, Taliaferro, Blackburn, Bailey.

On Civil Service and Retrenchment.—Mr. Perkins (chairman), Lodge, Elkins, Platt, ———, Dubois, McLaurin, Clarke of Arkansas, Rayner.

On Claims.—Mr. Fulton (chairman), Kean, Clapp, Burnham, Allee, Smoot, Hemenway, Burkett, ———, Martin, McLaurin, Overman, Frazier.

On Coast and Insular Survey.—Mr. Piles (chairman), Allee, Flint, Sutherland, Bulkeley, Morgan, Berry, Clay, Culberson.

On Coast Defenses.—Mr. Knox (chairman), Alger, Ankeny, Heyburn, Cullom, Nixon, Culberson, Taliaferro, Clay, Simmons, Foster.

On Commerce.—Mr. Frye (chairman), Elkins, Nelson, Gallinger, Penrose, Depew, Perkins, Alger, Hopkins, Ankeny, Crane, Berry, Martin, Clay, Mallory, Foster, Stone.

On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.—Mr. McEnery (chairman), Latimer, Aldrich, Millard, Carter.

On Cuban Relations.—Mr. Burnham (chairman), Aldrich, Kittredge, Hopkins, Clapp, Beveridge, Bulkeley, Teller, Money, Taliaferro, Simmons.

On the District of Columbia.—Mr. Gallinger (chairman), Hansbrough, Dillingham, Scott, Gamble, Allee, Long, Burkett, Martin, Mallory, Simmons, Dubois, Gorman.

On Education and Labor.—Mr. Dolliver (chairman), Penrose, Clapp, Flint, Brandegee, Daniel, Newlands, Stone, Rayner.

On Engrossed Bills.—Mr. Berry (chairman), Kittredge, Hemenway.

On Enrolled Bills.—Mr. Dryden (chairman), Beveridge, Foster.

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.—Mr. Bulkeley (chairman), Crane, Nixon, Piles, Culberson, Simmons, McCreary.

On Finance.—Mr. Aldrich (chairman), Allison, Burrows, Platt, Hansbrough, Spooner, Penrose, Hale, Daniel, Teller, Money, Bailey, Gorman.

On Fisheries.—Mr. Hopkins (chairman), Proctor, Frye, Perkins, Bulkeley, Mallory, McEnery, Bailey, Overman.

On Foreign Relations.—Mr. Cullom (chairman), Frye, Lodge, Clark of Wyoming, Foraker, Spooner, Kean, Beveridge, Morgan, Bacon, Money, Clark of Montana, McCreary.

On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.—Mr. Brandegee, (chairman), Depew, Perkins, Kittredge, Burnham, Ankeny, Smoot, Morgan, Tillman, Overman.

On the Geological Survey.—Mr. Flint (chairman), Elkins, Heyburn, Burkett, Money, Newlands, Rayner.

On Immigration.—Mr. Dillingham (chairman), Penrose, Lodge, Dryden, Heyburn, ———, McLaurin, Patterson, Latimer, Clarke of Arkansas, McCreary.

On Indian Affairs.—Mr. Clapp (chairman), McCumber, Gamble, Clark of Wyoming, Long, Warner, Sutherland, Brandegee, ———, Morgan, Dubois, Clark of Montana, Teller, Stone, Clarke of Arkansas.

On Indian Depredations.—Mr. Burkett (chairman), Dick, Dillingham, Cullom, Platt, Hemenway, Bacon, Martin, Berry, Pettus, McLaurin.

On Interoceanic Canals.—Mr. Millard (chairman), Platt, Kittredge, Dryden, Hopkins, Knox, Piles, Morgan, Carmack, Taliaferro, Gorman, Simmons.

On Interstate Commerce.—Mr. Elkins (chairman), Cullom, Aldrich, Kean, Dolliver, Foraker, Clapp, Crane, Tillman, McLaurin, Carmack, Foster, Newlands.

On Irrigation.—Mr. Ankeny (chairman), Warren, Hansbrough, Fulton, Carter, Flint, Nixon, Sutherland, Bailey, Patterson, Gorman, Newlands, Dubois.

On the Judiciary.—Mr. Clark of Wyoming (chairman), Nelson, Depew, Spooner, Foraker, Dillingham, Kittredge, Knox, Bacon, Pettus, Culberson, Blackburn, Patterson.

On the Library.—Mr. Wetmore (chairman), Hansbrough, Dryden, Clark of Montana, Gorman.

On Manufactures.—Mr. Heyburn (chairman), McCumber, Gallinger, Allee, Clay, Latimer, Frazier.

On Military Affairs.—Mr. Warren (chairman), Scott, Foraker, Alger, Lodge, Hemenway, Bulkeley, Warner, Pettus, Blackburn, Foster, Overman, Taliaferro.

On Mines and Mining.—Mr. Dick (chairman), Scott, Heyburn, Nixon, Sutherland, Tillman, Clark of Montana, Clarke of Arkansas, Newlands.

On the Mississippi River and its Tributaries.—Mr. Nelson (chairman), Dolliver, Millard, Warner, McEnery, McLaurin, Carmack.

On Naval Affairs.—Mr. Hale (chairman), Perkins, Platt, Penrose, Gallinger, Burrows, Dick, Tillman, Martin, McEnery, Blackburn.

On Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments.—Mr. Carter (chairman), Allee, Wetmore, Allison, Knox, McLaurin, Blackburn, Stone, Frazier.

On Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.—Mr. Foraker (chairman), Depew, Wetmore, Clapp, Flint, Piles, Warner, Mallory, Blackburn, Clark of Montana, Rayner.

On Pacific Railroads.—Mr. Alger (chairman), Dolliver, Frye, Long, Burkett, Morgan, Taliaferro, McCreary, Latimer.

On Patents.—Mr. Kittredge (chairman), Clapp, Smoot, Knox, Mallory, Foster, Latimer.

On Pensions.—Mr. McCumber (chairman), Scott, Burnham, Alger, Smoot, Burkett, Piles, ———, Taliaferro, Patterson, Carmack, Overman.

On the Philippines.—Mr. Lodge (chairman), Hale, Beveridge, Burrows, Long, Dick, Nixon, Brandegee, Culberson, Dubois, Carmack, McCreary, Stone.

On Post-Offices and Post-Roads.—Mr. Penrose (chairman), Dolliver, Proctor, Burrows, Scott, Crane, Fulton, Hopkins, Carter, Clay, Culberson, Taliaferro, Simmons, Rayner.

On Printing.—Mr. Platt (chairman), Elkins, Gorman.

On Private Land Claims.—Mr. Teller (chairman), McEnery, Pettus, Hale, Kean, Gamble, Flint.

On Privileges and Elections.—Mr. Burrows (chairman), Foraker, Depew, Beveridge, Dillingham, Hopkins, Knox, Dolliver, Pettus, Dubois, Bailey, Overman, Clarke of Arkansas.

On Public Buildings and Grounds.—Mr. Scott (chairman), Warren, McCumber, Wetmore, Millard, Dryden, Heyburn, Culberson, Simmons, Clay, Stone, Latimer.

On Public Health and National Quarantine.—Mr. Morgan (chairman), McEnery, Mallory, Culberson, Spooner, Depew, Fulton, Proctor, Brandegee.

On Public Lands.—Mr. Hansbrough (chairman), Nelson, Clark of Wyoming, Gamble, Fulton, Smoot, Carter, Flint, Hemenway, Berry, McEnery, McLaurin, Dubois, Newlands, Patterson.

On Railroads.—Mr. Allee (chairman), Clark of Wyoming, Nelson, Ankeny, Smoot, Bulkeley, Hemenway, Bacon, Pettus, Money, Carmack.

On the Revision of the Laws of the United States.—Mr. Depew (chairman), Proctor, Fulton, Dick, Carter, Daniel, Mallory, Bailey, Patterson.

On Revolutionary Claims.—Mr. Clay (chairman), Frazier, Alger, Spooner, Lodge.

On Rules.—Mr. Spooner (chairman), Aldrich, Elkins, Lodge, Teller, Bacon, Bailey.

On Territories.—Mr. Beveridge (chairman), Dillingham, Nelson, Burnham, Kean, Dick, Piles, Patterson, Clarke of Arkansas, Newlands, Frazier.

On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.—Mr. Gamble (chairman), Clark of Wyoming, Allee, Sutherland, Warner, Pettus, Daniel, Dubois, Clarke of Arkansas.

On the University of the United States.—Mr. Hemenway (chairman), Long, Frye, Wetmore, Dillingham, Dryden, Allison, Clay, Carmack, Blackburn, Foster.

SELECT COMMITTEES.

To Investigate the Condition of the Potomac River Front at Washington.—Mr. ——— (chairman), Frye, McCumber, Gamble, Martin, Bacon, Clark of Montana.

On Woman Suffrage.—Mr. Bacon (chairman), Berry, Wetmore, Beveridge, Burkett.

On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress.—Mr. Martin (chairman), Stone, Cullom, Allison, Nelson.

On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.—Mr. Daniel (chairman), Stone, Clark of Wyoming, Nixon, Brandegee.

On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians.—Mr. Tillman (chairman), Teller, Kittredge, Burrows, Proctor.

On Industrial Expositions.—Mr. Warner (chairman), Crane, Hansbrough, Fulton, Aldrich, Sutherland, Brandegee, Daniel, Carmack, McCreary, Newlands, Rayner.

On National Banks.—Mr. Nixon (chairman), Penrose, Ankeny, McEnery.

To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands.—Mr. Sutherland (chairman), Heyburn, Morgan.

On Standards, Weights, and Measures.—Mr. Smoot (chairman), Millard, Warner Clark of Montana, McCreary.

On Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.—Mr. Pettus (chairman), Frazier, Gallinger.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I rise to inquire if every Senator on the roll has been assigned to a committee, and if not, why not?

Mr. HALE. Yes; I think, undoubtedly, Mr. President, every Senator upon the roll has been assigned upon different committees by the committees from both sides to make up the committees, with the exception of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BURTON], who himself desired—and made his wish known to the committee having the matter in charge—that during the pendency of examination into the case against him no assignment be made him upon any committee; and upon that no assignment was made in his case. That is the only exception.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, it is an exceedingly disagreeable duty to raise a question as to the rights of any Senator in this body, but I am not able to see how the Senate can leave a Senator upon the roll of the Senate and still not assign him to a committee. So long as a man is a Senator he ought to be permitted to exercise his privileges as a Senator and he ought to be required to perform the duties of a Senator.

I sympathize with the delicacy of the task which the committee had before it. I also appreciate the force of the argument that when a question affecting the character and conduct of a Senator is under investigation by the courts it might be well for the Senate to withhold any judgment or proceeding until the final disposition of the criminal charge in the courts of the country. But, sir, there is another side to that question. Whenever a Senator can not come to his seat in this Chamber, can not attend the meetings of our committees, and can not answer to his name on the roll call, the effect of it is to deprive the State which he represents of at least a part of its representation in this body.

I believe the rule ought to be that when a charge affecting the fitness of a Senator to continue in this body is made in such a way as to challenge the attention of the Senate, a committee ought to be appointed, or the matter ought to be referred to some standing committee of the Senate, and they ought to report without delay upon the right of that Senator to continue as a member of this body. If he is found unfit, the Senate owes it to the State which he represents, the Senate owes it to the country which it represents, and the Senate, most of all, owes it to itself to dispose of that question without the least delay.

I do not concede to any court the right to decide who is entitled to a seat in this body. The Constitution commits that to us in the first instance and in the last instance. We are to judge of their election and qualifications when they come; and, under our power of expulsion, we are to judge how long they may remain.

The rule is different here from that which prevails in the courts. There, as a safeguard for the liberty of the citizen, he must have his guilt established beyond a reasonable doubt; here the rule ought to be that he must free himself from all appearance of wrongdoing beyond reasonable doubt.

Mr. President, this is not the time to discuss this question on its merits. I simply embrace the opportunity to declare my belief that the Senate should determine this question without waiting longer on the courts.

We are already in a most awkward attitude. The death of a member of this body has not yet been announced to it. His successor will soon appear at that bar to take upon himself the obligations of the office, and yet the credentials of that successor will be the first formal notice the Senate will have received of the death of the predecessor.

Mr. President, we can not afford to be too tender with these questions. I would be the last man here or elsewhere to stain an honorable name by even proposing an unjust inquiry; but Senators who do behave themselves ought not to rest under the shadow of a suspicion cast upon the Senate by those who do not behave themselves.

Without any formal motion I protest against recognizing the right of a Senator to remain upon the roll and yet denying him the right of an assignment to a committee.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] that this is not the time to discuss the fundamental question as to membership in this body. The resolution before the Senate does not deal with that question in any way.

In doing the business of the Senate the important task of arranging and rearranging committees is intrusted to a select committee raised by the conferences of the two organizations, who go over the whole subject-matter and report to their respective parties. The final report of the two committees is embodied in a resolution such as I have submitted. It is invariably the habit and the method of doing business that Senators' wishes respecting committees are consulted; not that every Senator has his way, but if a Senator expresses his desire to retire from a committee, I have never known an exception to the rule of letting him retire. What is true about a Senator on one committee is true about a Senator who is on several committees; but in this case the Senator from Kansas, still a member of the body, still upon the roll, to be dealt with not here, but in any resolution that may subsequently be introduced by any Senator, if he should so choose, expressed his desire—from commendable reasons, I should say—in the exercise of some self-restraint and delicacy, that during the pendency of the legal proceedings against him, while he was the subject of the action of a court where no final result had been reached, that he be left off of all committees. Had he selected one com-

mittee or two or three committees, as other Senators did, that would have presented one question; but the only question presented was, Should the committee assign him to places when he desired not to be so assigned?

We have no power to enforce either attendance or service upon committees. If this resolve had placed the Senator from Kansas upon any or all of his old committees, he could have declined service the next day, and the Senate, as it always does, would have accepted and would have carried out his wishes, and the places would have been left vacant, to be filled otherwise. The committee thought it was not dealing with the great question of membership—was not touching upon it—but simply upon the convenience and business of the Senate, in agreeing to his wishes as communicated to it by Mr. BURTON, and left him off. That is all there is to it.

As I said at the beginning, I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Texas that this is not the time to discuss the other fundamental matter. Therefore I shall take no more of the time of the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, this is rather a delicate question to discuss pending the consideration of the case of the Senator from Kansas in the court of the United States. The Senator from Kansas is still a member of this body, and so far as the action of the Senate is concerned he stands exactly as he did before there was any complaint made against him by a grand jury.

I agree with the Senator from Texas that this is the place in the first instance where this question should be determined as to his guilt or innocence. Unquestionably when complaint was made against the Senator by a grand jury we could have taken cognizance of the case and proceeded to examine it and determine whether or not there was sufficient cause for his expulsion. I believe, although I do not speak with absolute certainty, that we have pursued the same course that has been pursued in other countries, as in the country from which we received most of laws and customs—Great Britain. There a charge of this kind is not taken up by Parliament until such time as the courts, if the courts have jurisdiction of the case at all, have decided it.

I can see a good deal of difficulty if we should take up the case before the courts have decided it and the courts should decide it differently from what we decided, especially if after we have acquitted the courts should convict. Then certainly we should be in a very embarrassing situation. So the case, I believe, being one without precedent in the history of the Senate, as I understand, is certainly a very embarrassing one. How far we should be governed by the courts is a question which addresses itself to the conscience of every Senator.

The Senator from Texas said it is our prerogative to determine whether the Senator is guilty or not. Undoubtedly, and it is one we can not afford to surrender and one we must always maintain. I refer to our right, and not that of any court, to determine whether or not a man is entitled to sit in this body. It is the only way that the Senate can be legally maintained, and, what is of equal importance, the only way the reputation of the Senate can be maintained in the judgment of the country. If a court has a right to convict a Senator here and there and practically remove him from the Senate, you can see very readily that there may be times when there would be danger to the Senate. If, on the other hand, we declare that if a court acquits a man that shall be an end to the controversy and we shall be compelled to accept him here, we may be compelled to sit with Senators whose characters we despise and whose characters the public at large distrust.

A controversy of this kind coming before the Senate puts every Senator upon his conscience. Suppose a Senator is convicted? Suppose that I, as a Senator, do not believe, after acquainting myself with all the facts, that that is a legal and proper conviction? Suppose I believe, on the contrary, that it is an unjust and wicked conviction? What am I to do? What is my duty? Must I follow the courts? I do not know, because there is no precedent, what the Senate will do. I know what I would do. If I did not believe the man convicted by a jury was guilty of the crime with which he was charged, I would never vote to expel him from this body, no matter what public sentiment and popular opinion might be. I have known men—perhaps not in this body—but I have known men charged with offenses against the law, and serious offenses against the law, acquitted, when, in my judgment, they were guilty. On the other hand, I have known in my practice as a lawyer men whom I believed were guiltless of crime convicted by the courts. So I say this is the place to try these questions, and we certainly should not surrender that right nor should we be in haste. If we should take up the case pending its consideration in the courts, we might be charged, and properly charged, with having unduly and improperly prejudiced the defendant in the trial.

Mr. President, in the case of the Senator from Kansas he is charged with having violated a statute. I do not know how many lawyers in this body have considered the question whether or not the crime charged against him is within the statute. I have not studied that question, and I am unable to commit myself, except to say that my first impressions, which are not always sufficient to carry a lawyer to a final conclusion, are with the four dissenting judges and of the Supreme Court who declared that the case was not within the statute. Five judges asserted that it was within the statute. If his case was within the statute, then another case that came here to grieve us is within the statute. Is not that, after all, the question the Senate will have to decide first—is it within the statute or is it not?

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has alluded to the fact that a member of this body has died, charged with an offense under this statute and convicted of the offense, and the Senate has not taken the usual notice of the fact of his death, and that his successor will be the first legal information we have that he is dead. Mr. President, we all know that he is dead. I never should have mentioned this case in the Senate but for the fact that the Senator has referred to it. We all know he is dead. I wish to say for myself here, knowing something of the facts, whether the law is as the five judges or as the four judges held, I could not bring myself to believe, and would not if called upon here to act believe, that the dead Senator was guilty of any crime which would justify his expulsion from the Senate. Against the sworn testimony of confessed perjurers and forgers and bribers and thieves I will put, when it comes to make up my judgment, his long years of honest service in this body. I will put against it his devotion to the interests of his people and the interests of the people at large. I will put against it the fact that this man, with unnumbered opportunities to create for himself wealth, went down to the grave practically a pauper. It will need more than the testimony of any self-convicted thief and forger to convince me that the dead Senator from Oregon was a vicious criminal at the time of his death or at any time in his history in this service.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] has said, this is an extremely painful subject. But it has been brought before the Senate, it is here, and I think it would be most unfortunate if from what has been said any impression should go out to the public which is in the least misleading as to exactly what the Senate has done or left undone.

First, in regard to the death of the Senator to which reference has been made, no notice of a Senator's death is required by law or under the rules, so far as I am aware, and I should suppose that the death of a Senator is a matter of which the Chair and the clerks take judicial notice. That is certainly done whenever a Senator dies during a recess. His name is omitted when the first roll of the Senate is called at the opening of the session. The name of Senator Platt of Connecticut, who died during the last recess of the Senate, was omitted when the roll of the Senate was first called at the beginning of this session. My former colleague's name was not called the year before, and both instances show that judicial notice had been taken of the fact of their deaths, although formal announcement was made subsequently. Formal announcement is merely a usual form, nothing more. It was omitted in this instance—very properly, in my opinion, for I think the death of the Senator from Oregon was a case where silence was best and kindest.

Mr. President, I agree with the general purport of what has been said by the Senator from Texas. I think there has been here, naturally and in all kindness no doubt, too much of a tendency to remember Senators and forget the Senate. I think we may be quite right in following what I believe to be the English practice, as the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, of taking no action here while the trial of the charges against a Senator is still pending in the courts. But I do not see——

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me a question right here?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. Suppose that a Senator was within two years of the expiration of his term; that he was convicted; that the courts reversed the conviction for error; that the case was sent back for new trial; that it was tried again, and that his term expired before the final judgment in the court of last resort, and the sentence below should be affirmed. The Senate would be in the attitude of having allowed an unworthy Senator to pass from its jurisdiction without recording one syllable of criticism against him.

Mr. LODGE. I quite agree with the Senator that under the

precedents, and I think they are the precedents, such a case as he mentions might arise, and it would certainly be excessively unfortunate. But the Senate has been unwilling, and I think quite naturally unwilling, to anticipate the action of the courts. But I do not think, Mr. President, that awaiting the decision of the courts affects the action of the committee in leaving the Senator's name off all committees of the Senate when the list was made up, especially when the Senator has himself made the request that they should do so. I think that fact separates it from the other question of awaiting or not awaiting final action in the courts.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. I am trying now to prevent the Senate from establishing the precedent. I am utterly opposed to the practice prevailing in the English Parliament of allowing the courts to dispose of the matter before the legislative body takes it up.

I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, who intimates that the Senate is following the precedents, if it is true that any Senator was ever indicted, until within the last few years?

Mr. LODGE. Never to my knowledge.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Dietrich, was indicted, and he came in and asked for the appointment of a committee. That committee was raised to investigate the matter and report. The Senate, so far as I know, took no formal action upon the report.

In the earlier days it is possible that an indictment was returned against Senator Blount, from Tennessee. There an attempt was made to impeach him, and it was held that he was not an impeachable officer. It is probably true—I have not looked up the history of that case for many years—that he was indicted, but at any rate he withdrew from the Senate either by resignation or by expulsion. I think——

Mr. LODGE. I do not recall that he was indicted, but he may have been.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not sure. At any rate, he relieved the Senate of his presence, and in that case it was a political offense more than a personal one. He was charged, as I remember, with inciting insurrection among the Indians, or giving to them advice hostile to the Government.

Mr. LODGE. I think it was treason.

Mr. BAILEY. That would have been the technical charge undoubtedly. It was charged that he incited Indians to resist the authority of the Government.

I am free to say—and I beg the Senator's pardon for interposing at this point—that I am anxious to see the Senate establish its own way of dealing with these questions as they arise, without waiting the tedious processes of the courts.

The Senator will indulge me long enough to say that if the Senator from Colorado, for whom I have the most profound respect and whose statement with reference to the Senator from Oregon weighs with me, is right as to the innocence of the dead Senator, and my policy could have been pursued of investigating the charge as soon as it was brought to the formal notice of the Senate, the Senate would have found that the Oregon Senator was persecuted—assuming that the Senator from Colorado is correct—and we would have heard the announcement of his death and we would have adjourned out of respect to his memory. I only instance that to show the embarrassment which results from leaving these matters until they are finally adjudicated by the courts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I did not mean to be understood as saying that I thought the English precedent was always wise by any means. All I said was that I thought it very natural that, never having had such a case in the Senate until recently, the Senate should follow the English precedents. But, Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator from Texas that we ought to have it distinctly understood that action by the Senate is not to be foreclosed by any judicial action. Under no circumstances can the Senate escape responsibility in that way, nor ought it to do so if it could. It is quite conceivable that a man might be found guilty by a jury whom, after investigation, we should hold innocent. On the other hand, I for one wish to say emphatically that I do not think acquittal on a technicality as to jurisdiction or as to the offense not coming within the statute is sufficient ground for inaction here or one to which the Senate should be confined. Whenever the Senate does act it must act on broader grounds and higher principles than these narrow, legal, and technical ones afford, if we are to keep the reputation of the Senate what it always has been and what we wish it always to be.

For my own part I should have been very glad to have seen the Senate in each of these cases, when they had reached the point of a conviction by a jury, make investigation in a proper way through one of their own committees, and I do not when I say that in the least underrate the difficulties which hedge such action.

Mr. President, I do not see how the Senate could, with propriety, have behaved otherwise than it did in regard to the Senator from Oregon. I do not see how the committee could have behaved with propriety otherwise than they have done in making up the committees. It seems to me they proceeded with good taste and with proper judgment. Whether we should go further, whether we should take any steps now toward an investigation of the remaining case, is for the Senate to determine.

But, Mr. President, I think it very important that it should be understood by the people of the United States that the Senate has considered these cases with a full appreciation of their profound gravity and of the meaning which they have in regard to the position of this great body in the eyes of the people of the United States. Men come and go, but the integrity of the Senate and of the House and a belief in that integrity are essential not merely to our own good name, but to the honor of the Government and the welfare of the American people.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, as a member of the committee to arrange the committees, I wish to speak for a moment only. It is a very happy thing that there have been in the history of the Republic, I think, but three cases of the kind to which reference has been made. It is to be hoped that in as many years of the future there will be less than have occurred within the last two or three years.

The embarrassment and mortification arising through the indictment of Senators for violating the law of the land, are of course confined to no Senator nor to one side of the Senate. It is a feeling which is shared by all of us. The subject, to my knowledge, has had much consideration on the other side of the Chamber and on this side, as to the proper course which in dignity and justice the Senate should pursue in such cases.

I agree with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] that the action of the committee and the Senate, if the report shall be adopted, in omitting the Senator from Kansas from all committees is anomalous, for he is a member of the Senate. His name is on the roll—as legally there as that of any other Senator. He is entitled to vote; he is entitled to act upon committees, for a State which is entitled to send a Senator into this body, as all the States are—and it can not be deprived of that right by the Senate or by any law—is entitled to have the Senator it sends here participate in the important legislative duties involved in committee action. But this is all changed by the request of the Senator not to be included in committee assignments.

So when it was suggested to this committee that the Senator from Kansas should, under the circumstances, be omitted from the list of committees, we were confronted at once by the suggestion which has been made by the Senator from Texas, and we were only relieved from the embarrassment by the request of the Senator from Kansas. The Senator from Kansas has acted with great propriety in absenting himself from the Senate under the circumstances. It has been, I am bound to assume and believe, out of a proper sense of delicacy and deference to his colleagues. No Senator is ever displaced from a committee, when once placed there by the Senate, without his consent, except, so far as I remember, Mr. Sumner; and we were relieved and gratified that the Senator from Kansas should have supplemented his absence from the Senate Chamber, pending the determination in the courts of his case, by a request that he be not assigned, until that determination, to any positions on committees.

Now, if the State of Kansas is deprived for the time of a Senator it is not by the Senate. She is deprived of a part of her representation here for a time by the position in which one of the Senators finds himself. That is embarrassing. There is only one man I know who can relieve the Senate in such a case of its embarrassment, unless we abandon the English rule on the subject, and that is the Senator who is involved. A Senator might leave his place in the Senate, if he were so minded, fight out the battle in the courts, establish his innocence, if possible, and then go to his State and ask to be returned in vindication to this body. That is a remedy we can not control.

The Senator from Texas referred to the case of Senator Dietrich, of Nebraska. Senator Dietrich asked for no investigation by the Senate while his case was *sub judice*. After the circuit court of the United States for the district of Nebraska had dismissed the indictment and discharged Senator Dietrich, holding the indictment to be bad, he came into the Senate, made a statement, and presented a resolution for the appointment of a select committee to investigate his case. And out of the action of the

Senate and out of the investigation by that committee comes something of an argument entitled to be considered as to the course which in such cases should be established by the Senate.

That committee was made up of Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, and Senator Platt, of Connecticut, both gone forever from our midst and both unspeakably mourned, and I had the honor to be associated with them as a Republican member of the committee. From the minority were the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS], and Mr. Cockrell, from Missouri. We sent for all the information which was possessed by the Department of Justice and the district attorney for Nebraska, and a list of the names of witnesses who had been before the grand jury and who had been subpœnaed evidence on the trial. The committee examined searchingly all of the witnesses, and came unanimously to the conclusion, Mr. President, that the charge against Senator Dietrich was utterly without foundation, and so reported to the Senate.

Now, I doubt whether the Senator from Texas, for whom I have great admiration and respect, both for his ability as a lawyer and his sense of justice, would be willing on careful reflection to establish the precedent that the moment a Senator is indicted for a violation of the law the Senate should institute an investigation into the same charge, pursue it to the end, and acquit him or convict him, executing if the latter a judgment of expulsion. It rather shocks one's sense of fairness to contemplate two prosecutions at the same time against a man for the same offense in different tribunals.

Mr. President, whatever the Senate might do, whatever its determination might be, the jurisdiction of the court would remain unaffected. The officers of another branch of the Government would not deem themselves obstructed in the regular prosecution of that indictment. This indicted Senator, with his case prepared to be presented in the usual way in a court of justice, would be summoned to his defense before a committee of the Senate and called upon to give to the committee and to his prosecutors in the court all the evidence gathered for his defense. That, Mr. President, would be unjust. It would handicap him in his defense unless there were some way to bring about an acquiescence by the other department of the Government, the judicial, in the action or judgment of the Senate.

Then, too, in prosecuting this investigation the Senate would be entitled, and ought to be entitled, to the evidence possessed by the Government against the Senator. We could not very well ask the Department of Justice to send here the whole case. And the whole case ought to be before the Senate just as it should be before a court—before judgment, either of acquittal or condemnation. We could not very well summon the Department of Justice and the district attorney of the district to bring before a Senate committee all the evidence gathered by the Government and upon which it relied for conviction. That would embarrass the judicial and executive department of the Government in the discharge of public duty.

And, Mr. President, there is another and worse feature about such a course. Men sometimes are indicted not so much upon the truth as by way of conspiracy or in obedience to public clamor. In a criminal case, pending trial before a common-law jury in the tribunal created by the Constitution for the determination of such cases, an expulsion from the Senate and judgment arrived at upon a partial knowledge of the case would go with crushing and inexpressible weight against a possibly innocent man.

In support of the English rule, what the Senator from Texas says is absolutely true, that this body in determining who shall leave it and who may remain in it is above the courts and it is above the Congress. It is a part of the penalty denounced by the statute in cases like the one pending in Missouri that upon conviction the defendant shall be disqualified forever from holding any office of trust, honor, or profit under the United States. Of course, as to a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives, that part of the penalty denounced by the statute is absolutely void and ineffective.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator will remember that the man proceeded against might be disqualified from holding any other office under the Government, although the law could not disqualify him for the House or the Senate. I take it the statute makers——

Mr. SPOONER. Of course; I had not finished. This provision of the statute can not by any human possibility operate to vacate a Senator's seat or the seat of a Member of the House, because the Constitution has made each body the sole judge of the election, qualifications, and return of its Members. It requires two-thirds to expel a Member and two-thirds to expel a Senator, and a majority only to enact this law. It is impossible that it could apply or could operate to vacate the seat of a Senator.

So, Mr. President, if the court acquitted a Senator the Senate would be entirely at liberty, and if the circumstances seemed to justify it would be shamefully derelict if it failed to investigate the Senator acquitted by a jury and to try the case for itself, and if convinced that the man was unworthy of a seat in the body to pronounce and execute that judgment against him. That affords the remedy without at the same time prejudicing either the Government or the defendant by an abandonment of the English rule.

Of course every member of this body wishes there were no such questions possible to be suggested. Now, as to the failure of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. FULTON]—for it was his duty under the custom—to announce the death of the late Senator from Oregon. He consulted his colleagues about it. It is just to him to say that in this public way since the question has been raised.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly. I shall be through in a second.

Mr. PATTERSON. I wish to ask a question simply for information.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATTERSON. Suppose the Senator should be finally convicted under such a statute as the two Senators were indicted for violating, and the governor of the State should conclude that, the Senator being disqualified for holding any office of trust or profit, and so forth, under the United States, a vacancy existed, and appoint a Senator to fill the vacancy, would he not under the circumstances have authority to so act?

Mr. SPOONER. I do not think the Senate of the United States would feel itself in the slightest degree bound by the opinion, and the erroneous opinion, too, of the governor of a State.

Mr. PATTERSON. If the statutes of the United States and the Constitution declare a person upon conviction to be disqualified from holding an office of trust or profit, is there not a vacancy upon conviction, to be filled by the governor of the State?

Mr. SPOONER. Of course, in most cases that may be true, the statute being a self-executing statute or the constitutional provision being a self-executing provision; but the cases I have put are clear exceptions, for the reason that the Constitution has given the sole jurisdiction to vacate a seat in this body to the Senate and in the other House to the House of Representatives.

I was speaking of the action of the Senator from Oregon in not announcing formally, as is the custom, the death of his colleague. It was his wish to do it.

Mr. SCOTT. He ought to have done it.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from West Virginia says he ought to have done it. Some of us think, in the situation, he was not only excusable for omitting to do it, but that if he had done it he would simply and unnecessarily have been intensifying the tragedy and bringing fresh sorrow to the hearts of those who loved John H. Mitchell, because, Mr. President, no man in this body needs to be told that unless an announcement of that kind is followed by the *unanimous* adoption of the customary resolution of adjournment out of respect to the memory of the dead, it is a reproach, not a tribute. It is not to be contemplated that it should be done or attempted where there is knowledge that it will be controverted, and the Senator from Oregon knew, for to my knowledge he had been so informed, that there would be objection to the resolution and adverse votes upon it. Whether just or unjust is not the question; it is the fact to which I refer, and it was for that reason, and that only, to prevent an inference from nonaction by this body or controverted action in it that would put an additional stain here upon the memory of a Senator while he lay unburied in his home in that distant State that the notice was omitted.

I have thought the Senator from Oregon acted wisely, although we were all pained that there was an environment which seemed to demand such action. The world sometimes will not stop to hear a motion for a new trial in any man's case, but sooner or later the time comes, Mr. President, as a rule, when the people do justice.

Mr. President, I have taken more time than I intended.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I was very unfortunate in what I said, or in my manner of saying it, if I conveyed the impression that I intended to criticise the remaining Senator from Oregon for his failure to announce the death of the late Senator from that State.

Mr. SPOONER. Allow me to say to the Senator——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. If that inference might be drawn from my remarks I disclaim any such purpose. I did not impute, or intend to impute, that to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. For I want to say that I cheerfully bear my small part of the responsibility for his failure to make the announcement. Indeed, I went so far as to tell him that I would be compelled by a sense of duty to vote against a motion to adjourn in honor of the memory of any Senator who stood under a conviction in the courts. That was not an agreeable thing to say, but I cheerfully take my part of the responsibility for that failure.

Mr. President, although I rose only to make that statement, being on my feet I will crave the indulgence of the Senate while I make a brief reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin that it is not compatible with the spirit of American institutions to have two prosecutions in progress against the same individual for the same offense at the same time. If you deem this a prosecution, that is true; but the Senator, who seldom overlooks anything, happens to have overlooked in this case that the Constitution itself provides for that very procedure. The apparent contradiction is not a real contradiction, because the object of the two proceedings is different. The power of expulsion, like the power of impeachment, is exercised for the purpose of removing an unworthy official, and thus freeing the public service from the harm and scandal of his incumbency, while the criminal prosecution is intended to punish him for his crimes. In other words, the right to impeach a civil officer and to remove him by expulsion from the place which he has shown himself unfit to occupy does not abridge the right of the people to call him to the bar of public justice and compel him to answer for his crime. Yet, of course, it is contrary to the genius of the American institutions to prosecute a man twice for the same offense. But the law, the Constitution, and the theory all recognize a difference between an impeachment or a motion to expel and a prosecution for the ordinary crimes which a Senator might have committed.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, did the Senator ever hear of criminal prosecution and an impeachment proceeding together?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, there have been very few impeachments in this country, and I believe never one where a man was guilty of a statutory crime. The only conviction that ever happened was in the case of Judge Foster, and I believe everyone now concedes that the Senate convicted a crazy man in that proceeding. Under our system of life tenure that seemed to be the only way to relieve the people of that judicial district from the work of an unbalanced mind; and so they convicted him. Without asserting it absolutely, I do not now recall that any civil officer called here to answer in an impeachment proceeding has been guilty of a statutory crime, except in the case of Belknap, who was so guilty that he resigned before he could be arraigned before the bar of this body, and I believe a reference to the votes upon the question of his conviction or acquittal will reveal the fact that he only escaped conviction upon the ground that a majority of the Senators felt that he had evaded the jurisdiction of the Senate by resigning his office.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. My friend from Texas of course did not understand me as denying the power, but the wisdom and justice; that is all.

Mr. BAILEY. I perfectly understood that; but I was reminding the Senator from Wisconsin that the Constitution requires us to disinguish between a proceeding to relieve the Government of an unworthy officer and a proceeding to convict the same unworthy officer of his crime.

I never can agree, myself, that the Senate shall wait upon the slow processes of the courts, because as a lawyer, Mr. President, with great pride in my profession, I would incomparably rather hear people complain that the court was too technical than to hear them applaud the court because it was not technical enough; for I have always found that when they complain against the court for being technical their complaint is really against the law, and when they applaud the court for brushing aside the technicalities I have always found that they were applauding the court because it had set aside the law.

I am one of those who do not want to see the safeguards of the citizen broken down. I am one of those who hope never to see the courts of the country proceed with indecent haste. But, sir, it will not do for the Senate to wait until indictments have been found, and motions to quash have been made and granted; then new indictments found, with a trial and conviction, followed by a motion for a new trial, sometimes granted and sometimes overruled, and when overruled an appeal to the highest court of the land, and that court constrained by its sense of justice and its knowledge of the law to send the case back for another trial, where again it must repeat this series of motions and delays. I do not complain at the court for granting motions that ought to be granted, for allowing delays that ought to be allowed under the law and according to the rules of justice. I complain that the Senate must sit here and await the slow and tedious process of the court and await a judgment that it can not accept as final in the end.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that it is beyond the power of the Congress to prescribe who is qualified and who is disqualified to sit in this Chamber. The Constitution fixes that, and under the Constitution the Senate is the judge of it. All that the law meant, I assume all that the lawmakers intended it to mean, is that if a Senator or Representative should be convicted under that statute he is disqualified forever after, not to sit in this body or in the House at the other end of this Capitol—because Congress had no power to determine that—but he is disqualified from holding any other office of profit or trust. If the judgment of a court were brought to the bar of this Senate and tendered as a reason why we should unseat one Senator and seat another I would never recognize the validity of that statute to such an extent. If a Senator or a Member, having been convicted of a violation of that statute, sought an appointment under the Government to some other place, then I should say the statute would operate as a bar against him. I admit the right of no court to determine who may or who may not sit in this Chamber.

Indeed, Mr. President, I can easily conceive a case where a Senator might be acquitted on a criminal charge and yet be expelled from the Senate. Suppose he pleads the statute of limitations? I would unhesitatingly vote to expel a Senator who stood in court and protected himself against an indictment by saying: "I committed that crime four years ago, and therefore this prosecution is barred by the statute of limitations."

I can also conceive of a case where a Senator might be convicted in a court, and I would be so well satisfied of his innocence that I would leave his vacant seat as a protest against the malice of his accusers. I can imagine a time of great popular prejudice, when the public mind might be stirred to its profoundest depths, and when party spirit might run so high that they would persecute an innocent man who had the courage to defy a popular clamor. In a time of great and general excitement an upright Senator's enemies might indict and convict him of a crime. Such a Senator, convicted under such circumstances, might be an honor to the Senate, and I would esteem it a privilege to occupy a seat beside his vacant chair.

Mr. President and Senators, I am not supersensitive, and perhaps I am sometimes more indifferent to the criticisms with which this Senate is assailed than a Senator ought to be; but none of us can be unmindful that throughout the length and breadth of this land, in pulpit and press, we are daily being called upon to answer at the bar of public opinion why we do not call Senators to answer at the bar of the Senate. Within two years flippant and thoughtless men have done more to diminish the respect in which the Senate has been held by the public for more than a century than in any other twenty years of the Senate's existence. You know and I know that upon the average to-day the Senate is as clean as it ever was. You know and I know that the very statute which forbids Senators and Representatives to appear as attorneys before these Departments had its origin in the fact that during the days of the civil war the practice became so frequent as to become a public scandal, and Congress was compelled by its self-respect and in obedience to a wholesome public sentiment to make the law. Yet not long ago I heard of an eminent minister denouncing the Senate of to-day as more corrupt than ever before in its history, and lamenting that the good old times—the times in which giants lived—could not come back again. He cited the Congress during the war times, forgetful of the fact that the greed of Senators then needed the restraining prohibition of the law, while that can not be said of many Senators to-day.

We have our differences, and sometimes they are acrimonious. I have no doubt that on that side of the Chamber you sometimes think that on this side we are demagogues; and I know that on this side we sometimes believe that you are the mere creatures of corporate greed [laughter]; but at the bottom of his heart there is not one Senator in this Chamber to-day who believes that there are four members of this body who are actuated by other than high and lofty motives. Yet, sir, we have fallen to the point that even when in the common play-

houses of the country where cheap playwriters stage cheap plays, the audience applauds when Senators are described as grafters.

I believe the rule—the best and safest rule—is that when a Senator finds himself compelled, by a sense of delicacy toward his associates, to absent himself from the Senate, he ought to resign and give his people a chance to fill his place while the case against him proceeds, and, unless he represents a constituency unlike any that I have ever known, if he can vindicate himself against the charge they will call him back into their honorable service with renewed devotion to him. But if a Senator so situated will not resign, the Senate ought either to relieve him from the sense of delicacy which keeps him from the Chamber or else it ought to relieve his State from the representation of a man that it will not allow to exercise the rights and privileges of his great office.

There have been within the last ten years five indictments of Senators, and each of those indictments implied a crime committed for the sake of money. It is time that the Senate was testifying to the world that this is no place for a man who wants to make money illegally or unfairly, not to say dishonestly.

If a man in an unfortunate personal encounter should be compelled to take the life of his fellow-man, that might or might not unfit him to be a Senator. It would depend entirely upon the provocation. It sometimes happens that high-minded men are compelled, by a sense of self-respect, to slay; but it never happens that a high-minded man attempts to line his pockets with dishonest gain.

The only question in my mind for the Senate to decide is whether the Senator attempted to traffic in his great office. If he did, there is no justification for him; if he did not, we ought to certify to the world that he has been accused without sufficient reason.

I protest against leaving the Senate to suffer under the ribald jests of many good men while the court slowly proceeds with an inquiry which we ought to conduct and conclude without delay.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, has the resolution been agreed to?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution has not yet been agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I hope the question will be put upon the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not wish to interfere with the desire of the Senator, but I should like to say a few words.

Mr. HALE. I was merely calling the attention of the Senate to the resolution.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator if he desires to address the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Not at all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] is recognized.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, this is a painful subject. I shall endeavor to say nothing that will make it more painful, and what I shall say will be brief.

It does not seem to me, Mr. President, that the Senate has erred in any respect with regard to this matter. I shall not discuss the case which is now pending in a court, and for the reason that I think public discussion of matters which are in the course of adjudication should be avoided. For the same reason I do not think that it was incumbent upon the Senate to have a Senatorial investigation running along parallel to a judicial investigation, predicated upon identically the same transaction, although they differentiated in their juridical and their Senatorial aspects.

I have heard the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] make many speeches; seldom have I had the satisfaction of concurring in all he said in those speeches; but I do concur in all that he has said to-day and consider that he has drawn the various lines of refinement with great skill, great care, and with great equity and precision of judgment.

The reasons, Mr. President, that it would have been inappropriate for the Senate of the United States to enter upon an investigation here of a subject-matter which was under advisement in the criminal courts, it seems to me, are manifold. Largely, if not principally, is the reason that no man can attend two trials at once; no man can be in two places at the same time; no body of witnesses can be in attendance or looking to present themselves to two distinct tribunals under one condition of circumstances; no man can have a perfectly fair trial when he is at one and the same time with one power pulling him this way, another power pulling him that way, and having it upon his mind to concentrate his forces, whatever they may be, upon both of them. This is a difficulty that lies in the nature of things and can not be avoided.

There is another reason. The judicial examination is attended with more precise process, is regulated by more precise machinery, and is that examination which, as a rule—I will not say every time—is more apt to be conducted and brought to a conclusion with calmness of mind and without prejudice. Political bodies, however high they may be, however intelligent they my be, and however right-minded they may be, are seldom quite so serene and so unaccompanied by the disturbing concomitants of life as to render them quite so reliable in their juridical opinions and in connate matters as are the courts. They in their structure and nature and inculcation and being are more calm and more independent.

There is still another reason, Mr. President, why, in my judgment, it would not have been a wise thing to have conducted here, cotemporaneously with and collaterally to a judicial investigation, also a Senatorial investigation; and this applies to this case especially. As I understand the matter, though I do not claim to be entirely or familiarly conversant with it—I presume that nobody is, for we have only had scrappy information about it, a little here and a little there, from divergent points of the press—but the first intimation, if I recollect aright, about this matter was either cotemporaneously with or soon after the courts took jurisdiction of it. It was not practicable for the Senate to have taken jurisdiction of this transaction before they found that the courts had it in jurisdiction and consideration. The Senate could not have proceeded without traversing the same lines in large degree that the court was to traverse; and no matter what the Senate might think about it, whether in the direction of the guilt or of the innocence of the accused, its action would have been the passage of opinion by an influential body of men upon a question which was hanging in the judicial scale.

Ours is a country which, it has been said by the most learned and able commentators, is more controlled by public opinion than any other. When that opinion has been duly and maturely formed upon a condition of things which has been fully stated, there is no public opinion in the world that I had rather look to for a correct judgment than to that of the sober-minded American people. But, Mr. President, public opinion upon the identical or connate subject ought never to be invoked while the scales of justice are trembling in the balance. The best conduct of any good citizen while a trial is pending that concerns the rights of man in tender degree is to stand in awe of justice and let justice speak. Had the Senate undertaken to investigate this subject-matter while the courts were in proceeding about it, it would seem to me that it had acted inadvisable and rather in consonance with clamor than at the dictates of evenhanded and level-headed justice.

It is true that we are subjected to inconvenience. One Senator says that the Senate is subjected to ribald jests. Mr. President, if he can invent any process or suggest any receipt that will prevent a Senator from being subjected to ribald jests, he would be held as the greatest discoverer and inventor of all the ages, and I should like to honor and gratify myself by being the first subscriber to the propagation of his work. [Laughter.] It can not be done; it never has been done. No man can go before the public without having people opposed to him, at least not by any process that I have ever known. No procession can forbid a boy to get upon a wall and make fingers and faces at somebody in it as it passes.

But after all, Mr. President, the people have their own way of estimating these things. I do not think that many honest and brave reputations in this country have ever been destroyed by a ribald jest. They are dreadfully annoying; they are dreadfully irritating; but not to notice them at all is the best way in the world to treat them. If you notice one and hit at it like you would at a mosquito or hornet, a whole swarm of mosquitoes or hornets will gather on the other side while you are trying to get rid of one. It is just one of the incidents of life in which the philosophy of the stoic is the best of all applications.

I am not going to discuss this case at all. If it be a case of guilt, let no man apprehend that either the Senate of the United States is going to be ruined or that the country is going to pieces, or that it will escape the just judgment of mankind. Where there is guilt in such high places, people find it out, and punishment in one shape or another is sure to be administered. Suppose it is a case of innocence. The law, Mr. President, enjoins upon each of us—and it is the most saving of all the principles of that merciful justice upon which our whole structure of jurisprudence is based—to presume no man guilty until he is proved to be guilty.

I will relate, Mr. President, a little incident that I heard but a few days ago. It was in relation to Gen. Robert E. Lee, when he was president of Washington and Lee College. Sitting at the head of the board where the faculty gathered, and where inqui-

ries were being made about the progress and the conduct of the young men of the college, a professor remarked to him, "I hear that Mr. Blank is drinking too much." "Professor," said the president of Washington and Lee College, "do not tell me what you hear about any young man; tell me what you know and can prove. Every one of these young men here is entitled to the benefit of the common-law presumption of innocence until he is proved to be guilty."

Mr. President, it does not do for the Senate of the United States, whatever may be its sidelong information, to turn from its path of dignity and duty because of cartoons in a newspaper or because of ribald jests. It must attend upon the due and orderly procedure of slow-footed but in almost all cases certain justice. If it be put to inconvenience, let it suffer it. We can not avoid inconveniences in this life; we can not get through a day or an hour without them. If a State suffers, we can not help that. If we suffer, we can not help that. The only way that we can endeavor to do is to try to deserve not to suffer and wait the patient judgment of enlightened and honorable mankind upon our conduct.

A few people will say that because this man or that man has made a malodorous reputation the Senate is bad. Mr. President, there was never a body of men upon the face of the earth half as big or a fourth as big, or almost any fractional part of a body as large and varied as is the United States Senate, that did not, now and then, disclose some ill character that ought never to have been a part of it. But those bodies have never been misjudged, except in some transient fever of aberrated opinion of those circumstances. We do not cease to reverence the disciples because there was a Judas that broke bread with them; we do not cease to admire George Washington because he had generals in his camp who turned against him; and there is no danger that the American people will ever suppose that their Senate is a discredited body because they have heard or may ascertain that now and then some State has had the misfortune to send here some man who was not the peer of his fellows.

I hope this subject may be dropped for the present. It may come again in due course. There are courts in America yet, and we have no right to distrust that they will attend duly to their criminal jurisdiction.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The resolution was agreed to.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to inquire whether it is the purpose of the Senator from New Hampshire to have the Senate take up the bill for consideration at this time?

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say in reply to the inquiry that it is not my purpose. I thought that if it was made the unfinished business Senators would have an opportunity to consider it during the recess, and immediately after the recess I would submit some observations in support of the bill, and other Senators, of course, could then proceed to discuss it. That is my purpose.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the motion is not open to debate.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is not debatable. I understand that.

Mr. ALLISON. I was aware of that, but I desired a little information before I was able to cast my vote for the proposition of the Senator. But, as I now understand him, it is the purpose of the Senator to call up the measure and make some few observations.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not to-day.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the holidays?

Mr. GALLINGER. Not before the holidays.

Mr. SPOONER. Some other day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Some other day.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to ask unanimous consent to say a word.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it is too early for the Senate now to decide what particular important measure shall have precedence after the holidays.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SCOTT. Let the motion be restated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

WOMEN IN THE CANAL ZONE.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on Saturday last a statement was made, on the authority of the New York Herald, by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], in regard to the importation of women from Martinique to the Isthmus of Panama. On the authority of the Secretary of War, I took occasion at the time to deny the truth of the statement put forth in the newspaper; and I now ask permission, without detaining the Senate to read them, to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter from the Secretary of War and the accompanying correspondence relating to the subject.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the communication and accompanying papers will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter and accompanying papers are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 16, 1905.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Referring to the subject of your telephone message of yesterday, in which you said that it had been stated on the floor of the Senate, on the authority of a newspaper, "that a cargo of women had been brought to Colon, under the authority of the Commission, to be distributed up and down among the laborers on the Isthmus for immoral purposes," I beg to say that my answer to you that the statement was false was founded on information received in letters written me by Judge Magoon. Subsequently I had the correspondence of Judge Magoon with the Commission examined, and all the papers found relevant to the matter have been sent to you. The records of the Commission have this morning been searched and the vouchers accompanying the accounts of labor agents examined by Mr. Pepperman, the assistant chief of the Washington office of the Canal Commission. These records show that the labor agents of the Commission had no authority conferred on them except to pay for the transportation of laborers, and the vouchers show no payments except for the transportation of laborers. I have also conferred with Mr. Shonts and with Colonel Ernst, of the Commission. I find also that Mr. Jackson Smith, the chief of the bureau of labor and quarters on the Isthmus, in charge of the importation of laborers, who happened to be in Washington at the time, was interrogated in respect to the matter when the first dispatch from Judge Magoon came. The correspondence that I have sent you speaks for itself. After this investigation, I am able to reiterate my statement to you over the telephone, "that the charge that a cargo of women was brought to Colon on a vessel of the Commission, or under their authority, or with their encouragement, to be distributed up and down among the laborers of the Isthmus for immoral purposes," is unqualifiedly false.

I may say generally that the Commission has been exceedingly solicitous concerning the conditions as to morality and decent living of those whom they are gathering into settlements along the line of the canal on the Isthmus. They are furnishing schools, and they have now in their pay six or seven pastors of the different churches to which the laborers belong, including the Roman Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church, and the Salvation Army. Eight buildings have already been assigned for religious purposes, and as soon as the buildings now under construction for school purposes are completed they are to be devoted to religious purposes on Sunday. I venture to say that there are no more law-abiding and orderly communities assembled under analogous circumstances anywhere than in the villages and towns situate along the line of the canal and the railway upon the Isthmus.

Very sincerely, yours,

WM. H. TAFT.

HON. H. C. LODGE,
United States Senate.

[Translation of cablegram received from Panama.]

NOVEMBER 16, 1905—7.40 p. m.

ISTHMIAN, *Washington.*

SHONTS: Rumored here that many of the 150 women recently arrived on ship from Martinique and represented as employees' wives, are not married, and have been brought here and distributed among men by our officials for immoral purposes. First knowledge of their arrival and this rumor reached me November 14; immediately brought to Stevens's attention in writing, and instructed chief of the Zone police to make quiet investigation and ascertain the facts. Also requested the municipalities, where such ordinances do not exist, to enact ordinance prohibiting lewdness. Confer with Jackson Smith, chief of branch of labor and quarters, engineering department, sole charge of the work of bringing in and disposing of common laborers. He is in Washington, D. C.; ascertain the facts from him and confer with Secretary of War.

This matter involves Zone government, as that government is charged with protecting public morals. Heard this morning that sensational article was mailed New York Herald to-day.

MAGOON.

ISTHMIAN CANAL ZONE, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Ancon, November 16, 1905.

SIR: I have the honor to bring to your attention copy of a letter dated November 14, addressed to Chief Engineer Stevens; copy of order

issued November 16 to the chief of the Zone police, and copy of cablegram this day sent to Chairman Shonts, with reference to the rumor that 150 Martinique women have been brought to the Zone and distributed among our employees for immoral purposes.

It is no doubt true that private contractors find it advisable, if not necessary, to supply their common laborers with women, and quite possible, if the practice is not permitted in the Zone, that it may affect the question of labor supply from the West Indies or elsewhere.

In this situation I would like to be advised what, if any, action I am to take should it be established that the rumors referred to have some basis of fact.

Very respectfully, CHARLES E. MAGOON, *Governor.*

The honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR,
Washington, D. C.

ANCON, *November 14, 1905.*

SIR: A rumor comes to me that 150 women from the island of Martinique have been brought to the Zone by the division of labor and quarters of the department of construction and engineering and permitted to disperse among the laborers engaged in canal construction work and are now living with the men as concubines. I sincerely hope and believe that the rumor is not true. Although not advised of their coming, I heard that there had arrived on the Isthmus about 150 women who were the wives and families of laborers who were brought from Martinique. This was gratifying intelligence, as it seemed to show that the men were satisfied with conditions here. There is no reasonable objection to women coming here for employment as servants, laundresses, boarding-house keepers, etc., but that is very different from bringing in women for immoral purposes.

I have heard that railroad companies and other private concerns in the United States and elsewhere, employing large bodies of common laborers brought from foreign countries, sometimes resort to the practice of importing women from the same countries for the use of the men. Such a practice indulged in by the Government of the United States, or any of its agencies, would shock the public mind and be so repugnant to our citizens that it would seriously embarrass not only the agency, but also the administration responsible for the acts of that agency.

If there is any ground for believing that the women referred to, or any part of them, were brought to the Zone, or came voluntarily, for the purpose suggested, they should be gathered up and returned to Martinique, without regard to the effect upon the several hundred workmen from the island now employed on the construction work.

As already stated, I hope there is no basis of truth for this scandalous rumor, and shall be glad to learn the facts, if you know them, or to be assured that neither the Commission nor the Panama Railroad Company is involved in the matter.

Yours, very truly, CHARLES E. MAGOON,
Governor.

Mr. JOHN F. STEVENS,
Chief Engineer, Ancon.

ANCON, *November 16, 1905.*

SIR: It has come to my knowledge that a rumor is in circulation that within the past few days about 150 women from the island of Martinique arrived in Colon, a port of the Republic of Panama, and from there dispersed to several localities within the Zone where workmen from Martinique are stationed, and also that in numerous instances women who came in said party are living and cohabiting with men who are not their husbands.

I am confident that a majority of these women were married and came to the Isthmus for the purpose of living with their husbands. I know it is generally believed that in many of the West Indies a great many men and women live together without being married, and it would be difficult to prevent such immoral conduct along the line of the canal, for it will be difficult to secure admissions of wrongful and illegal action, especially among people who do not consider such conduct as being reprehensible, and it will of course be impossible for us to prove that a man and woman living together and claiming to be husband and wife are not husband and wife. It is, however, incumbent upon us to ascertain the facts in this matter, and I wish you would make a systematic investigation with reference to the women referred to above. The investigation should be conducted quietly in order not to induce scandal or unnecessarily offend innocent parties, yet must be sufficiently thorough to develop the truth.

You will make such investigation and report the facts to me in writing as early as the exigencies of the public service and the limited means at your command permit.

Yours, very truly, CHARLES E. MAGOON, *Governor.*

Capt. GEORGE R. SHANTON,
Chief of Police, Ancon.

[Translation of cablegram.]

PANAMA, *November 20, 1905.*

ISTHMIAN, *Washington:*

Letter from Stevens to me respecting Martinique women says:

"These women consist largely of the wives of laborers who had preceded them coming to our work, and were sent here on the request of their husbands. Some came to fill positions as servants in white families, and some as laundresses and chambermaids, for which there was a demand, and all were brought with only the above objects in view, precisely as white women have come from the States under similar conditions, to join their husbands, and as nurses, et cetera. Nearly every one of these families was known personally to our representative in Martinique, and care was taken to include only those who came for legitimate purposes, and to my belief the selection was justified by the results. You can hear any sort of a rumor on the Isthmus, and the one you refer to is entitled to just as much credence as any of them—none at all.

"At the same time, it must be borne in mind that the situation as regards social and family relations among the island blacks differs entirely from that which obtains among white people generally. Thousands of men and women in these islands live together their lives long and never go through the marriage ceremony, but they are recognized as man and wife, and all their family relations are based on the above arrangement. In fact, the proportion of illegitimate children (illegitimate according to our standard) in some of the largest and most populous islands is 80 per cent. Still the families so constituted form the unit of the social and political life of the islands, and from their point of view, from which it is entirely proper to judge them, are entitled to just as much respect as our people who happen to be born and live in another country and under different conditions.

"You can absolutely and unqualifiedly deny any other purpose in bringing these women to the Isthmus, excepting an absolutely legitimate and honest one. Our effort is to establish our blacks as well as whites in old home relations, so that a feeling of stability and contentment, with consequent better work, will result."

MAGOON.

ISTHMIAN CANAL ZONE, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Ancon, November 22, 1905.

MY DEAR SHONTS: Referring to my letter to you of November 16, relative to the Martinique women who recently arrived on the Isthmus, and to my several cables on the same subject, I inclose herewith a copy of the report of the chief of police, dated November 21, made in compliance with my instructions of November 16.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES E. MAGOON, *Governor.*
H. D. R.

Hon. THEODORE P. SHONTS,
Chairman Isthmian Canal Commission, Washington, D. C.

(One inclosure: Copy of report of November 21, 1905.)

ISTHMIAN CANAL ZONE, HEADQUARTERS POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Ancon, November 21, 1905.

Hon. CHARLES E. MAGOON,
Governor Canal Zone, Ancon.

SIR: Referring to your letter of recent date relative to the women who arrived in Colon from Martinique October 30, 1905, I have the honor to report as follows:

A great many of these women have relatives working on the Canal Zone and most of the balance are working at the various hotels along the line, are employed as domestics in the families of employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission, or are living with some one man exclusively. The balance find employment as laundresses.

As a class these women are neat, clean, and industrious, and the records of this department show that none of them have been arrested for any cause whatever. Of the entire number which have arrived on the Canal Zone not more than three or four are common prostitutes.

Approximately these women are distributed along the line and are employed as follows:

Station.	Married, living with husband.	Single working for private families.	Working for isthmian canal hotels.	Single, not employed.	Living with men, not married.	Laundresses.	Total.
Corozal		7	9			24	40
Pedro Miguel	6	1	20				27
Paraiso	1	1	2	10	11		25
Cucaracha	5				23		28
Culebra	11	13	14				38
Las Cascadas	4	7					11
Bas Obispo	18	2					20
Matachin	6						6
Gorgona	2	5	3				10
Lirio	25						25
Cirio	20						20
Cuneta	4				17		21
Chagres	24						24
Total	126	36	48	10	51	24	295

In conclusion I wish to say that I think bringing these women in is a move in the right direction, as it tends to make the men more contented and their presence causes the laborers to be more orderly and industrious than formerly.

Very respectfully, GEORGE R. SHANTON.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 25, 1905.

MY DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of November 16, inclosing a copy of a letter of November 14 addressed to Chief Engineer Stevens, a copy of an order issued November 16 to the chief of the Zone police, and a copy of a cablegram sent to Chairman Shonts with reference to the rumor that 150 Martinique women have been brought to the Zone and distributed among the employees for immoral purposes.

I have read your letters and entirely concur in the policy favored by you in your letter to Engineer Stevens.

Very respectfully, WM. H. TAFT,
Secretary of War.

Hon. CHARLES E. MAGOON,
Governor of the Canal Zone, Ancon, Panama.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 19, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 18, 1905.

AUDITOR FOR PORTO RICO.

George Cabot Ward, of New York, to be auditor of the island of Porto Rico, to succeed Thomas W. Hynes, resigned.

MARSHAL.

Thomas J. Alcott, of New Jersey, to be United States marshal for the district of New Jersey. (A reappointment, his term having expired December 16, 1905.)

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Robert G. Pearce, of Illinois, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Rock Island, in the State of Illinois. (Reappointment.)

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Frederick Enos, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for the district of Fairfield, in the State of Connecticut, to succeed Frank J. Naramore, whose term of office will expire by limitation January 28, 1906.

PENSION AGENT.

Oscar A. Janes, of Michigan, to be pension agent at Detroit, Mich., to take effect January 16, 1906, at the expiration of his term. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 16, 1905.

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

Hart H. North, of California, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of San Francisco, Cal.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 18, 1905.

CHIEF JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF NEW MEXICO.

William J. Mills, of New Mexico, to be chief justice of the supreme court of the Territory of New Mexico.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

William Harrison Bradley, of Illinois, lately consul at Manchester, to be consul-general of the United States at Manchester, England.

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

Reese Blizzard, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of West Virginia.

Harry J. Bone, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas.

MARSHALS.

Charles D. Elliott, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of West Virginia.

James F. Shea, of North Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Clarence A. Hammett, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for the district of Newport, in the State of Rhode Island.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Thomas Hull, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be surveyor-general of Utah.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Henry S. Chubb, of Florida, to be receiver of public moneys at Gainesville, Fla.

George W. Bibee, of Oregon, to be receiver of public moneys at Portland, Oreg.

Don B. Colton, of Vernal, Utah, to be receiver of public moneys at Vernal, Utah.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Benjamin L. Eddy, of Tillamook, Oreg., to be register of the land office at Roseburg, Oreg.

Frank C. Prescott, of San Bernardino, Cal., to be register of the land office at Los Angeles, Cal.

George W. Fisher, of Topeka, Kans., to be register of the land office at Topeka, Kans.

Robert J. Montague, of Crookston, Minn., to be register of the land office at Crookston, Minn.

Algernon S. Dresser, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at Portland, Oreg.

Charles De Moisy, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be register of the land office at Vernal, Utah.

Thomas V. Davis, of Rock Springs, Wyo., to be register of the land office at Evanston, Wyo.

Walter G. Robinson, of Florida, to be register of the land office at Gainesville, Fla.

Galen J. Dixon, of Independence, Cal., to be register of the land office at Independence, Cal.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Stephan C. Fitch to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Jackson and State of Alabama.

William H. Woodruff to be postmaster at Andalusia, in the county of Covington and State of Alabama.

George F. Schad to be postmaster at Brewton, in the county of Escambia and State of Alabama.

FLORIDA.

George C. Crom to be postmaster at Ocala, in the county of Marion and State of Florida.

Andrew Green to be postmaster at Arcadia, in the county of De Soto and State of Florida.

Hettie B. Spencer to be postmaster at Dade City, in the county of Pasco and State of Florida.

MISSISSIPPI.

Richard O. Edwards to be postmaster at Jackson, in the county of Hinds and State of Mississippi.

William T. Martin to be postmaster at Natchez, in the county of Adams and State of Mississippi.

Michael J. Mulvihill to be postmaster at Vicksburg, in the county of Warren and State of Mississippi.

Nannie S. Neilson to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Washington and State of Mississippi.

OREGON.

Chester G. Coad to be postmaster at Dallas, in the county of Polk and State of Oregon.

Abel W. Severance to be postmaster at Tillamook, in the county of Tillamook and State of Oregon.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Albert J. Matson to be postmaster at Delta, in the county of York and State of Pennsylvania.

Oliver E. Mayhew to be postmaster at Export, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 18, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. Joseph C. Sibley, a Member-elect from the Twenty-eighth district of Pennsylvania, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

An act (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriations for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes.

ISTHMIAN CANAL.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House from the Speaker's table the following House bill with Senate amendments, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 480. An act supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriations for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes.

The amendments were read.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Senate amendments to House bill 480 be nonconcurred in and that a conference be asked.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks that the Senate amendments be nonconcurred in and a conference asked.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield a minute?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before you put that motion to the House would the gentleman make an explanation to the House of the character of the Senate amendments? The bill has come over from the Senate so suddenly the House is not acquainted with the character of the amendments.

Mr. HEPBURN. It leaves out the bond provision entirely and makes no other very important change. It requires estimates for annual salaries. The amendments, as the gentleman may have noticed, are not of a very important character except those of which I have spoken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does it leave out the requirement for borrowing the money and leave it within the discretion of the Secretary, as it is now by law, to pay it from money out of the Treasury?

Mr. HEPBURN. It omits that section.
Mr. WILLIAMS. It omits that section entirely?
Mr. HEPBURN. That is my understanding.
Mr. WILLIAMS. It omits the proviso I moved to strike out on the floor?
Mr. HEPBURN. I think it omits the entire section as I understand it. I have not examined it carefully, but that is what I gather simply from the statements in the newspapers and the reading now. The whole of the first section is omitted I understand.
Mr. WILLIAMS. I see. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has called my attention to it. It leaves the proviso for reimbursement out of the proceeds of the bonds in the bill.
Mr. HEPBURN. My understanding is that the whole section goes out with the Senate amendment.
Mr. WILLIAMS. I have the bill now as it came. I see on page 2, line 13, that the language is in the bill, and this bill, if it is passed as it comes from the Senate, will require the issuance of bonds and leave the money on deposit in national banks which might be used for construction. With that stricken out I was going to move to amend by moving to concur, but as that is still in the bill, and in my opinion it is a very vicious thing, I hope it will go to committee for conference.
The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].
Mr. BARTLETT rose.
The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT]?
Mr. HEPBURN. I do.
Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if there is a probability that the report of the conference that is asked for now will be made before Thursday?
Mr. HEPBURN. I can give the gentleman no information on that subject.
Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa another question? It is this: When the bill was up in the House originally the statement was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], stated positively, that there was no such thing as a press agent employed at $10,000 a year in the service of the Commission. I have not been able to see the amendment this morning. Does the amendment offered by the Senate dispose or prohibit or lessen the salary that was paid to Mr. Bishop, whatever his capacity was, who was employed by the Commission?
Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman will have to repeat his question; there was so much confusion that I could not understand.
Mr. BARTLETT. What I asked the gentleman was this: It was stated last week, when the bill was up originally, by the gentleman from Illinois, in reply to an inquiry by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], that there was no such employee in the employment of the Isthmian Canal Commission as a press agent. Now, it has already been developed, in the testimony offered before the Senate committee, that Mr. Bishop was employed, at a salary of $10,000, to perform some duties in the capacity of a historian or creator of public sentiment in behalf of the interests of the Canal Commission or the canal project. I desire to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] if the Senate, by amendment, struck off or prohibited the employment of any person in that capacity or reduced his salary? I saw it stated in a report of the evidence before the Senate Committee on Appropriations that this gentleman was both secretary and "historian" of the Commission.
Mr. HEPBURN. So far as I am advised——
Mr. BARTLETT. I will say further——
Mr. HEPBURN. So far as I am advised, the amendments of the Senate do not refer to the subject the gentleman has referred to.
Mr. BARTLETT. Permit me to say that the testimony before the Senate committee developed the fact that a gentleman by the name of Mr. Bishop, who was secretary, or something of that sort, was employed at a salary of $10,000 for some purpose which was stated on the floor of this House, to act in the nature of a press agent, and it was testified to by him and also testified to by the chairman of the Commission that his duties were rather in the nature I have stated. I do not want to take the time of the gentleman, but I have the testimony before me.
Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know anything as to the state of facts that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] thinks justifies his statement. I know of nothing of that kind. I do not know of any press agent having been employed. I think the gentleman's statement of denial was accurate.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] not know that before the Senate Committee on Appropriations it appeared without question that the gentleman to whom I referred when this bill was before the House was employed practically to devote all his time to the Commission as a press agent and historian?
Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know anything of that kind. I heard no testimony to that effect. I do not believe there was any such testimony as that. This gentleman had certain duties which he performed in the nature or line of duty to which the gentleman referred. He was the historian of the Commission and he was secretary of the board. Those were his major duties. These other were merely incidental.
Mr. FITZGERALD. I have read the testimony of the gentleman before the Senate committee.
Mr. HEPBURN. I do not care to yield to a controversy of this kind at this time. We are ready to take care of that matter when the proper time comes.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker——
Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?
Mr. HEPBURN. I yield to a question.
Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman permit me to put into the RECORD the testimony upon that subject now under discussion as a part of my remarks?
Mr. HEPBURN. Not now. Read the testimony.
Mr. BARTLETT. Permit me to read it.
Mr. HEPBURN. No. When the gentleman has the floor he can adopt such plan as he chooses.
Mr. FITZGERALD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.
Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the Chair state when it will be proper to interrogate the gentleman from Iowa upon questions affecting this bill?
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa declines to yield.
Mr. FITZGERALD. "The gentleman from New York" desires to obtain information from the gentleman from Iowa about this bill.
The SPEAKER. The Chair will not reply in debate. Does the gentleman yield?
Mr. HEPBURN. "The gentleman" will not yield for the purpose of informing the gentleman from New York.
Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is it not the duty of the chairman of a committee reporting a bill or a conference report to explain it to the House before he calls upon the House to act upon it? I distinctly remember Senator Sherman in the Senate declared that it is his duty.
The SPEAKER. On the parliamentary question the Chair begs to differ with the gentleman. The gentleman from Iowa has the floor.
Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the Chair rule that it is not the duty of the chairman to make that statement?
The SPEAKER. What motion does the gentleman from Iowa desire to make?
Mr. HEPBURN. I move the previous question.
Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend for a moment. The gentleman from Iowa moves the previous question upon the motion that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.
The question was taken; and the previous question was ordered.
The question was taken; and the Senate amendments were disagreed to, and a conference was asked.
The SPEAKER announced the appointment of the following conferees: Mr. HEPBURN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:
To Mr. COCKRAN, indefinitely, on account of illness.
To Mr. GRANGER, for this week, on account of illness.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House resolution 42.
The motion was agreed to.
The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania in the chair.
The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House resolution 42.
Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, as a policy holder, I arise to discuss insurance. It has received more attention during this session than all other questions, and

this is as it should be, because the people are giving it more thought than all others. It is our greatest problem. I call it such because the amount of insurance now in force in the United States is more than twelve billions of dollars. This is more than the public debts of Germany, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States combined. It is more than all the individual deposits in National, State, and private banks, and loan and trust companies. It is five times greater than all the money in circulation in the United States. What a monument to thrift! What an invitation to plunder! What a call to duty!

This Republic has ten million policy holders, twenty million policies, and at least forty million people, half her population, directly interested in this matter. The labor, the economy, and the plans of years are all involved.

The most eminent suggestion is that Congress shall pass a law declaring insurance to be an article of interstate commerce, or incident to it, and thus confer Federal authority over all life insurance corporations doing business outside the States where they are organized. Such a law would do three things: It would give the nation supervision of their management, and their control. It would relieve the corporations, in part at least, from the expense and inconvenience of different State regulations. It would enable the Government at Washington to retaliate against foreign countries doing business here in the event their parent countries should discriminate against American countries doing business there.

The first object alone is vital. The second and third are relatively unimportant. The annual expense to all the life insurance corporations in the United States resulting from State control is about eight millions of dollars. More than this amount was spent last year by one great New York life insurance corporation for new business, over and above all of its premiums on such new business; and as respects foreign business, it is in the opinion of the ablest authorities a loss at best. In the light of our recent unhappy experience, it certainly is folly. [Applause.]

Such a law is of questionable constitutionality, and this country does not ask for a law suit. It asks for a result. It does not desire the infinite verbosity of constitutional lawyers. It is in no mood to listen to the deep thunder of profundity or contemplate atmospheric phenomena in the mist of precedent. It asks for the clear light of publicity, and nothing more. And it needs nothing more.

Should the Supreme Court declare life insurance not to be an article of interstate commerce, or incident to it, then we are undone, for the Constitution will not be amended for this purpose. It would take longer to amend the Constitution than to build a battle ship, and public interest could not be sustained. More than a year would pass before a law could be enacted, a case prepared, and a decision had. Two more years would follow before a resolution could be presented to the States and three-fourths of them return it with their ratification.

Time has a fine contempt for everything except a crisis, and in her potter's field rest the forms of many impulses more imposing in their prime than this. [Applause.]

And all this upon the assumption that there will be no positive opposition. This assumption is unfounded. There would be opposition. More than one-fourth of our States hold it a fundamental duty to resist the increase of Federal power at the expense of State power. In addition, the great majority of our people are disgusted with that form of hysteria which calls for a constitutional amendment every time the wind changes. And to this number I am happy to belong.

Then, let us say, the constitutionality of the interstate commerce proposition is a question, and an amendment to the Constitution nothing but a dream. Let us also say that the only value of the interstate-commerce idea is the opportunity it would afford for publicity, for giving the General Government power to supervise the operation and control of these great institutions.

We can enact this provision into law and leave State control undisturbed. We can do it in a way which leads past the courthouse straight back to national confidence. I believe the bill which I have introduced will accomplish this result.

Subject these corporations to national supervision and the eagle will keep the vulture from plucking the bodies of the dead. [Applause.]

Congress has unquestioned power to legislate for the District of Columbia, the Territories, and for our insular possessions, and all of these great insurance companies do business in some of these places.

True, a statehood bill may leave no Territories. In the future our power to legislate for our insular possessions may be abridged. But, gentlemen, the District of Columbia will always remain with us. Congress will always have, under the Constitution, the power to exercise exclusive jurisdiction in all cases whatsoever in the District of Columbia. This District of Columbia, this little District of Columbia, less than ten miles square, offers a solution of this question, offers the field for a display of that moral force and influence which will compel all the life insurance companies in the United States to come here and of their own volition invite the supervision and scrutiny of the Government. Enact into law the salient features of this bill and the life insurance companies of this Republic will be compelled, for prudential reasons, to not only invite but advertise Government supervision. They would hurry here, if not here already, in order that the agents soliciting business out in the States might possess the one absolutely essential asset of a life insurance solicitor in the future, namely, the proud and confident assurance that the books of his company are constantly open to rigid inspection. Every life insurance company in this Republic would be compelled to come here, write business, submit to Federal supervision, or go out of business. In other words, enact into law the salient features of this bill and this problem will solve itself.

I have a bill creating a division of insurance in the Department of Commerce and Labor, and providing for a superintendent of insurance and subordinate officials. This bill provides, among other things, that all corporations doing life insurance business in the District of Columbia shall file with the superintendent a sworn report on the first day of September of each year, thus enabling the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor to place it in his annual report to Congress.

This report shall contain a complete, classified, and itemized statement of all assets and liabilities.

This would disclose any scandalous perversion of funds.

This would prevent, for instance, any life insurance corporation from holding ninety million dollars' worth of securities marketed by J. P. Morgan & Co.

This would supplant speculation with investment.

This bill provides that this report shall contain a complete, classified, and itemized statement of the amount and character of all business transacted.

This would disclose how far these companies had departed from the original purpose of insurance and wandered off into a maze of more than two hundred forms of policies, puzzling the mind and absolutely defrauding the people.

This bill provides that this report shall give a complete, classified, and itemized statement of the number and character of all policies outstanding, the number and character of all policies issued during the preceding year, and the number and character of all policies forfeited during the preceding year.

This would direct attention to an amazing field of fraud. It would tell the story of conditions misrepresented, of stipulations not understood, of obligations too heavy to be borne, of dishonest estimates of earnings. It will warn the people against the most stupendous trickery of our time, namely, the investment feature of life insurance.

In one of the three great life insurance companies last year only 9,000 policies came to a natural end, 7,000 policies were surrendered, and 33,000 policies lapsed.

This bill provides that this report shall contain a complete, classified, and itemized statement of all dividends paid.

This will disclose whether the cold-blooded robbery of the past is being repeated. Let us hope that it will explain to the inquiring policy holder why his dividend fell from $149 in 1876 to $7 in 1904, and why the dividend of his friend sank from $55 in 1876 to $3 in 1904. Let us also hope that such a provision would make it impossible for a great corporation, whose profits in 1904 were a million dollars greater than in 1903, to pay $200,000 less in dividends than in 1903.

This bill provides that this report shall contain a complete, classified, and itemized statement of all the names of all executive officers, their respective salaries, and their compensation. This will disturb that touch of kin which makes the whole company a Christmas tree. [Laughter and applause.]

These salaries are dishonest, the great majority of them. The New York savings banks held deposits last year amounting to more than a billion dollars, practically the same sum as was paid into the three great life insurance corporations, and yet the total expense of their management, including taxes, was only 50 per cent larger last year than the salaries alone paid in the home offices of these insurance corporations.

This bill provides that this report shall contain a complete, classified, and itemized statement of all receipts and expenditures.

This will throw light upon the salaries of all parasites. It will call the roll of our purchasing agents in every state capitol from Maine to California. It may explain why the printing, stationery, and postage account of one corporation last year was

over a million dollars. Think of it! Almost half of the expense of our entire diplomatic and consular service.

It will also inform us whether the lunches we give our executive clerks are satisfactory to them, and whether our banquets to agents in New York and Paris are in keeping with their ancient dignity. We, the absent hosts, of the United States demand that the high standard set by our Hyde ball shall be maintained.

This bill provides that this report shall contain a complete classified and itemized statement of profits and losses with full information as to all profits and losses.

This would turn the searchlight on a multitude of syndicate operations, such as the international marine scheme, which was a wild desire to own the sea as well as the land, the sky having strangely eluded the calculations of these Napoleons of larceny—up to the time, at least, that I was recognized by the Chair. [Laughter.]

This bill provides that this report shall contain a complete classified and itemized statement of all advertising and copies of the same. This will emancipate the magazines and newspapers from the most subtle deception that ever assumed the form of literature.

And in addition another feature should be added. There should be a statement respecting the number of proxies voted at the election of trustees, and the number of policy holders voting in person, and no executive officer should be permitted to cast any ballot but his own.

No feature of this investigation has been more ridiculous than the pretense of mutuality.

A mutual affair is where men band together to give and take, and these companies have been mutual only in this, the policy holders give and the officers take.

On an average only 200 of one New York Insurance Company's 650,000 policy holders record their votes for the election of trustees. In the last ten years the largest vote at any meeting of the New York Life Insurance Company was 2,328, and of this number only 36 policy holders voted in person.

The Metropolitan Insurance Company has 8,000,000 policies outstanding, and at its last election 38,000 policies were recorded as having voted, but in fact only 3 policy holders actually voted in person. This is the source of all mismanagement. It is an endless chain, the officers ask the agents to have policy holders send their proxies to the president he then elects the trustees and they in turn elect him.

Should some policy holder wish to vote he must be very vigilant, for the notice of election is printed only in the New York papers, and the only notice he gets is on the back of the envelope in which his policy is mailed.

This bill provides that the superintendent of insurance may address inquiries to life insurance corporations doing business in the District of Columbia, the Territories, and insular possessions, and full answers must be made thereto, and at his discretion, or on application of a responsible party, the superintendent, or a subordinate named by him, shall make a personal inspection of books and accounts, this power including authority to examine witnesses under oath.

This bill also provides that any corporation shall forfeit its charter to do business in the District of Columbia, the Territories, and insular possessions whenever the superintendent of insurance shall learn that it has indulged in a number of forbidden practices. They shall not make any fictitious sales or loans. This would prevent a future Perkins, as vice-president of an insurance corporation, from buying bad stock from Perkins, as the trusted agent of J. P. Morgan & Co., and later transferring $800,000 worth of it to Morgan & Co. on the 31st of December, 1903, and buying it back on the 1st of January, 1904, in order to make a false report to the State superintendent of insurance.

It would prevent the transfer of a million and a half dollars' worth of industrial stock to a $600 a year messenger in order to deceive the German Empire, which forbids the holding of industrial securities.

This bill provides that no such corporation shall own to exceed 10 per cent of the capital stock of any other corporation.

This will take them out of the saloon business, the hotel business, the banking business, the trust business. It will restrict them to the insurance business.

This bill provides that no executive officer of any such corporation shall hold any office of trust or profit in any other corporation having any business of any kind with the insurance corporation.

This would dissolve the standing pair which Mr. Perkins has had with himself for so many years. [Laughter and applause.]

It will also prevent Mr. Cromwell, the treasurer of one of these corporations, from continuing to be a member of sixteen different syndicates, all of which do business with the insurance corporation with which he is identified.

This bill provides that no corporation shall pay a commission to exceed 40 per cent of the first premium. This is more than enough for honest progress, and if this racing for dishonest supremacy does not end in time it will end in insolvency.

Last year the total premiums on new business in the Equitable were over twelve million dollars, while the expenses of management were over fourteen millions. The new premiums of the Mutual amounted to more than fourteen millions. The expenses of management were over sixteen millions, the total premiums in the New York Life were over sixteen millions, the management expenses were over nineteen millions.

Think of such a corporation paying nine million dollars for new business. Think of another company borrowing fourteen million dollars with which to buy new business.

Thirty years ago the percentage of expense to income for ten large companies was 9 per cent, two years ago it was 19 per cent. And this is why this bill also prevents the giving or taking of any rebate on an insurance premium.

This bill provides that no contribution of any kind shall be made to any political campaign fund.

This will stop the indecent practice of converting private funds for vicious purposes; and from the bottom of my heart I condemn this infamous practice everywhere in the country. [Applause.]

This bill provides that no corporation shall make any investment of any kind or deposit any of its funds without the advice and consent of its board of directors. All of this dishonesty has been the result of arbitrary power.

This will prevent Mr. Harriman from borrowing $27,000,000 to cast into a struggle for the control of the Northern Pacific Railroad.

Arbitrary power to dictate the deposits and investments of these companies makes a king of Wall street, for less than 8 per cent of the assets of these corporations is in real estate. It is quick money. It can be reached in an instant, and this makes the commercial world the prey of these great institutions.

This bill provides that these corporations are forbidden to do anything without the consent of the board of directors, authority over which is given said board of directors by the laws under which the corporation shall have been organized.

Ever since time began arbitrary power has meant nothing but tyranny and shame, and this is why three great companies paid last year the mammoth sum of $49,000,000 for the expense of management. Think of it! More than twice the interest on our national debt, and almost one-half as much as they paid to their policy holders through all channels.

This is plunder, Mr. Chairman, pure and simple. One thing exceeds the perfidy of these offenders, and that is their impudence. All but two or three remain in power. There is not one of them good enough to wear the strips of the felon. For them to remain in office is unspeakable, as unspeakable as for the home wrecker to complacently sit in the ruin he has wrought and calmly invite the American father to return thanks for divine favor.

While no policy should lapse on this account, no man should take a new one in one of these corporations as long as one single remote descendant of Calvary's impenitent thief remains in power. [Applause.]

One of them has gone away. He has gone to Paris. I congratulate him on his conception of propriety. In the midst of all this brazenness his flight is as noteworthy as that of the belated swallow back to the Tropics through the autumn sky.

We send Mr. Hyde to France, not as an ambassador, thank God, nor even in return for the straw which was packed around the body of John Paul Jones. And he might say to our sister Republic that we will gladly exchange with her, for an equal number of honest dead men, to be selected at her own discretion, a band of brigands who seem resigned, but have not. [Applause]

How patient the people are. They know that when the nations united and swept piracy from the sea it planted its flag in the stock exchange. They know the skull and bones have been the coat of arms of brutal wealth in every age. And they should hate it. They should hate it for the genius it has debauched; they should hate it for the havoc it has wrought; they should hate it for the anarchists it has made. Instead it seems they see in it merely the Almighty's caricature of man's supreme stupidity, and they are patient still.

Patient though they be, I want to take away from the death bed of the policy holder the ugly faces of Harriman; Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; the McCurdys, the McCalls, the Perkinses, and Pierpont Morgan, the international kleptomaniac. [Applause and laughter.]

About face, captains of industry, and Cassie Chadwick, daughter of the regiment! [Applause.]

I wish to say a word respecting the professional director in the United States, the embossed-stationery director, the bird's-eye-view director. He is usually a politician who knows nothing except cunning, and is used to decoy the people who have lifted him from obscurity. In business these men are universalists—that is, they are directors in every institution within the zone of their notoriety. Their souls are in pawn, but their names are still for rent. [Applause.] They plead financial success as a demurrer to the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, all we need is reassurance. These companies are solvent, but they charge too much and return too little. This investigation that is going on, these developments that have aroused the country, will prove a blessing, and the publicity which can be secured by this bill will preserve all the fruits of this blessing.

Confidence is not impaired; it is only alert. It has stood unflinchingly on too many fields of war to flee from a band of common thieves. [Applause.] Confidence is not hysterical; it is philosophic. Betray it basely if you will, it calmly counts the loss, repairs the damage, regrets a shattered idol, adds a line to its experience, and serenely goes forth to other duties.

Armies and navies and statesmanship and wealth and art and science are chattels, one and all, alongside of confidence. I do not mean the weather-vane confidence of the ticker, but the confidence of man in man. Old-fashioned confidence, clad in the homespun of common sense, you are the greatest aristocrat that ever stood at the fireside of organized society. [Applause.]

Pass this bill and you have publicity, complete publicity. Have complete publicity and this problem disappears. Publicity will bring regularity, retrenchment, simpleness. Insurance companies will come back to their legitimate field and expenses will decrease. Deferred dividend schemes and other vices will pass away before the searching eye of Government supervision. Publicity will give a sense of fear to all whom God has denied a sense of shame. [Applause.]

This bill will make the District of Columbia the most popular territory in all the world for soliciting insurance. There is a moral force in this measure against which no insurance company, large or small, in this Republic can stand and grow. These great corporations, knowing that their innermost transactions will be given to a country already suspicious, will compete, not for other worlds, but for the approval and esteem of their own land.

It is idle to contend that corporations would evade the provisions of this bill by removing from the District of Columbia, the Territories, or the insular possessions. That would be a confession of dishonesty and they would be branded everywhere.

Publicity is not an experiment—it has been tested in every age and it has never failed. It is but another name for light. It has led humanity from the cave to the cottage. Publicity bore the cross around the world. It has ever been the first instinct of honest human nature. It called our fathers together beneath the oaks and gave us the Magna Charta. It opened the book of faith and closed the lips of superstition. The colonists were unwilling to bear arms against oppression without its aid—without first giving the world their reasons—and the Declaration of Independence came. And when that war was over and Kings and Emperors jested at our feebleness, liberty stepped forward, took the hand of a Republic in rags, and, pointing to the western wilderness, said, "Give me but free speech and a free press and I will lead over mountain and plain, and when the cycle shall be full again I will point to a nation such as dreamer ne'er foretold.

How sacred is publicity's task to-day! What a vast treasure is at stake!

In the early seventies a victorious nation demanded what was thought to be an overwhelming indemnity from its helpless foe, and the admiration of the world burst forth when the payment of that indemnity followed close upon false prophecy. The plain American, thinking of wife and child and future has built for their indemnity against death a sum which is more than twelve times as great as the indemnity which France paid to Germany. What a man he is after all, this plain American.

This vast treasure publicity will protect.

Mr. Chairman, pass this bill and in the future the representative of no life insurance corporation can knock at the door of the lowliest cottage in this Republic and escape the question, "Does your company do business in the District of Columbia?" [Prolonged applause.]

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1905, on the 20th day of said month; when the Speaker signed the same.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. AMES rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] acquiesces in the recognition of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES]?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate for me that I have to follow so distinguished a speaker as we have just listened to, and I regret that I have to treat in the few minutes allowed me a plan of insurance regulation along very nearly the lines of the bill so well explained in the last hour. But in order that the Members of the House may know what the Administration has been actually doing along the line of possible and proper control of insurance, I consider it my duty, as well as my pleasure, to submit as briefly as possible the plan which has already received the approval of the Attorney-General of the United States, as well as that, I am given to understand, of the President himself.

Briefly, a code is being drawn, and has been in preparation for some weeks past, with the assistance of the commissioner of insurance of Massachusetts, Mr. Cutting, than whom there is no greater authority in the United States, and with the assistance of the assistant attorney-general of the State of Massachusetts, Mr. Frederick H. Nash, who for six years has fought the insurance battles of Massachusetts against all comers; and this code is a code that embodies in its features all that is just and proper and right and reasonable in the way of insurance laws, combining the best features of the laws of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, protecting the individual policy holders against every form of abuse, every type of corruption, and at the same time permitting a legitimate insurance business by a corporation.

Now, briefly, starting with such a code, if you can imagine it—for it will be a code of nearly 100 pages in length—starting with such a code the proposed plan is this: To make the District of Columbia, which everyone admits is free from any constitutional question so far as Congressional legislation is concerned, the seat of a national commission of insurance, in the Department of Commerce and Labor. This commission will supervise all insurance companies which would do a business in the District of Columbia. No company to be allowed to do business in the District until it has complied with this code in all of its requirements. More than that, no company will be allowed to do business in the District until it has received a certificate of authority from the insurance commissioner to the effect that the company has complied with this code. And more than that—and in this, gentlemen, is the crux of the whole proposition—this certificate of authority shall be revoked unless these insurance companies conduct their business in the several States according to the code laid down by Congress for the District of Columbia. What will be the effect of this? It establishes a black list of companies not willing to do an honest business. The actual business of insurance in the District will amount to nothing; but it sets a standard for honest and legitimate business, and a company that is unwilling to come within this code is a wild-cat company. Public opinion will do the rest. It permits a company to do a legitimate business, and by a legitimate business I mean an honest business, such as our national banking business. In my State of Massachusetts the law provides that a street-railway corporation shall not be allowed to declare more than 8 per cent dividends on its capital stock, and in that State no stock watering is allowed. That might be legitimate business.

In the manufacturing business, in cotton and in woolens, we would be glad to be assured of 6 per cent on the capital actually invested in plant and equipment year in and year out. There are plenty of insurance companies that would be willing to conduct their business on a 6 per cent profit—a legitimate business—turning all other surplus beyond that necessary to safeguard the interests of the insured over to the policy holder and saving none for a corruption fund. That, in brief, is the scheme. The code—and a just and proper code is the prime requisite in the bill—has been under way some weeks; and I hope shortly after the holiday recess to present a bill incorporating a complete and most carefully drawn code that will meet with the approval of all the insurance commissioners of the United States—and I have no doubt of all

honest insurance companies—and you will have before the House a scheme already approved by the Attorney-General and, I have been given to understand, meets the most cordial support the Administration. [Applause.]

I only regret the ten minutes allowed me has expired, and I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for his kindness.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for our consideration a resolution distributing the message of the President of the United States to the various committees of the House. For some days I have listened with much interest to the speeches made on one question considered in the President's message. From the discussion which has taken place about this message, one might be led to believe that there was but one question involved that could awake the interest of this House—the clause relating to insurance. I believe the question of insurance is a vital one. It is a new question in Federal legislation, one that should be considered carefully and well. But I believe that there are more important questions before this House to-day than that of regulating insurance companies. There are issues that come more closely to the homes of the people than even the insurance discussion. You might say that insurance only involves the rich; at least you can say insurance only involves the homes of those who are well-to-do, because it is only the well-to-do classes that pay the premiums on life insurance, and therefore are directly interested in that matter.

But there is a suggestion in the President's message that involves the homes of the poor, which involves the question of wages, which involves the question of competition for everyday work; and in my humble opinion that suggestion is of far more vital importance to the American people than even this great question of life insurance and regulation of life insurance companies can ever be. It is no new question to American legislation, and yet, although the matter has been repeatedly brought before Congress, that body has failed up to this time to pass legislation that would effectively regulate it and protect the American people. I refer to that portion of the President's message that calls the attention of Congress to the suggestion that the immigration coming into this country from foreign lands should be restricted and regulated.

Members of the House, I want to say that there is a very strong sentiment in this House, a dominant sentiment, that we shall not change the present tariff law. There are many of us on this side of the House who consider the present tariff laws a detriment rather than a benefit to the country, believing that they hold back the march of progress. But a majority of the House for the last eight years have shown that they are unwilling to change the tariff laws. Why? Because they say we are in an era of prosperity, that that prosperity brings work to the American workman and wages to the American laborer, and they will not interfere with present conditions. They say it comes from the protection that has been given our manufacturers under the Dingley bill; yet they are leaving the sluice gates wide open for indiscriminate immigration to come into this country, for the pauper labor of the world to come into competition in American factories and on American farms with American labor [applause], contrary to the very essence of the argument that they make that the protection of American labor is secured by the protective-tariff theories of the Republican party. It is argued by those in favor of admitting all immigrants that it was by that policy that we built up this country; that it was through the admission of immigrants without restriction into America that this great country was settled and developed. We are all bound to admit that we can count back in the course of four or five generations to the original immigrants who came from the old country to establish our line here. But I want to say that the question of immigration in the past and the question of immigration to-day are entirely different problems to consider. They are as different as black is from white; and why? Because we are receiving an entirely different kind of people. We may want, and do want, immigration of our blood, of our kith and kin, to develop and build up this country; but we do not want immigrants to come into this country who will tear down the American standard of life, of living and of wages, who are of inferior races to our own, who have been oppressed and pauperized for so many centuries that they are unable to maintain the high ideals of American citizenship.

The early history of the immigration coming to this country shows that it came from the people of Celtic and Teutonic blood. It came from northern Europe. It came from those people who have created the present civilization of the world. The facts show that the immigration coming to America to-day is not of the Teutonic and Celtic peoples, but it is from the Slav, the Iberic, and the Mongolian races in larger proportions than it is of the blood of northern Europe. What is the difference? We find that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, 1,026,000 immigrants came into the United States, a greater number than the entire number of immigrants that came to this country from the settlement of Jamestown down to the adoption of the Declaration of Independence—more people coming into the United States in one year than all who came prior to the establishment of our independent Government. That immense number should cause the American people to look well to the question as to who are making up this vast immigration coming here to mix their blood with our blood and with whom we must ultimately assimilate.

In the early history of the country the immigrants came to America for a different reason than that which brings them here now. In the beginning of our settlement they came here to free themselves from the oppression of bad government in Europe. They belonged to that same independent race of men of the Aryan blood who, when they left their homes in the Caucasian Mountains, came with the idea already embedded in their hearts and minds of the glories of self-government. When those wild tribes first came to Europe they elected their own chiefs. When a leader was killed in battle, his son did not succeed him, but the candidates for the office laid their shields on the turf, and the warriors, the electors of their day, threw their swords into the shield of the man that they desired to follow, and the man who received the greatest number of swords was the chief and the ruler from that day on.

They brought that principle with them from the Caucasus Mountains. It has been embedded in them to this day. It is the same principle that worked in the blood of the American patriot when he drew his sword for independence at Bunker Hill and at Yorktown. In other words, it is what is in the blood that makes a people great and prosperous. God Almighty did not create all animals equal. He created some strong and some weak. He did not create all races of men equal. He created some intelligent and some unintelligent, some brave and some cowardly, some thrifty and some lazy.

Practically all of the immigrants who came to this country before 1880 were from northern Europe. They were of the Teutonic and Celtic origin. They did not come because they were assisted by others; they did not come because somebody paid their way to get them out of their old country, but they came here because they wanted to live in a free country. They came here to get rid of the oppressions of their old home. They came here, themselves raising the money that it cost them to move their families to America. They came here facing the terrors of an unknown ocean, and cut their way through a primeval forest, facing savage tribes, to build their homes and to establish this Republic.

As long as there were any homestead lands left in the West to be taken up and to be made into homes, that immigration still continued from northern Europe—continued to come from people of our kith and kin, people whom we could absorb and make a part of us in one generation. But when that class of immigrant could no longer find a homestead here on which to build his home and found his independence, he ceased to come. When the great steamship companies of the world found that the immigration was falling off, which had been very profitable to them, they felt it was necessary for their business to keep it up. They found that the immigrant from northern Europe was no longer willing to come, because the inducements that in former years brought him to America no longer existed. Then they put their agents in the field to bring not good immigration, but to bring any immigration they could get, for the sole purpose of the profit derived from the money paid for the steerage passage, and not for the benefit of America or the upbuilding of our Republic. It then became a question of who was it easiest for them to get. It was that class of people who were most discontented with their home surroundings, who were most oppressed and downtrodden at home, and who therefore were most willing to leave.

And it was in that field they sent their agents to secure the immigration that make the profits for their great companies. I am informed, and I am sure that the facts are true, that the steamship companies entering New York in the last year made over $25,000,000 of profit off of the steerage immigrants they brought into this country. That is the inducement for them to bring in the class of people that we now find coming here, and when they come here they are here for good or for bad. If they are of benefit to the country, we derive the benefit; if they are of injury, we suffer that injury.

Now, the contention that I make is that we should take care of our own people first. The argument is often made that this is a free country; that we should open our arms to everyone; that America should be the home of the downtrodden and the

oppressed of all lands. That is a beautiful sentiment, one worthy of those who utter it; but my idea is that the true way to live, the true way to push forward civilization and Christianity, is to build up the best standards and not tear them down. I believe that our first duty is to our home people. Show me the man who does not think his first duty is to his home and his fireside and I will show you a man who is too cowardly to protect that home and that fireside. [Applause.] Show me the man who is not loyal to his own State before he extends his loyalty or friendship to some other State and I will show you a man that is unworthy the State that gave him birth. Show me a man that does not believe that the Stars and Stripes that fly over this Capitol are the emblem of the greatest nation on God's earth and I will show you a man that is unworthy of American citizenship. [Applause.]

It is that which makes us a great nation. It is that reason which makes us the great race that we have always been—loyal to ourselves and loyal to our people. It is because we have refused to mix our blood with the blood of an inferior people that we to-day stand at the head of the world's civilization.

If the immigration coming into this country is a menace to American citizens, to American people, is it not our duty to stop it now? I want to call your attention to a few sentences that the President uses in his message in reference to this question that goes right to the meat of the question. He says:

> What we should desire to find out is the individual quality of the individual man. In my judgment, with this end in view, we shall have to prepare through our own agents a far more rigid inspection in the countries from which the immigrants come. It will be a great deal better to have fewer immigrants, but all of the right kind, than a great number of immigrants, many of whom are necessarily of the wrong kind. As far as possible we wish to limit the immigration to this country to persons who propose to become citizens of this country, and we can well afford to insist upon adequate scrutiny of the character of those who are thus proposed for future citizenship.

Now, are we doing it? Are we scrutinizing those who propose to come here for future citizenship? I find that the report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration for this year—that is, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905—shows that of the 1,026,000 immigrants that came into this country only 221,000 were of Teutonic origin, 124,000 of Celtic origin, and the balance were either Slavic, Iberic, or Mongolian origin, people of a different blood from ours and a different race. You say that may not affect us; that we are able to absorb these people and have them become a part of us. If 1,000,000 comes this year—and it has been gradually increasing from year to year—in ten years it will amount to 10,000,000 immigrants, two-thirds of whom are people of a race different from ours and inferior to ours. We must absorb them. A million a year in ten years will amount to more than one-tenth of the population of the United States.

Mr. GOULDEN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania). Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman what per cent of immigration coming here return home again—of that 1,026,000 what per cent does the gentleman estimate will return within the next five years?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have not ascertained the percentage.

Mr. GOULDEN. Then I will give it to the gentleman. It is 40 per cent. Forty per cent return and 60 per cent remain. Now, Mr. Chairman, one more inquiry, if the gentleman will permit me. I live in New York City and have made a study of this matter—have been to Ellis Island a number of times in the last year. Is the gentleman aware that the demand for laborers—those doing the lowest manual labor—is so great that it is necessary that the immigration be kept up to the present number of good, honest, healthy men and women?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I am not.

Mr. GOULDEN. It is a fact nevertheless.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It may be a fact from the standpoint that the gentleman looks at it, but the standpoint from which he looks at it is the standpoint of wealth and not of humanity.

Mr. GOULDEN. No; it is not; but from that of absolute necessity of the times.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am looking at it from the standpoint of the man who earns his daily bread by his daily work. [Applause.] I will say to the gentleman right here, and that is where the issue comes in this question, I would rather let the factory and the furnace and the plantation wait a reasonable length of time to make its development than I would to drive American citizens to Canada in order that they may get homes because they can not compete with the class of labor that is coming into the United States to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. GOULDEN. Does the gentleman know that out of the 400,000 or more coal miners at least 75 per cent are foreigners?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes, I know that; but most of them are the right kind of foreigners.

Mr. GOULDEN. It is almost impossible to get anyone to do ordinary manual labor and the work of necessity unless you get it through our ports of admission for immigrants.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Is not that true, I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN], because of the various injunctions that have been issued by mine owners against native men who at various times have struck, and then these people have been brought here in cattle cars by the contract and by the head to supplant the different places of the American laborer? If that is not the case in New York, it is to a shameful degree in Kentucky. [Applause.]

Mr. GOULDEN. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to yield to my friends, but I do not want to yield for a controversy outside of the line of my speech.

Mr. GOULDEN. I only want to say that I believe the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] is at times true, but it is a condition and not a theory that confronts us now, and my figures are taken from the report of the Commissioner of Immigration at Ellis Island, Mr. Watchorn, a gentleman who rose from the position of a coal miner to the position he holds to-day, and who is an authority on these matters.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have the report of the Commissioner of Immigration before me on my desk, and I know that there is a certain class of immigrants coming to this country who ultimately intend to return to Europe. A large number of Italian immigrants who come to this country return, as do a great many of the Chinese and Japanese. That may lessen the numbers that stay here, but, according to the gentleman's own figures, of the men that came last year 600,000 would remain, and we would have the same problem, maybe in a little less degree, but the same problem of assimilating those people and raising them to American standards. Now, look at the difference. You say that it makes no difference, but why does this condition obtain? The people of northern Europe have not mixed their blood with any alien race. They are still the pure, white blood, the people of the Aryan race who came down from the Caucasian Mountains. In southern Europe we find the Iberic race. It is a well-known fact in history that the Spaniard, the Italian, the Greek, and the Assyrian have mixed their bloods with the races of Asia and of Africa for many generations past. They are not of the pure white race, and when we mix with them we also are not of the pure Aryan race. Consider what is the difference in the civilization produced by these different races of people. The Iberic race, the Spaniards, settled South America. The civilization of South America is a Spanish civilization. It is the civilization of that mixed race. What do we find there? We find the so-called "republics" are military despotisms. We find them far behind the progress of the world in the arts, in agriculture, and in mechanics. It is not that they have not great fertile plains or rich mines or great rivers to carry their commerce to the sea, but they are a race of people who are not up to the high standard of the Teutonic and Celtic races in the fight for progress and civilization. Compare them with North America, that has been peopled by the races of northern Europe, where we find the highest type of republican form of government that the world has ever produced and the greatest Christian civilization that the world has ever known. You have a fair comparison of the two races of people there.

Now, do you wish to have the standards of North America pulled down to the standards of South America? If you mix the same blood in the veins of the people of North America to-day that is found in South America, of necessity you will pull them down to that standard. It is just as much a folly to claim that we will not lower American standards by admitting to this country the immigration that has lower standards than ours as it is to say that you will not destroy the breed of thoroughbred Kentucky horses by breeding with them a Texas broncho pony. But, as I said, take the history of these people and you find that the people who came here from northern Europe and settled this country went to the farms. They wanted independence; they wanted their own homes. They cleared away the forests, they developed the country, they built the railroads, and they developed new markets for our manufactured products. You take the settlement of Minnesota by the Norwegians and Swedes. They were from northern Europe, and many of them to-day can not speak the English language, but they have made a great State. They have developed the lands of that State,

they have produced markets for us, and they are rapidly becoming assimilated and a part of the American people; but you take the immigration that is coming here to-day, only one-third of whom are from northern Europe, and what do you find? Are they going out to the West and developing the farm; are they making new markets? No; under the present system that is bringing this class of immigration to America it is the weakest who come. It is those who can not stand alone at home, and by reason of the very small cost of bringing them to this country they come here, in many cases, assisted by those in foreign countries who desire to get rid of them. They do not go out and develop the farm. They are not the class who build the railroads, and, as a rule, they are not the class who go into the mines, but they are the class who become the tramps and the organ grinders of the great cities. Of the immigrants who came to this country last year, I find that 31 per cent of them remained in the great State of New York, 7 per cent in Massachusetts, 20 per cent in Pennsylvania, and 5 per cent in New Jersey; four States retained 63 per cent of them, and I find that Illinois retained 7 per cent and Ohio 5 per cent, making a total of 75 per cent of those immigrants who came to this country remaining in those six States of the Union.

Now, why? In the early history of the settlement of this country the immigrants who came here, the immigrants of our blood and kin, went all over the United States. They went to the frontier and faced the dangers of the Indian war and the hardships of the frontier country and built their homes, but of this class of immigrants coming to-day we find 75 per cent of them located in six of the great States of the Union; and why? Because in those great States we find the great cities of New York, Philadelphia, Jersey City, Chicago, Boston, and Cincinnati. It means that they have gone to the cities and not to the farms. It means that they have gone where they could find the easiest prop to rest on, because they could not stand alone. Now, what must be the result? They are becoming charges upon the people of those States. The statistics show that there is a much greater per cent of aliens in our reformatory and charitable institutions than there is of Americans. I find from the statistical reports that in the penal, reformatory, and charitable institutions of the United States there are 349,000 inmates. Of those inmates 97,000, or 28 per cent, are of foreign birth. Compare the number of foreign-born people in this country with the number of American-born people in it, and then realize that nearly one-third of the inmates of our penal and charitable institutions are of foreign birth, which conclusively demonstrates that the class of immigrants coming into this country are not up to the American standards or American ideals of life or living; and even more, that when they come here we must be charged with their support and maintenance in the greater number of cases.

That being the case, what is the result when they come in competition with the American workmen? That is the real question. My friend from New York has said that we need these immigrants; that we need them all. I know and am willing to admit that there is a greater demand probably for labor in the country than there ever has been, but there is a greater prosperity in America to-day than there ever has been. There is more surplus capital in America to-day than there ever has been, and necessarily there is a great demand for labor. I wish this condition would last forever; but it will not, my friends. It may be a year, it may be a decade, but in the end this condition will not continue. Hard times will ultimately come around, furnaces and factories will close, and when that time comes who will be the laborer that is employed? He will be the man who can work the cheapest.

Now, is that man who can work the cheapest the American laborer of our blood and kith and kin, or is he the laborer of foreign importation? The American laborer has a high standard, the highest standard, probably, in the world of any laboring man. He believes that he has got a right to a good home for himself and his family, to such wages as will enable him to properly clothe his children and give them good schooling, and have separate rooms for his boys and his girls, and he ought to live up to that standard. The man who denies that proposition is unworthy of his American birth. But, on the other hand, the class of immigrants that are coming in here to compete with the American laborer is a class of people who for hundreds of years have been downtrodden and oppressed in their own homes in the old country. They are people many of whom live to-day in America in one room in the tenements of the big cities and are satisfied with their condition. They are people many of whom I am informed do not wish their children to go to school. They are a people who live on the coarsest food. Well, now, my friend, when the day comes that the furnaces and factories go out of blast, when the farms have bad crops, I want to ask you which of these laborers is going to hold his job, the laborer of our kith and kin, whose fathers helped build this Republic, whose fathers carried the American battle flag in the war of the Revolution, who faced the dangers of the frontier and cleared away the forest, drove back the Indian, and founded our Republic, or the laborer that comes to-day from the oppressed classes of Europe? Why, you know and I know when that day comes the man who will work the cheapest will hold his job. The man who can work the cheapest will be found willing to work the cheapest. And you will find that the laborers of southern Europe, the people who have been downtrodden and oppressed for years, will take the places of American workmen and the latter will be driven to the soup houses. They will go to British America, as they are doing to-day and have gone in the past, to find homes, because they can not find work in America, and because they can not stand the competition of this class of labor you are leaving your doors open to receive to-day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I wish to say is this: That I believe the Congress of the United States is willing to pass a bill to protect the American laborer from this unfair competition. But in the past we have never been able to get a Committee on Immigration to report a bill to the House for the House to act upon. In the Fifty-seventh Congress, when that committee had a bill before the House dealing with other questions, I offered an amendment seeking to restrict the tidal wave of European immigration coming into this country, and the House by more than a three-fourths vote adopted the amendment. Unfortunately, it found its resting place in a committee of the Senate and was never heard from again. Of course, we all know there is a great pressure by the steamship lines to induce immigration to come into this country and opposition to any law cutting off the number of immigrants. It is worth $25,000,000 a year to them for it to continue. But the American workman has a right to protection against that class of labor. The only place where he can get protection is in this House. This House can not act unless the committee charged with the consideration of these bills reports them to the House.

Therefore, in the beginning of the session, when we are considering the President's message, I take this opportunity to bring this question before the House, for fear that if the House does not take it up and voice the sentiment of the American people in favor of protecting the American workman against the pauper labor of Europe we will never have any action in the matter at all. It is for this reason that I am taking up the time of the House to-day. [Loud applause.]

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will my colleague allow me to ask him a question. I did not hear all of his remarks.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. The accomplishment of your purpose will have to be obtained by making additional restrictions?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Since the beginning of this session of Congress I have introduced a bill increasing the per capita tax to $20; it is only $2 now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to my colleague from Alabama I think that is right. I did not go into the discussion of how we should restrict the immigration at this time, because I did not care to go into the discussion of a bill which I introduced and that passed the House at one time, but was defeated in the Senate. I think there are but two ways to meet the question. One is along the line of the bill I offered some years ago, which provided for an educational test; in that way I think we will get the best class of immigrants from the different countries. It required that each immigrant should be able to read and write some portion of the Constitution of the United States. The other was to increase the head tax, as my colleague has suggested; and I do not think $25 is too high at all—the amount he has put in his bill. The most undesirable class of immigrants that we have to-day, of which there is a large number, is the assisted immigrant. That is an immigrant who has his way paid for him by somebody else. The assisted immigrant is a weak immigrant. We want the strong. When you put the head tax high you will eliminate the weak, and only the strong will come.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. The assisted immigrant that you refer to is the one who is assisted by some relative who comes to this country and who by his intelligence earns enough to be able to send back to the old country for any relative. Do you not think, as you have just said, that it is the most undesirable class of immigration to come into this country? Do you not think that restriction ought to be increased and the degree of relationship narrowed down to father and mother, son and daughter, and not to general relationship?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do, because the statistics show that the tax on immigrants, assisted immigrants, makes it possible that they may include cousins who are so far removed that you can not trace any relationship at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. And thereby a great many of their neighbors are brought into this country in that way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think a great many are.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. That is my information.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no criticism to make of my colleague's bill. If you had doubled the amount that you had put in your bill, making it $50 rather than $25, then we would be sure to eliminate the assisted immigrant; and also providing in the law that the immigrant should be able to read and write, then we would only have the most intelligent come here to compete with American laborers; and it goes without saying that the most intelligent would hold up American standards.

Mr. McNARY. Before the gentleman sits down, I would like to ask him whether the statement which I have frequently read in the newspapers, that the South wants immigration, is correct or not, and whether he does not believe that the large amount of prosperity which has been enjoyed in the Northern and Western States from the time of the war on has been largely due to the immigration to those uncleared territories; and would he kindly explain, if the South does not want immigration, what it does want to supplant the negro labor which we have heard so often spoken of by gentlemen from that section?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to say this, in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts: In the first place, I do believe the great prosperity in the Northern States to-day and the development of the great Northwest is due to the immigration that came to this country before 1880. I call my friend's attention to the fact that the immigration that came here up to 1880 was of the Teutonic and Celtic people. It was immigration from northern Europe. They went out, as stated, into these western plains, cleared the land and developed farms, built railroads, and made markets for us, and in a large measure our prosperity is due to them; but the immigration coming to-day is not from northern Europe; it is from southern Europe; the same class of people that settled South America, as I explained a few moments ago. We do not want South American civilization in the Southern States. In place of that we want the Teutonic, and Celtic, and white civilization of the North. Now, if you would give us to-day the immigration from northern Europe, if you would give us the Irish, the English, the French, the German, the Scotch, and the Scandinavian, we will welcome him with both arms open, and are ready for him in the South and want him in the South.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, if it will not interrupt my colleague——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. As bearing on the demand for labor in the South, last year we made the largest cotton crop ever produced in the South—nearly fourteen million bales.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to my colleague that I think there is a demand for labor in the South. I know in my district that we could use a good many more men in the furnaces, the mines, and the factories than we have got, and I would be glad to have them if we can get the right people, if we can get the kind of people that made the North and Northwest great—people of the Teutonic blood; but we do not want in the South an inferior race. We have one inferior race to contend with, and we do not want another that will give us a great deal more trouble.

Now, as to the production of cotton last year, I shall have to say to my colleague that I can not agree with him that it was labor that made that great crop. It was an unusual cotton season. It was the weather and the long-continued cotton season that made the 13,000,000 bales.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. In that connection, if my colleague will allow me to suggest, there is an explanation of that immense cotton crop. Take the statistics along in 1880 and you will find that 10 per cent of the cotton was produced at that time in the South by white labor. Take the statistics of last year and you will find that of that immense crop more than 50 per cent was made by white labor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sure that is true.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. My friend behind me says 62 per cent of it last year was produced by white labor; and we contend that if they will let us alone we will solve the great problem of the negro by the white people coming into the South and cultivating the land.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no doubt my colleague's statement is true, and I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McNARY] that there is a demand among some of the southern farmers for more laborers; but it is from the large planters, the men who have four or five thousand acres of land under cultivation. The negroes of the South have gone to the North—have gone to railroad work; have gone to the furnaces; gone to the mines—and there is a scarcity of labor among the large planters. But you must remember that a great majority of the cotton farmers of the South are the men who follow the plow themselves. The great agitation among the farmers of the South is to cut down the amount of acreage, and to keep up the price of cotton thereby, and if you brought cheap Chinese labor or cheap European labor and put it on these big plantations, you would only increase the amount of the crop, pull down the price for the farmer who is following the plow himself, and make his condition worse than it is to-day.

Mr. McNARY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. There are one or two more thoughts I should like to ask the gentleman to consider before taking his seat.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has only about two minutes remaining.

Mr. McNARY. He will hardly have time to consider these thoughts of mine, and perhaps I had better give expression to them myself a little later on; but I should like to ask him whether he does not know that it is the presence of the negro and the conditions under which the negro labors in the South that have kept the Irishman, the German, and the Scandinavian out of the South.

I should like to ask him also to explain to the House in what way the civilization of New Orleans and Louisiana, built up by the French, is inferior to the civilization of other white people.

I should like to ask him further to explain how it is that the countries of Argentina and Chile, occupied by Spanish-speaking people, with very few negroes or Indians, and lately receiving an immense immigration from Italy, are advancing as rapidly as the United States ever did in its history, so much so that Buenos Ayres, at the Paris Exposition, received a higher award for its educational work than did the city of Boston, the best educational center in the United States.

I think the gentleman is entirely wrong in his premises, and I hope to be able to convince this House at a little later stage that the Italian labor and the labor of southern Europe, instead of being a detriment, will be a benefit in every section of the country wherever it comes. Wherever they immigrate they buy property and improve it, and in my judgment they would prove to be buyers of property and improvers of waste land and would tend to develop waste territory and would prove to be builders-up rather than tearers-down of the civilization of the South. And later, if the committee does report a bill, I would like to submit some pertinent questions to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I can not in the two minutes remaining to me answer all of the gentleman's questions. I want to say, however, that there are many Italian laborers who come from the north of Italy who are of Celtic origin. They are of the white blood—a people of the same civilization and blood as ourselves. It is the immigrants of Iberic blood that do not come up to our standards.

Mr. McNARY. Is not the Spaniard of Celtic blood? Were not the great majority Celts and talking a Celtic tongue when the Romans conquered the country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; the Spaniard is of Iberic blood.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to answer the question of the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I can not go fully into an answer without taking some time. If the House will allow me a few minutes, I will endeavor to answer him briefly.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama have fifteen minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama may be extended fifteen minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will not occupy the time of the House many minutes, because I have said very fully what I intended to say, but in answer to the remarks of my friend from Massachusetts I will say briefly that he referred me to the civilization of Chile and the Argentine. We know that Chile is the most powerful country in South America, the most progressive country in South America; that it has always been the most progressive country; that the civilization of Chile is more nearly equal to the civilization of America to-day than any other South American republic. I think my friend

will agree with me as to that. Why is that the case? It only carries out and sustains the argument I have already made. Chile is the only South American country that has been more fully settled by the people of northern Europe—by the Celtic race and the Teutonic race of people—than any other country in South America. We know that although the people of Chile speak the Spanish tongue, to-day the leading men, the progressive men of that great southern country, came from the Scotch and Irish ancestry who went there one hundred years ago. It is the Scotch and Irish blood—the Celtic blood—in those people that has made Chile the great Republic of South America.

Mr. McNARY. Will the gentleman give me the names of a few of those Scotchmen?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not recall the names in an offhand speech.

Mr. McNARY. Is it the O'Higgins and the Lynches and the McKennas? [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, that would only carry out my argument, because they come from Ireland and are of the same Celtic blood. [Laughter.]

Now, as to the Italians. He says that there are instances in this country where the Italian labor has developed and done well. Well, that is true. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact: The report of the Commissioner of Immigration says that of the Italians that came to this country last year there were 185,000 from the south of Italy, or of the Iberic blood—that is, of the mixed blood. There are 35,000 who came from the north of Italy, of the Celtic blood—of the blood of our people.

Now, when you are speaking of Italians, you must designate where they come from, because the Italian from the north of Italy is of as good blood as we are, of the same blood, of unmixed blood; that same blood that made our civilization, and there are many settlements of Italians from northern Italy that are to-day doing as much good and advancing as rapidly in this country as any other class of immigrants, as those who come from Scandinavia, England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, or France, because they have the same blood in them. As I have already said in this argument, the Creator of the universe made some men weak and some men strong; He made some men intelligent and some unintelligent; He created the great Celtic and Teutonic races to carry forward the banners of our present civilization and the principles of Christianity, and when we contaminate our blood with an inferior race we will not be carrying out the object of our creation, but will be tearing down the old-time American standards instead of building them up.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman to clearly define what he means by Iberic blood? May I ask him whether or not the race that produced the world's civilization anterior to the Romans, and in some respects the greatest race the world ever saw, were not the Greeks; whether or not Sicily and southern Italy were not Greek in origin; whether or not they did not talk the Greek tongue when the Romans extended their dominion over them, and whether or not they have not preserved the Greek characteristics? And in what way are the people of Greek blood inferior to those of northern Italy, other than because of the unfortunate conditions that surround them, other than the keeping up of the feudal system, the denial of opportunity, the absolute restriction of education—in what way are they inferior to the people of the other parts of Italy?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to encroach on the time of the House much further, but I shall be glad to answer the gentleman's questions, if I can. There is no question that the original Greek and the original Roman were of the same Aryan blood that we are, but, as I said, the people of Syria, Greece, Italy, Spain, and Portugal have for generations, yes, for hundreds of years, mixed their blood. They have absorbed emigrants from Asia and Africa; they have become amalgamated with the inferior races of Asia and Africa until to-day the Commissioner of Immigration and those who are learned in these matters designate these races of people from Spain and Portugal and Italy and Greece and Syria as of Iberic blood to distinguish them from the pure Celt and the pure Teuton—the men of the pure Aryan white race—and if the blood of the Iberic race is mixed and we try to assimilate it we mix our blood in the same way, possibly not to the same extent, that we would if we tried to bring to this country races from Asia or Africa and assimilate them.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. Chairman, one more question, to get at this Iberic blood. Do I understand the gentleman would like to have the House understand that the Commissioner of Immigration, who, apparently, has invented a new race, would lead this House to believe that the Arab who invented and developed a civilization, many of the elements of which are among our choicest treasures at the present time, is not of Caucasian blood? That the Jew and the Syrian who developed a civilization of their own and have given to us many of the most precious things that we now have were not of Caucasian blood, and that the mixture therefore of Syrian and Arabic blood would be a mixture of elements non-Caucasian? What I desire to get at is this, whether or not that blood, the Aryan blood, a branch of the Caucasian race, is, in his judgment and the judgment of the Commissioner of Immigration, deteriorated to such a remarkable degree by mixture of the Semitic blood from the Arab and from the Syrian and from the Jew—other branches of the Caucasian race—that it produces an inferior race?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I do not attempt to say what the Commissioner of Immigration believes. I merely state what the Commissioner says in his report and that he does designate the peoples of Portugal, Spain, southern Italy, Greece, and Syria as of the Iberic race, and as showing what the result would be I simply suggested, as an example, the difference between the civilization of the South American republics, that were settled and civilized by the people of the Iberic race, and the civilization of North America to-day, which is the civilization of the Celtic and Teutonic peoples.

Mr. BEDE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to my friend from Minnesota in a moment.

Mr. BEDE. I wish to ask one question, and that is, in your study of this subject, do you not think it would be better to put the burden upon the steamship companies who bring over these people, rather than upon the mere individual who comes here? Is it a crime not to have $25 upon reaching America? How many of the original settlers of Jamestown and Plymouth could have paid $25, as your colleague from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] would put in his bill? Is it not character rather than cash that we desire?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say I am not blaming any man for coming to America. I think he is a wise man who tries to come, but I think we ought to protect ourselves. I suggest that when each immigrant is charged a head tax of $25 and can not pay it the steamship company which brings him over without it ought to be made to carry him back free. I do not believe in putting any hardship upon the poor immigrant. We can not pass a law designating from what European countries we will admit emigrants and which we will not, therefore we must adopt a plan that will only admit the strongest and the best, and a head tax is part of that plan.

Mr. BEDE. Had we not better put them under civil service? [Laughter.] Would not a head tax make the immigrant merely the slave of the man who advanced the $25?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; because our laws prohibit anyone from paying it for the immigrant; he must earn it in advance for himself.

Mr. BEDE. I know, but it is done just the same.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. WHARTON. Does the gentleman from Alabama think and has he ever considered, or has he made an investigation and does he not now think, that along this line of labor and for the purpose of securing the proper amount of labor in the southern industries, not confined to any one Congressional district, but to the whole South—the new South and the industries there—if the same rate of wages prevailed there as does in the Northern States you could fill up the whole South and the industries there with enough of this good Irish labor, which can be procured in the North and which is the best kind of labor on the face of the earth, to meet your demands?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that he is assuming a fact which is not so. He is assuming the wages of the South are not as good as those of the North. I represent a large manufacturing industrial district in the South, and I will say that our wages—that is, the mills and factories—are governed by the amalgamated scale. The labor scale that governs your wages is identically the same as that which governs ours, and the wages paid to our miners are greater than they are paid to your miners, because your coal miners, if you are referring to them, are paid by the long ton and are only paid for the coal that goes from the screen; they get nothing for the slack coal. It is only the lump coal for which they are paid. Our miners are paid by the short ton and are

paid for all the coal that comes out of the mine; therefore if the gentleman makes a fair comparison of miners' wages he will see the miner of Alabama is paid more per ton for his work than the miner in Pennsylvania. So my friend is making a mistake when he assumes that there is cheap labor in the South. I will tell you what keeps the class of immigrants that we would like to have from coming South: It is that they have to come in contact with the negro, and they do not wish to do so. That is our unfortunate position. We will be glad to welcome them there.

Mr. Chairman, let us hope that at an early date the committee having this important matter in charge will report a bill to the House so restricting immigration to our country as to protect the American wage-earner, whether on the farm, in the furnace, the mines, or the factory, against the pauper labor that is now threatening his family and his home. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the article I send to the Clerk's desk be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESPONSIBILITY FOR HAZING.

When the facts of the Branch-Meriweather tragedy first transpired, the Post was at no loss to identify it as the fruit—and the perfectly legitimate fruit—of a survival of hazing. It stood unmistakably revealed in that sinister light, and we so described it in our editorial comment at the time. Meriwether had been hazed—they call it "running" now, but it is the same old abominable persecution in another name—and Meriwether, instead of submitting to the outrage, forced a fight upon his tormentor.

Now, it appears that hazing or running—label the barbarism as you will—has been going on steadily, and not so very secretly at that. Young Meriwether told no tales. He took his own case in hand, and managed it as best he could for his dignity and self-respect. It was plain enough that he had no protection save in his own courage and his own strong arm. Anyone could see that he had to fight or incur the contempt and ostracism of the whole academy.

Whose fault was it? Whose fault is it now with this hazing and little boys sent to the hospital every few days? When Willard Brownson was Superintendent at Annapolis he executed the law and expelled three hazers, as was his bounden duty. Then came Congress repudiating its own laws and reinstated those three offenders. They had a pleasant holiday, lost nothing in grade, escaped a little unpleasant service, and are at present, on the whole, distinctly beneficiaries of the episode. Congress is making a great uproar over these recent disclosures of hazing and general ruffianism, but what could Congress have expected after reinstating the hazers expelled by Admiral Brownson and thus sealing their offenses with approval? Is it now proposed to hold Admiral Sands responsible for conditions which Congress itself has deliberately created?

Meanwhile, as the perfectly natural product of all this hypocritical nonsense, we are developing at Annapolis every latent instinct of cowardice and hoodlumism. It is all very fine for Congress to get up on its hind legs and snort at the spectacle now presented for its inspection. All the same, the fault lies at the Government's door, and nowhere else.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I call that rather a drastic article on the situation and especially with reference to what is said about the Congress of the United States, but while it is hard and severe, can any Member of this House challenge the correctness of the statement? A few years ago a young man in the Military Academy was hazed to death, a constituent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER]. Congress was wrought up over that death, as it should have been, and a committee of investigation was appointed which investigated and made its report, and proper legislation followed the recommendation of that committee. The matter certainly was made as public as anything of the kind could be. The investigations of that committee were published from day to day in the press of the country. The discussions upon the floor of this House were published, but when three young men, in defiance of the laws of the United States and in defiance of the rules and regulations and discipline of the Naval Academy, proceeded deliberately to violate that law and were tried and expelled by the officers of the Naval Academy, as it was their sworn duty to do, what followed?

Because they were three fine specimens of American manhood, and because they had three eloquent gentlemen on the floor of this House to plead for them, a bill was introduced that authorized their reappointment into the Navy. It could not be construed in any other light by those men than to be at least a forgiveness for what they had done and a weakening on the part of Congress in the enforcement of the law. When that bill was brought up in the House repeatedly and unanimous consent was asked for its consideration, some Member of the House invariably objected. And on the 4th day of February, 1905, the bill was brought up, and I will read from the RECORD to show what took place at that time:

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWN] again asks unanimous consent for present consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will again report.

The Clerk read as follows:

"A bill (H. R. 17750) authorizing the appointment of certain midshipmen to the United States Navy."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I shall object until I understand this bill better. We passed a bill to prevent this offense, and here we are going to work to rescind that action at the first instance of its violation. The President himself says that it was a plain violation of the law, though not an aggravated one. Now, we will have six suspension days at the end of this Congress, when the House can pass the bill, if it is disposed to do so. I voted for the measure to prevent hazing, and here upon the very first occasion where it has been violated we are asked to vacate action under it. I have no feeling in this matter myself, and do not know any of these young men.

The suspension days came, and we know how suspension measures get through the House. They come right on the heels of Congress, when every Member is interested in getting some other measure through in that way or by unanimous consent. He fails to vote against the measure for fear that some measure in which he is interested will be refused unanimous consent or voted against. That measure was passed in this House, I believe, not as a result of the deliberate judgment of the House, but by reason of the coercion growing out of the circumstances. It is unpleasant to say "I told you so," but it was talked privately here and urged upon the part of Members not to object until it almost became a menace as well as a species of persuasion. So the bill was passed.

Mr. PRINCE. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] yield for just a suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. PRINCE. I think the gentleman from Tennessee and myself agreed upon that proposition, and both of us spoke in opposition to it.

Mr. SIMS. We certainly did.

Mr. PRINCE. In order to remind the gentleman, I wish to call his attention to this, that the President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, on January 11 sent a special message to Congress. Does the gentleman recollect that?

Mr. SIMS. I do.

Mr. PRINCE. I will just hand you this paper.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman can read it while he has it there.

Mr. PRINCE. The gentleman from Tennessee can use it himself. I wanted to call his attention to the fact that the President asked it be done.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Illinois is entirely correct. The President of the United States did ask that he be authorized to reappoint the young men. The President himself is subject to the same influence that we are. No doubt the almost irresistible gentlemen who appealed to Members of this House in private conversation to not vote against these young men also brought pressure to bear upon the President of the United States, and he, through the same feeling, committed the same mistake that we did.

Mr. RIXEY. I understand that the gentleman from Tennessee referred in the first part of his remarks to a young man who lost his life as a result of hazing at the academy?

Mr. SIMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. RIXEY. And to argue that this law against hazing was a result of that case? Now, if that is true, hazing then was then supposed to be an aggravated offense, something from which would necessarily follow physical disability or injury?

Mr. SIMS. Possibly.

Mr. RIXEY. Will the gentleman tell me if he knows what were the circumstances in regard to the three cadets?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not recall the circumstances in regard to the three cadets who were expelled, but the President in his message says it was a plain violation of the law.

Mr. RIXEY. Now, will the gentleman allow me to inform him to some extent as to what the circumstances were? In that case there was practically no physical hurt. There may not have been any other kind of injury to these three cadets. One of them, as I remember the circumstances, had failed to promptly respond when ordered to line or dress up by his superior officer. The superior officer said, "Come to my room to-night." That evening he came around. The superior officer was not in, but his roommate was, and he asked him what he wanted. The cadet said, "I have come here because I am ordered by my superior officer." He said, "I suppose he wants to put you through some of the ordinary exercises." I had forgotten the names of them, but they were ordinary gymnastic exercises such as are practiced at the academy. That was the offense in one case. When the witnesses were before the naval committee, one of them, and I think it was Captain Brownson, in reply to a question from me as to what was hazing—because the statute does not define it—said, "It is any command by a superior classman to a lower classman."

For instance, he said: "If a superior class man directed one

of the other class men to 'bring him a glass of water,' and he obeyed, that," he said, "is hazing." Now, I wish to ask the gentleman this: Ought there not to be some degrees in hazing?

Mr. SIMS. Of course I will be glad to answer the gentleman. I will ask the gentleman from Virginia who has just interrogated me if he was not one of the members of that committee?

Mr. RIXEY. I was, and heard all the testimony.

Mr. SIMS. And therefore as a Member who determined with reference to this particular case, I take it that he did know, and that he voted in favor of it?

Mr. RIXEY. I did, and made some remarks on the floor in favor of the action which was taken.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman also voted for the law which was passed on the subject?

Mr. RIXEY. I do not know when that law was passed. I presume I voted for the law if it came up during my term of service here.

Mr. SIMS. The young gentlemen who had been expelled violated the law which this House passed.

Mr. RIXEY. The court-martial which tried them decided that they had violated the law, but the law which was passed by Congress contained no definition of hazing. These young men were dismissed from the academy for doing what I think was a very minor offense. I think it was a gross injustice to the young men that they should be dismissed from the academy, and not be allowed to hold office under the Government of the United States again. Congress has righted the wrong that was done by inflicting the minor punishment of reduction in rank.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman now returns to the argument that he favored at first; I take it that he takes that position in all good faith. But it certainly occurs to me as the experience of my life that the first offense committed is usually the least, and if you begin forgiving and overlooking the first offense it simply leads to graver offenses. I have no doubt that the gentleman from Virginia and members of the committee who reported that bill were animated by humane motives and goodness of heart, but the whole country believes that by reason of the action of this House it has brought upon itself the shed blood of Midshipman Branch.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee if the evidence in the Meriwether case does not disclose the fact that this hazing and these contests have been going on there for several years, and if that had not been the custom long prior to the time that Congress passed this act reinstating these young men? If that is the case, why is Congress to be criticised and held responsible for the action that the newspaper referred to charges?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, the newspaper article I read charges—and it is a conservative paper, the Washington Post, which is not given to yellow journalism or sensationalism, but reechoes the press of the entire country—that when the officers of the Naval Academy, in pursuance of the law, had done their duty Congress wiped out the result of their action by restoring to their rank in the Navy these first offenders against the law.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Does not the evidence in the Meriwether case show that the law had been violated constantly prior to the time that Congress passed this act reinstating these young men?

Mr. SIMS. Why, Mr. Chairman, the very fact that this practice existed was the cause of the enactment of the law.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Yes; and all the faculty there in charge of that naval institution knew that this law was being violated constantly, and if they did know they should have come in and made objection when this bill was pending in Congress.

Mr. SIMS. Let me say in reply to the gentleman, in the case of the hazing of Mr. Kimbrough, of Tennessee, which took place only a few days ago, and since the death of Branch, and since the trial of Meriwether began, Kimbrough was threatened with death if he reported the guilty parties.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. You do not answer my question.

Mr. SIMS. I am going to answer it.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, if these young men were guilty of this inhuman, brutal, and cowardly conduct, and then threatened to kill their victim if he reported them, do you suppose it does not have some effect upon the officers of that institution, after having discharged their duty, that Congress by its action nullifies their action?

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. I want to say to the gentleman that I supported that measure under the representation and belief that the young men had been guilty of nothing more than at least a technical violation of this law, that they had not violated the spirit of the law at all, and that there was no objection really on the part of the faculty to their reinstatement. But it was with the full understanding and belief that the offense of hazing was not practiced in that institution. If I had known the facts disclosed since, I would never have voted to reinstate those young men. But nevertheless I think the faculty of that institution should have communicated to Congress what knowledge they had, if they were going to hold Congress responsible for refusing to enforce the law as we had made it.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman certainly did not read the report of the Secretary of the Navy. The officer in charge of the Naval Academy said the act would have a bad effect upon the institution and a bad effect upon the discipline, and, while they did not use the exact language, the meaning was that it would bring the law into disrepute and render it null and void, just as it has done.

Mr. MUDD. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. MUDD. If the gentleman will permit me, I want to correct what I think is a misapprehension in his mind.

Mr. SIMS. I should be glad to have any misapprehension corrected.

Mr. MUDD. The gentleman states that these young men were reinstated in the academy.

Mr. SIMS. Reappointed, I said.

Mr. MUDD. They were not in fact reappointed to the academy, but reinstated in the Navy.

Mr. SIMS. Reappointed in the Navy.

Mr. MUDD. I do not say that for the purpose of controversy, but simply to correct a misapprehension. The gentleman states that all punishment was wiped out. The gentleman is mistaken in that. In the intervening time they had suffered considerable punishment, and they suffered the punishment of a very large reduction of rank, for they were put back at the very foot of the class in which they had formerly had held quite high rank.

One other thing. The Superintendent of the academy, if I recollect aright, said it would be very hurtful to discipline if these young men were allowed to come back to the academy, where their unlawful practices had been carried on. As a matter of fact, as I have already stated, they were not allowed to come back to the academy.

Mr. SIMS. They were pardoned by act of Congress. Whether all the discomforts that they had suffered by reason of their misdeeds and violation of law were wiped out or not is not the question. Whether they were reappointed to the academy or not is not the question. They were reappointed to positions in the Navy. They were not degraded.

Mr. LOUD. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. SIMS. I am glad to yield, although it looks as though my speech would be all questions and no answers.

Mr. LOUD. Just one question.

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. LOUD. Are you aware that there were twenty fist fights at the academy between the time that these men were expelled and the time when they were reinstated in the Navy, previous to the time mentioned in this article?

Mr. SIMS. I was not aware of it. I assume from the gentleman's question that he means to assert that that is true—that there were twenty fist fights.

Mr. LOUD. I mean to say that when the investigation takes place which we have asked for those facts will come out.

Mr. SIMS. You charge that there were twenty fist fights?

Mr. LOUD. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. I do not know myself whether there were or not, but I accept the gentleman's statement that there were. And what a comment it is upon the Naval Academy of the United States that we are being taxed here to keep young men there to practice fist fights. [Applause.]

Mr. LOUD. And, more than that, fagging, which is just another method of hazing, has been in full swing all this time, which fact now comes to our knowledge and will come out in the investigation.

Mr. SIMS. In other words, the law we passed has been held in utter contempt by the young men of that institution.

Mr. LOUD. Precisely, before the time you speak of.

Mr. SIMS. Before and since.

Mr. LOUD. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. And it seems to me, if this be true, that it must have been with the connivance of the officers.

Mr. LOUD. Exactly.

Mr. SIMS. I do not make that charge on my own personal knowledge, for I do not know; but, Mr. Chairman, there is a resolution introduced at the other end of this Capitol and one introduced in this House to investigate. I am in favor of both resolutions; and when these deplorable and disgraceful facts

are brought out in the heat of our indignation we pass salutary laws, and when an attempt is made to enforce them we turn around, childlike, in the spirit of kindness, and wipe out all we have done by pardoning the offenders.

Now, if the naval officers in charge of that academy are to be censured, let us censure them. But are we not rather estopped, at least those of us who voted for that reinstatement measure, for these officers at the time stated plainly what would be the effect upon the discipline of the academy. They said it would not help it, and it did not help it. But, are the officers in charge of that institution simply there to draw salaries and shut their eyes to these enormities, and neither report them or act upon them? If they are, the sooner we remove them the better. These young men from the several Congressional districts of this country are sent there to receive their education in order that they may ornament the Navy and be useful to their country; but if they are to receive the education only of prize fighters and bullies, the sooner we stop the appropriation the better it will be. [Applause.]

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee who appointed Mr. Kimbrough is not here to speak for himself, or I would not have arisen on this occasion. What do we hear from the press of Tennessee to-day? That the parents of that young man who was hazed, and who would have died if he had not had medical attention, want him to resign and come home. I do not believe, and I shall not believe until I see the proof, that a majority of the cadets are of the brutal type that the proof shows that some of them are. It is the bad minority, and some of the others seem to have a fear of reporting it. Why, who would not be afraid when death is to be measured out to the student who reports these misdeeds? Somebody has asked what is hazing? I do not care what hazing is, but I know what assault and battery and manslaughter and murder is.

A MEMBER. That is hazing. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. Is there a city or town in the United States that permits such conduct to go on as is going on at our Naval Academy and at West Point and called "hazing?" Would municipal or State authorities permit it among those under their immediate charge and not place them in jail or the penitentiary, where they belong? I think you can not find a community anywhere in which the young men go about beating and bullying and killing other young men. But that is what is going on at these academies. It is very difficult to find it out, and it is only when death comes as a shock to the whole community. You may talk about twenty fist fights—there may have been 120, and probably there were. Nothing but a death that shocks the whole community brings it to the country's attention, and then we find out the facts. Think of it! Millions have been spent for magnificent buildings, officers detailed under good salaries, and young gentlemen sent there from all parts of the United States to learn what? The rules and practices of the prize ring—upper cuts, solar plexus, stomach punching. How can any man who has a heart feel proud of a record made by a young man that goes there and learns such things as that? Show me a commanding officer, a great general, or admiral in the world's history that was not a kind and humane man. Show me one that ever, because he had it in his power, put to pain a weaker mortal simply for the sake of brutal inhuman pleasure that he might get out of seeing the weak one suffer. But that is the record this academy is making.

We can not be too severe in the denunciation of it or in speaking of the fact. The facts are bad enough, and I have no doubt that we have not got all of them. But I hope that we shall have them, and then after deliberation, if the House passes additional legislation, after thorough investigation and report, I hope we shall have the hardihood to stand up and sustain our action, and not reverse the action of the officers of the academy when they have carried out, or attempted to carry out, the law that we have made.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania). Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Did the gentleman observe in the press that the officers of the academy state that the reason that the hazing took place is that Congress passed a law two years ago relieving the two young men from the sentence that had been imposed?

Mr. SIMS. I have noticed in the newspapers that the officers say that our action here is the occasion of the recent hazing.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is their defense for the recent hazing.

Mr. SIMS. Yes; that is the defense made by the officers, that Congress itself has restored the young men to the academy.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman whether he remembers that the President of the United States sent a message to Congress upon that subject? I would like to have the gentleman put it in the RECORD in connection with his remarks, so that the facts may be fully set forth and the responsibility of Congress concerning the matter.

Mr. SIMS. Yes, I will include the message. I do not know how long the report is, but will include it if not too long, or the letter of the Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Chairman, in order that the House may have the defense—those who voted for that—of the President's message, I shall include it in my remarks. It is as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In the fall of 1903 John Henry Lofland, Earl Worden Chaffee, and Joseph Drummond Little, then members of the first or highest class at the Naval Academy, severally committed acts for which they were charged with the offense of hazing, were tried by court-martial, and were dismissed from the academy and from the naval service.

In a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, March 21, 1904, the Secretary of the Navy, after reviewing the facts upon which action in the cases of these midshipmen was based, states that "if discretion in the infliction of punishment had been vested either in the court-martial or the Department a lighter punishment than dismissal from the service might have been inflicted," and concludes that Congress is the proper authority to determine in cases of this character whether exception should be made to the operation of the statute.

The Committee on Naval Affairs (House Report No. 2454, 58th Cong., 2d sess.), upon consideration of the Department's report, unanimously concludes that "under all the circumstances no detriment will be done the service" by sanctioning the appointment of these midshipmen to the naval service under appropriate conditions and restrictions.

Upon review of the facts in this case, I concur generally in the conclusions of the Secretary of the Navy and the Committee on Naval Affairs with respect to the character of the offenses committed by these midshipmen. Their acts were in plain violation of the letter of the statute, but the case presented is not an aggravated one, and I believe that their severance from the academy, their reduction to the foot of the class of which they were members, and their entry into the naval service without formal graduation will be adequate punishment.

The draft of a bill granting authority for the appointment of these midshipmen to the Navy under conditions and restrictions believed to be sufficient to guard the interests of the service is inclosed for the consideration of the Congress.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 11, 1905.*

I take the following from the report:

[H. R. 12273, granting President authority to restore certain midshipmen to service.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 21, 1904.

SIR: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 29th ultimo, with which you inclosed, with request for the views and recommendations of the Department thereupon, the bill (H. R. 12273) granting authority to the President, in his discretion, to restore certain midshipmen to the naval service.

In reply I have the honor to state that the midshipmen referred to in this bill are John Henry Lofland, Earl Worden Chaffee, and Joseph Drummond Little, all members of the first or highest class at the academy. The class left the academy in February, 1904, for the purpose of completing their academic course at sea. In October, 1903, these midshipmen severally committed acts for which they were charged with the offense of hazing, tried by court-martial, and sentenced to dismissal from the service. The sentences were approved by the Superintendent of the academy and were duly carried into effect.

I have examined with care the evidence in each case, and find no substantial differences in the facts. In each case the accused selected a midshipman of the lowest class who had been guilty of some minor irregularity, such as taking fruit from the mess room, being surly or disobedient in the ranks, and the like, ordered him to the room of the accused, and there directed him to repeat in each case one or more of certain exercises as a punishment for his misconduct. The exercise may be described as follows: The "sixteenth exercise," where, while standing erect, one bends the knees until the thighs touch the heels and rapidly rises again; standing upon the head; "doing the cruise," where one lies on the back and raises one leg to a position perpendicular to the body, lowering slowly until within 1 inch of the floor and raising it again to the same position; hanging upon the wardrobe by the hands. These exercises were repeated very many times. No injury was incurred, except that the muscles of the leg were somewhat stiff the next day. The exercises which were performed were legitimate gymnastic exercises not unusual at the academy. They were performed under compulsion and for the purpose of inflicting punishment. There was no right on the part of the accused to inflict any punishment whatever for a violation of discipline, as punishment can be inflicted only by order of the Superintendent. Each of the accused was an officer in the corps of midshipmen, and it was his duty to take notice of breaches of discipline and report them, instead of inflicting punishment for them.

From this statement of the cases it will be seen that if discretion in the infliction of punishment had been vested either in the court-martial or the Department, a lighter punishment than dismissal from the service might have been inflicted; but this can not be said with certainty, in view of the great importance which has been attached to the total eradication of the practice of hazing. There was, however, under the law, no discretion as to punishment. The act of June 23, 1874, is as follows:

"In all cases when it shall come to the knowledge of the Superintendent of the Naval Academy at Annapolis that any naval cadet has been guilty of the offense commonly known as hazing, it shall be the duty of the Superintendent to order a court-martial, composed of not less than three commissioned officers, who shall minutely examine into all the facts and circumstances of the case and make a finding thereon; and any naval cadet found guilty of said offense by said court shall, upon recommendation of said court, be dismissed; and such finding, when approved by said Superintendent, shall be final, and the cadet so

dismissed from said Naval Academy shall be forever ineligible to reappointment to said Naval Academy."

The act of March 3, 1903, is as follows:

"That the Superintendent of the Naval Academy shall make such rules, to be approved by the Secretary of the Navy, as will effectually prevent the practice of hazing; and any cadet found guilty of participating in or encouraging or countenancing such practice shall be summarily expelled from the academy, and shall not thereafter be reappointed to the corps of cadets or be eligible for appointment as a commissioned officer in the Army or Navy or Marine Corps until two years after the graduation of the class of which he was a member.

It will be observed that the first act renders the offender forever ineligible for reappointment to the academy. The second act, in addition, renders the offender ineligible for appointment as a commissioned officer in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps until two years after the graduation of the class of which he was a member. The class from which these midshipmen were dismissed will be finally graduated in 1906, the course of instruction being by law six years, part of which is spent at sea. Under the law, therefore, the persons dismissed are not eligible for appointment as commissioned officers until the year 1908.

I feel that I should be lacking in my duty to Congress if I did not present the views of the officers responsible for the administration of the Naval Academy, who have loyally endeavored to obey the will of Congress as expressed in the law. Upon certain bills contemplating the restoration of the offenders to the Naval Academy the Superintendent of the Naval Academy and the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation expressed the view that their restoration to the Naval Academy "will be a serious blow at its discipline, and will simply invite another outbreak of hazing, which has now been stopped at the academy. To reinstate them would probably necessitate the dismissal of others within the coming year." The bill under discussion, however, does not propose to reinstate the offenders to the Naval Academy, but authorizes the President to appoint them to the naval service, to rank below the other members of their class. They would thus reenter the Navy without completing the academic course at Annapolis, but with a reduction in rank which would constitute a continuing punishment throughout their future service. Even upon this bill, however, it is pointed out by the commandant of cadets who, in the absence of the Superintendent, at the Department's request has expressed his views thereon, that "the effect upon the discipline of this school of restoring these midshipmen to the service in any capacity until two years after the graduation of the class of which they were members will * * * be bad."

Upon the foregoing statement of facts it is believed that the committee will be able to reach a conclusion respecting the question presented. The Department considers that its duty in cases of this character is to obey the law as it stands, and that Congress is the proper authority to determine whether, in any given cases, exceptions should be made to the operation of statute.

Very respectfully,

W. H. MOODY, *Secretary.*

Hon. GEORGE EDMUND FOSS,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives.

I am not here censuring any man as having improper motives. They voted as they did because it was presented to them in the way of a kindness, as a species of forgiveness, and as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RIXEY] said, that they had been guilty of like offenses. But what are you going to do? Suppose you have another bill presented here. We have already got a good law if it is only enforced. Here are three men who were convicted on the same law who are now in the Navy. Here are others guilty of like offenses, maybe more aggravated, who will be expelled, or ought to be. Then, you will find that we have established a precedent for putting them back, provided they can show that they were acting from long-standing habit. Do numerous repetitions on this thing make it right or a pardonable wrong?

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee says that he knows what assault and battery and what beatings and murder are.

Mr. SIMS. I said manslaughter.

Mr. RIXEY. Manslaughter. I desire to suggest to him that the case of the three cadets was neither one of these. If that is what he means by hazing, then the three cadets were not guilty of hazing. The cadets were not only heard in testimony, but Captain Brownson and the other officers at the Naval Academy were also heard, and it was thoroughly sifted. It was shown to be neither assault and battery, beating, nor manslaughter. It was simply requiring the cadets to do some of the exercises that they were accustomed to under their superior officers.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Standing on their heads?

Mr. RIXEY. I do not think that was in it. No; my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD] says it was not. One of them was holding oneself up by the arms in this fashion and bringing the body up a number of times. Another was the "setting-up" drill. I want to ask my friend this, If he does not think there ought to be a difference between the punishment of people who are not guilty of serious offenses and those who are guilty of serious offenses? And I want to say, furthermore, that instead of my friend saying, as he can very readily now, "I told you so"—and nearly every gentleman in this House who voted against the three-cadet bill now comes up and says "I told you so"—instead of leveling his remarks against the Congress why does he not level his remarks against the authorities at Annapolis? [Applause.] According to the recent testimony in the Meriwether case, they evidently winked at and had knowledge of the fact that the rules were continually being violated.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I have said before that I was not acquainted with the details of the violation of the law by the three cadets mentioned.

You have heard read the plea the President made, and now the officers of the academy say that law was the cause of hazing being recommenced or pursued in the academy.

Mr. RIXEY. And it looks as if the officers of the academy were to blame.

Mr. SIMS. The officers say that Congress was to blame.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does that make it so?

Mr. SIMS. And the newspapers of the entire country say that Congress was to blame, and I am trying to call the attention of the House to the fact of how useless it will be to have a new investigation and another law or an amendment of an existing law if we are going, through sympathy or otherwise, to abrogate the law or its penalties after they have been inflicted in the future.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Do I understand the gentleman to state that the law, as it now stands, is sufficient to prevent hazing if properly enforced?

Mr. SIMS. Why, Mr. Chairman, it is amazing to think that at these two great institutions, kept up by the Government—by the taxes of the people—that they will be guilty of such brutal, inhuman, and barbarous conduct as the evidence shows they have without any law except self-respect and the environment of a Christian neighborhood.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. I understand the gentleman to say that the law, as it now stands, is sufficient, if properly enforced, to prevent hazing.

Mr. SIMS. I do not want it to be understood that I am not in favor of making this law stronger.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Is the law adequate, as it now stands, if properly enforced?

Mr. SIMS. I think it is, or would have proven so if Members of Congress had only had the nerve to stand by the law which they passed themselves.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Well, I will ask the gentleman another question. Does he not think it would be proper and right that there should be a full investigation by Congress to see why this law has not been enforced and who is responsible for its not being enforced?

Mr. SIMS. I certainly do. As I said before, if you can not enforce the laws we have with the officers you have there now, what is the use of giving them more laws?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. In one moment. Now, if we have an academy here filled by a lot of young men who, instead of being an honor to their country, are studying prize-ring rules and seeking more the reputation of a bully than a hero [applause], the sooner we keep them at home the better. Wipe out the appropriation and stop the crimes. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. I fully agree with the gentleman, and I think this ought to be stopped; but inasmuch as it seems the responsibility is being placed upon Congress by the faculty of that institution for the violation of law, as he has stated, I think it is incumbent upon Congress to investigate the condition of affairs down there and see who is responsible.

Mr. SIMS. I think you are exactly right, and I will vote for it.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. And I believe that the failure on the part of Congress to take due notice of this would have a demoralizing influence, not only on Annapolis and West Point, but upon every college in the country.

Mr. SIMS. I think you are exactly right, and I approve of every word you have said.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I have just come in, and I have not heard all the gentleman from Tennessee has said, but he has referred to a statute there, and I presume he has it before him, which is applicable to these cases. Now, will you please read the statute for the information of the House, and I think this will be a good time to do so, and let us see whether it needs strengthening or not.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I have not the statute.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. The gentleman from Virginia has the statute.

Mr. SIMS. Then I will be glad to read it.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will ask you to read that part which is marked.

Mr. SIMS. It reads as follows:

Provided further, That the Superintendent of the Military Academy shall make such rules, to be approved by the Secretary of War, as will effectually prevent the practice of hazing; and any cadet found guilty of participating in, or encouraging or countenancing such practice shall be summarily expelled from the academy and shall not thereafter be reappointed to the Corps of Cadets, or be eligible to appointment as a commissioned officer of the Army or Navy or Marine Corps until two years after the graduation of the class of which he was a member.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Now, I will ask the gentleman if he does not think, instead of remanding that question to the superintendents of the academies, would it not be better for Congress to pass some criminal statute applicable to such cases, defining hazing and assault and battery, aggravated assault, manslaughter, and murder, and then make it applicable to those two institutions, and not leave it to the superintendents and commandants, who, I believe, are winking at this offense daily and weekly there?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I heartily approve of the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I would also make it applicable to them as coconspirators when they wink at it. I believe they are winking at it, and I believe there ought to be a further investigation and this statute ought to be so amended.

Mr. BOWIE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. BOWIE. The gentleman from Tennessee believes that pardons are sometimes properly granted?

Mr. SIMS. Oh, yes, indeed.

Mr. BOWIE. That the pardoning power ought to rest with some officer for an offense. That being true, would the gentleman contend that because the governor of a State, or pardoning power, recommended a pardon in a particular case, that therefore they were responsible for all murders committed thereafter?

Mr. SIMS. I certainly would not think so and I do not think the gentleman from Alabama was very serious in his question. The President, as I am informed, could have restored these young men without act of Congress——

Mr. BOWIE. Evidently not, because he recommended the passage of this bill, and they are trying to put upon us the responsibility for the commission of crimes since then merely because we thought in three cases there was just cause for the pardon or mitigation of the penalty existing, which I do not think justifies their subsequent conduct in the slightest degree, any more than the pardon of a man charged with murder would justify the commission of murder afterwards.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this is on all fours with the suggestion of the gentleman. The officers in charge of the Naval Academy are responsible for its discipline and its government, and when they make rules in accordance with what the law authorizes and we set aside the result of their disciplinary measures, it has the effect to break down the discipline in the institution thereafter. While you might be perfectly willing to pardon a young man who had been guilty as they were in this case, if it results in a reinstatement of the conditions that existed before, which seems to be the fact if the officials of the Naval Academy are to be believed, the result is greater than usually attaches to the pardon of an individual. It is the wiping out of the good effects of law. Every time a good rule is violated and its violation is condoned, you weaken the rule. And that is what has been done in the present case.

Now, I am certainly in favor of all legislation that is necessary to prevent a recurrence of the conduct of which these gentlemen have been guilty, however severe it may be, to bring about that result, even if it goes to the extent of wiping out the academy entirely. I am not willing to vote appropriations here to educate young men in a charity school to compete with Corbett, Fitzsimmons, and Jeffries in the learning of the prize ring. I will vote willingly to wipe out the whole thing if it can not be run as a Christian nation ought to run it. [Applause.] Who wants to see a battle ship in charge of an admiral who in his schoolboy days took pleasure in the suffering of a helpless, innocent victim, simply being tortured, that he might enjoy the brutishness of a nature that even excels that of the lower animals. Where in nature do you find an animal among the lower animals or beasts that ever yet punished or tortured one of their own kind simply to enjoy the spectacle of the suffering growing out of it?

Talk about defining hazing! I do not care what hazing is. The things that have been done in its name can never be conducive to the building up of a noble character and fit those guilty of it for the high positions for which they are intended.

Mr. WACHTER. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SIMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WACHTER. Would not the gentleman include football in that as well?

Mr. SIMS. I am not so well up on football.

Mr. WACHTER. Has the gentleman ever seen a game?

Mr. SIMS. I saw one game, and that was enough for me.

Mr. WACHTER. Well, the gentleman should include that in his remarks.

Mr. SIMS. Let me draw the distinction. I never yet knew a long-haired gentleman who was forced into a football team because the other fellows were larger than he was. He voluntarily goes into it, turns his hair loose and makes a rush at another man whose hair is loose. [Laughter.] It is all voluntary; there is no coercion. And besides, the Government of the United States does not pay for the education of a football bully.

Mr. WACHTER. But the Government pays for the man if he is maimed to such an extent as to be sent away from the academy?

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Maryland did not state that he meant football at the academy. Mr. Chairman, if we stop murder and manslaughter maybe we will get down to where we can stop the brutalities of football. But in such a contest they are at least selected with reference to their equality. They do not take only the students of the upper class. I think if you were to rake down to the mudsills of society you would find a class higher than such a class. [Applause.] The members of the upper class are several years older. They have gone through what is necessary to harden their muscles, and they make a practice of taking a little boy who has just been appointed, a boy who is the pride of his parents and the hope of the community, and compel him to stand on his head, in order to please these gentlemen of the upper class, until he is almost dead. That is the information that I have with reference to Mr. Kimbrough, of Tennessee.

Mr. MAHON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SIMS. I do.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Where these cadets engage in a brutal fist fight, whether the cadets engaged in it and the referee, in case a cadet is killed, do not deserve suspension and discharge from the academy as well as the cadets who simply stand a boy on his head and make him unconscious for a half hour or so?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, the question is well put and well asked. Where in any State of this Union could you go on and hold a prize fight in which manslaughter follows that every party to the fight would not be regarded as guilty and as a principal? I think the same punishment should be administered to those who violate the laws of the land and State in the naval and military academies that would be meted out to men in a town of a State for such an offense.

Mr. MAHON. Would not the effect of the code be that it would not be murder, but where a cadet goes voluntarily into a fight and the cadet is killed, the offense would be that of manslaughter?

Mr. SIMS. I know that it is manslaughter, but there is in a sense premeditation. The fight is prearranged and is according to a programme. There is at least that much premeditation. The killing was no doubt not intended; but any killing in violation of law is manslaughter. I say, are we going to continue appropriating money to keep up a great institution that ought to be the pride of the people, that permits such conduct as has been brought to the knowledge of every one in this House in the last few weeks?

Mr. MAHON. Does not the gentleman believe that the trouble about these academies is not so much in the boys as it is in the officers of the Navy and the Army [loud applause], and that in order to get at the root of the whole evil we will have to strike at the men in command who do not discourage this condition of affairs, as appears to be the case with the officers of the Navy and of the Army?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I must be candid. I have nobody to shield. I believe that if the officers used that degree of diligence which they should and which they are there to use, they might not possibly prevent every offense, but certainly we would have much less of it than we have been having. I do not wish to shield them.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not a fact that Mr. Bronson, the Superintendent of the academy, recommended or said to the Naval Committee and through the Naval Academy to Congress, that they had no objection to having them reinstated, and if they were it would not interfere with the discipline of the academy?

Mr. SIMS. I do not know. I was not present, and I did not hear the testimony, but I have read a report in the newspapers as coming from the Secretary of the Navy, in which the officers stated that it would have a bad effect on discipline.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. I stated some time ago in the discussion I understood that the officials at the naval school made no objection or protest. I did it by reason of the fact that a member of the Naval Committee stated to me that they would make no objection to the reinstatement of these men. They were helpless and they had to go into the case and endeavor to secure proper administration, but that they would make no objection to the reinstatement.

Mr. SULZER. Who is the member?

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. I do not care to give the name; I talked to him in private.

Mr. SIMS. This is all a closed incident so far as the people of this country are concerned. They did act upon the law which was passed, and expelled three young men, and the President said it was a plain violation of that law, and we relieved them here of the result of a violation, a plain violation of a plain law. I do not care whether the officers of the Naval Academy said they had no objection or not. We know that officers of the Government, in hearings before committees of Congress, do not say: "I am opposed," "I object," or "I recommend." They answer the questions asked. They make a report and only answer questions, so that there was nothing unusual in the officers not entering a violent protest against that report. They simply give the facts in answer to the questions asked.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these remarks are irregular and incoherent, I have been interrupted so often. I make no complaint of that. I have almost lost the thread of my discourse, but I only had one object in view; not to say: "I told you so," but there is the RECORD where I did tell you so [applause], in which I urged a year ago my reason for objecting to what I regarded as bad legislation.

I shall object again if any bill of the same kind comes before this House, without any personal feeling, but simply in the exercise of a duty that is broad and general, and based upon a demand for the best results for the whole country, and not simply the exercise of forgiveness to individuals.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. As I understand the various definitions that have been given of hazing, it is ex parte punishment. For instance, they will take a green boy who has just come in there, and young men who have been there for several years, who have got smart and know how to do things, will take this boy and punish him, and no one else will be punished; but in this case of Meriwether it was a plain case of a duel, and in such a case as that both men are punished. I think the evidence taken in the Meriwether court-martial clearly shows that that fight was umpired by some officers of that institution down there. I hope I am mistaken, but I think the press reports state that the officers winked at it; that the officers knew it, and that they had had this kind of a code for duels, and so forth, down there for years. Now, that is not hazing, but is simply a plain case of dueling.

Mr. SIMS. I do not know how those facts are, but if the officers of the Naval Academy are becoming referees for fights of this kind I think we had better quit making appropriations to run the academy.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. No; I think we had better turn out those officers and put others in there.

Mr. SIMS. And let us see if we can find somewhere in this broad land and in this Navy of ours men who will go there for the purpose of preparing these young men for the high duties they are to perform, and let this crowd who like hazing and who defend it and the officers who wink at it go down and join the Fitzsimmonses and Jeffries in their chosen profession, at their own expense, and not as the result of taxes to be paid by our constituents.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I should like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that if these cadets are expelled and kept out it will cure this evil at the academy? I should like to ask him if the possession of a high and honorable profession, and a living for life and the possession of a commission and all that goes with it, will not be a sufficient inducement to keep these men from jeopardizing it, if they know that as soon as they are detected they will be expelled and forever barred from the opportunity to attain these desirable things? I should like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that will cure this evil?

Mr. SIMS. I think expulsion would be enough, no doubt, if adhered to, to prevent it; but where hazing is accompanied by brutality and bodily injury it should also be punished as it would be punished under the laws of all the States in this Union. I do not think simple expulsion is adequate punishment, but that the offenders should receive the same punishment they would receive if guilty of like offenses in any State of the Union.

Mr. WACHTER. I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he can give any reason for hazing or for the playing of football in the brutal manner it is played?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, why did not the gentleman ask me something easy? To me it is inconceivable that young men going there or to any other school should want to bring suffering upon younger men, who are physically inferior, simply for the purpose of seeing them suffer. It is impossible for me to conceive how anyone can want to do that. Certainly no such a young man should be an officer in the American Navy or be educated at public expense.

In closing I beg to call attention to the Department letter of Secretary Moody as to what effect the naval officers said the reappointment of the expelled cadets would have upon the continuance of hazing in the Naval Academy.

Mr. SIMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have any time remaining, I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has five minutes remaining, which he yields to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in the five minutes allotted me I can only refer briefly to the statute read by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], which provides "that the Superintendent of the Military Academy shall make such rules, to be approved by the Secretary of War, as will effectually prevent the practice of hazing," etc.

The whole country has been shocked by the recent occurrences at Annapolis. Without discussing the merits of the case one way or the other, I simply call the attention of the House to the fact that the statute which has been read in reference to the Military Academy is not applicable to the Naval Academy. Both these academies are located on Federal territory. The States in which they are located have no jurisdiction to deal with the stated offenses. Therefore it is left with Congress to pass some suitable provision covering such offenses as have occurred at both these institutions. Since the statute referred to was passed it seems we have had no hazing at the Military Academy, but we have had some harrowing instances at the Naval Academy.

Without making any accusation, permit me to say the country believes that there are some officials in these institutions winking at offenses of hazing being committed there, and I must confess that by reading the testimony and studying these cases as they have appeared in the newspapers before the country it does seem that some of the officials in these institutions have encouraged or tolerated such things to some extent. Congress can put an end to hazing at these academies if it will but enact a Federal statute, exercising the power that is conferred upon this body, defining clearly what constitutes hazing, and prescribing a penalty. Then if officials at either academy wink at it, or knowingly encourage or tolerate it, let the statutory provisions make them accessories before the fact, or conspirators, subject to punishment for a crime and removal from office. [Applause.]

Mr. MUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I have only five minutes.

Mr. MUDD. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that the statement has been made that this fight was refereed by an officer of the academy. I want to say that that is a mistake. It is not a fact, and I want it to go into the RECORD.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I made that statement and I got it from the public press. I do not know whether it is true or not, but I believe it to be true.

Mr. MUDD. The testimony does not show anything of the kind.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Well, Mr. Chairman, there is a widespread belief in this country that the authorities at the academy are not frowning upon and discouraging such occurrences. There is only one way to stop hazing at these great governmental institutions. The plain remedy is to enact a most comprehensive Federal statute covering hazing and kindred crimes in their every aspect and affix a commensurate penalty suitable to every grade of the offense.

As it is now, you leave it in the hands of the Superintendent of the academy to prescribe the rule, to be the court and jury, and if some of the officials are inspiring and encouraging these infamous practices of course they will suppress all knowledge of their action and the facts in regard to them. Define what

hazing is, and whenever these students who have been there a number of years take up a callow youth just entering the institution and make him stand on his head, and subject him to other similar cruelties, make that assault and battery, which it is, and punish them as their crime deserves. Wrest the power of making rules as far as possible from the Superintendent, enact a wholesome statute and then force the officials there to enforce it or take off their officials heads.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What about dueling, which I understand goes on there?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Of course the statute ought to be made so broad that it will cover that and every offense.

Mr. WACHTER. Football?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes; I would stop football, unless you are the beginner with a six-shooter and club so that he may cope on equal terms with the veteran player. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HILL of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this matter is vividly before the country, and now is the time for Congress to act. We have jurisdiction of the subject-matter. We can clothe the Federal judiciary and machinery with ample power to reach these things. The States have not the power because the scene of action is on Federal territory. My contention is that a general Federal statute should be enacted taking the power of making rules out of the hands of the Superintendents of these academies on this subject. It should specifically define such pernicious practices, make them so broad that they will apply not only to the students, but to every offending official of the institution and everyone else connected with them. Then you can suppress it, but not before.

Oh, it is well enough for us to talk about inculcating the manly art in these institutions, but, as I understand it, we are not maintaining these great academies for the purpose of bringing up a race of ruffians. We are sending these young men to be educated for the service of their country, to refine them, to broaden them and make them gentlemen, and not to train them up as pugilistic prodigies to vie in the fistic graces with those notables, Jeffries, Fitzsimmons, and Corbett. [Applause.]

This is about all I care to say on this subject to-day. We have the power, and I wish to say when an opportunity is presented I shall vote for some statute broad enough to define every aspect of hazing, one swift and effective in its provisions and operations, one that will terminate these disgraceful occurrences that have brought shame to the participants, discredit to the institutions, and dishonor to the country. An honest and exhaustive investigation will test whether the officials, if they be guilty, can supinely sit by and permit assaults, murder, maiming, and brutalities; whether they can sit idly by and month after month permit the hospitals at Annapolis and West Point to be filled with victims of such encounters, bruised, bleeding, and mangled, and then blandly plead to the Government and the American people that they were ignorant and innocent of what was going on under their very eyes and what all others seemed to know. [Applause.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, on the 11th day of this month (December, 1905) I introduced the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the people of the United States, animated by the sympathy of a common humanity, view with deep sorrow, heartfelt commiseration, and poignant regret the deplorable condition of the people in Russia, and especially condemn and exceedingly deplore the cruel outrages, the unspeakable brutalities, and the unwarranted and wholesale assassinations of Russia's Jewish citizens; and

Whereas it is solemnly alleged, and there is a widespread and prevalent feeling throughout the world that it is true, that these terrible crimes, these brutal atrocities, and these willful murders of the Jews in Russia are connived at by the Russian Government, and have been incited by the Russian ruling classes, and are instigated directly or indirectly by high officials in Russia for political purposes, and have continued for a long time in all parts of Russia to such an extent that they have aroused the sympathies and shocked the moral sensibilities of the civilized world: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States, voicing the humanitarian sentiments of the American people, deplores the terrible crimes, the brutal outrages, and the uncalled-for and wanton murders of the Jews in Russia, and hereby condemns and denounces these awful outrages, these shocking assassinations, and these appalling atrocities as great international crimes against a common humanity that must be stopped, and stopped quickly, by the Russian Government; otherwise Russia, in the opinion of mankind, will and must stand indicted before the judgment bar of the world as beyond the pale of its civilization.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, that resolution expresses my sentiments in regard to the terrible crimes against the Jews in Russia; and, if I mistake not, it expresses the sentiments of most of the Members of this House of Representatives, and the heartfelt and sympathetic opinion of the humane and liberty-loving citizens of our country, who are shocked and grieved and outraged by the inhuman barbarities and appalling atrocities which have been going on for the past two years in Russia. During this short time, I am reliably informed by those most competent to testify, that more than 100,000 helpless Jews—men and women and children—absolutely defenseless and guilty of no wrong, have been cruelly, inhumanly, pitilessly, and barbarously murdered and butchered to make a Russian holiday. There has been nothing like it in all the history of the world, not even during the horrors of the Dark Ages, and humanity to-day stands aghast, stunned and grieved and horrified. It is simply impossible to describe the outrages on the Jews in Russia. Whole communities have been destroyed by fire and sword. No calamity of such magnitude has ever befallen Israel. All the horrors of the Inquisition, all the persecutions of the Middle Ages pale into insignificance in comparison with these stupendous crimes and appalling atrocities. The terrible bloody work is too frightful to contemplate; and yet we only know but a fragment of the awful truth. What a spectacle Russia presents at the dawn of the twentieth century!

Mr. Chairman, I feel deeply on this question. Only a few weeks ago 125,000 Jewish people, at the least calculation, relatives of the thousands and thousands of murdered Jews in Russia, marched through the streets in my Congressional district, clothed in somber black and crape, in a great mourning funeral procession for the martyred dead in Israel. It was one of the most impressive, one of the most striking, and one of the most pathetic scenes in all the history of the city of New York. Sadness and misery were written on every face. Bystanders took off their hats, bowed their heads in sympathy, and shed tears of sorrow. Nothing like it ever occurred before—Israel weeping and mourning for her dead—and I hope nothing like it will ever occur again in this land or any other.

But the murders go on. A veritable reign of terror exists. The black hand of ignorant fanaticism, race hatred, and religious bigotry has been raised throughout Russia against the law-abiding, peaceable, and defenseless Jews, and the barbaric work of rapine, plunder, outrage, and assassination continues and increases until even the heartless and hardened and superstitious Cossack is sickened by the bloody and ruthless scenes. Thousands and thousands of helpless men, women, and children are being slaughtered before the very eyes of civilization, and not a power lifts its voice in protest or raises a hand in condemnation. The facts—such as we get—are blood curdling and the numbers of the dead are appalling. Nothing like it ever occurred before in all the annals of time. It is a big, blood-red page in human history—a gigantic crime against a common humanity—and Russia must be forced to stop it. How, do you ask? I answer, How were the butcheries in Armenia stopped? How were the cruelties in Cuba ended? What did the powers do in China? Russia can, if Russia wants to do it, end these atrocities in a day. They must be stopped. The red reign of the Romanoffs must end. We can not look on longer without taking some decisive action. These crimes are great international crimes. The victims appeal to mankind, to the brotherhood of men, to the justice of the world. The massacres of Lodz and Odessa and Kishineff cry out to high heaven, and the time has come when the civilized world must tell Russia in no uncertain tones that these wholesale crimes against the Jews must cease, now and forever, or the civilization of this day will stand disgraced in the eyes of future generations. [Applause.]

Now, sir, I stand in my place on this floor, and charge on my responsibility as a Member of Congress, that it is solemnly alleged, and not denied, and there is a widespread and prevalent feeling throughout the world that it is true, that these terrible crimes of rapine and pillage and devastation, that these brutal atrocities, and that these monstrous murders of the helpless Jews in Russia, are secretly connived at by the Russian Government; that they have been incited by the Russian ruling classes—the grand dukes—and that they are instigated, directly or indirectly, by high officials in Russia for religious and political purposes. What a fearful indictment of Russia! Is it true? We will know some day. It is not for me to say now, however, whether these fearful charges implicating the Russian Government with direct responsibility for these atrocities on the Jews in her dominions are true or not, impartial history, sooner or later, will reveal the truth and the whole truth, and I leave that awful charge to unerring Time. But I do stand

here to-day and I do say that any nation that will permit, or that does permit, or that has permitted, these terrible assassinations to go on and continue, and makes no effort to check them, deserves the condemnation of the civilized world; and that we, the representatives of the American people, have the right, true to our traditions, voicing the sentiments of our constituencies and a common humanity, to cry out against these wholesale and willful crimes against a persecuted race, and denounce these barbarous outrages upon the Jews, and to notify Russia that, in our opinion, unless she stops, and stops immediately, these assassinations of the Jews, she will place herself, in the judgment of mankind, beyond the pale of civilization. That is the position I take now, and that is the position this House should take, and we should take it at once.

Mr. Chairman, I arraign Russia before the bar of civilization for great crimes against a common humanity. The Russian Government is responsible for these outrages on the Jews. She can not avoid the awful and tremendous responsibility. I believe that Russia could stop these murders if Russia wanted to stop them. These great crimes, sir, against an oppressed race, on account of race, are not local crimes; they go beyond State lines; they are great international crimes; they are butcheries of innocent men and women and children, and in the eyes of the Master these innocent victims are our brothers and our sisters, and we would be false to ourselves, to all that we revere and hold dear, and to every dictate of humanity, if we did not denounce and cry out against them with all the vehemence of our righteous American indignation. If we do not, ours will be the shame and ours the blame. We can not evade our responsibility by asking "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman, I know it is said by those who speak for the Administration that our Government can do nothing; that the President and the Secretary of State can not act and have no power, according to international law, to intervene or to interfere in the internal affairs of Russia. That may or may not be true, but one thing is certain—it has been done in Turkey and in Cuba and in China; and another thing is sure, and that is, that we, the Representatives in Congress of the American people, have the right to raise our voice in protest against the plundering and the massacre, week in and week out, of thousands and thousands of poor, helpless, defenseless men, women, and children in Russia. We can do that. Let us do it. We aided the Greeks in their heroic struggle; we sympathized with the Irish in their aspirations; we interfered when the Turks massacred the Christians in Armenia, and we intervened with force of arms to aid the Cubans.

Why should we refrain from aiding the Jew in Russia? I say, in my judgment, it is our duty and the duty of the Government to condemn and denounce these Jewish atrocities and to protest against these unspeakable crimes against the Jewish people in Russia in words that can not be misunderstood, and I believe that if we do, that if we pass this resolution, that it will have the desired result and effectively put a stop to the Russian Jewish outrages, atrocities, and massacres. That right we have; let us exercise it. It will be a declaration to Russia, to the Czar, and to the grand dukes, who are directly or indirectly responsible for these crimes, that the American people and the House of Representatives of the United States sympathize with the Russian Jews the same as we would with any other outraged and downtrodden and oppressed people, and that we are opposed to these race crimes and that the ruthless extermination of the Jews in Russia must cease. If this is all we can do, let us do it, and do it quickly; and I believe that if we do our protest, our condemnation, and our denunciation will be heard in St. Petersburg and that the Russian Government will quickly see to it that the wholesale butchery of Jewish communities is stopped. We can not ignore these crimes against humanity. We can not escape our duty and our responsibility. These innocent victims are our brothers and our sisters—mankind throughout the world are one. A great and continuing crime against one race is the concern of all the other races. Can anyone who believes in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man successfully deny it?

> For mankind are one in spirit, and one instinct bears along,
> Round the earth's electric circle, the swift flash of right or wrong;
> Whether conscious or unconscious, yet humanity's vast frame
> Through its ocean-sundered fibers feels the gush of joy or shame—
> In the gain or loss of one race all the rest have equal claim.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have said that we do not know one-half of the truth regarding the terrible crimes against the Jews in Russia. The facts at present are unobtainable. Russia suppresses them. In the dying throes of their official power, the cruel and heartless rulers of Russia have sense enough to preclude the world from knowing the awful truth of the unprecedented barbarities that are taking place within their dominions. To their credit be it said that they have decency enough to be ashamed to let the light of publicity beat on their cruel infamies and their infamous butcheries. But murder will out, and sooner or later the bright light of investigation, searching for truth, will beat upon them more fiercely than ever. Then, and not till then, will the awful calamity of the Jews in Russia be known, and when it is known I predict the revelation will be the most frightful in the annals of time, and the blackest page in all history.

Mr. Chairman, my heart goes out to the ravished and plundered and oppressed Jews in Russia. I grieve with those who grieve for the dead. I sympathize with the living and the terror stricken. I have enlisted with all my soul in their cause, and in Congress and out of Congress I shall do all that I can to aid them to ameliorate their condition. I am not a bigot. I care naught for creed. I have no race prejudice. I stand for humanity, and a man is a man, for all that, to me. I have struggled all my life to help those who needed help, to do something to better the conditions of the poor and the humble, to aid oppressed humanity in every land and in every clime, and to raise the lowly and downtrodden to a higher plane and push them forward a step further in the grand march of human progress. I shall continue my work along my own lines. I shall never turn back. I know my duty to my fellow-man, and it makes no difference to me whether he lives in the Orient or the Occident—whether he be Jew or gentile. In the battle for the right I can not go far wrong. There is nothing right but justice. I appeal for justice for the Jew, and I say to all the world that these outrages on the Jews in Russia must stop. I tell you that we can do our share to stop them. This resolution I offer is only a beginning. Let us pass it. Let us condemn and denounce the massacres of the helpless Jews in Russia, and that will accomplish something; and then let us hold a monster demonstration of protest—here in the capital of the Republic; here in the shadow of the White House—and demand, in the name of the American people and a common humanity, that official America, in a diplomatic way, serve notice on official Russia that the murders of the Jews in Russia must cease, and that will accomplish much more, and I believe effectually put a stop to these atrocities and devastations. A word from the President will go far to realize the object desired. A note of warning from the Secretary of State will have a most salutary effect. All the world applauded Theodore Roosevelt in using his good offices to bring about peace between Russia and Japan. We ask him now to use his good offices as President of the great Republic to bring peace to the harassed and maligned and outraged and persecuted Jew in Russia. He can do it if he will; and if he does, sorrowing humanity will place him on a higher pedestal, and a great race of grateful people will forever call him blessed.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to this House that I have the honor to represent in the heart of the city of New York one of the largest Jewish constituencies in the United States, and most of these people, or their parents, have come to our shores from Russia and southeastern Europe, and I want to say here, knowing them as I do, living among them, believing in them as I do, and respecting them as I do, that there are no better, no more loyal, and no more patriotic citizens in the United States. They are honest, sober, thrifty, industrious, liberty loving, and intelligent. They have come to our free land to escape the ostracism and the persecution of governments like Russia, and taking advantage of the opportunities vouchsafed them here, by frugality and industry, by perseverance and sobriety, by hope and tenacity of purpose, they have forged rapidly to the front in every line of endeavor, and they are to-day as good citizens as any other class of people in all our country. [Applause.] If anyone here will go over to the densely populated great East Side of New York, where I live, and where these people live, and where there are more people to the block than in any other like space on earth, he will be convinced of all I say regarding the Jew, and he will find among the throngs of school children in the public schools that the Jewish boys and the Jewish girls are among the brightest, the neatest, the aptest, the smartest, and the most intelligent. I know well these people; they know me, and have always been my friends; and I would be false to myself, false to my convictions, and false to every impulse of my nature, if I did not sympathize with them and do my best to comfort and aid them in the day of their greatest sadness and affliction and calamity. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, just a word of truth for the Jew and I will conclude. It is, however, unnecessary for me, or any other man, to eulogize the intrepid sons and the virtuous daughters of Israel. The Jew needs no eulogy. All he asks is justice. All he demands is equal opportunity and equality before the law. The record of his race from the dawn of time down to the present

day is the history of the march of humanity along the highways of progress and the avenues of civilization. In all ages of the world the ostracized and persecuted Jew has done his share for his fellow-man, for enlightenment, for liberty, for freedom, for progress, and for civilization—and he has done it all in the face of intense adverse circumstances. In science and in art, in literature and philanthropy, the Jew, in all lands and in all times, has written his name high in the temple of human fame. In statesmanship and diplomacy, in law and in medicine, in ethics and philosophy, in research and discovery, the greatness of the Jew is and ever has been unchallenged. In commerce and in trade, in industry and husbandry, overcoming forces that would deter another, he has held his own in the vanguard of progress. Persecuted for thousands of years he has surmounted all obstacles; shunned for centuries he has kept in the very front of the higher and the better civilization. In trial and in triumph, in tempest and in sunshine, in war and in peace, on land and sea, in all eras and in all places, the Jewish race has written its enduring name and its eternal fame all over the pages of human history. Civilization owes much to the Jew; Christianity owes more. Neither debt can ever be paid. Destroy what Israel has done for the human race and you leave a void that can not be filled—an abyss which can not be bridged. Call the roll of the earth's illustrious dead and at least one name in every five will be the immortal name of a distinguished Jew who has stamped his indelible impress on the brightest pages of the world's history. [Prolonged applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CONNER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution 12.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, December 21, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Thursday, January 4, 1906.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and for making appropriation for the isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ALLISON, Mr. HALE, and Mr. TELLER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, a short while ago my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] gave us a bird's-eye view of how things are at Annapolis and of the horrors that have been enacted there. We have been now out in Russia for a few moments, so I think we had better come back to Annapolis. When this matter was before the House, in relation to West Point, when we had the trouble about hazing, the position I then took on the floor of this House was that the punishment of officers who failed to stamp it out, and boys who engaged in this business, should be certain, severe, and sure. I was even opposed to the Lacey bill, that my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] so eloquently championed and which passed this House. When we settled the West Point matter we thought thaf there would be an end to this business in these institutions.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. LACEY. Does the gentleman not know that since 1874 the law at Annapolis provides for absolute dismissal?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. LACEY. No other punishment, and absolute prevention from ever being reappointed?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. LACEY. And that the very severity of the punishment prevented the officers from enforcing the law, while if there could have been some leeway up and down, so as to meet trifling offenses like the one referred to, they could not only have discovered the crimes, but could have punished them. But the punishment is so severe that the result is that they have usually done nothing.

Mr. MAHON. That law is still in force.

Mr. LACEY. Yes; but absolutely ineffective.

Mr. MAHON. And they did find a mild remedy in the Meriwether-Branch case.

Mr. LACEY. Well, in the Meriwether case a rebuke was administered to the cadet, but if instead of being convicted of assault and battery, which resulted in the death of a cadet and then being rebuked, he had been convicted of the crime of the mildest form of hazing, he would have to be punished by dismissal and practically perpetual exclusion from the Navy.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; and he ought to be punished under the act of 1874 as it stands.

Mr. WACHTER. But what right has an officer to construe the law as being too severe, when Congress has said that it is not too severe? What right has a naval officer to use any discretionary powers when the law is plain and explicit?

Mr. MAHON. He has no right to do it.

Mr. LACEY. May I answer the gentleman from Maryland in the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. LACEY. Why, he has no right at all.

Mr. WACHTER. But the gentleman says that they did it, however.

Mr. LACEY. Certainly; they always did, and the effect of making a punishment beyond that which seems just——

Mr. WACHTER. To whom?

Mr. LACEY. To anybody, and shocking to mankind is that it always results in no punishment. If you made the penalty for the offense of hazing that of death, no man would ever be charged with it. Such law would be a dead letter.

Mr. WACHTER. If Congress said so it would be right, and they have no discretionary powers.

Mr. LACEY. It has been the history of every country in the world that an excessive punishment without any minimum results in the ignoring or evading of the law. That has been the case at Annapolis and at West Point.

Mr. WACHTER. Well, they have no business to do it.

Mr. MAHON. The way they have run things at Annapolis, they can find a mild way to punish a boy, but they do at present just about as they please down there. Now, in the West Point matter, when it was before this House, I advocated an amendment, which I think I offered, providing that when a young man entered either one of those institutions, in addition to the oath he ordinarily takes, there should be added to the oath that he would not engage in brutal fist fights, hazing, or any disorder of that kind, and if he were found guilty of a disobedience of that law the punishment provided was not only dismissal, but punishment by fine and imprisonment for perjury. The House contended that the honor—the high standard of honor—controlling the officers of these institutions and the cadets would prevent fighting and hazing in the future.

I am free to confess, Mr. Chairman, that I have lost all confidence and all faith in the high standard of honor as practiced at Annapolis and West Point. I am one of those who believe that when two young men or two older men deliberately plan to have a brutal fist fight that every instinct of a gentleman in that fight is wiped out. That is for dogs and not for men. I will admit there are cases when reputable men and reputable cadets, under the impulse of passion, a word said and a word flung back, may come in conflict, but there is a difference between that sort of contest with fists and fights which have been conducted deliberately and winked at by the officers of that institution.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MAHON. A moment; yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will be very glad to have the gentleman, or some one else who knows, to state it as a fact, if it is a fact, that these officers have winked at this code duello that they have had there for years and years.

Mr. MAHON. I will simply state that they must have had knowledge of it. When three or four or five boys are, as I am informed, placed in the hospital of the institution—the officer in charge of the hospital being an officer of the Navy—and when boys are brought to the hospital with their faces blackened by brutal fist blows and other injuries, with other severe injuries inflicted, it certainly shows that the surgeon is aware of it, and it is his duty to report to the officer in command. [Applause.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do I understand that this code duello has existed down there for years, and this brutality, as it can well be called, has been carried on for years?

Mr. MAHON. I simply make the statement that I understand it has never been stopped at Annapolis.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The officers seem to make a distinction, or there is a distinction some one is trying to make, between hazing, which you know is ex parte punishment—they all jump on one little fellow——

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And bully some one. As I understand, it seems the code duello has been the code amongst the young men down there for years and years, but in the matter of hazing——

Mr. MAHON. That is only a more violent form of hazing. Take a young stripling, a boy of 16 years of age, who is put in the academy; the upper-class men throw themselves in his pathway to get some word or expression from him that they can take as an insult, and then make his life miserable until they get him to confront a big bully so that he can be properly beaten.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. My friend is an old soldier and will agree with me that hazing is not as fair treatment of a boy as where he is given a chance to protect himself in a duel.

Mr. MAHON. It is all hazing.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Of course it is all "hazing," it seems, but there is a difference between all parties jumping one fellow and two lads fighting a duel on a common plane.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am free to say I have an appointment to make to the academy, and I have a bright boy 16 years and 1 month old, and I have withheld his appointment, and I am very free to say if I can not send that bright little boy in my district down to Annapolis without subjecting him to this brutal treatment some other person can fill that appointment. [Applause.] He is now living among cultivated people and not in danger of the insults and fists of the big rowdies of upper class——

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I heard stated a few years ago by the father of a boy in this institution that this code of honor, as they call it, had been in operation ever since the beginning of the institution, and I submit it as a reasonable proposition that this practice could not have been carried on during all these years without the knowledge getting to the authorities of the institution.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; so has hell been in operation since the beginning of creation.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for just another suggestion? Over in the State of Ohio, you will remember, a few days ago, at Kenyon College, I believe, the boys of a certain society tied a young man on the railroad track and a train came along and killed him. These young men are indicted and will have to stand trial before a civil court for manslaughter. Now, what reason is there that these young men, sent there by the Government and kept by the Government, should not be compelled to abide by the same sort of treatment and the same sort of punishment?

Mr. MAHON. I am free to say they would get it if they were not on a military reservation. If this institution was not under the control of the Government and under the laws of Maryland the crime Meriwether committed would have put him behind the bars in some jail.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to come to another point.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MAHON. I will.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. The gentleman said something about a statute of 1874 being ample to cover these cases.

Mr. MAHON. I recall the law.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I would like the gentleman to tell me what that is.

Mr. MAHON. My friend from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] is very familiar with it.

Mr. LACEY. I can state it. In 1874 a law was passed providing that hazing at Annapolis should be punished by dismissal. That was the only punishment provided by law; and that dismissal should prevent the dismissed cadet from ever again being appointed to Annapolis.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. That applied only to Annapolis?

Mr. LACEY. Only to Annapolis. In 1903 a bill was passed for West Point, which provided in the case of the dismissal of a cadet for hazing he should not be eligible for appointment in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or any naval or military academy for two years after the graduation of the class to which he belonged. That was the change in the law, and afterwards that same bill was brought into the House and adopted as to Annapolis, without any reference being made to the act of 1874. The committee evidently overlooked the fact that the act of 1874 existed, because no reference was made to it.

The point I make is this, that the statutory punishment is not too severe in a great many cases. In the three cases to which such allusion has been made—practically it was not hazing at all, but technically it could be called so—nothing short of dismissal and exclusion from the Navy could be imposed upon the parties found guilty. And if we would give some latitude to the officers there they could enforce the law; but to say that because one man tells another to stoop down and stand up, and to stoop down and stand up, a couple or more of times, he shall be dismissed for doing it, and, being dismissed, shall be ineligible to being appointed again in the Army or Navy, is simply ridiculous; and the result is that the cadets refuse to testify or give information, because they know that the only punishment that can be inflicted is an extravagant one; one that shocks their own sense of fairness. And therefore they keep their complaints to themselves, and the officers find themselves unable to enforce the law because the only way to enforce it is by imposing a punishment that shocks the conscience of a court-martial.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. After the clear statement made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] it would seem clear that the law, being inflexible now, is too mild to apply to the extreme cases and too extreme to apply to the mild ones. Therefore the punishment is not suitable, and that both of those statutes should be so amended that we can have a sliding scale of punishment that is commensurate with the crime.

Mr. MAHON. The act of 1874 is a good law. The amendment of it would be a weak thing for this House to do.

Now, what is hazing? The gentleman from Iowa says a boy stoops down and puts his hands on the ground. I believe that is what they call something like "setting up." There is nothing in the mere fact of making a boy put his head down. But the whole system of hazing, from the slightest to the greatest, is to humiliate the young man when he enters that institution. Gentlemen know that as well as I do.

Mr. Chairman, I know of an instance at West Point which occurred not long ago. I heard it from a cadet. A young lad went there and he was made to stand guard all night when they were out in camp. The older class men watched the officer of the day, and the young man was made to stand from 8 o'clock at night until daylight with his musket at shoulder, guarding a dead rat lying at his feet. That did not hurt anybody. That did not hurt the boy particularly, but it was intended to humiliate the boy. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe in the case of these young cadets who enter these institutions, and who are outraged and insulted by upper class men, if there is anybody to use their fists or use a bludgeon, let it be the young boy who can go in and club or knock down the first high tough who insults him.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to another matter: Somebody through the press has undertaken to charge that the trouble in this matter has been caused by the action of the House in the Fifty-eighth Congress adopting the bill which my friend from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] so earnestly advocated and had passed. At the time I was opposed to restoring these cadets, but a message comes from the President, supporting one by the Secretary of the Navy, that under certain conditions the restoration to the service of these boys would not have any bad effect upon the academy; and I allowed myself to be hoodwinked and bamboozled in the matter and voted for it. I will not vote again for such a bill.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman allow me a question in this connection? There ought to be, perhaps, some legislation upon the matter. Take the case of General Sheridan's boy, who went to West Point. Of course they had some fun with him. They made him sit in a saddle on a clotheshorse, and had him recite Buchanan Read's "Sheridan's Ride." Now, that was hazing. Would you dismiss all those boys who played a joke like that upon a boy who had been appointed to West Point? Would you bar those boys forever from the Army?

Mr. MAHON. I would say that that was not hazing. If I was the officer in charge I would have sense enough to make a distinction between play and hazing.

Mr. LACEY. But that is hazing.

Mr. MAHON. Some one, through a newspaper—I do not know whether it is the press agent of the Panama Canal [laughter]—has undertaken to show to the country that this House was censurable for the lack of discipline down there on account of reinstating these boys. Now, what is that act? It is short:

That the President be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered in his discretion—

It was left entirely to the discretion of the President whether these boys should be reinstated without weakening the discipline of that institution—

to appoint to the naval service the three midshipmen of the then first class who were dismissed on the 6th day of November, 1903, pursuant to the findings and recommendations of a court-martial——

Mr. LACEY. I want to correct my friend there; the bill does not authorize their reinstatement at all.

Mr. MAHON. I am coming to that.

Mr. LACEY. Reappointment to the Navy.

Mr. MAHON (continuing)—

said midshipmen to take rank at the foot of the class from which dismissed, and to serve at sea in like manner as the other members of said class: *Provided*, That such appointments shall not be operative or effective unless and until said midshipmen shall have passed such examinations and conformed to such requirements as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

Now, this bill did not make these boys go back to the academy to join their class, because they had shown to Congress and to the court-martial that tried them that they were not worthy to go back to the academy and join their class; that their conduct was such that it would be demoralizing to the discipline of the institution; but they had to go away somewhere and pass an examination, and then they were appointed to the Navy and put into the service. In other words, that they were not proper subjects to go back to the academy on account of their former conduct—could not even join their class and take their examination—but they were proper men to send away for examination and be made officers on our great battle ships.

Mr. LACEY. I would like again to correct my friend. There was no such proposition involved as that. The class had all graduated. The time of the class had expired. These boys were within three months of graduation when dismissed. To send them back again was an entirely useless thing. They simply missed their examination, and it required them to take another examination, but deprived them from getting a diploma, not to disgrace them.

Mr. MAHON. The Superintendent of the academy was bitterly opposed to these boys going back to the academy.

Mr. LACEY. Certainly; but not to their going into the Navy.

Mr. MAHON. "I was opposed to these boys going back to the academy or into the Navy."

The Superintendent of the academy wanted them sent somewhere else to be examined, and then they could go and take positions as officers on a gunboat, a cruiser, or a battle ship. He did not want them to go to the academy and be treated like other cadets—compel them to graduate like all the other boys and get their two years' cruise at sea.

Mr. LACEY. They have to take their two years' cruise at sea, but at the foot of the class.

Mr. MAHON. Congress is not to blame fully for their restoration to service, but through some influence coming from the Navy Department, some from Secretary of the Navy, up through the President, into this House, to persuade us to restore these three cadets and put into the Navy those who should never have gone there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one other thought and then I am done. The case of Branch and Meriwether was a gross and outrageous violation of the rules of the academy, a prearranged fight between an upper class man and a lower class man, with referees appointed to see that there was a fair fight. That was only the culmination of a long system of the hazing of Branch which resulted in that brutal fight.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman know who the officers were or who the men were who had charge of that duel? I used the word "officers" a while ago. I do not know that they were "officers." I want to find out if they were; all my information is derived from the press, which used the word "officers."

Mr. MAHON. The testimony taken before that court-martial shows who the referees were.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I thought perhaps the gentleman knew. I have not read the testimony except what I saw in the papers. I do not want to do anyone any injustice. These "officers" may not have been, and I hope were not, the officers in charge of the academy.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield for a further question? He said a moment ago that this affair was a gross violation of the laws and regulations of the academy. Can the gentleman give us any information whether the laws of the State of Maryland permit prize fighting within the limits of that State?

Mr. MAHON. No, sir.

Mr. MUDD. The Naval Academy is not under the jurisdiction of the State laws. It is a Federal reservation.

Mr. MAHON. It is a military reservation.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Then does the gentleman say that the criminal laws of that State have no jurisdiction there?

Mr. MUDD. The Federal courts have jurisdiction.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is a Federal matter, I should say, but I have some doubts about it.

Mr. MUDD. There is no law in Maryland authorizing prize fighting.

Mr. MAHON. It is a military reservation, and it is an open question whether the civil authorities can punish for a crime committed on those grounds. That question is now before the Attorney-General of the United States to be settled—whether the civil or Federal courts can go in there and take hold of a man and punish him.

Mr. WACHTER. I want to say for the information of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER] that the United States district attorney from Baltimore was in attendance upon that court-martial as the representative of the Government.

Mr. MAHON. If I was the United States district attorney in that district I would have made a very strong effort to have brought the offenders into the criminal court to punish them for the life taken. I think the Federal authorities have the power.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Congress is not to blame. The responsibility can not be thrown on Congress. This legislation which we passed in the Fifty-eighth Congress was on a recommendation from the Navy Department and the President. Whether it was right or wrong, if there is any responsibility for this lax discipline, getting worse and worse, it does not rest upon the Congress of the United States. We act largely on the recommendations of the heads of the different bureaus of the Government, who are supposed to know the facts.

Now, how are you going to cure this evil? I was a boy once, and probably if I had been a midshipman at Annapolis I might have gotten into the same trouble. Boys will be boys the world over, and you can not change them. If they are permitted to practice these brutal things in our institutions they will practice them; but, as was stated before, Mr. Chairman, the boys are not at the root of this trouble. The trouble is with the men who have charge of them. Think of an officer in the Navy—a man who has been educated at the expense of the Government, whose position has thrown him amongst the best and most cultured society—think of such an officer permitting these brutalities. It is almost beyond the pale of belief of even a Member of Congress. But I am firmly convinced, and it will take a great deal to change my conviction, that the officers at the Naval Academy have known that this thing has been going on; that sufficient efforts have not been made to punish hazing; that there has been no restraining arm put upon these young boys, full of young blood, but that the condition of things there has been winked at and encouraged by the officers of the Navy, who have somehow or from somewhere got it into their heads that you can not make brave men and gentlemen out of boys unless they are put through these brutal practices and fights during their educational career. That is the belief that prevails in the Army and in the Navy. If you sit down and discuss it with them, they say that it makes brave and heroic men to put these young men through these practices. I assert the contrary, and that a brutal prize fight will degrade and lower the gentlemanly instincts in a young man. It is not going to make him braver or better.

Now, I understand a resolution has been offered to investigate not only the boys, but to investigate the officers in charge of the academy. It is a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD]. It has been referred to the Committee on Rules. I hope that dignified committee, all gentlemen of culture and distinction, will give us a chance at it in the near future, and if this House gets a chance at it, some of these gentlemen will be taught a lesson that they will not forget, at least until they are put on the retired list. [Laughter.] If the Committee on Rules forgets it—and they may, for they are pretty busy—there may be a motion to discharge the committee from its consideration.

A MEMBER. Let us hear the resolution.

Mr. MAHON. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be, and is hereby, directed to make a thorough investigation of the situation and conditions at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, and especially to ascertain and report whether there have been violations of law and the regulations governing the academy, and especially whether there has been hazing, fagging, running, and class fist fighting in practice there, and the knowledge of and responsibility of the officers of the academy for any conditions found. Such committee may act by a subcommittee, if found advisable, and may sit at the Capitol or at the Naval Academy or elsewhere, and may send for persons and papers and examine witnesses and take such other action as may be found necessary.

Now, I want to suggest to the Naval Committee that they call the surgeon at Annapolis and ask him how many boys with broken noses, blackened faces, and bruised heads he has treated within the last year or two. When they get his answer, it will be something to start on.

I want to make another suggestion to the Naval Committee—a committee that I have very high regard for. That is this: That if we can not get the officers to enforce the law we shall

take every cadet and make him take a solemn oath that he will not only support the Constitution of the United States, the laws, and the flag, but to raise his hand before high heaven and take a solemn oath that he will not in any manner, shape, or form take any part or be guilty of any practice of this kind in either of our military of naval institutions. Then we will put him on his honor, and he either must refrain from this practice or else he must stand before his fellows as a perjured man.

Mr. MUDD. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. MUDD. If I am not altogether wrong, these cadets—all of them—take an oath now to obey all the regulations of the academy. One of the regulations is not to engage in hazing.

Mr. MAHON. I know they take it, but they do not pay any attention to it; they take it with a mental reservation.

Mr. MUDD. But the gentleman said that he would require them to take the oath. I want to say that they take that oath now.

Mr. MAHON. The rules and regulations as they construe it is what they take the oath to keep.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But the proposition as put by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is much broader than the one suggested by the gentleman from Maryland. The gentleman from Pennsylvania said they should have an oath to uphold "the laws and Constitution of the United States."

Mr. MAHON. There is a great deal of mental reservation in taking the oath at Annapolis.

Mr. MUDD. But how will the gentleman stop the mental reservation?

Mr. MAHON. If the boy takes the oath that he will not engage in a fist fight or hazing in these institutions and it can be proved that he does, he is guilty of perjury, and punishment in the Federal courts of the United States will follow, if he is on a military reservation.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are others on the list who wish to address the committee, and as it is getting late, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House resolution 42 and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. DALE, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of bill H. R. 15577, Fifty-eighth Congress, providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Carbondale, Pa., no adverse report having been made thereon.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

H. R. 299. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company.

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1905, on the 20th day of said month.

And then, on motion of Mr. DALZELL (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a bill relating to accountability of disbursement of public moneys and public stores by officers of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, asking permission for Commander William G. Cutler, United States Navy, to accept the insignia of the Legion of Honor—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs showing open-market purchases in the Indian Department because of exigencies—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for a cable connecting Forts Dade and De Soto, Fla.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting an estimate of appropriation for salaries in the public schools—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for relief of L. K. Scott—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for relief of persons who sustained damage by fire at Rock Island Arsenal—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for defense in Indian depredation claims for the year ending June 30, 1906—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of the claim of John and David West, of Cathlamet, Wash.—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for United States penitentiaries at McNeil Island, Washington, and Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting an estimate of appropriation for addition to the Eastern Market house—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of claims of Lieut. Col. William M. Black, United States Army, and Lieut. Mark Brooke, United States Army—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State asking permission for Col. T. W. Simons, United States Army, to accept the decoration of the Order of the Double Dragon from the Chinese Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, asking permission for Lieut. Gen. A. R. Chaffee, United States Army, to accept the commission and insignia of the office of Grand Commander of the Legion of Honor—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, submitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the disposal of useless papers in the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Center Harbor, Brooklin, Me.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 73) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to report progress of investigation of black sands of Pacific slope, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 7); which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 8965) to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers of the Confederate army and navy, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 8966) to set apart certain lands in the Territory of Arizona as a public park, to be known as the Petrified Forest National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8967) to attach St. Lucie County, in the State of Florida, to the southern judicial district—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8968) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Lake City, in the State of Florida—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 8969) ratifying and confirming chapter 58 of the twenty-third legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, providing for repair of the Territorial bridge at Florence, Pinal County, Ariz.—to the Committee on the Teritories.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 8970) authorizing the Commissioner of the General Land Office to quitclaim the title conveyed to the United States for land in forest reservations under certain conditions—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 8971) to erect an addition to the post-office and court-house building in the city of Jackson, State of Tennessee—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8972) to extend the lines of the Capital Traction Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 8973) to amend section 5200, Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 8974) extending the time for settlement upon the Uintah Reservation or lands originally within the limits thereof—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 8975) to prohibit the coming into and to regulate the residence within the United States, its Territories, and all territory under its jurisdiction, and the District of Columbia, all Japanese persons and persons of Japanese descent and Korean persons and persons of Korean descent—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 8976) to change the line of the reservation at Hot Springs, Ark., and of Reserve avenue—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 8977) to create a new division of the western judicial district of Texas, and to provide for terms of court at Delrio, Tex., and for a clerk for said court, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 8978) to authorize Indian allottees to sell and convey their allotted lands for school sites—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 8979) to enable the Department of Agriculture to conduct demonstration experiments for the purpose of eradicating pear blight in California—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 8980) increasing the limit of cost of public building at Columbia, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 8981) to authorize purchase of a certain index and roster of military organizations of the widow of David P. Craig, and so forth—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 8982) for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at Isle au Haut, Me.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 8983) to authorize the detail of a retired naval officer in behalf of American seamen—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 8984) to amend the laws governing labor or improvements upon mining claims in Alaska—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 8985) to establish a fish-cultural station in the county of Hickman, in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8986) for the establishment of an Indian sanitarium or school at or near Fort Pierre, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8987) to enable the President of the United States to call an international conference relating to immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 8988) to fix the standard of weights and measures by the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8989) to create in the War Department a special roll to be known as the "volunteer retired list," to authorize placing thereon, with pay, certain surviving officers of the United States Volunteer Army of the civil war, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 8990) making an appropriation for the completion of a 14-foot waterway from Chicago to St. Louis—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 8991) to repeal certain laws relating to permanent and indefinite appropriations—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 8992) to appropriate money for the completion of classification of lands included within the Northern Pacific Railway land grant—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 8993) to amend the Bowman Act, volume 22, Statutes at Large, page 485—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 8994) to provide for a land district in Yellowstone, Carbon, and Rosebud counties, in the State of Montana, to be known as the Billings land district—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 8995) to add 10,000 acres of land, by purchase or condemnation, to the Chattanooga and Chickamauga National Military Park, and appropriating $200,000 for that purpose—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8996) requiring life insurance companies to make annual report to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and providing penalties for failures so to do—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 8997) to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 8998) to pension widows of deceased soldiers and sailors of the United States at the same rate as their deceased husbands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 8999) to supplement the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and the acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 9000) for the erection of an auditorium in the national cemetery at New Albany, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 9001) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9002) for the erection of a public building at Centralia, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 9003) repealing an act entitled "An act to extend the time for presenting claims for additional bounties"—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9004) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 9005) dividing the State of South Carolina into two judicial districts, providing for the appointment of a district judge, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 9006) for improving, repairing, and the erection of an addition to the public building at Peoria, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9007) for the relief of gaugers, storekeeper-gaugers, and storekeepers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 9008) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to add to the segregation of coal and asphalt lands in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, Ind. T.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 9009) authorizing the board

for the leasing of school lands in the Territory of Oklahoma to lease the said lands reserved for educational and public building purposes for mining and quarrying purposes and the development and operation of oil and gas wells, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9010) to constitute the Osage Indian Reservation, Oklahoma Territory, a recording district, and to provide for the incorporation of cities, towns, and villages, and cities of the first class therein, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9011) allowing the Otoe and Missouri Indians to dispose of all surplus lands and removing restrictions on all "inherited lands"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9012) to provide for the selection of grand and petit jurors for the district court in the Territory of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9013) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws relating to the disposition of lands, and so forth, approved March 3, 1901,'" approved June 13, 1902—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9014) donating lands in Oklahoma Territory for educational purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9015) providing for the sale of a part of Noble Park, in the city of Guthrie, Logan County, Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 9016) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of all claims presented on behalf of churches, schools, libraries, hospitals, and establishments conducted for the benefit of churches, or for charitable purposes, arising from the occupation and use of the buildings, grounds, and other property of various kinds occupied, used, taken away, injured, consumed, or destroyed by the United States or its Army during the civil war, or for its benefit in any way—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9017) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the State of North Carolina—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9018) authorizing a public building at Fayetteville, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 9019) to provide for the erection of a public building in Henderson, Vance County, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 9020) to regulate process and proceedings in the courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 9021) to prevent conspiracies in restraint of trade and to punish those engaged therein—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9022) granting second-class mail privileges to certain charitable, educational, and religious publications—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 9023) to provide for the proper lighting and maintenance of the Statue of Liberty, Bedloes Island, New York Harbor—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RIXEY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 52) asking for estimates for the improvement of Accotink Creek, in Fairfax County, Va.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DALZELL: A resolution (H. Res. 105) directing the Clerk of the House to pay to the widow of Daniel P. Hickling, deceased, late locksmith of the House, a certain sum of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A resolution (H. Res. 106) directing the Clerk of the House to pay to the widow of Isa Black, late a doorkeeper of the House, a certain sum of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A resolution (H. Res. 107) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions to appoint a janitor to said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 9024) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Lennox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9025) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9026) granting an increase of pension to Henry Meiners—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9027) to correct the military record of Corwin M. Holt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDRUS: A bill (H. R. 9028) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of James W. Quintard—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9029) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Ambrose McGregor—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9030) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Lydia A. Oakley—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9031) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of John D. Heins—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 9032) to carry out the finding of the Court of Claims in the case of the St. Louis Hay and Grain Company—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 9033) granting an increase of pension to Burgoyne Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9034) granting a pension to Mary F. McCauley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9035) granting a pension to William D. Frazier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9036) granting a pension to Mary A. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9037) granting an increase of pension to David Fannin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9038) granting an increase of pension to Moses Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9039) granting an increase of pension to James R. Hales—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9040) granting an increase of pension to John W. Fults—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 9041) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9042) for the relief of Albert Rebsamen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9043) granting an increase of pension to William A. Coverston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 9044) granting an increase of pension to Albert B. Woolverton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 9045) granting certain lands belonging to the United States and situated in the State of Alabama to the State of Alabama for the use and benefit of the common schools of that State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9046) granting a pension to William Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9047) for the relief of the heirs of Lloyd Brooks, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9048) for the relief of the heirs of Austin Nix, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9049) for the relief of Bennett Robertson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 9050) granting an increase of pension to William Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9051) granting an increase of pension to Asher S. Bouden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9052) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9053) granting an increase of pension to John M. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 9054) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth D. Lasater—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9055) granting an increase of pension to John N. Matthews—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9056) granting an increase of pension to J. V. Galliher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9057) granting an increase of pension to Wilson D. Hankins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 9058) granting an increase of pension to James Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 9059) granting an

increase of pension to Ebenezer S. Edgerton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9060) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9061) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Walls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 9062) granting an increase of pension to Edward Delaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9063) granting an increase of pension to George W. Steele—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9064) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. McClintic—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9065) granting an increase of pension to George G. Brail—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9066) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Barton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9067) granting an increase of pension to David Muffly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9068) granting an increase of pension to John W. Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9069) granting an increase of pension to George W. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9070) granting an increase of pension to Norman Morford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9071) granting an increase of pension to Chancy Pickell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 9072) for the relief of Henry Fitzgerald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 9073) granting an increase of pension to Melissa McCracken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 9074) granting an increase of pension to Abraham E. Pierson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9075) to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of Minor Berry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9076) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Willett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9077) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Engle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9078) granting an increase of pension to Arnold Mattingly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9079) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Whitehead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9080) granting an increase of pension to Joel D. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9081) granting an increase of pension to John Attaway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9082) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Gambill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9083) to correct the military record of Allen Byers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9084) for the relief of Charles Snyder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 9085) granting an increase of pension to Harrison H. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 9086) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 9087) granting an increase of pension to William Winn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9088) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Rue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9089) for the relief of Virginia K. Hahn and Mary E. Carroll—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 9090) granting an increase of pension to Amasa B. Saxton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 9091) granting an increase of pension to Stacy B. Warford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 9092) granting a pension to Lucy Walke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 9093) granting an increase of pension to Farrie M. Allis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 9094) for the relief of the trustees of Walnut Grove Church, of Gibson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9095) for the relief of the heirs of James M. Claxton—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 9096) granting a pension to Ruth F. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9097) for the relief of the legal representatives of Margaret Robertson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 9098) for the relief of the legal representatives of John McCabe and Patrick McCabe, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 9099) granting a pension to Mary A. Leary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9100) granting a pension to Nancy C. Paine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9101) granting an increase of pension to James W. Loomis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 9102) for the relief of Ephram Hunter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 9103) granting an increase of pension to Alfred M. Hooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9104) granting an increase of pension to Henry Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 9105) for the relief of R. M. Magill—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9106) granting an increase of pension to James M. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9107) granting a pension to James W. Russell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 9108) for the relief of the estate of Mary A. Gough, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 9109) for the relief of J. H. Henry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 9110) granting a pension to Jessie A. Rand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9111) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9112) granting a pension to Ada P. Connaughey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9113) granting a pension to Elizabeth Cleaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9114) granting an increase of pension to John Beerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 9115) for the relief of the estate of Moses K. Wheat, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9116) to pay the estate of Sampson B. Cloud the sum of $1,595—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9117) for the relief of Thomas Bonner, jr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9118) for the relief of Fannie R. Bonner—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 9119) granting a pension to H. F. E. Schroer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9120) granting an increase of pension to John J. Cain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 9121) granting an increase of pension to John Adair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9122) granting an increase of pension to Philander Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9123) granting an increase of pension to George W. McKenzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9124) granting an increase of pension to T. J. Tupper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9125) granting an increase of pension to Nelson B. Toole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9126) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Parish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9127) granting an increase of pension to Isaac L. Rerick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 9128) granting an increase of pension to William T. Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 9129) for the relief of John C. De Lany—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 9130) granting an increase of pension to John Brinkley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 9131) for the relief of the legal representatives of Charles D. Southerlin—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9132) for the relief of the legal representatives of Benjamin F. Pettit—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9133) for the relief of John Rothchild & Co., of San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9134) for the relief of Riley Moutrey—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9135) granting a pension to August Croma—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9136) granting an increase of pension to R. L. Mitchell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9137) granting an increase of pension to George Molitor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9138) granting an increase of pension to Aaron L. Rockwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 9139) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 9140) granting a pension to Amanda Hoover—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9141) granting an increase of pension to Louis Ortleib—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 9142) granting an increase of pension to Herman A. Kimball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9143) granting an increase of pension to Adolph M. Clay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 9144) to correct the military record of Wilson B. George—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 9145) for the relief of John M. Vandiver—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9146) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9147) granting an increase of pension to Jorden H. Saylors—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 9148) granting an increase of pension to William H. K. Southard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE (by request): A bill (H. R. 9149) granting an honorable discharge to David A. Nichols, late private, Company K, Second Arkansas Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9150) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Fleming—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9151) to correct the muster rolls of Company K, Second Arkansas Cavalry, as concerns Isaac Thompson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9152) to correct the military record of H. Clay Griffin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9153) for the relief of Pardon M. Bowen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9154) for the relief of Joseph Crist—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9155) granting a pension to Catharine Haddock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9156) granting an honorable discharge to Isaac Dulhagen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9157) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Garrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9158) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 9159) granting an increase of pension to John S. McClary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9160) to correct the military record of James McMillan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 9161) for the relief of W. E. Gorton—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 9162) for the relief of the heirs of Ewing M. Skaggs, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 9163) granting a pension to Margaret M. Best—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9164) for the relief of Mary S. Logan—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 9165) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the Scandinavian Evangelical Lutheran Little Missouri River Congregation to certain lands for cemetery purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 9166) for the relief of the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 9167) for the relief of John S. Friend—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9168) granting an increase of pension to John R. Mote—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9169) for the relief of E. N. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 9170) granting an increase of pension to George McAldridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9171) granting an increase of pension to John Herbison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9172) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Carmack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9173) granting an increase of pension to William H. Burgess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9174) granting an increase of pension to Henry Roam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9175) granting an increase of pension to Belfield Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9176) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9177) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9178) granting an increase of pension to John J. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9179) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Odle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9180) granting an increase of pension to David F. Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9181) granting an increase of pension to H. C. Boughan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9182) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Burress—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9183) granting an increase of pension to Edward Goodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9184) granting an increase of pension to Robert Sims—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9185) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Sternes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9186) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9187) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Kittrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9188) granting an increase of pension to John S. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9189) granting a pension to Dempsey Cope—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9190) granting a pension to Ida Carty—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9191) granting a pension to Mary C. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9192) granting a pension to Sylvania Engle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9193) granting a pension to James Miles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9194) granting a pension to A. Welch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9195) granting a pension to Sarah E. Wilcoxon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9196) granting a pension to John H. Fenwick—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9197) to correct the military record of Davis Todd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9198) to amend and correct the records of Company D, Seventh Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, by including the name of Valentine Fraker therein, with the dates of his enlistment and discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9199) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel A. Richardson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9200) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Timothy J. Guthrie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9201) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Doms—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9202) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John C. Bennett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9203) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George Robson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9204) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Calvin C. Young—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9205) for the relief of Abram Floyd and S. H. Floyd, heirs of Mahala Floyd—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 9206) for the relief of Mary A. Ayres—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9207) granting an increase of pension to William W. Ailes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9208) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Welschhaus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9209) granting an increase of pension to Stephen D. Cohens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9210) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Conner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9211) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Crisman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 9212) for the relief of Joseph W. I. Kempa, executor of the last will and testament of William J. Grutza, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9213) granting a pension to Daniel Skipper—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 9214) granting an increase of pension to Victoria Bishop—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 9215) to authorize the reopening and readjustment of the accounts of Maj. Thomas B. Dewees, late major, Ninth Cavalry, United States Army—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 9216) granting an increase of pension to Catherine R. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 9217) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Singer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9218) granting an increase of pension to William T. Blanchard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9219) granting an increase of pension to Walter McDaniel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9220) granting an increase of pension to James M. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 9221) for the relief of T. L. Weedon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9222) for relief of Dan Fry, of Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9223) for the relief of Thomas Fletcher, of Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9224) for the relief of F. H. Cleveland, of Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9225) for the relief of Andrew Grady, of Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9226) for the relief of Charles Dearborn, of Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9227) for the relief of James Sheridan, Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9228) for relief of N. A. Kraft, sr., of Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9229) for the relief of A. J. Nalls, of Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9230) for the relief of R. B. Warren, of Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9231) for relief of A. L. Lewis, of Alexandria County, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9232) for the relief of the trustees of Cedar Grove Church, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9233) granting a pension to Elisha P. Maconaughey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9234) granting an increase of pension to W. A. McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 9235) granting an increase of pension to Kate H. Kavanaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9236) granting a pension to Albert I. Merrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: A bill (H. R. 9237) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Dachrodt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 9238) for the relief of William Saphar—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9239) granting an increase of pension to James Cronwhite—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 9240) granting an increase of pension to William S. Dawson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9241) granting an increase of pension to Peter W. Duffield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9242) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9243) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Bernard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9244) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Barber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9245) granting an increase of pension to John Hix—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9246) granting an increase of pension to Allen Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9247) granting a pension to Joshua C. Carney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 9248) granting an increase of pension to James T. Butler—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9249) granting an increase of pension to R. S. Cromer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9250) granting an increase of pension to Obediah B. Nation—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 9251) for the relief of John F. Byars, of Brown County, Tex., formerly of Newton County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9252) for the relief of Mrs. M. L. Baker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9253) granting a pension to Vallie A. McMillin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9254) granting a pension to Eliza J. Morgan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9255) granting a pension to F. M. Harrison—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9256) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Sanford—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9257) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel M. Stukes—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9258) granting an increase of pension to John Nash—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9259) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9260) granting an increase of pension to Harrison B. Freeman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9261) granting an increase of pension to William C. Herridge—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9262) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Farrar—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9263) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Highsmith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9264) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Baetz—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9265) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Holland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9266) to pay W. M. Edgar for mules killed by Mescalero Apache Indians—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9267) granting an increase of pension to William Cook—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9268) granting a pension to Milton R. Dungan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9269) granting an increase of pension to William Winans—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9270) granting an increase of pension to Wiley B. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9271) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Henry Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9272) granting an increase of pension to Bayles E. Cobb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9273) to authorize the Secretary of War to correct the military record of Reuben C. Freese—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9274) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Valentine Kirchner—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9275) for the relief of the heirs of William Pitcher and Axel Hayford and Samuel Otis and George B. Fergusson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9276) granting an increase of pension to Mary O'Hare—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9277) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9278) granting an increase of pension to Melville A. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9279) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Curley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9280) to correct the military record of John McGrail—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9281) to correct the naval record of Joseph Roberts—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 9282) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9283) granting an increase of pension to James Doody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9284) granting an increase of pension to George H. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9285) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Washington E. Hall, alias John Duffy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9286) to correct the naval record of George Nelson Armstrong—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 9287) granting a pension to Eliza Byron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9288) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Braggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9289) for the relief of the Mitsui Bussan Kaisha—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9290) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas B. Doe, of Virginia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 9291) granting an increase of pension to Marshall H. Burnham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBBER: A bill (H. R. 9292) granting an increase of pension to Charles Skadden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9293) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Wagner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEMS: A bill (H. R. 9294) granting an increase of pension to S. Amanda Mansfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 9295) to provide for the reimbursement of officers and seamen of the Nantucket Shoals light-ship No. 58—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON: A bill (H. R. 9296) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth D. Hoppin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9297) for the relief of Henry E. Rhoades, assistant engineer, United State Navy, retired—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GILLESPIE. A bill (H. R. 9298) for the relief of the estate of David C. Haynes, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of John S. Lindsay, to get out of committee and aid in its passage at present session the Penrose and Dalzell bill granting $2 per day to prisoners in military prisons during such confinement and $12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the New Orleans Board of Trade, for legislation to secure an effective and enduring American mercantile marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, for converting building used at Portsmouth by the peace conference into recreation headquarters for sailors, and that it be named "The Roosevelt"—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Charleroi Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, No. 1030, of Charleroi, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Modesto Irrigation Association, against granting San Francisco reservoir site in the Yosemite Park—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of the Humane Association of America, against any change in the present law relative to live stock in transit—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Samuel Vaux, bill H. R. 8143; Mrs. Lucy Thomas, bill H. R. 8140, and John H. Winne, bill H. R. 8139—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Richard Callaghan, bill H. R. 8481—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Commission on Trade and Commerce, of Pittsburg, for measures to further and promote trade with foreign countries, but against any revision of the present tariff laws of the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Gordon Choctaw Game Preserve, for appropriation to create game preserve of 100,000 acres—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Petition of the New York City Association, relative to maintaining treaty obligations with Indians of civilized tribes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petitions of Federation of Trades, per the following unions: Machinists, No. 58; Carmen's, No. 47; Blacksmiths', No. 190; Painters', No. 898; Boiler Makers', No. 27, and Sheet Metal Workers', No. 56, against Interstate Commerce Commission having control of railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Gordon Choctaw Game Preserve, favoring appropriation to create game preserve of 100,000 acres—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Maine, against amendment of the Grout law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the United Confederate Veterans of New Orleans, for provision to care for graves of Confederate soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: Petition of the New Orleans Board of Trade, for an effective and enduring American mercantile marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the United Confederate Veterans of New Orleans, for provision to care for graves of Confederate soldiers that died in northern prisons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Melina McCracken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Lee W. Putnam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRESSER: Petitions of Washington Camp, No. 312, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Houtzdale, Pa., and W. M. Rounsley, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Piowingo Tribe, No. 199, Improved Order of Red Men, of Bradford, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Patriotic Order Sons of America, Camp No. 55, of Lajose, Pa., and Scott W. Norris and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Welcome Council, No. 406, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Morrisdale Mines, Pa., and John A. Shimel and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Ansonville Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, No. 1005, and C. A. Sawyer and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Amasa B. Saxton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Stephens Dickerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Charles Horn and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, favoring sale of 100,000 acres of land in the Indian Territory to certain persons for a game preserve—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of United Confederate Veterans, for legislation for care of graves of Confederate soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ambrose Burton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John S. Hart—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John E. Hardway—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the American Bar Association and others, favoring permanency of bankrupt act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Aspinwall Council, No. 238, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Gordon Choctaw Game Preserve, for appropriation to create game preserve of 100,000 acres from lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Eastern Oklahoma Miners' Association, against grant of mineral lands to Oklahoma—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of National Grange of Patrons of Husbandry, at Atlantic City, November 20, 1905, for removal of tax on denaturized alcohol rendered unfit for a beverage—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE: Petitions of Council No. 28, of Oneida; Council No. 85, of Winfield; Council No. 26, of Knoxville; Council No. 26, of Coal Creek; Council No. 54, of Louisville; Council No. 106, of Sharps Chapel, and Council No. 81, of Wellsville, all in Tennessee, Independent Order of United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Daniel Cullers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Abraham Baggett—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of John Evans Lodge, No. 751, of Diller, Nebr., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, newspaper article, Cheyenne, Wyo., for use of steel cars in postal railway service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the Presidio Heights Improvement Club, of San Francisco, for appropriation for improvement of the Presidio—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Association of Wholesale Grocers of California, against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sequoia Parlor, No. 160, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KNAPP: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Louis Orthleib—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Amanda Hoover—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of A. M. Clay—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Herman A. Kimball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Wilson B. George—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Society of the Isle of Pines, against cession of said island to Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade of Denver, Colo., favoring creating of the Mesa Verde National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEVER: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 8122) providing for the erection of a public building at Sumter, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the United Confederate Veterans, for an appropriation to care for the graves of Confederate soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Joseph H. Gleisch and others, for repeal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of Orbisonia Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 604, of St. Thomas, Pa., and Orbisonia Lodge, No. 640, Orbisonia, Pa., Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of John L. Beveridge and 95 other generals of the Volunteer Army of the United States of the civil war, requesting the creation of a volunteer retired list for surviving generals of said Volunteer Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, letters from Charles Francis Adams and others, requesting Congress to pass an act to create a volunteer retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of Growers and Packers of Leaf Tobacco of the Miami Valley, against reduction of tariff on Philippine tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Victoria Bishop—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Niobrara Tribe, No. 373, Improved Order of Red Men, of Tremont, Pa.; Reiner City Council, No. 370, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Washington Camp, No. 145, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Hegins, Pa.; G. W. Osman and others, of Hegins, Pa.; Washington Camp, No. 72, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Delano, Pa., and Harry E. Shafer and others, of Delano, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. A. McDonald, Lignum, Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of E. P. Maconaughey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARTEL: Petition of citizens of Monette, Mo., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of the Seminole tribe, for independent statehood for Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: Petition of the board of supervisors of Yavapai County, Ariz., against jointure of statehood with New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the common council of Hartford, Conn., for a government forest reserve in New Hampshire—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Municipal Art Society, of Hartford, Conn., for preservation of American forests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Municipal Art Society, of Hartford, Conn., against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Putnam Council, No. 19, Independent Order of United American Mechanics, of Wallingford, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Wallingford, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, favoring tariff revision and reciprocity with certain European governments—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress, for liberal appropriations for improvement of harbors of Gulf of Mexico and Pacific coast and for the Columbia River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the United Confederate Veterans, urging provision for caring for graves of Confederate soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 19, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

TRANSPORTATION OF COAL AND MINE SUPPLIES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant, the record, testimony, and opinion of the Commission in the matter of alleged unlawful rates and practices in the transportation of coal and mine supplies by the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, and requesting that the original papers be returned; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In accordance with the request stated in the letter of transmittal the original papers will be

preserved and returned to the Interstate Commerce Commission after having been printed.

COL. T. W. SYMONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting, pursuant to law, that permission be granted by Congress to Col. T. W. Symons, United States Army, to enable him to accept the decoration of the Order of the Double Dragon conferred upon him by the Chinese Government; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

COMMANDER WILLIAM G. CUTLER.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting, pursuant to law, that permission be granted by Congress to Commander William G. Cutler, United States Navy, to enable him to accept the insignia of the Legion of Honor conferred upon him by the Government of France; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

LIEUT. GEN. A. R. CHAFFEE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting, pursuant to law, that permission be granted by Congress to Lieut. Gen. A. R. Chaffee, United States Army, to enable him to accept the commission and insignia of the office of Grand Commander of the Legion of Honor conferred upon him by the French Republic in recognition of his recent visit to France as the head of the special mission of American Army officers to witness the grand maneuvers of the French army; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES FOR INDIANS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, a compliance with section 2 of the Indian appropriation act of March 3, 1905, a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs submitting a statement showing the open-market purchases in excess of $500 on account of exigency; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the National Firemen's Association, of Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Dryden insurance bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, praying for the enactment of legislation to have the storehouse at Portsmouth, N. H., lately used for the peace conference, devoted to a gymnasium and recreation headquarters for sailors, and that it be called "The Roosevelt;" which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a petition of the legislature of Idaho, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Certificate of certified copy.]

STATE OF IDAHO,
Office of the Secretary of State:

I, Will H. Gibson, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house joint memorial No. 1, by Aulbach.

Passed the house of representatives February 21, 1905.
Passed the senate February 27, 1905.
Filed in the office of the secretary of state March 2, 1905.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 4th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] WILL H. GIBSON, *Secretary of State.*

House joint memorial No. 1 (by Aulbach), memorializing the Congress of the United States.

Your memoralists, the legislature of the State of Idaho, respectively represent that, having heretofore enacted laws for the protection of the people against adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines, realizing the necessity for adequate legislation by Congress to protect the States against interstate commerce in such prohibited articles, does hereby memoralize the Senate of the United States to speedily enact legislation prohibiting interstate commerce in adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines, to the end that the laws of our State relative thereto may be more effective.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a petition of the legislature of Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Certificate of certified copy.]

STATE OF IDAHO,
Office of the Secretary of State:

I, Will H. Gibson, secretary of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of house concurrent resolution No. 4, by Thomas, passed the house of representatives January 20, 1905; passed the senate March 3, 1905; filed in the office of the secretary of state March 4, 1905.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 4th day of March, A. D. 1905.

[SEAL.] WILL H. GIBSON, *Secretary of State.*

House concurrent resolution No. 4 (by Thomas).

Whereas steps have been taken by the National Congress, now assembled in Washington, toward enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the ideas of President Roosevelt: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That our Representatives in Congress from Idaho be requested to uphold the hands of our President in this movement; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This house concurrent resolution passed the house of representatives on the 20th day of January, 1905.

JAMES F. HUNS,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house concurrent resolution passed the Senate on the 3d day of March, 1905.

B. L. STEVES, *President of the Senate.*

I hereby certify that the within house concurrent resolution, No. 4, originated in the house of representatives of the legislature of the State of Idaho during the eighth session.

WILL H. SHERIER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a petition of the legislature of South Dakota, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[State of South Dakota, department of state.]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of South Dakota, Secretary's Office:

I, D. D. Wipf, secretary of state of South Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 10 as passed by the legislature of 1905, and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 1st day of March, 1905.

[SEAL.] D. D. WIPF, *Secretary of State.*

A joint resolution memorializing the Senate of the United States to speedily enact legislation prohibiting interstate commerce in adulterated, misbranded foods, drugs, medicines.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the legislature of the State of South Dakota, having heretofore enacted laws for the protection of the people against adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines, realizing the necessity for adequate legislation by Congress to protect the State against interstate commerce, which is beyond the control of the State, in such prohibited articles, does hereby memorialize the Senate of the United States to speedily enact efficient legislation prohibiting interstate commerce in adulterated, misbranded, and deleterious foods, drugs, and medicines, to the end that the laws of our State relative thereto may be more effective.

The secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward copies to our United States Senators and one to the chairman of the Manufactures Committee of the United States Senate.

(Indorsed:) A joint resolution memorializing the Senate of the United States to speedily enact legislation prohibiting interstate commerce in adulterated, misbranded foods, drugs, medicines.

J. L. BROWNE, *Speaker of the House.*
J. E. MCDOUGALL, *President of the Senate.*

Attest:
H. C. DUNHAM, *Chief Clerk.*
Attest:
L. M. SIMMONS, *Secretary of the Senate.*

I hereby certify that the within joint resolution originated in the house and was known in the house files as "Joint resolution No. 10."

H. C. DUNHAM, *Chief Clerk.*

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Office of Secretary of State, ss:

Filed February 27, 1905, at 4.15 o'clock p. m.

E. A. PLATTS, *Assistant Secretary of State.*

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Minnesota State Association of Builders' Exchanges, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KNOX presented the petition of S. M. Howe, of Sligo, Pa., and the petition of John Trayor, of Falmouth, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called "ex-prisoners of war pension bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Duquesne Heights Methodist Episcopal Church, of Duquesne; of the congregation of the Mount Washington Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pittsburg, and of the congregation of the Mount Washington Presbyterian Church, of Pittsburg, all in the State

of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, in session at Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of George Washington Council, No. 423, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Sharpsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oil City, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Government buildings, grounds, and ships; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Wilkinsburg, Pa., and a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Loysville, Pa., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented memorials of Easton Division, No. 250, of Easton; of Hazleton Division, No. 316, of Hazleton, and of Valley Subdivision, No. 678, of Pennsylvania, all of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the Civic Club, of Harrisburg; of the Civic Improvement Association, of Hollidaysburg; of the Reading Circle of Newcastle, and of sundry citizens of Philadelphia and Mercer, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented petitions of the Philadelphia Branch, National Indian Association, of Philadelphia; of the Indian Association of Pittsburg and Allegheny; of the Indian Association of Bethlehem, and of S. Newlin, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying that an appropriation be made for the purchase of small land holdings for the landless Indians of northern California; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Exeter Grange, No. 668, of Exeter; of Iona Grange, No. 272, of Towanda; of Richland Grange, No. 1206, of Richland Center, and of Allegheny Grange, No. 1208, of Kinzua, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the present oleomargarine law by striking out the word "knowingly;" which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1539) to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1540) to increase the efficiency of the Ordnance Department of the United States Army, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ELKINS, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 979) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak.," reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

WILLIAM H. HUGO, DECEASED.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1370) for the relief of William H. Hugo, deceased.

I ask for the present consideration of the bill. A bill on the same subject has passed the Senate, I believe, at every session since I have been here. It proposes to relieve Lieutenant Hugo, who, in 1881, was cashiered and dismissed from the service by a military court-martial in time of peace, in New Mexico. His commander has recommended the passage of the bill in the most earnest words. The bill merely relieves this man, now dead, of the stain of that court-martial. His offense was being tipsy at roll call in garrison in time of peace. This man was one of the most gallant soldiers who fought in the civil war. He was twice promoted for gallantry on the field. His commander recommends the passage of the bill for his relief. It carries no money and no promotion, but it merely relieves the family of the stain and enables them to associate with the families of the fellow-soldiers of the dead man. That is the whole of the bill, and I ask that it be passed now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill reported by him.

Mr. FRYE. Let it be read for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to review and revoke the order of court-martial of William H. Hugo, late a lieutenant of cavalry in the Army of the United States, and the status of the said William H. Hugo shall be as though he had never been separated from the service of the United States: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall accrue or become payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZA A. LEMON.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. SCOTT, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Eliza A. Lemon, widow of H. H. Lemon, late a member of the Capitol police force, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FRYE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2213) granting a pension to Sarah M. Howard (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2214) granting an increase of pension to Francis F. Stevens (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2215) for the relief of A. W. Walburn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2216) granting an increase of pension to David W. Magee; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a bill (S. 2217) for the relief of Bird L. Fletcher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2218) granting an increase of pension to Hiram R. Ellis;

A bill (S. 2219) granting an increase of pension to George W. Bannon; and

A bill (S. 2220) granting an increase of pension to David O. Ramsey.

Mr. ELKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2221) granting an increase of pension to John F. Sacks;

A bill (S. 2222) granting a pension to Isabell Reckner;

A bill (S. 2223) granting an increase of pension to James C. Plybon;

A bill (S. 2224) granting a pension to Isaac W. Allen;

A bill (S. 2225) granting an increase of pension to Samuel White;

A bill (S. 2226) granting a pension to John T. Hudson (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2227) granting a pension to Daniel M. Yeager;

A bill (S. 2228) granting a pension to Leonidas H. Cook;

A bill (S. 2229) granting an increase of pension to William I. Hilkey; and

A bill (S. 2230) for the relief of Capt. Isaac Alt's company (B) Forty-sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Militia (with accompanying papers).

Mr. ELKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2231) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Keyser, formerly New Creek, W. Va.;

A bill (S. 2232) for the relief of Jane C. Surber (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2233) for the relief of the estate of Jacob J. Foreman, deceased;

A bill (S. 2234) for the relief of Martina Nieto;

A bill (S. 2235) for the relief of Kaenhappauch Thomas;

A bill (S. 2236) for the relief of Louis F. Brooks;

A bill (S. 2237) for the relief of D. B. Barbour and A. P. Gladden, copartners doing business under the firm name of Brown, Barbour & Gladden;

A bill (S. 2238) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of the legal heirs of John Harper, deceased, to certain lands in the State of Virginia;

A bill (S. 2239) for the relief of Harmon W. Hessen; and

A bill (S. 2240) for the relief of William Large.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 2241) granting an honorable discharge to Benjamin F. Helmick; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALLEE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 2242) for the widening of Mills avenue NE. from Rhode Island avenue to Twenty-fourth street; and

A bill (S. 2243) to acquire certain ground for a Government reservation.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2244) to authorize transfers of imported merchandise on deposit in bonded warehouses; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2245) to promote the efficiency of the clerical service in the Navy of the United States, to organize a clerical corps of the Navy of the United States, to define its duties, and to regulate its pay; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 2246) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Gettysburg, in the State of Pennsylvania; and

A bill (S. 2247) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at York, in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2248) granting an increase of pension to James Hassan;

A bill (S. 2249) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith;

A bill (S. 2250) granting an increase of pension to John Rauch (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2251) granting a pension to Henry G. Clement; and

A bill (S. 2252) granting an increase of pension to Orestes B. Wright (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. CLARK of Montana introduced a bill (S. 2253) to defray traveling and other expenses of judges of United States district courts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 2254) granting a pension to Oliver H. Moore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2255) granting an increase of pension to James Thompson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 2256) granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. McConnell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2257) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Campbell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2258) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Milton A. Romig; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 2259) granting an increase of pension to Charles Duby; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2260) authorizing the extension of Meridian place NW.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced a bill (S. 2261) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1897, and all acts amendatory thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 2262) for the relief of Pay Director E. B. Rogers, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2263) granting an increase of pension to Harrison C. Plummer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 2264) to provide for enlarging the public building at Roanoke, Va., in order to accommodate the United States courts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2265) to provide for enlarging and improving the United States building at Lynchburg, Va., containing the United States court rooms, clerk's office, and post-office; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2266) authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to purchase a bust of President Zachary Taylor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 2267) requiring estimates of expenditures, and specifying in detail the items thereof; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2268) to prevent corporations engaged in interstate commerce from making contributions to campaigns for Federal office; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 2269) to provide for the payment of certain claims against the District of Columbia, in accordance with the acts of Congress approved January 26, 1897, and as amended July 19, 1897; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2270) for the relief of Nicola Masino, of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2271) repealing an act entitled "An act to extend the time for presenting claims for additional bounties," and its amendments and extensions, so far as they limit the time for presenting claims for additional bounties granted to soldiers by the twelfth and thirteenth sections of the act of July 28, 1866; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 2272) providing for the maintenance and operation of snag boats on the Sacramento, Feather, and San Joaquin rivers, California;

A bill (S. 2273) to establish at Cape Mendocino, California, quarters for the light keeper;

A bill (S. 2274) to establish a fog signal on one of the jetties at the entrance to the harbor at Humboldt Bay, California;

A bill (S. 2275) to provide for the erection of a keeper's double dwelling at Point Bonita, California;

A bill (S. 2276) to establish a light-house near Santa Barbara landing, California;

A bill (S. 2277) to establish a light-house and fog signal on Red Rock, upper part of San Francisco Bay, California;

A bill (S. 2278) to construct a tender for the engineer service of the twelfth light-house district;

A bill (S. 2279) to establish a light and fog-signal station near Point Cabrillo, California;

A bill (S. 2280) making an appropriation and providing for the construction of a United States revenue cutter for service in the harbor of San Francisco, State of California;

A bill (S. 2281) providing for the construction of a vessel of the first class for the Revenue-Cutter Service, to be stationed with headquarters at Honolulu, Hawaii; and

A bill (S. 2282) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, California.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2283) making an appropriation for the erection of a permanent rostrum in the national cemetery at the Presidio, San Francisco, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2284) making an appropriation for the improvement of the grounds within the Presidio Military Reservation, at San Francisco, Cal.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 2285) granting an increase of pension to William W. Herrick; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 2286) to confer jurisdiction upon the circuit court of the United States for the ninth circuit to determine in equity the rights of American citizens under the award of the Bering Sea arbitration of Paris, and to render judgment thereon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2287) granting an increase of pension to James V. Pope;

A bill (S. 2288) granting a pension to Sarah E. Thompson;

A bill (S. 2289) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Leatherman; and

A bill (S. 2290) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Duncan (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 2291) for the relief of Jesse L. Adams; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2292) for the relief of certain entrymen and settlers within the limits of the Northern Pacific Railway land grant; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2293) granting an increase of pension to William C. Hitchcock; and

A bill (S. 2294) granting a pension to Michael Reynolds (with accompanying papers).

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 2295) to grant an honorable discharge to Nathan P. Randall; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 2296) restoring to the public domain certain lands in the State of Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 2297) for the relief of the estate of Andrew B. Conley, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRAZIER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2298) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Franklin, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 2299) for the relief of the estate of J. E. Bauman, sr., deceased;

A bill (S. 2300) for the relief of the estate of N. T. Power, deceased;

A bill (S. 2301) for the relief of the estate of H. B. Henegar, deceased;

A bill (S. 2302) for the relief of I. J. Humphreys;

A bill (S. 2303) for the relief of the estate of Lemuel Cox, deceased;

A bill (S. 2304) for the relief of the estates of Asa Faulkner, deceased; Lewis L. Faulkner, deceased, and S. B. Spurlock, deceased;

A bill (S. 2305) for the relief of the estate of J. H. Frith, deceased;

A bill (S. 2306) for the relief of the estate of William Grigsby, deceased;

A bill (S. 2307) for the relief of M. E. Hall and the estate of James B. Hall, deceased;

A bill (S. 2308) for the relief of James J. Crunk;

A bill (S. 2309) for the relief of the estate of Alvin Barnes, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2310) for the relief of George W. Webster.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 2311) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Pettit; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 2312) to pay to the heirs of J. H. McVeigh, deceased, the sum of $10,375; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 2313) granting an increase of pension to George W. Castle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2314) for the relief of the heirs of George B. Simpson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2315) granting an increase of pension to William T. Graffam; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEE introduced a bill (S. 2316) recognizing the military service of and giving pensionable status under all pension laws of the United States to persons serving under United States officers as home guards, militia, or other provisional troops during the civil war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2317) to fix the status of the Fifth and Sixth Regiments of Delaware Volunteers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2318) for the relief of Thomas Kennedy, executor of the estate of Margaret Kennedy, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 14) accepting the recession by the State of California of the Yosemite Valley Grant and the Mariposa Big Tree Grove, and including the same, together with fractional sections 5 and 6, township 5 south, range 22 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, within the metes and bounds of the Yosemite National Park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

STATISTICS RELATING TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Mr. GALLINGER. There has been presented, Mr. President, in this body a bill relating to the public schools of the District, and likewise one in the other House. It is a matter which is attracting a great deal of attention. I understand that other bills are to follow.

I have had some statistics very carefully collected relating to the schools in Washington, as well as in certain other cities, which will be very helpful to the committee in considering that important matter, and I beg to ask unanimous consent to have the paper printed as a Senate document and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FOREST RESERVES.

Mr. HEYBURN. I submit a resolution and ask that it may lie on the table, to be taken up for consideration at another time.

The resolution was read, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, instructed to send to the Senate of the United States a statement of all moneys received and disbursed on account of the creation of forest reserves, and in the management and control thereof, since July 1, A. D. 1903; also a statement of sections 16 and 36 of the public lands set aside for educational purposes which have been included within any forest reserves created and within any lands withdrawn from entry and settlement in anticipation of the creation of any forest reserve, giving such information separately as to each reserve and designating the State or Territory in which such reserve and sections are situated; also the amount of surveyed public land subject to be selected by the State or Territory in lieu of said sections 16 and 36 so included in said forest reserves and the character of such land subject to such lieu selection, giving the location of such land.

MESSENGER FOR COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL EXPOSITIONS.

Mr. KEAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law

MESSENGER FOR COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS.

Mr. MILLARD submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger at an annual salary at the rate of $1,440 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF THE INTERIOR OF PORTO RICO.

On motion of Mr. FORAKER, it was

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to take from the files of the Senate the original manuscript of the Report of the

Commissioner of the Interior of Porto Rico for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905, printed as Senate Document No. 59, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session, and return the same to the Secretary of the Interior.

BRIDGE AT NOME CITY, ALASKA.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 955) authorizing the city of Nome, a municipal corporation organized and existing under chapter 21, Title III, of an act of Congress approved June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," to construct a free bridge across the Snake River at Nome city, in the Territory of Alaska.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, let the bill be read for the information of the Senate before any request is made that it may now be considered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE AT YANKTON, S. DAK.

Mr. GAMBLE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 312) to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across the Missouri River at Yankton, S. Dak.

Mr. FRYE. Let it be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in line 7, after the words "South Dakota," to insert "as amended by the act approved January 27, 1905;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act approved March 9, 1904, authorizing the Yankton, Norfolk and Southern Railway Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak., as amended by the act approved January 27, 1905, be, and is hereby, amended by extending the time for commencing the construction of said bridge to March 9, 1907, and by extending the time for completing said bridge to March 9, 1909.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MINING CLAIMS.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 93) to amend section 2326 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to mining claims.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It provides that all suits brought pursuant to the provisions of section 2326 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in support of an adverse claim filed in any United States land office against an application for patent for a mining claim shall be deemed actions at law, to be tried as other actions at law are tried in the courts having jurisdiction of the subject-matter of the suit.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, it will be an accommodation to me if the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of executive business. There are three or four nominations which have been neglected in the Senate for some days, and I should like to have them disposed of. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-five minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

WIDENING OF BLADENSBURG ROAD.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 55) for the widening of Bladensburg road, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill the title of which he has named. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill was read; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WIDENING OF COLUMBIA ROAD.

Mr. GALLINGER. Unless there is some other business to be transacted, there is on the Calendar the bill (S. 68) for the widening of a section of Columbia road east of Sixteenth street which I should like to have considered. A similar bill passed the Senate at the last session, and it is recommended by the Commissioners.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, in section 7, page 6, line 5, after the word "appropriated," to strike out "one half from" and insert "out of," and in line 6, after the word "Columbia," to strike out "and the other half out of any moneys in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. That when the verdict of said jury shall have been finally ratified and confirmed by the court, as herein provided, the amounts of money awarded and adjudged to be payable for lands taken under the provisions hereof shall be paid to the owners of said land by the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia from moneys advanced to him by the Secretary of the Treasury upon requisitions of the Commissioners of said District, as provided by law; and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of said judgments and awards is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIFE-SAVING STATION AT GREENHILL, R. I.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Calendar for present consideration the bill (S. 280) to provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island. It is the first bill on the Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MALLORY. Is there a report accompanying the bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is; and the report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. DEPEW on the 14th instant, as follows:

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 280) to provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island, having considered the same, report with a recommendation that it pass.

A similar bill was favorably reported from this committee in the Fifty-eighth Congress and passed the Senate, but failed to receive consideration in the House. The report of the committee on that bill is as follows:

"The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7173) to provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island, having considered the same, report with a recommendation that it pass.

"A similar bill was favorably reported from this committee in the Fifty-fourth Congress, having the sanction of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury and the Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service, as will appear by the following letters which were printed in the report on that bill:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
"*Washington, D. C., January 25, 1897.*

"SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your reference of the 21st instant of bill S. 3569, 'To provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island,' and asking for suggestions touching its merits and the propriety of its passage.

"In reply, I have to state that the matter was referred to the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service for report, which has been received and is herewith transmitted, with my concurrence.

"Respectfully, yours,

"W. E. CURTIS, *Acting Secretary.*

"The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
"*United States Senate.*

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
"OFFICE OF THE GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT
"LIFE-SAVING SERVICE,
"*Washington, D. C., January 25, 1897.*

"SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your reference, for report, of the letter of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, transmitting bill (S. 3569) to provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island, for suggestions touching the merits of the bill and the propriety of its passage.

"A bill of the same import was introduced in the House of Representatives during the Fifty-third Congress, and in response to a similar request from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I, under date of February 5, 1894, reported to the Secretary of the Treasury my views thereon, concurring in those expressed by certain officers of the Life-Saving Service that such a station is desirable.

"I inclose a copy of this report and beg that it may be accepted as my report upon the present bill.

"Respectfully, yours,

"S. I. KIMBALL,
"General Superintendent.

"The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY."

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT LIFE-SAVING SERVICE,
"Washington, D. C., February 5, 1894.

"SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge your reference, for report, of the letter of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, dated September 13, 1893, inclosing bill (H. R. 218) entitled 'A bill to provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island,' for suggestions touching the merits of the bill and the propriety of its passage.

"Desiring the views of the officers of the district which embraces the point referred to, I addressed letters to them asking for the same. The inspecting officer replies:

"'In regard to the establishment of a station at Greenhill I respectfully state that in my judgment this part of the coast, from its exposed situation, would be better protected by the addition of another station at or near the place mentioned for the following reasons: The distance between Quonochontaug and the Point Judith stations, following the shore, is about 14 miles. The patrols from these stations cover but a small part of this distance, leaving a long stretch unprotected.

"'By the addition of a station halfway between these points, which would lie in the immediate vicinity of Greenhill, the coast could be practically patrolled from the Pattaquamscott River to Noyes Point, leaving about 3 miles from the first-mentioned point to Watch Hill not covered by the patrols of the life-saving force. In view of the large number of vessels of all classes constantly passing and repassing this part of the Rhode Island coast to and from Long Island Sound, through the "Race" and Fishers Island Sound, it is my unbiased opinion that the establishment of a station in the vicinity of Greenhill would increase the efficiency of the Service and justify the cost of erecting and maintaining it.'

"The district superintendent reports:

"'The station contemplated at Greenhill, I think, would be of service, as it, in connection with the one already at Quonochontaug, would about cover the coast from Point Judith to Watch Hill.'

"The assistant superintendent of the district says:

"'In my judgment, stations at these points (Greenhill and Watsons Pier) would be of great benefit to all marine interests and are much needed. With a station at Greenhill the most dangerous parts of the shore from Point Judith to Watch Hill would be guarded.'

"I concur in the views of these officers.

"Respectfully, yours,

"S. I. KIMBALL,
"General Superintendent.

"The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FISH-CULTURAL STATION IN ILLINOIS.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask leave to call up for present consideration the bill (S. 653) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Illinois.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to appropriate the sum of $25,000 for the establishment of a fish-cultural station in the State of Illinois.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JUVENILE COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Calendar is in order.

Mr. LODGE. I was going to suggest a recess, as I think all the bills have been taken from the Calendar which could be passed without debate or objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from New Hampshire has another bill to call up, I will yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. If there is no objection to a bill on the Calendar (S. 51), which is similar to the one that was passed at the last session, creating a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia, I would like very much to have it considered, and will ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from New Hampshire. Is this measure drawn up on the plan of the juvenile courts which have been so successful in two or three parts of the country?

Mr. GALLINGER. It follows precisely the form of the bills enacted in several of the States, and is very carefully guarded in every particular.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will give us a little explanation about it. I am sure I do not exactly appreciate the effect of it—how far it will go. Will the Senator from New Hampshire, in just a word or two, give us an idea of the scope of the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. President, at the last session we had a similar bill before the Committee on the District of Columbia, which was submitted to the Commissioners for their consideration, and they proposed several amendments, which were very important and which are incorporated in this bill. As I understand, the bill simply provides for a court for juvenile offenders, separating them from offenders of adult age; and the Senator from Georgia knows that in this city particularly the police court is not a very good place in which to try children. The bill provides for a judge at a salary of $3,000, and merely creates a separate court for juvenile offenders, giving considerable latitude to the judge in the matter of punishment. It is following precisely what has occurred in the legislation of California, some of the New England States, and I think in other parts of the country.

Mr. PERKINS. In Pennsylvania.

Mr. GALLINGER. In Pennsylvania.

Mr. CULLOM. And Illinois.

Mr. GALLINGER. And in Illinois and other States, and they have been a great success. This bill has been drawn along those lines guarded, I feel sure, with great care, and some of us believe that if enacted into law, as I trust it will be, it will have a very beneficial effect upon the children of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SPOONER. It is one of those tribunals which depends for its success almost entirely upon the person who is chosen for judge.

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly so.

Mr. SPOONER. He must be a man who cares more for children and their welfare than for the strict enforcement of law.

Mr. GALLINGER. The suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin is certainly a wise one. The appointment of a judge to administer this bill, if it shall become a law, is really a matter of surpassing importance.

Mr. SPOONER. I have followed with a good deal of interest the development of these tribunals in two or three places in the country, and have read much about them. I think it is one of the finest of all the modern improvements in the way of caring for children who are without adequate paternal care. It gives them a chance.

Mr. BACON. The bill provides for the trial of juvenile offenders?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Under 17 years.

Mr. GALLINGER. Under 17 years of age.

Mr. BACON. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether there is any provision either in this bill or under any existing law in the District by which juvenile convicts are separated from the others. I think it is very much more important than the court to make provision so that those who are convicted shall not be herded with the older convicts. The great need of reformation—very much more so than the court—is in what you shall do with the juvenile offender when he has been convicted of crime. This bill, it seems, went to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I do not know whether it is practicable or whether it would be within the jurisdiction of this bill to so enlarge it as to incorporate that feature, which I regard as much more important of the two.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. KNOX. I should like to state for the information of the Senator from Georgia that there is now in the District of Columbia, under the control of the Department of Justice, both a reformatory for girls and one for boys, under the age of 17, to which juvenile offenders below that age are committed.

Mr. BACON. Very well. That is a very important piece of information, Mr. President, and adds very largely, I think, to the importance of this bill. So I understand that all convicts would go from this juvenile court to the reformatories mentioned by the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GALLINGER. They would go to the reformatories, certainly, for girls and boys, which are institutions well established here.

Mr. BACON. Very well; that is an important point.

Mr. MALLORY. If the Senator from Georgia will permit me, I will call his attention to the feature of this bill which prescribes that, in the judgment of the court, the court may suspend sentence and put the juvenile offender on his good behavior, giving an opportunity to reform rather than send him to jail.

Mr. BACON. I desire to say that with that feature now in the existing law, I very heartily approve of this additional bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I am informed that the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Panama appropriation bill will be ready very shortly to report, and are anxious to dispose of the matter to-day, if possible, so as to clear the way for the adjournment for the holidays. I therefore move that the Senate take a recess for half an hour.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., when it reassembled.

PANAMA CANAL APPROPRIATION.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the conferees of the two Houses on House bill 480 have met and agreed upon a report, which I present to the Senate, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report of the committee of conference will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902 and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3 and from its amendment to the title of the bill.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10; and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following:

"That the 2 per cent bonds of the United States authorized by section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans,' approved June 28, 1902, shall have the rights and privileges accorded by law to other 2 per cent bonds of the United States, and every national banking association having on deposit, as provided by law, such bonds issued under the provisions of said section 8 of said act, approved June 28, 1902, to secure its circulating notes, shall pay to the Treasurer of the United States, in the months of January and July, a tax of one-fourth of 1 per cent each half year upon the average amount of such of its notes in circulation as are based upon the deposits of said 2 per cent bonds; and such taxes shall be in lieu of existing taxes on its notes in circulation imposed by section 5214 of the Revised Statutes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. B. ALLISON,
EUGENE HALE,
H. M. TELLER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

W. P. HEPBURN,
SERENO E. PAYNE,
L. F. LIVINGSTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, as I understand the report of the committee of conference, the first section of the bill is amended so as to make it identical with the bill (S. 1475) which recently passed the Senate in relation to the taxation of bonds held by national banks as security for circulating notes.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I suppose I need not remind the Senate of the conditions and circumstances under which the bill to which I refer was passed by the Senate. I was personally very greatly surprised when the bill came back from the other House with a message that the House held its adoption by the Senate to be in contravention of section 7 of Article I of the Constitution. I believe it will be found that neither House of Congress has ever held that bills imposing or reducing taxes upon national banks were revenue bills within the meaning of the Constitution. The section, as it came from the House and as it is proposed to be adopted in the conference report, is an amendment of section 13 of the refunding act of March, 1900, which originated in the Senate and was sent to the other House, where it was received and passed without the constitutional question having been raised. All the provisions of the refunding act were placed in the bill by the Senate, and to this there was no objection. Other important measures affecting taxation of banks have originated in the Senate without protest.

Last year, when the isthmian canal bill, so called, was before the Senate, a similar provision to that now in controversy was inserted in that bill at the suggestion of the Finance Committee. That bill went to the other House and no constitutional objection was raised. By the rules of the House of Representatives all revenue bills—all bills relating to or affecting revenue—are referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. All bills relating to the taxation of national banks have been uniformly referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, showing very clearly that the House itself in its practice has not held bills of this nature to be revenue bills. In the very last session—and I suppose I am at liberty to speak of what occurred in that House as shown by the public records—a bill was introduced by a Member from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] containing substantially the same provisions that are now incorporated in this first section. That bill was referred by the action of the House to the Committee on Banking and Currency; it was reported back by the Committee on Banking and Currency with additional provisions as to the taxation of national banks; it was taken up for consideration without a question being raised as to its character; taken up without any claim that it was entitled to the privileges of a revenue bill; and it was discussed for weeks. No point was ever raised as to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, nor was there any claim or suggestion on the part of anybody that the bill was a revenue bill. The claim is now made for the first time that the prerogatives of the House are invaded by legislation of this kind.

There have, in my judgment, been very good reasons why such bills have not been considered revenue bills. Taxation in this case is a mere incident of the general legislation for the management and control of national banks. The taxes imposed are not for purposes of revenue.

If the question is to be raised, it can not properly be settled by the action of one House alone; and I hope and believe that the action of the Senate in agreeing to the report of the conference committee will not be held, as it can not be held, as a waiver of any constitutional rights of this body. The matter should be taken up and considered carefully between the two Houses as to what determination shall be reached upon the question.

If the bill which came from the House of Representatives, and which is now before the Senate, is a revenue bill, if it is subject to the prohibition of section 7, Article I, of the Constitution, it is certainly also subject to the provision in the same section which gives the Senate full power of amendment. Does anybody in the Senate suppose that we could have properly amended this canal appropriation bill by placing an entire tariff bill upon it, or that we could have amended it by taking duties off this article or that article, or by increasing or diminishing internal-revenue taxes? No attempt has been made here, within my knowledge, to amend bills of this character in that way; but if the contention of the House of Representatives is to stand, if we are to change the rules and practices between the two Houses on questions of this kind, it must become apparent to all that the powers of the Senate in regard to dealing with tariff questions will be immeasurably enlarged, because if we can take any of these bills—and we have too many of them in which the power of taxation is used not for general revenue purposes, but for regulation, repression, or prohibition—and amend them as we please by tariff and internal-revenue amendments, the Senate's powers over this class of legislation is practically unlimited. But whatever may be the effect of this action, an invasion of this kind, or an attempted invasion of this kind, should be treated calmly and deliberately between the two Houses, as I hope this question will be. Certainly I shall insist that the Senate relinquishes none of its rights and makes no admission that the contention of the House is correct by the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I rise mainly for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the Senate some authorities upon the question which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] has been discussing. In order that in the RECORD the real issue between the House and the Senate may be made apparent, I ask the insertion, without reading, of the first section of House bill 480.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The section referred to is as follows:

That the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall be subject to the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled "An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900, the same as though said bonds were issued under the provisions of said act of March 14, 1900.

Mr. SPOONER. It will be observed that this section refers solely to the bonds authorized by the "canal act" to be issued to provide funds for the construction of the isthmian canal.

As there seemed to be reasonable doubt concerning the construction which might be placed upon the language of the section as it came from the House, it was thought wise, in order that national banks might not be deterred by any doubt from utilizing the bonds as a basis of circulation, to employ different phraseology.

As section 1 was not germane to the appropriation contained in section 2 of the bill, and not ordinarily within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, a bill was introduced by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], reported from the Committee on Finance, and passed by the Senate as an independent bill, although identical, except as to phraseology, with the section 1 which had come from the House. I ask that the bill be inserted in my remarks without reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The bill referred to is as follows:

A bill supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, shall be subject to the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled "An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, to refund the public debt, and for other purposes," approved March 14, 1900, the same as though said bonds were issued under the provisions of said act of March 14, 1900.

Mr. SPOONER. Thereupon, Mr. President, the following resolution was adopted by the House and, with the bill S. 1475, messaged to this body:

Resolved, That the bill S. 1475, in the opinion of the House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution, is an infringement on the privileges of this House, and that the said bill be taken from the Speaker's table and be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

The matter, of course, demands and must receive serious attention, as the public interest requires that it shall be brought speedily to a sound conclusion. The bill was returned unconsidered, with a challenge of the power of the Senate, under the Constitution, to originate it. If the House of Representatives is correct in its view that the bill is a bill "for raising revenue," within the meaning of section 7 of Article I of the Constitution, certainly the bill is properly returned and must rest here. If the House of Representatives is wrong, the Senate has no right to yield its jurisdiction. No department of the Government has any right to surrender any portion of the power or responsibility with which the Constitution has clothed it. It is vital, both as to the National Government and to the State governments, that the line of demarcation drawn by the framers of the Constitution of the United States and of the various States between the three independent and coordinate branches of the Government shall be observed always with the utmost strictness, to the end that neither shall, in the slightest degree, invade the other.

And so it is inexpressibly important that each branch of the legislature, National or State, shall keep within the constitutional limitations upon its power.

The only fear I have ever entertained, Mr. President, for the future of our Government has arisen from apparent popular toleration of or encouragement to invasions by one department of the Government of the functions of another—in the nation or in the States. There seems to be a popular complaisance upon the subject, or an indifference of public opinion, which bodes no good throughout the country. I read in a newspaper this morning, and I can here refer to no State, that the governor of a State has decided who shall be speaker of the house of representatives of that State, and it seemed to be accepted as sound governmental conduct under our system of government. It has occurred in other States. It is a tendency to be resisted, not encouraged.

Mr. President, the men who founded this Government and framed our Constitution took lessons from history and experience on the other side of the sea, and when they created the three coordinate and independent branches of the Government, assigning to each its jurisdiction, they created a government which, in its divisions, was a perfect representative or democratic government. And when the people of any State permit, under any pretext, those three branches of the Government to be reduced to two, they tolerate treason to our constitutional system.

The legislature of a State is not to be organized by the judiciary nor is it to be organized by an executive, and if the time shall ever come—and we have seen it in some States—when by passive acquiescence the execution of the law is practically combined with the making of the law, the structure in its completeness and as the fathers made it is destroyed and the distinction between it and a monarchy is largely obliterated.

Mr. President, as important as I regard that—and as I said before, it is fundamental, and our people should cling to it in season and out of season as they cling to the flag—it is likewise profoundly important that neither House of the Legislature shall transcend in its relation to the other constitutional limits. Assertion was made in the House in advocacy of the resolution for the return of the bill that at the last session the Senate invaded the prerogative of the House and upon its being resented had receded. In my judgment, at the last session of Congress the Senate transcended its rights under the Constitution and invaded the prerogative of the House. That was in the amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill by which the Senate enacted a construction of the tariff act in its relation to drawbacks. The Secretary of the Treasury had construed the drawback clause as including wheat and was admitting it free of duty. That was a question of construction. The Senate adopted an amendment to the appropriation bill declaring the drawback provisions not to include wheat.

It is not the function of legislatures to construe the laws. That is a judicial function. It may be persuasive in the court, but it is not binding upon the court, and where such an act is passed and the court is of opinion, as to past transactions, that the legislative construction is not the sound one, it stands by the judicial construction, but from the passage of the construing act it works a change in the law. Therefore the House rightly objected, in my opinion, to the amendment by the Senate to the tariff act, and the Senate did only its duty in receding from the proposition. But there is no similarity whatever between that amendment and the action here complained of.

But, Mr. President, if the House of Representatives, 357 of whose Members voted for this resolution challenging the power of the Senate, rising to make it more solemn, is right, then the Senate is deprived of a legislative jurisdiction which from the foundation of the Government it has exercised, and it is weakened in its legislative power to the detriment of the public interest. Now a word as to the obvious purpose of the bill which has been returned unconsidered. I apprehend that very few will be found to characterize it as a "tax bill." Certainly from a constitutional standpoint it is not a "bill for raising revenue."

What is its manifest object?

Under existing law the 2 per cent canal bonds heretofore authorized could, when issued, be used as a basis for national-bank circulation. Under existing law the tax upon that circulation would be 1 per cent. The law which is made by this bill to apply to the canal bonds relates to 2 per cent bonds, and to encourage their use as a basis for bank circulation reduces the tax from 1 per cent to one-half of 1 per cent. So the bill which was returned to us was simply a bill bringing these 2 per cent canal bonds upon the same basis in respect of taxation with all 2 per cent bonds of the Government.

Is it possible, Mr. President, that it can with reason be said that the object of this bill is to "raise revenue" for the support of the Government?

The question is this: Is the bill, which was introduced as a separate proposition by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], and which the Senate passed, a revenue bill within the meaning of section 7 of the first article of the Constitution?

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

This brings us to the question: What is a "revenue bill" within the meaning of the Constitution?

The definition is well settled, thus:

Revenue laws: Laws made for the direct and avowed purpose of creating and securing revenue or public funds for the service of the Government. (Anderson's Law Dictionary, p. 899.)

This embraces clearly all bills passed in the exercise of the taxing power, whether in the form of customs duties or internal-revenue taxation, for the purpose of raising money for the support of the Government.

This definition excludes, and the constitutional provision was intended to exclude, bills passed in the exercise of constitutional powers other than the taxing power, even if they operated to raise revenue, or even if they imposed incidentally a tax or taxes to secure the more efficient and successful exercise of the power.

Such bills or laws have never been either in practice or judicially deemed "revenue" bills or laws.

Congress enacts laws from time to time which operate to raise revenue. The post-office laws operate to raise revenue. Congress frequently changes the post-office laws so as to raise more revenue. But it has not been contended for many years—it was once—that those were revenue bills within the meaning of this clause of the Constitution.

The power to create national banks is a power which exists in Congress. It is not the sole prerogative of either House. It is not the taxing power. It is legislation which Congress may enact under the money power; and the Supreme Court of the United States has so decided. The taxation imposed from the beginning upon the circulation of national banks is purely incidental to the exercise by the Congress, in creating national

banks, in supplying the people with the circulation of national banks, of a distinct power vested by the Constitution in either House.

Mr. MORGAN. Was not the oleomargarine bill of the same character?

Mr. SPOONER. The oleomargarine bill was hardly of the same character, perhaps. It is a close question. The Senator puts to me the question now whether the Congress may use the taxing power solely for the purpose of regulation. In other words, he would ask me whether Congress under the Constitution may exercise the taxing power for any other purpose than to raise revenue for the general purposes of the Government.

Mr. BACON. Like the 10 per cent tax on State-bank issues.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes. I do not care to go into that question, for I wish to get along with what I have to say. I am trying to say this: It would be under the commerce power, to my mind, that the oleomargarine tax could be levied lawfully. I am not sure that I am prepared to say I like the theory of using the taxing power simply to regulate, except as a means of exercising a granted power. It has gone as far, I think, at least as it ought to go. But the tax imposed upon the circulation of State banks is a lawful tax. It was a tax enacted by the Congress under the money power. Whether a wise tax or an unwise tax, a just tax or an unjust tax, it was a constitutional tax, and it was not a tax simply for purposes of regulation.

Mr. BACON. The Supreme Court, I think, held directly to the contrary, that it was not such a tax, and was for the purpose——

Mr. SPOONER. A tax which of course was intended——

Mr. BACON. To destroy State-bank circulation.

Mr. SPOONER. To destroy State-bank circulation.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. But that was an incident to the main purpose, which was to put in its place a national circulation. So, after all, in the last analysis, it was an incident to the exercise of a conceded power, in my judgment, rather than the exercise of one power for the purpose of accomplishing indirectly an object. But let that go.

Mr. President, the definition of "revenue laws" which I read to the Senate is taken from Mr. Justice Story, (see United States *v.* Mayo, 1 Gall, 398, and Story on Constitution, sec. 880); and the Supreme Court, in the case of United States *v.* Norton, 91 United States, 568, had occasion to consider carefully the question as to what is meant by the phrase "revenue bill," or what the word "revenue" as used in section 7 of Article I of the Constitution means. This was a post-office money-order case. It was a criminal case, but the court was obliged in deciding it to pass upon the question whether it was a "revenue law" or not, because as it determined that it was or that it was not the law, it was claimed, would be valid or invalid. They say:

> In no just view, we think, can the statute in question be deemed a revenue law.
>
> The lexical definition of the term "revenue" is very comprehensive. It is thus given by Webster: "The income of a nation, derived from its taxes, duties, or other sources, for the payment of the national expenses."
>
> The phrase "other sources" would include the proceeds of the public lands, those arising from the sale of public securities, the receipts of the Patent Office in excess of its expenditures, and those of the Post-Office Department, when there should be such excess, as there was for a time in the early history of the Government. Indeed, the phrase would apply in all cases of such excess. In some of them the result might fluctuate, there being excess at one time and deficiency at another.
>
> It is a matter of common knowledge that the appellative "revenue laws" is never applied to the statutes involved in these classes of cases.
>
> The Constitution of the United States, Article I, section 7, provides that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."
>
> The construction of this limitation is practically well settled by the uniform action of Congress. According to that construction, it "has been confined to bills to levy taxes in the strict sense of the words, and has not been understood to extend to bills for other purposes which incidentally create revenue." (Story on the Constitution, sec. 880.) "Bills for raising revenue" when enacted into laws become revenue laws. Congress was a constitutional body sitting under the Constitution. It was, of course, familiar with the phrase "bills for raising revenue" as used in that instrument and the construction which had been given it.
>
> The precise question before us—

That is, as to what was meant by a "revenue bill" under this clause of the Constitution—

> came under the consideration of Mr. Justice Story, in The United States *v.* Mayo (1 Gall., 396). He held that the phrase "revenue laws," as used in the act of 1804, meant such laws "as are made for the direct and avowed purpose of creating revenue or public funds for the service of the Government." The same doctrine was reaffirmed by that eminent judge in the United States *v.* Cushman, 426.

These views commend themselves to our judgment.

Here is an interesting and original discussion of the question, and I will take but a moment with it before I bring to the attention of the Senate a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States declaring this very section involved between the Senate and the House not to be a revenue bill within that clause of the Constitution invoked by the House. I read from the case of the United States on the relation of Oran C. Michels *v.* Thomas L. James, postmaster of the city of New York, 13 Blatchford's Circuit Court Reports, 207. After quoting the clause "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives," the court says:

> Certain legislative measures are unmistakably bills for raising revenue. These impose taxes upon the people, either directly or indirectly, or lay duties, imposts, or excises for the use of the Government, and give to the persons from whom the money is exacted no equivalent in return, unless in the enjoyment, in common with the rest of the citizens, of the benefit of good government.

That is a well thought out distinction and definition.

> It is this feature which characterizes bills for raising revenue—

Taxes levied throughout the United States upon all coming within the purview of the act to raise revenue for the general uses of the Government and all of the people—

> It is this feature which characterizes bills for raising revenue. They draw money from the citizen; they give no direct equivalent in return. In respect to such bills it was reasonable that the immediate representatives of the taxpayers should alone have the power to originate them. Their immediate responsibility to their constituents and their jealous regard for the pecuniary interests of the people, it was supposed, would render them especially watchful in the protection of those whom they represented. But the reason fails in respect to bills of a different class. A bill regulating postal rates for postal service provides an equivalent for the money which the citizen may choose voluntarily to pay. He gets the fixed service for the fixed rate, or he lets it alone, as he pleases and as his own interests dictate. Revenue, beyond its cost, may or may not be derived from the service and the pay received for it, but it is only a very strained construction which would regard a bill establishing rates of postage as a bill for raising revenue, within the meaning of the Constitution. This broad distinction existing in fact between the two kinds of bills, it is obviously a just construction to confine the terms of the Constitution to the case which they plainly designate. To strain those terms beyond their primary and obvious meaning, and thus to introduce a precedent for that sort of construction, would work a great public mischief. Mr. Justice Story, in his Commentaries on the Constitution (sec. 880), puts the same construction upon the language in question, and gives his reasons for the views he sustains, which are able and convincing. In Tucker's Blackstone only, so far as authorities have been referred to, is found the opinion that a bill for establishing the post-office operates as a revenue law. But this opinion, although put forth at an early day, has never obtained any general approval; but both legislative practice and general consent have concurred in the other view.

Mr. President, I now ask the attention of the Senate to the case of Twin City Bank *v.* Nebeker, 167 U. S., 196, which is upon the precise question, and is unanimous and conclusive. I will take the time to read a portion of the statement of the case in order that Senators may see how controlling is the decision. In this case the plaintiff bank brought suit against Nebeker, then Treasurer of the United States—

> to recover from the defendant in error the sum of $73.08, alleged to have been paid by the former under protest to the latter, who was at the time Treasurer of the United States, in order to procure the release of certain bonds, the property of the bank, which bonds, the declaration alleged, were illegally and wrongfully withheld from the plaintiff by the defendant.
>
> The plaintiff went into liquidation—

That is, the bank—

> in the manner provided by law, on the 23d of June, 1891, and on the 25th of August, 1891, deposited in the Treasury of the United States lawful money to redeem its outstanding notes, as required by section 5222 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. After making such deposit the bank demanded the bonds which had been deposited by it to secure its circulating notes, and of which defendant had possession as Treasurer of the United States. The defendant refused to deliver them, unless the bank would make a return of the average amount of its notes in circulation for the period from January 1, 1891, to the date when the deposit of money was made—viz, the 25th of August, 1891—and pay a tax thereon. The bank then made a return of the average amount of its notes in circulation for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1891, and paid to the defendant $56.25, protesting that he had no authority to demand the tax, and delivered to him a protest in writing setting forth that, in making the return and in paying the tax, it did not admit the validity of the tax or defendant's authority to exact or collect it, but made the return and payment solely for the purpose of procuring the possession of the United States bonds belonging to it, which defendant had refused to release until such return and payment were made, and further protesting that it was not liable to the tax or any part of it. The bank's agent then made another demand upon defendant for the bonds; but he refused to deliver them until a return should be made of the average amount of its notes in circulation for the period from July 1 to August 25, 1891, and a tax paid thereon. Its agent then delivered such return to defendant and paid him $16.83, at the same time delivering a written protest in the same form as the one above mentioned. These transactions were with the defendant himself, and the money was paid to him in person.
>
> The Journals of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States for the first session of the Thirty-eighth Congress were put in evidence by plaintiff. The bank claims that these Journals show that the national-bank act originated as a bill in the House of Representatives; that when it passed the House it contained no provision for a tax upon the national banks, or upon any corporation, or upon any individual, or upon any property, nor any provisions whatever for raising revenue, and that all the provisions that appear to authorize the Treasurer of the United States to collect any tax on the circulating notes of national banks originated in the Senate by way of amendment to the House bill.

Which is the fact. The court say:

> The provision relating to taxation, which, it is alleged, was inserted by way of amendment in the Senate, appears as section 5214 of the Revised Statutes.

I am told by my friend the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] that that is the very section involved here.

Mr. ALLISON. The same section.

Mr. SPOONER. The same section.

Now, the court says:

> The contention in this case is that the section of the act of June 3, 1864, providing a national currency secured by a pledge of United States bonds, and for the circulation and redemption thereof, so far as it imposed a tax upon the average amount of the notes of a national banking association on circulation, was a revenue bill within the clause of the Constitution declaring that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills" (Article I, section 7); that it appeared from the official journals of the two Houses of Congress that while the act of 1864 originated in the House of Representatives, the provision imposing this tax was not in the bill as it passed that body, but originated in the Senate by amendment, and being accepted by the House became a part of the statute; that such tax was, therefore, unconstitutional and void; and that consequently the statute did not justify the action of the defendant.

The question could not, I think, be more clearly presented to the court than it is upon this statement of fact. The court say:

> The case is not one that requires either an extended examination of precedents or a full discussion as to the meaning of the words in the Constitution "bills for raising revenue." What bills belong to that class is a question of such magnitude and importance that it is the part of wisdom not to attempt, by any general statement, to cover every possible phase of the subject. It is sufficient in the present case to say that an act of Congress providing a national currency, secured by a pledge of bonds of the United States, and which, in the furtherance of that object, and also to meet the expenses attending the execution of the act, imposed a tax on the notes in circulation of the banking associations organized under the statute, is clearly not a revenue bill which the Constitution declares must originate in the House of Representatives.
>
> Mr. Justice Story has well said that the practical construction of the Constitution and the history of the origin of the constitutional provision in question proves that revenue bills are those that levy taxes in the strict sense of the word, and are not bills for other purposes which may incidentally create revenue. (1 Story on Constitution, sec. 880.)

That was the language of Mr. Justice Story long ago, incorporated in this opinion and expressly affirmed, and also in the Ninety-first United States, by unanimous decision of the Supreme Court. The court continues:

> The main purpose that Congress had in view was to provide a national currency based upon United States bonds, and to that end it was deemed wise to impose the tax in question. The tax was a means for effectually accomplishing the great object of giving to the people a currency that would rest primarily upon the honor of the United States and be available in every part of the country. There was no purpose by the act or by any of its provisions to raise revenue to be applied in meeting the expenses or obligations of the Government.

Now, Mr. President, I do not intend to take further time. Here is to be found, under the strongest possible sanction, a definition of the word "revenue," as used in this constitutional provision, made a great many years ago by Judge Story, practically adopted by both bodies ever since, sustained by a number of decisions which I have not stopped to even note, and lastly sustained in language too plain for dispute by the Supreme Court of the United States. Nothing can be plainer than that this bill and kindred bills do not fall within that definition.

There seems to be no answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] that if section 1 as sent to us by the House of Representatives is a revenue bill within the meaning of section 7 of Article I of the Constitution we have a right under that clause to add to it a tariff bill or amendments to the internal-revenue law. An attempt to treat the bill as a revenue bill for such a purpose could not fail to excite derision.

Mr. President, I can not take more time. I am conscious of the very imperfect presentation of a very strong and sound proposition.

The Senate is about seemingly to recognize some force in the contention of the House.

Mr. TELLER. How?

Mr. SPOONER. By incorporating the same provision in a little different language in the House bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is the same language.

Mr. SPOONER. The same language is used that is found in the Senate bill. But, Mr. President, that is to the credit of the Senate. It does not mean that the Senate yields in the slightest upon the point. In my view, to do this would be infidelity to the Constitution, and would be full of harm to the public interest. It means simply this, that without any temper, with, I think, the unanimous opinion among the lawyers of this body that the jurisdiction of the Senate to originate and pass returned to us the bill has been hastily and without foundation challenged by the House of Representatives, the Senate will not delay for one moment the passage of this emergency bill for prolonged conferences between the two houses on this question.

Mr. President, I intend to move at the proper time a reference to the Committee on Finance of the message from the House of Representatives with instructions to that committee to report fully to the Senate upon the subject.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the point raised by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] and so ably discussed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. I simply want to make the statement to the Senate that when Congress authorized the construction of the canal I thought then that this vast work should be intrusted to the engineers of the Army. I think so still. I hope at some proper time the committee authorized to pass upon this question will report a bill to that end.

I think the best organized body of men in the world, certainly in the United States, to do this work is the Army engineers. They have been intrusted with work of this kind for a hundred years, and in all the hundred years of the history of the engineers of the United States Army there has been but one case, I believe, of defalcation. I think that the Army engineers have the ability to do this work more economically and better than any other body of men that could be organized for that purpose. From their long experience they are not only fitted to do the work, but they are the largest employers in the country of civil engineers. In a sense the War Department is organized to take charge of all the sanitary arrangements in Panama. It has engineers to carry out that feature of this work, as well as the building of the canal.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I would not care to discuss this question except for the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] as he was closing, that we had apparently yielded to the contention of the House that another bill, in no wise connected with this measure, had been an evasion of their right to originate revenue bills.

The House sent to us a bill containing some legislation which it was entirely proper for them to incorporate in the bill, if they saw fit. I understand that the House may pass an appropriation bill and send it here containing general legislation. We have a rule that a bill coming from the House shall not be amended by any general legislation here. We also have a provision that certain amendments may be put on, if they are reported from a standing committee. We did what we had a right to do. We struck out the legislative portion of the bill as to bonds and some parts of the bill which might be considered as legislative giving directions as to the expenditure of this money.

Mr. GORMAN. They were limitations.

Mr. TELLER. They were but limitations on the bill.

Mr. President, so far as the members of the conference committee on the part of the Senate expressed themselves, they were entirely in accord with the position taken by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. I do not care myself to go into any general discussion except to say that I do want to enter it upon the records of the Senate that we in nowise gave way to that demand; that it was but an assertion of our right to amend the bill, and to amend it as we thought it ought to be amended if it was to pass with that clause in it.

Mr. SPOONER. What I said was that it might seem, in view of the fact that the section was put back into the bill, as if we were yielding, and that I immediately denied. I did not intend to impute that to the members of the conference committee.

Mr. TELLER. I did not consent that the provision as it came from the House should be put back, for the simple reason that the Finance Committee when considering it had not considered the character of the first section as sufficient to accomplish what the House intended to accomplish and what the Senate wanted to accomplish. We left the question open as to whether that was an invasion of the right of the House.

I confess, Mr. President, that I should not, under the circumstances, have been willing to consent to any change of the Senate rule on amendments—that is, in striking it out. I should have insisted that it should remain out but for the fact that the House members were insistent that it should go in, and we are at the end of the session before adjournment for the holidays, the executive department demanding of us the passage of this bill, saying they need the money, and I felt we could afford to yield something not in the way of the demand that they made, but on the amendment that we had made.

Mr. President, I listened to the legal argument made by the Senator from Wisconsin, as I always do, with great pleasure. I think it is perfectly unanswerable. There are one or two phases of his address to the Senate that struck me with great force. I must say that it was very refreshing and encouraging to me to hear the Senator from Wisconsin advising the Senate that we must stand by the old theory of government; that we had limitations upon the departments; that the legis-

lative department was to legislate, the executive department was to execute, the judicial department was to determine controversies. I know there are a great many Senators here who believe that doctrine to be true and who are devoted to it. Yet I know in the last few years there has been in every department of the Government apparently a disposition to forget that these are constitutional distinctions and are binding upon us all. There has grown up within a few years a disposition to say, When you want a thing done you must find a way to do it. I recall that within a very short time, in a message from the Executive to Congress, it was suggested that certain things ought to be done, and there was the advice to Congress that Congress must find a way to do it.

Mr. President, our power here is an unquestioned power. There can not be much controversy as to what are our duties and our rights here. The limitations between the legislative and executive are marked in the Constitution, so that any man fit to sit in this Chamber ought to have pretty clear ideas of them. Sometimes we let the pressure that comes from certain places, I think, compel us to surrender our own convictions to that of other people. So I repeat it is refreshing to hear a Senator stand on this floor and urge us to stand by the old traditions of the bodies.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask only one question of the distinguished chairman of the committee. The bill, as it will stand if the conference report is agreed to, enables the Treasury Department, under the direction of the President, to dispose of $135,000,000 of bonds, and the object of the amendment, I understand, is to enable the sale of the bonds to be made at a fair rate.

I observe from the hearing before the Committee on Appropriations that the distinguished officer who has charge of the construction of the canal, the Secretary of War, frankly stated that if these bonds were disposed of the executive branch would have a right to contract for any amount of work to the extent of the whole proceeds of those bonds without any further appropriation by Congress. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if that construction of the Spooner Act has been accepted by his committee?

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I think the committee was of the opinion (although I speak only for myself, as the question was not distinctly put to the committee as to their view of the Secretary's statement) that the original Spooner Act provides that the President may contract for the construction of the canal, with a limitation of one hundred and thirty-five million, so that it leaves in doubt, to say the least, the question whether, if the President desired to do so under the original Spooner Act, he could enter into a contract for the construction of the isthmian canal on the plan provided for in that act, if he could find a responsible contractor who would agree to construct the canal for $135,000,000.

But in order that there might be no future dispute on that question and questions arising respecting it, this bill provides safeguards in regard to appropriations and contracts which pro tanto change whatever the original construction might properly be as respects the power to make contracts. So I think whatever——

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me, I desire to ask him if he means by that that the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Rhode Island has been retained by the conference committee? The Senator will remember that the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island prohibited anything from being expended except that which was paid out in accordance with appropriations. Was that amendment retained? The amendments are described only by numbers in the conference report, and consequently we were not able to understand them from the reading of the report at the desk.

Mr. ALLISON. Practically all the amendments of the Senate are retained. The provision offered by the Senator from Rhode Island is retained in the bill as agreed upon by the committee of conference. So I think whatever difficulties or differences may have arisen respecting this important matter in the past, as to what the Spooner law did or did not authorize, it is made reasonably plain in the amendments made by the Senate and in the House bill agreed to by the conference committee that in the future there must be appropriations before contracts can be executed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference.

The report was agreed to.

PANAMA CANAL BONDS.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask that the message from the House of Representatives returning the Senate bill be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 15, 1905.

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1475) to provide that the 2 per cent bonds issued under section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, approved June 28, 1902, shall have the same right and privileges that are accorded by law to other 2 per cent bonds of the United States," in the opinion of this House, as respects the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution, is an infringement on the privileges of this House, and that the said bill be taken from the Speaker's table and be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. I move that the message be referred to the Committee on Finance, with instructions to report thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 20, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 19, 1905.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

Stanton J. Peelle, of Indiana, to be chief justice of the Court of Claims, vice Charles C. Nott, resigned.

JUDGE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

Samuel S. Barney, of Wisconsin, to be judge of the Court of Claims, vice Stanton J. Peelle, nominated to be chief justice of said court.

ASSISTANT TREASURER.

Joseph Bosler, of Pennsylvania, to be assistant treasurer of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., to succeed William S. Lieb, removed.

MARSHAL.

William P. Warner, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska, vice Trevanyon L. Mathews, removed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Joseph B. Stewart, of Virginia, to be collector of customs for the district of Richmond, in the State of Virginia. (Reappointment.)

Levi M. Willcuts, of Minnesota, to be collector of customs for the district of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota. (Reappointment.)

David S. Clark, of Delaware, to be collector of customs for the district of Delaware, in the State of Delaware, to succeed Robert G. Houston, whose term of office expired by limitation December 13, 1905.

Sterling A. Campbell, of California, to be collector of customs for the district of Humboldt, in the State of California. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTER.

GEORGIA.

Susie M. Atkinson to be postmaster at Newnan, in the county of Coweta and State of Georgia, in place of Robert F. Milner. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1906.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn December 19, 1905.

W. Y. Atkinson to be postmaster at Newnan, in the State of Georgia.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 19, 1905.

COMMISSIONER OF THE INTERIOR OF PORTO RICO.

Laurance H. Grahame, of New York City, to be commissioner of the interior of Porto Rico.

TREASURER OF PORTO RICO.

William F. Willoughby, of the District of Columbia, to be treasurer of the island of Porto Rico.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL OF PORTO RICO.

Frank Feuille, of Porto Rico, to be attorney-general of Porto Rico.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT.

Frank W. Parker, of New Mexico, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of New Mexico.

John R. McFie, of New Mexico, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of New Mexico.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

Charles W. Russell, of West Virginia, to be assistant attorney-general.

DISTRICT JUDGES.

William H. H. Clayton, of Indian Territory, to be judge of the United States court of the central district of Indian Territory.

William R. Lawrence, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States court of the western district of Indian Territory.

Hosea Townsend, of Indian Territory, to be judge of the United States court of the southern district of Indian Territory.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

William A. Prickitt, of New Jersey, to be consul-general of the United States at Auckland, New Zealand.

CONSULS.

Felix S. S. Johnson, of New Jersey, to be consul of the United States at Puerto Cortes, Honduras.

Howard D. Van Sant, of New Jersey, to be consul of the United States at Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

PENSION AGENT.

Oscar A. Janes, of Michigan, to be pension agent at Detroit, Mich.

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE.

Rovert H. Terrell, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

William E. Trautmann, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois.

Charles A. Wilson, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island.

William A. Northcott, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois.

Samuel J. M. McCarrell, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

Oscar Lawler, of California, to be United States attorney for the southern district of California.

John M. Cheney, of Florida, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Florida.

Earl M. Cranston, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado.

Nathan V. Harlan, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Alaska, division No. 3.

William D. Frazee, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi.

Robert C. Lee, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi.

Marion Erwin, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Georgia.

Wade S. Stanfield, of Indian Territory, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indian Territory.

Daniel W. Baker, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

MARSHALS.

Charles P. Hitch, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois.

Stephen P. Stone, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the western district of Pennsylvania.

Leon A. Townsend, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois.

Creighton M. Foraker, of New Mexico, to be United States marshal for the Territory of New Mexico.

John F. Horr, of Florida, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida.

Harry S. Hubbard, of Porto Rico, to be United States marshal for the district of Porto Rico.

Pope M. Long, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama.

Aulick Palmer, of the District of Columbia, to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia.

Morgan Treat, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

David S. Clark to be collector of customs for the district of Delaware.

William W. Sewall, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Aroostook, in the State of Maine.

Levi M. Willcuts to be collector of customs for the district of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota.

William H. Devos, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for the district of Milwaukee, in the State of Wisconsin.

Frederick Enos, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for the district of Fairfield, in the State of Connecticut.

Gad Smith, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for the district of Superior, in the State of Michigan.

ASSISTANT COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John Doscher, of New Jersey, to be assistant collector of customs at Jersey City, N. J., in the district of New York, in the State of New York.

SURVEYORS OF CUSTOMS.

Edward F. Woodward, of California, to be surveyor of customs in the district of San Francisco, in the State of California.

Robert G. Pearce, of Illinois, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Rock Island, in the State of Illinois.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Henry E. Bowman, of New Mexico, to be receiver of public moneys at Las Cruces, N. Mex.

Fen S. Hildreth, of Arizona, to be receiver of public moneys at Phoenix, Ariz.

George W. Detamore, of Clayton, N. Mex., to be receiver of public moneys at Clayton, N. Mex.

Frederick Mueller, of New Mexico, to be receiver of public moneys at Santa Fe, N. Mex.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Zenas Y. Coleman, of North Yakima, Wash., to be register of the land office at North Yakima, Wash.

Lucius Q. C. Lamar, of Oxford, Miss., to be register of the land office at Jackson, Miss.

Milton R. Moore, of Arizona, to be register of the land office at Phoenix, Ariz.

Howard Leland, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Roswell, N. Mex.

Edward W. Fox, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Clayton, N. Mex.

Manuel R. Otero, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Santa Fe, N. Mex.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF COLORADO.

William G. Lewis, of Edgewater, Colo., to be surveyor-general of Colorado.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF NEW MEXICO.

Morgan O. Llewellyn, of New Mexico, to be surveyor-general of New Mexico.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Ralph Waldo Dempwolf, of Pennsylvania, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from October 23, 1905.

APPOINTMENT IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Henry D. Long, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

Carl Frederick von dem Bussche for appointment as second lieutenant of infantry, United States Army, with rank from February 2, 1901.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

William Adolphus Duncan, of Kentucky, to be assistant surgeon with rank of first lieutenant, from May 1, 1905.

Earl Harvey Bruns, of Indiana, to be assistant surgeon with rank of first lieutenant, from May 1, 1905.

Herbert Charles Gibner, of Connecticut, to be assistant surgeon with rank of first lieutenant, from May 1, 1905.

Clarence Le Roy Cole, of Kansas, to be assistant surgeon with rank of first lieutenant, from May 10, 1905.

CHAPLAINS.

Rev. Francis Patrick Joyce, of Kansas, to be chaplain with rank of first lieutenant, from March 21, 1905.

Rev. Joseph Casey, of Missouri, to be chaplain with rank of first lieutenant, from April 22, 1905.

Rev. Simon Michel Lutz, of Illinois, to be chaplain with rank of first lieutenant, from May 1, 1905.

Rev. Herbert Stanley Smith, of New Jersey, to be chaplain with rank of first lieutenant, from June 19, 1905.

ARTILLERY CORPS.

William Thomas Carpenter, of California, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

John Lee Holcombe, of Virginia, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

Frank Huntington Phipps, jr., of Massachusetts, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

Thomas Duncan, of Pennsylvania, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

INFANTRY ARM.

Benjamin Mart Bailey, of New York, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

Charles Walker McClure, of Illinois, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

Lewis Carleton Leftwich, of Texas, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

Chester Henning Loop, of Tennessee, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

William Perkins Currier, of Virginia, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

Pickens Evans Woodson, of Texas, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

Ambrose Robert Emery, of Indiana, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

Albert Leas Hall, of Indiana, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

Edmund Clivious Waddill, of Virginia, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

John Hanckel Ellerson, of Virginia, to be second lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

SUBSISTENCE DEPARTMENT.

Col. Henry G. Sharpe, Assistant Commissary-General, to be Commissary-General, with the rank of brigadier-general, for the period of four years beginning October 12, 1905, with rank from that date.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

Corps of Engineers.

Cadet De Witt Clinton Jones.
Cadet Ernest Graves.
Cadet Francis Bowditch Wilby.
Cadet Clarence Self Ridley.
Cadet Alvin Barton Barber.
Cadet William Fitzhugh Endress.
Cadet Jarvis Johnson Bain.
Cadet Thomas Henry Emerson.
Cadet Robert Spencer Thomas.
Cadet Carlos John Stolbrand.
Cadet Roger Garfield Powell.
Cadet John Neal Hodges.
Cadet Arthur Rudolph Ehrnbeck.

Artillery Corps.

Cadet Douglas Imrie McKay.
Cadet Thomas Marshall Spaulding.
Cadet Thomas Bartwell Doe.
Cadet Louis Herbert McKinlay.
Cadet Benjamin Henderson Lorne Williams.
Cadet Thomas Dewey Osborne.
Cadet Otho Vaughan Kean.
Cadet Halsey Dunwoody.
Cadet David Curtis Seagrave.
Cadet William Henry Dodds, jr.
Cadet Le Roy Bartlett.
Cadet John Lund.
Cadet Robert Collins Eddy.
Cadet Patrick Henry Winston.
Cadet Julius Charles Peterson.
Cadet John Stevens Hammond.
Cadet Basil Gordon Moon.
Cadet James Frederick Walker.
Cadet Charles Roemer.
Cadet Ellery Willis Niles.
Cadet Adelno Gibson.
Cadet Charles Dudley Daly.
Cadet Albert Terrell Bishop.
Cadet Haldan Urling Tompkins.
Cadet James Saye Dusenbury.
Cadet Lloyd Burns Magruder.
Cadet Robert Henry Lewis.
Cadet Francis Bowen Upham.
Cadet Arthur Hazleton Carter.
Cadet Sidney Howland Guthrie.
Cadet Walter Evans Prosser.

Cavalry Arm.

Cadet John de Barth Walbach Gardiner.
Cadet George Dillman.
Cadet Philip John Radcliffe Kiehl.
Cadet Clarence Kumukoa Lyman.
Cadet Charles Lewis Scott.
Cadet William Adams Dallam.
Cadet James Hoop Dickey.
Cadet Ralph Talbot, jr.
Cadet William Nicholas Hensley, jr.
Cadet Charles Exton Bamford.
Cadet Louis Piaget Schoonmaker.
Cadet Karl Daenzer Klemm.
Cadet Edward Cornelius Hanford.
Cadet Berkeley Thorne Merchant.
Cadet Hugh Hunt Broadhurst.
Cadet Arthur William Holderness.
Cadet Louis Albert O'Donnell.

Infantry Arm.

Cadet Rolland Webster Case.
Cadet Charles Stuart Donavin.
Cadet Norman Foster Ramsey.
Cadet De Witt Clinton Tucker Grubbs.
Cadet Thomas West Hammond.
Cadet Calvin Pearl Titus.
Cadet William Charles Miller.
Cadet Frederick Willis Manley.
Cadet Arthur Willis Lane.
Cadet Bernard Lentz.
Cadet Frederic Coleman Test.
Cadet Arthur Charles Tipton.
Cadet Owen Stedman Albright.
Cadet Fred Hendrickson Baird.
Cadet Clifford Cabell Early.
Cadet George Frank Waugh.
Cadet Allan Rutherford.
Cadet William Henry Hawes.
Cadet Oscar Arden Russell.
Cadet William Seward Weeks.
Cadet Avery Duane Cummings.
Cadet Charles Smith Caffery.
Cadet Allen Wyant Gullion.
Cadet Louis Albert Kunzig.
Cadet John Pearson Bubb.
Cadet John George Hotz.
Cadet Clarence Andrew Mitchell.
Cadet John Roy Starkey.
Cadet Felix Waggoner Motlow.
Cadet Joseph Edward Barzynski.
Cadet Ralph Dwight Bates.
Cadet William Eaton Merritt.
Cadet Ben Waller Feild.
Cadet Robert Morrisson, jr.
Cadet Bloxham Ward.
Cadet Paul Hedrick Clark.
Cadet Thomas Hixon Lowe.
Cadet Herndon Sharp.
Cadet Torrey Borden Maghee.
Cadet William Whitehead West, jr.

TO BE ADDITIONAL SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

Artillery Corps.

Cadet Henry Tacitus Burgin.
Cadet Nathan Horowitz.
Cadet Clifford Lee Corbin.

Cavalry Arm.

Cadet Joseph Ray Davis.
Cadet Sherman Miles.

Infantry Arm.

Cadet George Washington Maddox.
Cadet Walter Eldridge Pridgen.
Cadet James Wilson Hemphill Reisinger, jr.
Cadet Rupert Algernon Dunford.
Cadet Charles Carr Bankhead.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

Brig. Gen. John P. Story (since retired from active service), Chief of Artillery, to be major-general from June 17, 1905.

Brig. Gen. George M. Randall (since retired from active service) to be major-general from June 19, 1905.

Brig. Gen. John F. Weston, Commissary-General, to be major-general from October 8, 1905.

Col. Thomas C. Lebo (since retired from active service), Fourteenth Cavalry, to be brigadier-general from June 22, 1905.

Col. Winfield S. Edgerly, Second Cavalry, to be brigadier-general from June 23, 1905.

MILITARY SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

Capt. Benjamin Alvord, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be Military Secretary, with rank of major, from June 10, 1905.

Capt. Eugene F. Ladd, detailed quartermaster, to be Military Secretary, with rank of major, from June 23, 1905.

ARTILLERY CORPS.

Col. Benjamin K. Roberts (since retired from active service), Artillery Corps, to be Chief of Artillery, with rank of brigadier-general, from June 19, 1905.

Col. Samuel M. Mills, Artillery Corps, to be Chief of Artillery, with rank of brigadier-general, from June 20, 1905.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

ARTILLERY CORPS.

Second Lieut. Mark L. Ireland, Eleventh Infantry, from the infantry arm to the Artillery Corps, March 30, 1905.

INFANTRY ARM.

Second Lieut. Byrd Alston Page, Artillery Corps, from the Artillery Corps to the infantry arm, March 30, 1905.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Robert R. Stevens, quartermaster, to be deputy quartermaster-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from December 15, 1905.

Capt. Richmond McA. Schofield, quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major from December 15, 1905.

INFANTRY ARM.

First Lieut. George B. Pond, Third Infantry, to be captain from October 6, 1905.

First Lieut. Dana T. Merrill, Twenty-third Infantry, to be captain from October 10, 1905.

First Lieut. Alexander M. Wetherill, Thirteenth Infantry, to be captain from October 11, 1905.

First Lieut. Charles N. Murphy, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be captain from October 29, 1905.

First Lieut. Theodore A. Baldwin, jr., Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be captain from October 30, 1905.

First Lieut. George H. Shields, jr., Twelfth Infantry, to be captain from November 2, 1905.

First Lieut. Eleutheros H. Cooke, Tenth Infantry, to be captain from November 15, 1905.

CAVALRY ARM.

First Lieut. Grayson V. Heidt, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be captain from November 28, 1905.

Second Lieut. Kerr T. Riggs, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from November 18, 1905.

Second Lieut. Carl H. Müller, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from November 28, 1905.

ARTILLERY CORPS.

Capt. Adelbert Cronkhite, detailed quartermaster, to be major from November 24, 1905.

THE MILITARY SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. James T. Kerr, military secretary, to be military secretary with the rank of colonel from June 17, 1905.

Maj. Alexander O. Brodie, military secretary, to be military secretary with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from June 10, 1905.

Maj. Benjamin Alvord, military secretary, to be military secretary with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from June 17, 1905.

SUBSISTENCE DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. Edward E. Dravo, deputy commissary-general, to be assistant commissary-general with the rank of colonel from October 6, 1905.

Lieut. Col. Abiel L. Smith, deputy commissary-general, to be assistant commissary-general with the rank of colonel from October 13, 1905.

Maj. David L. Brainard, commissary, to be deputy commissary-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from August 28, 1905.

Maj. George B. Davis, commissary, to be deputy commissary-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from October 6, 1905.

Maj. Barrington K. West, commissary, to be deputy commissary-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from October 13, 1905.

Capt. George W. Ruthers, commissary, to be commissary with the rank of major from August 28, 1905.

Capt. Harry E. Wilkins, commissary, to be commissary with the rank of major from October 6, 1905.

Capt. William L. Geary, commissary, to be commissary with the rank of major from October 13, 1905.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. George W. Adair, deputy surgeon-general, to be assistant surgeon-general with the rank of colonel from April 6, 1905.

Maj. William W. Gray, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from April 6, 1905.

Maj. Louis Brechemin, surgeon, to be deputy surgeon-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel from July 1, 1905.

Capt. Frederick P. Reynolds, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major from March 31, 1905.

Capt. Robert S. Woodson, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major from April 6, 1905.

Capt. Harry M. Hallock, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major from July 1, 1905.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

Capt. Manly B. Curry, paymaster, to be paymaster with the rank of major from April 13, 1905.

Capt. James W. Dawes, paymaster, to be paymaster with the rank of major from August 12, 1905.

Capt. James Canby, paymaster, to be paymaster with the rank of major from October 4, 1905.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Lieut. Col. Henry M. Adams, Corps of Engineers, to be colonel from June 26, 1905.

Lieut. Col. Charles E. L. B. Davis, Corps of Engineers, to be colonel from October 15, 1905.

Maj. William M. Black, Corps of Engineers, to be lieutenant-colonel from June 26, 1905.

Maj. Walter L. Fisk, Corps of Engineers, to be lieutenant-colonel from October 15, 1905.

Capt. Eugene W. Van C. Lucas, Corps of Engineers, to be major from June 26, 1905.

Capt. Henry Jervey, Corps of Engineers, to be major from October 15, 1905.

First Lieut. Lewis H. Rand, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from June 26, 1905.

First Lieut. Edward M. Markham, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from October 15, 1905.

Second Lieut. Lewis M. Adams, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from June 26, 1905.

Second Lieut. Charles R. Pettis, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from October 15, 1905.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Capt. Eugene O. Fechét, Signal Corps, to be major from August 22, 1905.

First Lieut. Mack K. Cunningham, Signal Corps, to be captain from August 22, 1905.

CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. William Stanton, Eleventh Cavalry, to be colonel from March 18, 1905.

Lieut. Col. Edward A. Godwin, Ninth Cavalry, to be colonel from June 22, 1905.

Lieut. Col. Frederick K. Ward, detailed inspector-general, to be colonel from June 23, 1905.

Maj. Edward J. McClernand, unassigned, to be lieutenant-colonel from March 18, 1905.

Maj. Levi P. Hunt, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 7, 1905.

Maj. Cunliffe H. Murray, Fourth Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 8, 1905.

Maj. Charles A. Varnum, Ninth Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 10, 1905.

Maj. Herbert E. Tutherly, detailed inspector-general, to be lieutenant-colonel from June 22, 1905.

Maj. Thaddeus W. Jones, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant-colonel from October 20, 1905.

Capt. Lloyd M. Brett, Seventh Cavalry, to be major from March 30, 1905.

Capt. Elon F. Willcox, Sixth Cavalry, to be major from April 7, 1905.

Capt. Henry J. Goldman, Fifth Cavalry, to be major from April 8, 1905.

Capt. Augustus C. Macomb, Fifth Cavalry, to be major from April 10, 1905.

Capt. Thomas J. Lewis, Second Cavalry, to be major from April 22, 1905.

Capt. William A. Mercer, Seventh Cavalry, to be major from June 26, 1905.

Capt. Charles H. Grierson, Tenth Cavalry, to be major from August 2, 1905.

Capt. Harry C. Benson, Fourth Cavalry, to be major from October 20, 1905.

Capt. George H. Sands, Sixth Cavalry, to be major from October 20, 1905.

First Lieut. Robert R. Wallach, Third Cavalry, to be captain from March 30, 1905.

First Lieut. George Williams, Eighth Cavalry, to be captain from April 7, 1905.

First Lieut. Charles S. Haight, Fourth Cavalry, to be captain from April 8, 1905.

First Lieut. William D. Forsyth, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be captain from April 10, 1905.

First Lieut. John J. Boniface, Fourth Cavalry, to be captain from April 22, 1905.

First Lieut. Warren Dean, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be captain from May 2, 1905.

First Lieut. Fitzhugh Lee, jr., Twelfth Cavalry, to be captain from June 26, 1905.

First Lieut. James F. McKinley, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be captain from July 7, 1905.

First Lieut. Patrick W. Guiney, Sixth Cavalry, to be captain from July 17, 1905.

First. Lieut. Leon B. Kromer, Eleventh Cavalry, to be captain from August 2, 1905.

First Lieut. Charles A. Romeyn, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be captain from August 8, 1905.

First Lieut. Evan H. Humphrey, Seventh Cavalry, to be captain from August 16, 1905.

First Lieut. George V. H. Moseley, First Cavalry, to be captain from September 22, 1905.

First Lieut. Charles C. Farmer, jr., Tenth Cavalry, to be captain from October 20, 1905.

First Lieut. Stuart Heintzelman, Sixth Cavalry, to be captain from October 20, 1905.

First Lieut. John D. Long, Twelfth Cavalry, to be captain from November 7, 1905.

Second Lieut. William C. Gardenhire, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be to be first lieutenant from March 6, 1905.

Second Lieut. Benjamin O. Davis, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 30, 1905.

Second Lieut. Edward C. Wells, Tenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 7, 1905.

Second Lieut. George A. F. Trumbo, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 8, 1905.

Second Lieut. Taylor M. Reagan, Twelfth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 10, 1905.

Second Lieut. Goss L. Stryker, Sixth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from April 22, 1905.

Second Lieut. Robert F. Tate, Twelfth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from May 2, 1905.

Second Lieut. Sebring C. Megill, Eighth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from June 26, 1905.

Second Lieut. Walter D. Smith, Eleventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from July 7, 1905.

Second Lieut. Harry B. Jordan, detailed in the Ordnance Department, to be first lieutenant from July 15, 1905.

Second Lieut. Frank P. Lahm, Sixth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from July 15, 1905.

Second Lieut. Orlando C. Troxel, Twelfth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from July 17, 1905.

Second Lieut. Creed F. Cox, Eleventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from July 31, 1905.

Second Lieut. Robert McC. Beck, jr., Twelfth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from August 2, 1905.

Second Lieut. George M. Russell, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from August 3, 1905.

Second Lieut. Lewis Brown, jr., Seventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from August 8, 1905.

Second Lieut. Jerome G. Pillow, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from August 16, 1905.

Second Lieut. Ralph N. Hayden, Seventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from September 2, 1905.

Second Lieut. Leonard Prunty, Fourth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from September 22, 1905.

Second Lieut. E. Kearsley Sterling, Third Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from October 20, 1905.

Second Lieut. Wiley P. Mangum, jr., Fifteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from October 20, 1905.

Second Lieut. Charles J. Naylor, Fourth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from November 7, 1905.

ARTILLERY CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Ephraim T. C. Richmond (since retired from active service), Artillery Corps, to be colonel from May 20, 1905.

Lieut. Col. Ramsay D. Potts, Artillery Corps, to be colonel from June 8, 1905.

Lieut. Col. Elbridge R. Hills, detailed military secretary, to be colonel from June 19, 1905.

Lieut. Col. Sydney W. Taylor, Artillery Corps, to be colonel from June 20, 1905.

Lieut. Col. Luigi Lomia, Artillery Corps, to be colonel from November 7, 1905.

Maj. John D. C. Hoskins, detailed inspector-general, to be lieutenant-colonel from March 22, 1905.

Maj. Henry L. Harris, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 12, 1905.

Maj. Arthur Murray, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 14, 1905.

Maj. William E. Birkhimer, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from May 20, 1905.

Maj. John A. Lundeen, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from June 8, 1905.

Maj. Medorem Crawford, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from June 20, 1905.

Maj. Garland N. Whistler, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from June 30, 1905.

Maj. Hugh A. Reed, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from September 16, 1905.

Maj. Albert S. Cummins, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from November 7, 1905.

Capt. Albert C. Blunt, Artillery Corps, to be major from April 12, 1905.

Capt. William C. Rafferty, Artillery Corps, to be major from April 14, 1905.

Capt. Warren P. Newcomb, Artillery Corps, to be major from May 20, 1905.

Capt. Charles L. Phillips, Artillery Corps, to be major from June 8, 1905.

Capt. Charles J. Bailey, Artillery Corps, to be major from June 11, 1905.

Capt. Clarence P. Townsley, detailed quartermaster, to be major from June 20, 1905.

Capt. George F. Barney, Artillery Corps, to be major from June 30, 1905.

Capt. David J. Rumbough, Artillery Corps, to be major from September 16, 1905.

Capt. Millard F. Harmon, Artillery Corps, to be major from November 7, 1905.

First Lieut. Gwynn R. Hancock, Artillery Corps, to be captain from April 12, 1905.

First Lieut. Dan T. Moore, Artillery Corps, to be captain from April 14, 1905.

First Lieut. Clarence B. Smith, Artillery Corps, to be captain from May 20, 1905.

First Lieut. Russell P. Reeder, Artillery Corps, to be captain from June 8, 1905.

First Lieut. Robert F. McMillan, Artillery Corps, to be captain from June 11, 1905.

First Lieut. Godwin Ordway, Artillery Corps, to be captain from June 30, 1905.

First Lieut. Charles E. Kilbourne, Artillery Corps, to be captain from July 17, 1905.

First Lieut. Edward Hill, Artillery Corps, to be captain from September 3, 1905.

First Lieut. William H. Monroe, Artillery Corps, to be captain from September 16, 1905.

First Lieut. Richard T. Ellis, Artillery Corps, to be captain from September 16, 1905.

Second Lieut. Wesley W. K. Hamilton, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from January 23, 1905.

Second Lieut. Hugh S. Brown, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from February 2, 1905.

Second Lieut. Henry H. Scott, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from February 24, 1905.

Second Lieut. Benjamin H. Kerfoot, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from April 12, 1905.

Second Lieut. William S. Browning, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from April 12, 1905.

Second Lieut. Francis W. Clark, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from April 14, 1905.

Second Lieut. Joseph F. Barnes, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from May 7, 1905.

Second Lieut. Edward Canfield, jr., Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from May 10, 1905.

Second Lieut. William P. Ennis, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from May 20, 1905.

Second Lieut. Arthur H. Bryant, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from June 8, 1905.

Second Lieut. Willis G. Peace, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from June 11, 1905.

Second Lieut. William P. Platt, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from June 19, 1905.

Second Lieut. Guy E. Carleton, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from June 30, 1905.

Second Lieut. Herbert G. Millar, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from July 17, 1905.

Second Lieut. Dennis H. Currie, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from August 6, 1905.

Second Lieut. Beverly F. Browne, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from August 9, 1905.

Second Lieut. Edward M. Shinkle, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from August 24, 1905.

Second Lieut. William R. Bettison, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from September 3, 1905.

Second Lieut. Raymond S. Pratt, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from September 16, 1905.

Second Lieut. Alfred A. Maybach, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from September 16, 1905.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Calvin D. Cowles, Fourth Infantry, to be colonel from April 11, 1905.

Lieut. Col. George P. Borden, Fifth Infantry, to be colonel from April 14, 1905.

Lieut. Col. William B. Wheeler, Second Infantry, to be colonel from October 11, 1905.

Lieut. Col. Walter S. Scott, Eleventh Infantry, to be colonel from October 30, 1905.

Maj. James A. Irons, Sixteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 9, 1905.

Maj. Leonard A. Lovering, detailed inspector-general, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 11, 1905.

Maj. Robert K. Evans, detailed military secretary, to be lieutenant-colonel from April 14, 1905.

Maj. George F. Cooke, Twenty-sixth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel from July 28, 1905.

Maj. Charles St. J. Chubb, Fifteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel from October 11, 1905.

Maj. Palmer G. Wood, Twelfth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel from October 30, 1905.

Capt. William F. Blauvelt, detailed paymaster, to be major from April 9, 1905.

Capt. Henry C. Hodges, jr., detailed quartermaster, to be major from July 15, 1905.

Capt. Robert L. Hirst, Twelfth Infantry, to be major from July 20, 1905.

Capt. Harris L. Roberts, Second Infantry, to be major from July 28, 1905.

Capt. Walter H. Chatfield, Fifth Infantry, to be major from August 15, 1905.

Capt. John F. Morrison, Twentieth Infantry, to be major from October 6, 1905.

Capt. Andrew S. Rowan, Nineteenth Infantry, to be major from October 11, 1905.

Capt. Frank B. Andrus, Eighth Infantry, to be major from October 30, 1905.

First Lieut. Benjamin H. Watkins, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be captain from February 11, 1905.

First Lieut. Robert M. Brambila, Fourteenth Infantry, to be captain from February 18, 1905.

First Lieut. Harry F. Dalton, Sixth Infantry, to be captain from April 11, 1905.

First Lieut. John N. Straat, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be captain from April 29, 1905.

First Lieut. George de G. Catlin, Second Infantry, to be captain from May 13, 1905.

First Lieut. Marshall Childs, Twelfth Infantry, to be captain from June 17, 1905.

First Lieut. Henry S. Wagner, Fourteenth Infantry, to be captain from June 30, 1905.

First Lieut. Frederick G. Knabenshue, Fifteenth Infantry, to be captain from July 20, 1905.

First Lieut. George H. Knox, Seventh Infantry, to be captain from July 28, 1905.

First. Lieut. Thomas J. Powers, Twentieth Infantry, to be captain from July 28, 1905.

First Lieut. James E. Bell, Seventeenth Infantry, to be captain from July 28, 1905.

First Lieut. Martin L. Crimmins, Nineteenth Infantry, to be captain from August 8, 1905.

First Lieut. Marion M. Weeks, Twenty-first Infantry, to be captain from August 15, 1905.

First Lieut. James M. Love, jr., Twenty-first Infantry, to be captain from August 21, 1905.

First Lieut. Paul H. McCook, Second Infantry, to be captain from September 22, 1905.

First Lieut. Frederick W. Coleman, Thirteenth Infantry, to be captain from October 4, 1905.

Second Lieut. James L. Craig, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from December 31, 1904.

Second Lieut. Edward K. Massee, Seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant from January 15, 1905.

Second Lieut. Joseph A. Marmon, Fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from February 3, 1905.

Second Lieut. James A. Higgins, Thirtieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from February 11, 1905.

Second Lieut. Rinaldo R. Wood, Fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from February 18, 1905.

Second Lieut. Leonard H. Cook, Fifteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

Second Lieut. Horatio I. Lawrance, Twentieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from April 11, 1905.

Second Lieut. William B. Wallace, Twentieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from April 29, 1905.

Second Lieut. Wylie T. Conway, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 1, 1905.

Second Lieut. Shepard L. Pike, Eighteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 4, 1905.

Second Lieut. George A. Wieczorek, Second Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 4, 1905.

Second Lieut. Henry G. Stahl, Sixth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 13, 1905.

Second Lieut. Roy C. Kirtland, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 18, 1905.

Second Lieut. Alfred C. Arnold, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from May 20, 1905.

OFFICERS PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST OF THE ARMY.

WITH THE RANK OF BRIGADIER-GENERAL.

Col. Butler D. Price, Sixteenth Infantry, with rank from the date upon which he shall be retired from active service.

Col. Henry H. Adams, retired, with rank from April 11, 1905.

Col. William A. Jones, retired, with rank from June 26, 1905.

Col. Henry W. Hubbell, retired, with rank from May 20, 1905.

Col. Henry C. Ward, retired, with rank from October 30, 1905.

Col. William Ennis, retired, with rank from November 7, 1905.

WITH THE RANK OF COLONEL.

Lieut. Col. John Tweedale, retired, with rank from June 10, 1905.

WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT-COLONEL.

Maj. Seymour Howell, retired, with rank from August 12, 1905.

Chaplain (Maj.) George Robinson, retired, with rank from March 19, 1905.

Maj. Otto Becker, retired, with rank from October 4, 1905.

WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Chaplain (Capt.) Orville J. Nave, retired, with rank from April 30, 1905.

Chaplain (Capt.) Joseph A. Potter, retired, with rank from October 19, 1905.

MEMBER OF CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION.

Capt. Charles H. McKinstry, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Débris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Débrs Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

William A. Heck to be postmaster at Cullman, in the county of Cullman and State of Alabama.

John J. Stephens to be postmaster at Attalla, in the county of Etowah and State of Alabama.

CALIFORNIA.

Norman Ashcroft to be postmaster at Hollywood, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

James G. Ferguson to be postmaster at Clovis, in the county of Fresno and State of California.

George W. Humphreys to be postmaster at Dunsmuir, in the county of Siskiyou and State of California.

James T. Negley to be postmaster at Alturas, in the county of Modoc and State of California.

GEORGIA.

Susie M. Atkinson to be postmaster at Newnan, in the county of Coweta and State of Georgia.

John M. Duff to be postmaster at Tifton, in the county of Tift and State of Georgia.

ILLINOIS.

John F. Donovan to be postmaster at Kinmundy, in the county of Marion and State of Illinois.

Augustus H. Heiple to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Tazewell and State of Illinois.

William W. Wagner to be postmaster at Hospital, in the county of Kankakee and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

Fletcher W. Boyd to be postmaster at Covington, in the county of Fountain and State of Indiana.

John J. Brown to be postmaster at Rockport, in the county of Spencer and State of Indiana.

Calvin F. Brown to be postmaster at Pendleton, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana.

Weldon A. Finch to be postmaster at Elwood, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana.

Robert P. Grimes to be postmaster at Anderson, in the county of Madison and State of Indiana.

William W. Kennedy to be postmaster at Martinsville, in the county of Morgan and State of Indiana.

William Miller to be postmaster at Nappanee, in the county of Elkhart and State of Indiana.

Marvin W. Pershing to be postmaster at Tipton, in the county of Tipton and State of Indiana.

Arthur P. Twineham to be postmaster at Princeton, in the county of Gibson and State of Indiana.

MARYLAND.

Philip T. Harman to be postmaster at Ellicott City, in the county of Howard and State of Maryland.

William F. Lankford to be postmaster at Princess Anne, in the county of Somerset and State of Maryland.

Alfred W. Thompson to be postmaster at Ridgely, in the county of Caroline and State of Maryland.

Gustavus B. Timanus to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Prince George and State of Maryland.

George Tise to be postmaster at Hyattsville, in the county of Prince George and State of Maryland.

Emma E. Zimmerman to be postmaster at Emmitsburg, in the county of Frederick and State of Maryland.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George T. Bailey to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Richard J. Considine to be postmaster at East Whitman, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

Clarence W. Daugherty to be postmaster at Huntington, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts.

Henry A. Pease to be postmaster at Edgartown, in the county of Dukes and State of Massachusetts.

Charles L. Scranton to be postmaster at Cottage City, in the county of Dukes and State of Massachusetts.

Leonard R. Smith to be postmaster at East Northfield, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts.

MISSISSIPPI.

George L. Holley to be postmaster at Booneville, in the county of Prentiss and State of Mississippi.

Thomas I. Keys to be postmaster at Ocean Springs, in the county of Jackson and State of Mississippi.

Fred H. Powers to be postmaster at Starkville, in the county of Oktibbeha and State of Mississippi.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

William A. Patterson to be postmaster at Contoocook, in the county of Merrimac and State of New Hampshire.

NEW JERSEY.

John A. Ackerman to be postmaster at Orange, in the county of Essex and State of New Jersey.

William M. Bergen to be postmaster at Belmar, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey.

Jacob Feldman to be postmaster at Woodbine, in the county of Cape May and State of New Jersey.

Nathan W. C. Hays to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Burlington and State of New Jersey.

Wilson D. Gill to be postmaster at Paulsboro, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey.

William B. Livezey to be postmaster at Wildwood, in the county of Cape May and State of New Jersey.

William Jeffers to be postmaster at Hackensack, in the county of Bergen and State of New Jersey.

Horace E. Richardson to be postmaster at Cape May Court House, in the county of Cape May and State of New Jersey.

NEW YORK.

George H. Brown to be postmaster at Kinderhook, in the county of Columbia and State of New York.

George E. Drumm to be postmaster at Chatham, in the county of Columbia and State of New York.

August F. Funk to be postmaster at Philmont, in the county of Columbia and State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Carlos McLeod to be postmaster at Carthage, in the county of Moore and State of North Carolina.

Albert Miller to be postmaster at Lagrange, in the county of Lenoir and State of North Carolina.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Clarence C. Banks to be postmaster at Lansford, in the county of Bottineau and State of North Dakota.

Lyman Brandt to be postmaster at Park River, in the county of Walsh and State of North Dakota.

Minnie L. Budge to be postmaster at Grand Forks, in the county of Grand Forks and State of North Dakota.

Clarence M. Condit to be postmaster at Westhope, in the county of Bottineau and State of North Dakota.

Jeremiah H. Dooley to be postmaster at Leeds, in the county of Benson and State of North Dakota.

James E. Galehouse, jr., to be postmaster at Carrington, in the county of Foster and State of North Dakota.

Ole Helseth to be postmaster at Balfour, in the county of McHenry and State of North Dakota.

Nelson C. Lawrence to be postmaster at Dickinson, in the county of Stark and State of North Dakota.

Henry T. Nelson to be postmaster at Courtenay, in the county of Stutsman and State of North Dakota.

OHIO.

W. P. Shepard to be postmaster at Nelsonville, in the county of Athens and State of Ohio.

OKLAHOMA.

Frank W. Hungate to be postmaster at Hydro, in the county of Caddo and Territory of Oklahoma.

John C. Morphis to be postmaster at Cleveland, in the county of Pawnee and Territory of Oklahoma.

OREGON.

Arthur Wheelhouse to be postmaster at Arlington, in the county of Gilliam and State of Oregon.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Samuel M. Altdoerffer to be postmaster at Ambridge, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania.

William D. Gerlach to be postmaster at Hazleton, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania.

David Kaye to be postmaster at Monaca, in the county of Beaver and State of Pennsylvania.

Harry B. Klingensmith to be postmaster at Ellsworth, in the county of Washington and State of Pennsylvania.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Sherman C. Denham to be postmaster at Clarksburg, in the county of Harrison and State of West Virginia.

WISCONSIN.

W. G. Walker to be postmaster at Odanah, in the county of Ashland and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 19, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. Brantley, a Member-elect from the Eleventh district of Georgia, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SITTINGS OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 108.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary and any subcommittee thereof have leave during the Fifty-ninth Congress to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk has just reported? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. JENKINS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF BLACK SANDS ON PACIFIC SLOPE.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which is on the Calendar, and which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish to Congress a report on the progress of the investigation of the black sands of the Pacific slope, authority for which was

included in that section of the sundry civil act approved March 3, 1905, which provided for the preparation of the report on the mineral resources of the United States, and for his opinion as to whether or not this investigation should be continued.

The SPEAKER. This resolution was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining, and was reported to the House and is upon the Calendar. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire who reported this resolution?

Mr. BROWN. It was reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining yesterday, but the report is not yet in the folding room.

Mr. PAYNE. Who reported it?

Mr. BROWN. I, myself.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to hear an explanation of what this is.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I will yield such time as is necessary in order to explain this matter thoroughly to the House to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, this is simply a resolution of inquiry. It calls on the Secretary of the Interior to furnish the House with information relative to certain experiments which have been made during the past summer at a plant erected by the Government to treat the black sands of the country with a view of determining their mineral constituents, and an economical method of the separation of the same. An appropriation was made in the last Congress of $25,000 for the purpose of carrying on these experiments. The immediate necessity of the experiments was due to the very rapid increase in the price of platinum by reason of the cutting off of the platinum supply from eastern Asia during the Japanese-Russian war. The experiments were carried on at Portland, Oreg., and continued until the fund was exhausted. There is a plant of considerable size there, but it is impossible to further continue these experiments owing to exhaustion of the appropriation.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that the Geological Survey, in a letter addressed to the Senate, has made a complete report of the result of the investigation as far as the investigation has gone?

Mr. MONDELL. It is true that the Secretary of the Interior has sent such a letter to the Senate, but it is also true that that report is not officially before the House, and this resolution is introduced for the purpose of bringing a report before the House officially.

Mr. DALZELL. Isn't there a communication addressed to the House or the Senate by the Secretary of the Interior and published as a document on this subject?

Mr. MONDELL. Not bringing out fully the information asked for in this resolution. The Secretary of the Interior has addressed the Senate on the subject, but there is nothing officially before the House, and it is for the purpose of bringing before the House committees the information desired that this resolution is asked for.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, the information the gentleman desires by this resolution is not embodied in this House document.

Mr. MONDELL. It is not embodied in any House document I know of.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is embodied, however, in the Senate document.

Mr. MONDELL. It is embodied in a communication sent to the Senate in response to a resolution similar to this.

Mr. TAWNEY. Would it not be just as well to have the Senate document printed for the information and use of the House?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, the report is rather brief, and I will say to the Members of the House that the resolution was introduced in the House and Senate about the same time. The Senate resolution unfortunately did not ask that information be sent to the Congress, but to the Senate, and therefore the House has not this information officially before it, and this resolution will bring somewhat the same information, I presume, from the Secretary to the Speaker as the Senate resolution brought.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. As I understand, this information called for by this resolution has been sent to the Senate.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. If it is not already printed as a document, it probably will be printed as a document, so that if it is printed by the House as a document it will be a duplication of printing.

Mr. MONDELL. It is not proposed to have this printed as a document, but simply proposed that the Secretary of the Interior shall inform the House in a communication.

Mr. MANN. I say to the gentleman if it comes here it naturally is printed as a document. Now, I suggest to the gentleman if the Committee on Mines and Mining need this information from the Secretary for their benefit they can get it by addressing a letter to the Secretary or Director of the Geological Survey. Every committee of the House gets that information upon request, and here is a proposition to duplicate printing——

Mr. MONDELL. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no proposition to duplicate printing at all. This communication has not been printed. I do not know that anyone has suggested that it be printed. It is the desire of the people living in many of the Western as well as some of the Eastern States, who have mineral lands which they desire to have tested by the Government, to have this information officially in the hands of the committees of the House. This information will be embodied in a comparatively brief letter, and this resolution will bring it before the House.

Mr. DALZELL. This resolution if passed will give the House information that is not to be had from any other source up to this time.

Mr. MONDELL. That is true, sir, so far as the House is concerned.

Mr. MANN. Has not this information been printed in the Senate?

Mr. MONDELL. I think it has not; I am confident it has not.

Mr. MANN. My understanding is the response of the Director of the Geological Survey has been printed in the Senate.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of the fact.

Mr. MANN. Then would it not be well to let this go over and ascertain that fact?

Mr. MONDELL. But even if it had been printed there is no expense attached to asking the Secretary of the Interior to address a letter to the Speaker on the subject.

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask the gentleman a question, and that is, if in response to this inquiry a letter would come from the Secretary to the Speaker direct?

Mr. MONDELL. It would.

Mr. PAYNE. And by him of course under the rules it would be referred to some committee and ordered to be printed, so by force of the rules if it comes here it will be printed as a document of the House. Now, is not that correct?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think that necessarily follows.

Mr. PAYNE. That is the invariable course, as I understand, and the same rule obtains in the Senate, so if it went to the Senate it must have been already printed.

Mr. DALZELL. But the gentleman says this calls for information which is not available in any other form.

Mr. PAYNE. But I understood the gentleman also to say this would bring a letter that has already gone to the Senate.

Mr. MONDELL. That is true; the Secretary has addressed the Senate on this subject, but that information is not officially before the House.

Mr. PAYNE. But did not the gentleman state it?

Mr. MONDELL. I stated that a similar resolution had been introduced in the Senate, and in answer to that resolution the Secretary of the Interior had written a letter to the President of the Senate in due and proper form.

Mr. PAYNE. And in answer to this inquiry the same letter in duplicate would come to the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I assume that some similar document would come here, and I desired to have it here officially in order that it might be considered by the committee.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will allow me to make a suggestion, I think I can tell him how he can get that letter officially——

Mr. MONDELL. What objection has the gentleman to having the information before the House? Why this sudden spasm of economy?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Wyoming will pardon me, I will say if this precedent be set the House will soon be deluged with resolutions of that sort, because every Department of the Government with a hobby wants to get a report before the House and have it printed as a document. Now, I would suggest to the gentleman how he can get it officially before his committee and before the House without violating the precedents of the House. Let him call upon the Secretary for the information and receive the letter and report it to the House, if the House be entitled to it, and have it printed as a part of the report. That saves the precedent of the House as to getting the information officially before the committee and the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the kind suggestion, but desire to inform him that this violates no precedent of the House whatever; information is often

obtained by the House in this way; it is the usual way of obtaining it. This is a small document. It pertains to a subject in which a vast number of people are interested.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. TAWNEY. Have you not seen the Senate document?

Mr. MONDELL. I have seen a copy of the Senate typewritten communication.

Mr. TAWNEY. Doctor Day, of the Geological Survey, called on me a few days ago with a printed report from the Survey on the result of the investigation and tests they have been making at Portland under the appropriation of $25,000 made by the last Congress. Now, that report is full and in detail, covering the percentage of platinum in all of the different samples they have tested, and also covering a full description of the processes that have been employed by the Geological Survey in separating the platinum from the gold. That communication was made to the Senate and has been printed in full and in detail, and inasmuch as the resolution will obtain no further information than that, it seems to me entirely unnecessary to duplicate it.

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to the gentleman that the communication to which he refers, and two other communications which have been printed, do not contain all of the information obtainable relative to this investigation. What we desire is in a concise, compact form; a statement as to what has been accomplished, the general results of this investigation, and, in the opinion of the Secretary, the necessity, in view of the fact that there are 80 tons of material, consisting of some 600 samples from 20 States, piled up at the plant awaiting treatment, of further prosecuting the investigation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS]?

Mr. MONDELL. With pleasure.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I desire to ask the gentleman if the Geological Survey has not authority to print geological bulletins, and does not the Director, Mr. Walcott, send them out over the United States all the while, and in view of that fact could not this information be given to the public and the gentleman's committee through one of these geological bulletins?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman listened to the reading of the resolution, he will recall that the resolution asks the Secretary for a statement as to the results of these investigations and the advisability of continuing them.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Has he not the right, without any authority of Congress to further authorize him, to print this as a bulletin, instead of coming to Congress, so that the general public can get the information?

Mr. MONDELL. What objection has the gentleman to the House having this information?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Nothing, except that it might duplicate the printing.

Mr. MONDELL. There will be nothing duplicated by this resolution, I think.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think it should be printed, especially the bulletin, to give to the House and the committee the information desired.

Mr. MONDELL. The information asked for in this resolution has never been officially before the House and will not be unless it is obtained in this form through a resolution of this character.

Mr. DALZELL. I want to say to the gentleman that my constituents are very much interested in a continuance of this investigation, and I am, therefore, with him in his desire to get all the information possible. I have here a document, No. 65, printed at this session of this Congress, which contains a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, written in response to a Senate resolution. The gentleman is undoubtedly familiar with the document. Now, is the information that he is seeking something in addition to what is contained in this document? I think if the House were persuaded that what he asks is something that has not already been furnished the House the House would be willing to pass his resolution.

Mr. MONDELL. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the information we desire is in addition to the information contained in this document, because the information in this document does not enlighten the House fully and officially on the subject. If the House will bear with me a moment, I will repeat there are a vast number of samples piled up out there at Portland—some 600 different samples from 20 different States. They can not be treated because the appropriation is exhausted. The plant is there ready to be started at any time, and we desire to learn officially from the Secretary as to this condition surrounding the investigation and the necessity of continuing it by reason of the very great good that has already been accomplished and the further good that will be accomplished by the examination of the samples now piled up at the Government plant and such as may be received.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Does not the gentleman think that this matter of authorizing the printing of documents ought to go to the Joint Committee on Printing, of which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] is the leading member, because the President has recommended economy in the printing business, and the newspapers last winter said that committee was going to save a million dollars in the printing bills? It looks like if they were going to make any saving they ought to be doing it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, for the present I will have to object.

Mr. MONDELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not this a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the first part of the resolution privileged. The latter part is not privileged; and that destroys the privilege of the whole resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House resolution 42.

The SPEAKER. Pending that, the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to make a request.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print some remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reference of the bill (H. R. 377) to extend the limits of the port of entry of New Orelans, La., be changed from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was then agreed to.

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House resolution 42.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I read a few days since a statement in the leading Republican organ of this city, the Evening Times, enumerating the number of bills that had been introduced in this House since the 4th day of December that ignored, or tendered to ignore, the well-established and distinctly reserved rights of the States by invoking Federal control. I was glad, Mr. Chairman, if I recollect correctly, that that staunch eRpublican organ condemned the tendency of the "present times" toward centralization. I accept such a declaration as a gratifying protest. Many of these bills that were enumerated in that statement came from Democrats. I rejoice, Mr. Chairman, that this discussion has presented an occasion for a revival of loyalty and allegiance on this side of this House, as well as on the other side of the Chamber, to the great fundamental doctrines that lie at the foundation of our complex and dual national system of government, both State and Federal. Mr. Chairman, I especially rejoice that such a discussion as we have witnessed here in the past two days precedes the discussion of a subject that surely will be brought to the attention of this Congress at a later day for consideration and action; a question, Mr. Chairman, far more important than the matter of whether insurance is commerce or not; a question that involves not only millions of dollars, but a question that involves the protection of the life and the health of the people—the exclusive control of quarantine by the Federal Government.

It is, Mr. Chairman, unwise and unsafe, in my opinion, for the Congress to permit the inspirations of any unusual event, fact, or development that appeals to or arouses the public mind in a fervid manner to dictate or influence what is intended to be remedial legislation.

This Congress, Mr. Chairman, assembled on the 4th day of December under the shadows of two great recent developments or conditions, one occurring in the northern section of our country and the other occurring in the southern section, which have

focused public opinion, and they are to-day weighing and pressing earnestly upon the public mind, demanding Federal control where the Federal Government has never before exercised supreme control. The one, as I have just said, being in the North, and the other in the South. The one is the startling, shameless, aggressive, and grasping demoralization and dishonesty unearthed in the insurance investigation in the city of New York; the other the strong and earnest clamor that comes up from certain sections of the South, following the dreaded and appalling visitation of the epidemic of yellow fever; both demanding or urging Federal control of these two great questions of insurance and health. The highest court of our country has solemnly declared that insurance is not commerce, but that it is a mere instrumentality of commercial exchange—an individual contract. It is not denied by anyone in the hearing of my voice that the protection of health is strictly a police regulation belonging to the State, yet we have it asserted by men of distinction and ability that the Federal Government should take control of these two great questions. Why, Mr. Chairman, the statement of the proposition itself is enough to cause this House of Representatives to pause and think well before we enact any legislation on that line.

In the remarks that I intend to make I shall not undertake to enter into a discussion of the insurance question. That has been ably done, and been of great benefit to our country, and done in a patriotic manner.

If we follow the ordinary course of this House, in my opinion that part of the President's message relating to insurance must necessarily go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House. The claim asserted by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, is an absolute confession that insurance is not commerce, because he says that he is reaching out for it for that great committee in order to use the taxing power of the Government, a power that we know, if exercised to its full extent, can mean and does mean destruction. What kind of a tax could be placed upon the business of insurance? Do we mean to drive it out of existence, as we intended to drive another industry out of existence when we passed the oleomargarine bill and taxed that industry out of existence to help another competitive industry? Nobody intends or desires to do that. The taxing power of the Government should only be used to create revenue. Any other use of it is an abuse.

And in this connection, suppose it is referred to the Judiciary Committee. What would be the result? Stare decisis governs lawyers. They are confronted by the decisions of the highest court of this country that insurance is not commerce, that it is a contract made by individuals, that it is an instrumentality of commercial exchange.

What can you expect from that committee? I know it has to be referred somewhere, because it is not admissible and proper, in the Committee of the Whole, to ask that it be laid on the table. I do not subscribe to the doctrine that I have heard asserted frequently in this discussion, nor do I believe that we can find justification or excuse that, because a matter belonging exclusively to State control has grown and enlarged and become more important, and that the Federal Government, in the superiority of its equipments and facilities, is better prepared to take charge, thereby it becomes the subject of Federal control. If it belongs to the jurisdiction of the States, as one of the local and domestic positive powers of the State, it matters not, in my judgment, how large it grows, how it stretches from the area of one State to another. It still remains the subject of State jurisdiction.

Why, suppose we follow this reasoning to its logical conclusion. It would be but a short time, with the tendencies of these times, that Federal control would absorb the reserved right of States to restrict and punish its criminals by its own local statutes. It would not only do that, but it would absorb the right of the State to protect the peace and the morals of the people. Therefore I say that there is a part of the President's message which I look upon as being unsafe and dangerous.

I dissent from the views of the Chief Executive of our Republic, and do it with great respect and profound regard. It is an argument or a plea for Federal control simply because the insurance business has expanded and grown larger and more powerful. He says, "The great insurance companies afford striking examples of corporations whose business has extended so far beyond the jurisdiction of the State which created them as to preclude strict enforcement of supervision and regulation by the parent State." I propound this question to the members of this committee:

Wherein and how has it changed in its methods and manners so as to invite Federal control? Is it not conducted in the same way now substantially as it was when the first decision of the Supreme Court was made declaring that insurance is not commerce? Are not solicitors sent out for patronage, and when reported back to the parent office policies are issued? It is still an individual contract. No more a matter of interstate commerce than a promissory note I might execute to a citizen of another State. I know that more people take policies of insurance to-day than they did twenty years ago. Why? Because there are a great many more people in this country than there were then. Are we not, Mr. Chairman, establishing a precedent in this House by our legislation by saying that because it goes from one State to another we should abandon the State government control of its fundamental rights, its home rule, and its home rights? It preeminently behooves Congress to check and stay such tendencies. Follow it to its logical conclusion. Follow these expressions of the President of the United States to their logical results, and no man can predict the end.

Mr. Chairman, it is proclaimed abroad throughout the land that we have become a great world power, that we are growing and expanding. If that be true, and it is true, then centralization of the most intense character will soon follow. Ah, Mr. Chairman, I fear that that is too true. But the President goes further in his message with expressions of relief that I cordially indorse:

> Of course the only complete remedy for this condition must be found in an aroused public conscience, a higher sense of ethical conduct in the community at large, and especially among business men and in the great profession of the law, and in the growth of a spirit which condemns all dishonesty, whether in rich man or in poor man, whether it takes the shape of bribery or of blackmail.

The fact is that the States have had no opportunity to show what they can do. I do not think any State in the Union would be remiss or derelict in meting out punishment to men who dishonestly and flagrantly, for political purposes and otherwise, criminally use the funds committed to their hands for unlawful purposes in utter disregard of their fiduciary obligations. I think that the State courts would be just as efficient to discharge these duties as a Federal court.

Again, is it possible that anyone could contend fairly that that quickened conscience that will impel the sternest action can not be found to exist among the citizens of a State? I believe that all laws that are made that are not upheld by public sentiment are the most likely to be laxly executed; that developments that are made in New York in the investigation of insurance has aroused the quickened public conscience of the people of the States, and that the State will administer just as effectually and thoroughly as the Federal Government would administer a penal statute prohibiting such crimes. I say this without one single sentiment of hostility to Federal control in its legitimate sphere. I believe in the old democratic doctrine—I mean the democratic doctrine that is the life and spirit of our Republic—that the nearer you get to the great body of the masses of the people the nearer you represent their true sentiment, their loyalty and affection, their individual liberties, and carry out the true principles of our republican form of Government. [Applause.]

Why, then, should we calculate that the Supreme Court, after having discharged its plain duty under the Constitution and declared insurance not to be commerce, etc.—why should we declare that the Supreme Court will change its decision? I know that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] has said that sometimes supreme courts, both State and Federal, change their opinions. Where have they changed it on a great fundamental principle that lies at the very foundation of our Republic in the matter of the undenied control of the States over all matters of personal contract? Let anyone point to an instance. There are cases where State supreme courts and Federal Supreme Courts have changed their opinions. In that connection, following out his characteristic frankness and honesty, I see that Hon. Alton B. Parker has changed his opinion about a matter wherein he gave his opinion in connection with the ballots in New York. That was honest and fair. And that reminds me, when we look back and see the factors that led up to the development of these great wrongs, this aggressive dishonesty that is described so powerfully in the President's message, who was it that first called public attention to the enormities being perpetrated by corporations in the unlawful use of their funds? It was a charge made by Judge Parker during the Presidential campaign of last year. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He charged that there was rottenness, that there were improper contributions being made from trust funds of corporations for the purpose of carrying on a political campaign. Who says to-day that what he declared has not been overwhelmingly established as the truth? I say, who says it? No one dare rise up and say that the charge that Judge Parker made has not been fully verified and established, and that he

has been vindicated, and that he stands proudly as one of the bold, brave, honest citizens of our Republic.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the President still goes further:

In my last annual message I recommended that the Congress carefully consider whether the power of the Bureau of Corporations can not constitutionally be extended to cover interstate transactions and insurance.

Mr. Chairman, that reminds me of a very important matter of legislation that occurred February 10, 1903. Many of you will remember in the creation of the Department of Commerce and Labor it was insisted, for the purpose of controlling trusts and combinations, that a particular feature for publicity be ingrafted on that bill. It was my honor to serve on the conference committee with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], with Senator Hanna, Senator NELSON, and Senator CLAY. That question came up about what was known as the "Nelson substitute." What was the Nelson substitute? And in that connection I say that it was my pleasure to come here on the floor of this House and dissent to the report of that conference committee on that "publicity" feature. In that connection I used this language on the 10th day of February, 1903:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I dissent most earnestly and sincerely from this Nelson substitute. I believe it to be an ultra dilution of a hypodermic injection of so-called "antitrust legislation." I believe it to be a travesty upon what its friends represent and claim to be its only virtue—publicity.

It is well that we can look at things dispassionately. It was claimed that that was all of the antitrust legislation that was needed to regulate these great combines and trusts at that time—vociferously claimed and earnestly argued. True, I put my humble protest in against it, but I desire to test the declarations of the gentlemen who advocated it and so earnestly supported that "Nelson substitute" as to the fruits and results of it nearly three years afterwards. What was that substitute?

The said Commissioner shall have power and authority to make, under the direction and control of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, diligent investigation into the organization, conduct, and management of the business of any corporation, joint stock company, or corporate combine engaged in commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, excepting common carriers, and gather such information and data as will enable the President of the United States to make recommendations to Congress for legislation for the regulation of such commerce, and to report such data to the President from time to time as he shall require, and the information so obtained, or as much thereof as the President may direct, shall be made public.

I pause and ask, What information on the subject of unlawful and oppressive combines and trusts has ever been conveyed to the President of the United States during the three past years by the Commissioner of Corporations of the Department of Commerce and Labor? Has anyone heard of the use of his powers by the Commissioner under that publicity law? The power was given in that substitute, the Nelson substitute, for the President to call for facts and information and hold in his hand just such part of it as he saw fit, and give to the public the balance. Have any facts furnished the President by the Commissioner been given to the public?

I put it to any Republican on the other side of this Chamber or elsewhere, point me to a single instance where that investigation or collection of facts has been made by the Commissioner of Corporations in that Department. The power was in his hands. The mighty Standard Oil Company, the steel trust, and all other kindred combinations were there, and what has he done? And yet the President in his message recommends that we shall confer still greater power upon the Bureau of Corporations, in charge now of the same Commissioner. Is there anything to encourage me or you or anyone else to give further power to that Bureau for the investigation of trusts and combinations? None whatever. The Nelson substitute—the publicity law—has been a dead law, a failure, not because it had no field to operate in; the game was abundant. Permit me now, Mr. Chairman, to present another subject occupying a more delicate and sensitive relation to the reserved rights of the States than insurance. I, of course, refer to quarantine.

In the trail or wake of the appalling and dreadful epidemic of yellow fever in the South there is a great clamor made for Federal control. No man could take his stand on the floor of this House who is more eager and anxious to forever banish that dreaded disease and plague from the shores of the South than am I; but rather than sacrifice one of the fundamental rights of my State, or its domestic and local control of one of its reserved powers, I would be willing to fight the yellow fever for ages to come. We are encouraged to believe that under the advance of science it will not be long before we will be free from this scourge. Many public men express the opinion that we want Federal control. They do not stop to consider the far-reaching effects of such a proposition.

The position that I take is that I concede that there is no violation of the reserved rights of the States in this proposition; that the Federal Government controls quarantine so as to prevent the importation of disease from foreign countries or the spread of disease from one State to the other. By so doing the Government is but exercising its constitutional function. That, Mr. Chairman, the Government is doing to-day, and I contend that under the present law the Government has clothed the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service with all the authority and power that Congress is authorized under the Constitution to give. But the other proposition is, and the real question is, can a Federal quarantine law, giving Federal health authorities supreme control, be framed within constitutional limits and not interfere with the positive reserve rights of the States? That is the main question. When I remember that Federal jurisdiction of quarantine is exercised primarily in the interest of commerce and that State jurisdiction is exercised primarily for the protection of life and health in different communities and secondarily in the interest of commerce, then I dissent from this proposition. Now, if any gentleman will take the trouble to investigate Federal legislation on quarantine he will find that every act of Congress up to 1900 on the subject of quarantine was in aid of the enforcement of State laws. I do not contend that if the Government can lawfully and rightfully exercise a certain constitutional function the mere failure to do that abnegates or causes the Government to abandon it. Let us look at the law.

The first law we have on the subject is "An act to prevent the introduction of contagious diseases from one State to another, and for the punishment of certain offenses," approved on the 27th day of March, 1890. What more authority can the Government give to the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service than to give the control of interstate quarantine? The next law, Mr. Chairman, on this subject is "An act granting additional quarantine powers and imposing additional duties upon the Marine-Hospital Service," which is now known as the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service. This act requires the Surgeon-General and even the President of the United States to maintain officers at foreign ports, medical or otherwise, or consuls, and not to let any vessel leave that port until it comes with a "bill of health." That is control of foreign quarantine in its supremest manner. Why, some gentleman said to me: "The Government has no right, it is extrajudicial to assert a power or to make a law that is to operate in a foreign port." I admit that is true. The Secretary of the Treasury by this law is required to formulate rules and regulations for the inspection of those vessels, and the answer that I make is that if those vessels do not allow that inspection to take place and to receive that bill of health, why we certainly have control over this side of the waters and we can prevent them from coming into our ports and landing unless they comply with our requirements. That is the answer to it. There is the legislation giving Federal control, in which I agree and believe, and I say right here that if the Federal Government had the control, with the consent of the States, of the maritime stations that the States control that it would be better for us and better for all concerned, and before I conclude I wish to point out what I conceive to be the way that can be done. Now, that is the legislation of the past. Let us look now and see the legislation that took place in 1902, and it happened to be my pleasure to have charge of the bill that came from the Senate to the floor of the House, and that bill did this. The important section of it was section 7, which reads:

That when in the opinion of the Surgeon-General of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States the interests of the public health would be promoted by a conference of said service with State or Territorial boards of health, quarantine authorities, or State health officers, the District of Columbia included, he may invite as many of said health and quarantine authorities as he deems necessary or proper to send delegates, not more than one from each State or Territory and District of Columbia, to said conference: *Provided*, That an annual conference of the health authorities of all the States and Territories, and the District of Columbia to be entitled to one delegate: Territories and the District of Columbia to be entitled to one delegate: *And provided further*, That it shall be the duty of the said Surgeon-General to call a conference upon the application of not less than five State or Territorial boards of health, quarantine authorities, or State health officers, each of said boards or quarantine authorities joining in such request to be represented by one delegate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will read the opinion from a distinguished Republican, giving his views on the subject of that section I have just read. The subject was carefully considered for days and days trying to get at what was right, what the jurisdiction of State and Federal quarantine was. Senator SPOONER, in the report which he made on this bill, says:

This section we regard as by all means the most important section in the bill. The dividing line between the Federal power of quarantine, in its relation to foreign commerce and interstate commerce, and the State power of quarantine and police regulation, in its relation to the public health, is undoubtedly real.

Why, some men think it is a fiction. If you can take charge by the Federal Government of quarantine and matters relating

to health, why can you not take charge of diphtheria or measles, or anything in the way of diseases that are contagious or infectious? Why does it not lead to that? He continues:

But it is often very difficult of discernment, and therefore it has often happened that State authorities have felt their province invaded by Federal authorities, and Federal authorities have insisted that the national function was invaded by State authorities, and out of it all has grown more or less of friction, necessarily detrimental to great public interests. No statute, of course, can change the power of the Federal authorities as defined by the Constitution, or take away the sovereign power of any State in respect of these matters.

That is all I am contending for to-day. I know that our people are aroused under the terrible visitation of yellow fever, and by the memory of that which occurred in 1879, in which 15,000 people lost their lives, with a monetary loss of more than a million dollars, which is calculated to lead us from the stanch mooring of what is right between the authorities of the States and the Government. Why, Doctor Wyman—and I say in this connection that I will be glad to see the Bureau of Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service made a separate department, but not with a secretary in the Cabinet; in my judgment it ought not to be controlled by the Treasury Department, for there is no compatibility, but make it a separate department—Doctor Wyman administers the laws of the Government with all delicacy, with great ability, with consummate skill in all matters of possible friction between the State and the Government, and has given full satisfaction by the manner in which he has administered them.

Senator SPOONER further said:

The committee has been impressed with the conviction that in the general public interest some recognition by Federal legislation of the State health authorities, in the way of consultation upon subjects of vital consequence to the localities, and as to the rules to be put in operation by both State and Federal authorities in accomplishing the same end, would of necessity bring about better understanding and a cooperation which would inevitably promote a fuller accomplishment of the great purpose desired by both the Federal and the State authorities.

He further predicted that the best of results would follow the law, because—

First. That when, in the opinion of the Surgeon-General, the interests of the public health would be promoted by a conference of that service with the State or Territorial health officers he may invite as many of said health officers and quarantine authorities as he deems necessary to send delegates, not more than one from each State or Territory and District of Columbia, to such a conference.

Second. That an annual conference of the health authorities of the States and Territories and District of Columbia shall be called by the Surgeon-General, each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia to be entitled to one delegate.

Third. That it shall be the duty of the Surgeon-General to call a conference upon the application of not less than five State or Territorial boards of health, quarantine authorities, or State health officers, each of said boards or quarantine authorities joining in such request to be represented by one delegate.

I take this occasion to read the well-established and accepted judicial view. I know that the Supreme Court of the United States, in a decision rendered by Judge Miller, shadows, or indicated, some different doctrine than this, but Judge Grier in a certain case said:

It has been frequently decided by this court that the powers which relate to the merely municipal regulations, or what may be more properly called "internal police," are not surrendered by the States or restrained by the Constitution of the United States, and that, consequently, in relation to these the authority of a State is complete, unqualified, and conclusive. Without attempting to define what are the peculiar subjects or limits of this power, it may safely be affirmed that every law for the restraint and punishment of crime, for the preservation of the public peace, health, and morals must come within this category.

As subjects of legislation, they are from their very nature of primary importance. They lie at the foundation of social existence; they are for the protection of life and liberty, and necessarily compel all laws on subjects of secondary importance, which relate only to property, convenience, or luxury, to recede when they come in conflict or collision. Salus populi suprema lex.

That is the fundamental doctrine. Mr. Chairman, I am repeating a great deal of the well-established doctrine as declared by our Supreme Court. I am repeating it simply for the reason that I believe that there is a strong and intelligent view and feeling prevailing in many sections of the South upon the advisability of supreme Federal control of quarantine. We have had it said over and over again to us by the northern people and by the Republican Representatives on this floor that they are willing to abide by whatever law the southern Representatives and the Southern States are of opinion will protect them from a visitation of yellow fever again. We are grateful for that generous sentiment. We appreciate it. As a southern man I do not invite them to give their sanction or their vote, and they would not do it if I did, to any proposition that ignored a fundamental, domestic, local right of a State. Why, Mr. Chairman, no people on earth could have been more grateful to the President of the United States for the absolute and unqualified courage and profound and earnest sympathy that welled up in his heart for our stricken people, that he manifested when he visited New Orleans. It was accepted with profound gratitude. The office of the President of the United States was forgotten in the appreciation and the esteem that they accorded the man.

But let us see for a moment what Doctor Wyman says about this matter. Listen to him talking about the law of 1902:

The conferences called for by this act are very valuable in preventing the spread of epidemic diseases by insuring cooperation of State authorities with the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service. Matters of sanitary interest, ventilation, housing, disposal of garbage, etc., and matters relating to prevention of epidemic diseases are considered by special committees appointed by the Surgeon-General for that purpose.

The State health authorities are thus brought into close relationship with the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service. The municipal health officers, through their dealings with the State board of health, form a part of the system. The result is an interchange of views of mutual understanding between all health authorities, and the closer relations thus established will be of great benefit in the public-health work of the future.

I think there ought to be an amendment to that law to the effect that every chairman of a board of health, or other designated State health officer, ought to be ex officio a member of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service. Doctor Wyman, I am certain, has recommended the same. Let them sit down at the same board and confer with each other, and in that conference agree upon rules of uniformity that will prevent many of the useless restrictions on travel and embargoes that were placed upon commerce and avoid serious inconvenience to people that occurred so frequently in the Southern States during the reign of the epidemic. Why, it went up as far north as Cairo, Ill. We suffered immensely in the derangement of our business matters, and consequently great loss of money. All we need is for the State to consent that this board of health, its president of the board of health, or any health quarantine officer be allowed to sit around the Federal board.

I would be glad to see a National Federal Board of Health with the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service at the head of it, so that they would have conferences and would adopt rules that would prevail at all ports and in the States. As it is now, the Federal Government, while it exercises interstate quarantine, can start a train from New Orleans to Louisville, going through two or three States, and not a man on that train, under the rules and regulations as administered by the State, can get off in Alabama or Tennessee unless he complies with the regulations prescribed by the State. I would be glad to see it so that when a man complied with the rules and requirements, detentions, isolations, and so forth, that are necessary to pronounce him free from infectious disease and bears a certificate that he should have the right to leave that train at any point in Alabama or Tennessee by presenting his certificate and go on rejoicing. That is the rule I want. That can never be accomplished except by the consent of the State through the action of its legislature.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman think now that a Federal statute could bring that about? I am very much interested in what the gentleman has been saying.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. The present statute brings that about.

Mr. GARRETT. Then it makes it possible to permit one to get off in violation of the local regulations? That is the point at which I am driving.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. No; the present statute does not do it, and it could not be done except with the consent of Alabama and Tennessee. It is impossible for it to be done.

Mr. GARRETT. And the Federal Government can not enact a statute which would permit it?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. No, sir; it could not enact a statute to permit that man, against the quarantine regulations of Alabama, to get off. He would probably have to go to Canada if the State of Kentucky objected to the same thing, because that would be making, my dear sir, the Federal Government supreme and exclusive on the question of quarantine in the limits of a State.

Mr. GARRETT. I concur with the gentleman entirely. Just one thought further, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Assuming, now, for a moment that that can be done, that the Federal Government can enact a statute which would force upon a community the reception of an individual traveler through the State that desired to stop at that particular station, despite the local quarantine regulation, and assuming that the Federal Government should pass an act undertaking to provide that he might do that, would not this also be true, that after he had gotten off the train and had ceased to be an interstate passenger he would immediately become subject to the police regulations of the State?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. How could he get off the train if the State has a guard there to meet every train? Now, let me read to my worthy friend from Tennessee a short paragraph.

Mr. GARRETT. I was assuming that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama (reading)—

Suppose a citizen or an alien, no matter whom, the President of the United States or the humblest individual that ever entered the harbor, to approach our city, bringing infection, bearing death to thousands—an approach more dreadful than that of an invading army. He is repelled, justly repelled, by the express authority of the law of nations. By whom is he repelled? By the Federal Government? Under what clause of the Constitution? Under which of its powers? Under its commercial power? A traffic in contagion! A tariff on disease! Under its war power? A war with the king of terrors! No; the State, and the State alone, has the power, and alone is charged with the duty of repelling disease and of guarding its confines from the entrance of whatever might injure its citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I must confess that it is no surprise to me that conservative, patriotic citizens from all sections of the Union, who love with honesty and sincerity and desire to preserve the principles of our Government, are becoming anxious and uneasy when they hear that the Federal Government is solicited by respectable, good, and intelligent citizens to take charge of contracts and health within the limits of the States.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and will yield it to the gentleman from Virginia. I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia does not appear to be present. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, that there is great diversity of opinion in this House in reference to this subject of insurance dealt with in the President's message is apparent. The discussion so far has to my mind been very instructive and beneficial. It is very important to take the right step at this time with reference to this portion of the message, because the proper action at this time will have an influence upon the action that is likely to follow. The gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, has contended that insurance, not being commerce, should not be referred to the Comittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; that the subject can be reached and regulated by means of the exercise of the taxing power. It seems to me that his position is unanswerable. On the other hand, the gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, contends that notwithstanding the fact that the highest court has decided that insurance is no commerce, yet that there is a possibility that the court may reverse itself upon that question in view of the assertion on the part of Congress of authority over the subject. This same view seems to be expressed by the Commissioner of Corporations in his report. He says:

Seemingly the most effective way to settle the question is for Congress to so legislate upon the subject as to afford an opportunity to present to the Supreme Court the question whether insurance as now conducted is interstate commerce, and hence subject to Federal regulation.

There is a distinction between control under the commerce clause of the Constitution and attempted regulation by reason of the power of taxation, as suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], or by reason of the regulation that would result from control of the mails, as suggested by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS]. If the Supreme Court should be induced to reverse its decision and hold that insurance is commerce, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, then the authority of Congress over that subject would be exclusive of all other authority and would ipso facto destroy all State regulation authority and control over the subject. On the other hand, if you exercise authority by means of the taxing power or any similar power, it would be simply supplemental to State authority and State control, and such regulation and control would not be interfered with. It would be analogous to the matter of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, where the Federal authority simply supplements and aids the power of the State and municipality. By means of the taxing power the Federal Government supplements and helps the government of the State and municipality with that subject.

I was very much impressed by the argument of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] in regard to the quarantine matter, in which it was argued that the authority of the Federal Government can be made to work in conjunction with the State authorities, and so, instead of being in conflict, the two would work together with more effectiveness than the one. I beg to congratulate gentlemen of the minority upon this floor on their argument against undue centralization of power in the Federal Government. I believe it is wise to retain as much power in the local and State governments as is consistent with the due and proper exercise of the authority of the General Government. I believe almost to the full extent that they do in the preservation of State authority, and I am as much against undue and unnecessary centralization of power in the Federal Government as they possibly can be. Now, what would be the result if Congress should enact a law asserting control over the subject of insurance as interstate commerce and such an act should be upheld by the Supreme Court? It is not life insurance alone that is referred to. It is fire insurance, marine insurance, casualty insurance, fidelity insurance, and all kinds of insurance contracts. This subject is already regulated in nearly every State, if not every State in the Union. In the State of Minnesota, for more than a generation, we have built up a code of laws on the subject of insurance, which laws, we think, are wise and beneficial. We make it a condition precedent to the entry of any foreign corporation into that State for the purpose of engaging in insurance that they must comply with the regulations that we prescribe. They must pay a fee. They must pay a 2 per cent tax upon all premiums paid in. The tax on fire-insurance premiums goes to the support and the relief of sick, injured, or disabled firemen, and their widows and orphans.

The State of Minnesota in 1903 collected $242,350 from insurance companies foreign to the State, in 1904 more than a quarter of a million, and this year approximately three hundred thousand, and a large share of this is used for the support of disabled firemen in the various municipalities, being divided according to the amount of premiums paid by particular localities. We do not want these laws destroyed or impaired.

Now, if you should succeed in inducing the Supreme Court of the United States to reverse itself on this question, and to say that Congress has the power under the commerce clause to regulate insurance of all kinds, you would deprive the State of its authority and destroy all of those statutes that we have on our books, and I venture to say that they are the result of long experience and that they are wise laws. They have safely guarded the rights of the policy holders of the State in the past. We are satisfied with them. We can amend them whenever our people so desire. We desire to retain both the control of and the revenue from insurance in the State.

Who have asked for their destruction? Not the people of Minnesota; not the policy holders of the State; not the brave and heroic firemen who have been injured in the line of duty, nor their widows and orphans. No; on the contrary, these have protested and are protesting against such legislation. Neither have I heard of the people of any other State asking for such a measure. The demand does not come from the people, but rather from the managers of insurance interests who feel impatient under State regulation and control. Why, the first bill introduced in the Fifty-eighth Congress placing insurance under Federal authority and control was introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN], who is and was the president of the Prudential Life Insurance Company, one of the largest in the country. The dishonesty in life insurance management disclosed by the investigation in New York, however deep and disgraceful, has not shown that the solvency of any of the companies concerned was affected.

To the location of these companies with their enormous accumulations of funds in the financial center of the country, where speculation and gambling on the exchanges is constantly going on, is largely due the fall of these men. These causes are local to the city of New York.

It may be claimed and it is claimed that Federal control is superior to State control. I myself went on the stump a few years ago and argued that if we created the Department of Commerce and Labor it would be a regular "trust buster;" that it would do wonders in the land in regard to monopoly; but it has not reached our expectations. Federal control in itself has never shown itself to be superior to State control in its proper field. [Applause.] Look at the banks. Is the supervision of the Federal Government over national banks superior to the supervision of the State banks by the State authorities? Are there not failures of national banks all over the land and depositors swindled just as much as the State banks? Look, for instance, at the supervision that ought to be exercised over interstate transportation. Have not the railroad companies ever since the interstate-commerce law was passed in 1887 been violating the law every day? [Applause.] Have we not created the machinery whereby the act should be enforced, and yet do we not find them unable to enforce it? And although the Department of Justice claims to have been very busy, has not that Department failed to land the rebaters and discriminators in the penitentiary so far?

How to make these laws of Congress more effective, how to make our regulation regulate is the problem constantly before us. It is the question of the hour. We hope to make our laws in regulation of interstate commerce, as well as for the suppression

of monopolies and trusts, so that they will at least, as a rule, be obeyed; but we have not yet succeeded. Let us not invade the jurisdiction of the States in such a manner as to destroy or impair it.

Compare the State control of transportation within the States with Federal control over interstate transportation. Which is the most complete and effective? I favor control by the Federal Government of matters within its proper sphere, but I do not want to see it supersede State control where that is practicable. The Federal authorities just now seem to have a great desire to supervise, but so far we have not had very efficient supervision in that field. Why, the very disclosures that have been made in the State of New York are the result of an investigation set on foot by the State machinery, as has been well stated here; and if that investigation were to be carried a little further I believe we would find national banks, under Government supervision, using the public money unlawfully in the financial operations and speculations carried on to enrich the men in control.

I do not believe that the Supreme Court will ever reverse its decision that insurance is not commerce, and I would be opposed to asking the court to reverse itself. I am glad it decided as it did. If we leave well enough alone, then when Federal control is desired we can exercise it by virtue of the taxing power, and that kind of Federal control will be supplemental to State control and not destructive of it or exclusive of it. I am therefore opposed to referring this matter to the Commerce Committee. I am willing to take, and I think this House ought to take, the decisions of the Supreme Court as conclusive. Insurance is not commerce, and this question should not be referred to the Commerce Committee. Should it be referred to the Ways and Means Committee? That is another question. It seems to me that before we decide that question we ought to have the opinion of the Committee on the Judiciary as to whether or not regulation by means of the taxing power is proper, or whether it is analogous from a legal point of view to the taxing of oleomargarine, mixed flour, and all these other subjects that have been reached in that way, or whether it would be practicable and lawful within the power of Congress to exercise control by means of our control over post-offices and post-roads under the Constitution or by means of any other authority that the Federal Government may possess.

When we have learned the opinion of these eminent gentlemen who compose that committee, I believe that we will be aided in a proper solution of this problem. I know it is claimed that we are most of us lawyers and can investigate for ourselves, but we have not all the time to determine this question and give to it such thought and attention as ought to be devoted to it. I believe that the Committee on Judiciary have the time and that they will render us valuable service in the solution of this question. As I have said, I am willing there should be Federal control over insurance, provided it will not destroy State supervision and control. Federal control or regulation under the commerce clause would be exclusive and would destroy all State authority over the subject, but Federal regulation by means of the taxing power would not. The two could work in harmony and supplement each other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota three minutes more.

Mr. STEENERSON. Now, it is claimed in the message that the inability of the State to regulate effectively insurance companies of other States doing business in such State is clear. I deny it. Experience has proven the contrary. The power over foreign has been just as effective as the power over domestic corporations.

In the power to exclude a foreign corporation from doing business within its limits a State possesses a most effective means of regulation. If the corporation does not comply with State requirements, it is excluded and can do no business therein. It would seem to me to be a reflection upon the people of the different States to say that with such absolutely effective weapon in their hands they can not control these matters better than can be done for them by a bureau here in Washington. Anyone familiar with the peculiar form of bureaucracy we have here will not be inspired by any great confidence in its superiority to regulate insurance.

No corporation foreign to a State has any absolute or vested right to enter or do business therein.

Its admission to the State is a matter of comity only. Whenever a foreign insurance corporation does not now, in the opinion of the State authorities, treat its customers or policy holders right, or there is a question as to the fairness of its methods or its solvency, it is excluded. Its license is revoked, and the funds deposited to secure existing contracts in the State are retained. In this matter of foreign insurance, the several States are amply able to take care of themselves now, and much better off than if foreign insurance companies could be forced upon them, as they could be were insurance adjudged to be commerce. I believe the people of the several States know what they are about, and the fact that no demand comes from them, but rather from the insurance interests, is significant. If it is desired to have action on the part of Congress on this insurance matter, let us proceed on the theory that what the highest court in the land has decided to be law is the law; let us exercise the taxing power or our power over the postal service with a view to such a control by Federal authority as will supplement and aid, but not destroy, the authority of the several States in the premises.

I hope, therefore, that the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] will prevail, and the whole matter be referred to the Judiciary Committee, with instructions. [Applause.]

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, it was with a great deal of interest, and profit as well, that I, among the new Members of the House of Representatives, have listened to the various arguments which have been presented by the Members before this Committee of the Whole on the question of referring the various phases in the President's message to the different committees to which it should properly go. On yesterday we heard oration, profound, inspiring, and prophetic, upon the injustice, inhumanity, and barbarity perpetrated on the Jews in Russia. These atrocities perpetrated on the Jews appeal to the refinement and the humanitarian sentiments of every human being. No doubt the President of the United States would approve any action taken by the House of Representatives toward authorizing him to express his sympathy with these mistreated human beings. He has already shown his humanitarian sentiments, his profound sympathy between the warring nations of Russia and Japan, and has well shown that he is entitled to the place which is ascribed to the peacemaker, of whom it is said: "Blessed is the peacemaker."

We also listened on yesterday afternoon to quite a dissertation on the wrongs perpetrated in the Naval Academy at Annapolis, in what is known as "hazing." Being from the State of Louisiana, from which State young Meriwether comes, I feel that it is proper at this time for me to state, in the absence at this moment of the other Members from Louisiana, that the Secretary of the Navy has found, upon examination of the facts in that case, that Meriwether was not guilty of hazing, because, under the act of Congress, should he have been guilty of hazing he would have been expelled from the Naval Academy. Neither do we find, upon that examination, as it has been claimed by some Members on the floor, that he was guilty of even assault and battery, much less manslaughter. But the Secretary has found that he was guilty of violating some of the rules and regulations of the academy, and for that reason a penalty has been assessed, apparently light in its form. There are good reasons why no heavier penalty should have been assessed in that particular case. A man may repel force by force, using sufficient force to overcome the attack with which he is opposed, and Meriwether being forced into the encounter which resulted in the unfortunate death of young Branch, simply repelled that force which was thrust upon him and by which he was opposed.

Unfortunate though it be, still it was one of those incidents which might happen in the life of anyone in defending his honor and in standing up for the rights which are given him by nature—the right of self-defense. But, passing from that to the immediate question which is now before the Committee of the Whole, as I understand it, it is whether or not that portion of the President's message which refers to an investigation and supervision of the insurance companies shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or whether it should be referred to some other committee of the House. Now, it may be that being a new Member, and, as was denominated by the leader on this side of the House on the first day of the session, one of the kids, it would be more appropriate that nothing should be said by one of them on this occasion, but we all know that it is the nature of a kid to butt in. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the leader of this side of the House gave an illustration only a few days ago to show why it is best on some occasions that the mouths of Members should not open. But if we are to be consigned to the tomb or denominated likenesses of corpses because we remain silent, I prefer, at least, to open my mouth upon this occasion. It is said that a few years ago, before the manufacturing enterprises had attained the magnitude to which they have now come in the State of Alabama, where there was an abundance of coal and of iron and of limestone with which to flux the metal and an abun-

dance of forests, on one occasion an enterprising man from the North attended a funeral. He was inquisitive to know from what section of the country the beautiful horses came which were drawing the hearse to the grave. He was told the horses came from Kentucky, that the harness came from Cincinnati, that the hearse came from Chicago, that the coffin came from Pittsburg, and that the case in which the metallic casket was contained came from Maine. He was struck with astonishment that with all the facilities for making iron and steel and leather and wooden material none of these materials should come from the State of Alabama. Expressing his astonishment he asked, What is it that the people of Alabama contribute on this occasion? He was answered that they contributed the corpse and the hole in the ground. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that unless we on this side of the House succeed better in agreeing upon the various propositions which have been discussed we may also be called upon to contribute in the future the corpse and the hole in the ground, or we may be in the position that the young lady was placed in when she was not prepared to see the young gentleman who was visiting her. She sent down word by the green servant girl that at present she could not come in; that she was negligee. The servant did not correctly pronounce the expression which she had gotten from her mistress, and I am afraid that if we do not try to agree upon the various propositions that have been presented, when we go back to give an account of our stewardship we will find ourselves as "naked as a jay." [Laughter and applause.]

The President says in his message, under the head of insurance:

> Recent events have emphasized the importance of an early and exhaustive consideration of this subject to see whether it is not possible to furnish better safeguards than the several States have been able to furnish against corruption of the flagrant kind which has been exposed.
>
> I repeat my previous recommendation that the Congress should also consider whether the Federal Government has any power or owes any duty with respect to domestic transactions in insurance of an interstate character. That State supervision has proved inadequate is generally conceded.

Mr. Chairman, in presenting that feature of the question before this committee I wish to say that the President has in his message shown that he possesses the convictions of a Bryan, the firmness of an Andrew Jackson, the popularity which he will obtain through the medium of this instrument as great as that of Witte among the Russian people, and he has shown by his position on the various measures which he has taken in this message to have the patriotism of the Japanese. I say this in spite of the fact that there are many questions upon which we have widely differed from the President, and we believe have had just cause for finding serious fault, but the position which he has taken on these public questions now before the country draws him nearer and nearer to the Democratic heart, and we may well allow the dead past to bury its dead. There are various ways under the Constitution of the United States in which the question of regulating insurance companies may be followed. Any one of them would be adequate, in my humble opinion. None of them violates either the letter or the spirit of the Constitution of the United States. I say this with due deference and with all deference to the learned and able leaders on this side of the House, and by it I do not wish to be understood as taking the position that the Federal authorities should supervene or should take the place of the control which the States now have of the various insurance companies.

As suggested, insurance may be regulated by the levying of taxes. Under that article of the Constitution which provides for establishing uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcy. It may be regulated under that provision which reserves to Congress the right to make laws for the District of Columbia, and if it had not been that the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held that insurance is not commerce it might have been regulated under that clause, but if it should, as expressed by the gentleman who has just preceded me, I would not be willing for it to be regulated through that channel, because of the fact that it would in all probability supersede the supervision which the States now have over insurance. There is no principle of democracy more thoroughly embedded in my nature than that the rights of the various States should be reserved to them and that these rights should remain forever in the States. Under the head of levying taxes, without going into detail, it is perfectly apparent that with twelve billions of insurance policies outstanding it would be proper that a vast amount of that kind should be controlled by some power, that it would be proper that some strong arm intervened between the weak arm of the State and these strong insurance companies. The mind of man can not conceive of an amount so vast, so stupendous as $12,000,000,000, to be controlled in one form and another by these insurance companies, either with or without supervision. The acts of wrong which they have already perpetrated upon widows and orphans and upon those holding insurance policies for the benefit of themselves and their creditors go to show that they can not be left alone to do their own will in their own way. If it should fall under the head of bankruptcy, under which it could properly fall, it could easily be held or a statute could be enacted by which it could be determined that they should submit to the inspection of the proper committee and tribunal or a bureau whenever the facts justified an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not their outstanding obligations exceeded their assets, and construing these twelve billions distributed among the several companies, a billion or a billion and a quarter in any one company of outstanding insurance, whether or not that was a liability which could be counted against them in declaring them to be insolvent in cases where fraud is charged, and the prima facie showing is that fraud has been perpetrated, either in contributing to national campaign funds, in paying outrageous and unreasonable salaries, a hundred thousand dollars and a hundred and fifty thousand dollars, to the presidents of their companies, and other acts which have been shown by the investigation carried on recently in the State of New York and other places. But it is contended that the supervision by the United States of insurance companies would contravene the right inherent in them and reserved to them by the Constitution of the United States.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we see that the Constitution allows us to keep and bear arms; still the various States of the Union are permitted, in the construction of that clause in the Constitution, to regulate the manner in which arms shall be kept and shall be worn, and as to whether citizens shall be allowed to carry them concealed or whether they shall be allowed to carry them of a certain size, etc. We find also that the national Interstate Commerce Commission is vested with the power to discriminate and determine certain things in reference to interstate traffic on the railroads; and still nearly every, if not every, State of this Union has a State commission on the same lines, and their interests, their desires, and their duties do not conflict. The sale of intoxicating liquors is regulated by the United States laws, and still we find in every State in the Union that the traffic in intoxicating liquors is regulated by the State authorities. We find the same in reference to the irrigation of the arid lands in the West. We find the same in reference to levees, particularly on the Mississippi River, which are contributed to by the States as well as by the United States Government, and their supervision does not interfere one with the other. We have also been told this morning upon this floor that some Members are opposed to national quarantine regulations. For one I believe that the strong arm of the National Government ought to come to the aid of the State government in the question of quarantine. The point has been reached in the history of infectious and contagious diseases that all the States are not able to control satisfactorily to the other States the question of quarantine, and while I take the position that each State should still have the right in its own way to control its local matters, in the question of quarantine and in all other questions of the kind as well, there should be a supervisory control, and to a certain extent now there is a supervisory control on the part of the United States Government, and there is no conflict so far as my attention has been called. The people of the South are recently aroused on the question as to whether or not we shall obtain at this session of Congress anything in benefit of our public-road system. We are deeply interested in that question. That might be construed in the same way as interfering with States rights and trespassing upon our domain; but I understand that some bills have been presented and will, no doubt, be pressed by those who are favoring them. They will be reported, I hope, but the regulations are to be so arranged that they will not contravene the rights of the States. All of these questions might as well be eliminated by the States, because of the fact that the United States Government is to supervene in behalf of these various matters, as that will deprive them of the right to exercise their local authority.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that it will not. The wrongs of the insurance company should be remedied. The frauds have been stupendous. The depredation and spoliation and injustice to the people can not longer be tolerated, and, if they are, it is only a question of a short time when the people will be so hampered, so chained, so enslaved, that they can not longer be considered as freemen. We have had an experience of that kind in our own State, where the great lottery company organized there for years and years not only interfered with questions of legislation and hampered but actually controlled for the time being the legislature of the State, until the strong arm of the National Government came in and regulated them to a certain extent by saying that they could not transmit the lottery matter through

the United States mails. That was the regulation, and it stopped this evil practice. Where a fraudulent concern, be it lottery company, insurance company, or any other kind of a company, sought to perpetrate any wrong or frauds or injustice on the people, they could be debarred from using the United States mails, and they could be investigated by proper authorities in this connection. There is another thing which this side of the House stands for, and I believe that there is not a Member on this side, with perhaps a few exceptions, but who is in favor of the railroad rates being regulated by some authority, whether the Interstate Commerce Commission or some other. It makes no difference whether it is to be regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission and whether it be a question of commerce or not, the principle is the same. Why do the Members on this side of the House favor the National Government regulating the question of railroad rates, and at the same time object to the regulating of insurance companies? The question of the right of the State, the inherent right of each State to govern its own internal affairs, is the same in the one case as it is in the other. I believe that the great law committee, the Judiciary, should handle this question. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have taken the authority of saying something with reference to what a new Member has observed after a short stay in the capital. I do believe that the feeling, the inspiration, of patriotism is implanted in the hearts of every Member of this national body. We are here to make the laws for the whole United States. We are here representing the people of this entire Government. We have a great and glorious country, one worthy of all love, all respect, of every emotion of patriotism. The oppressed of all lands and climes find here a harbinger of peace and plenty. Italy's balmy zephyrs kiss our southern skies and Russia's congealing vapors envelop our northern homes in robes of purest white. The prow of ocean's monster directs her course from America's beach and gladdens the hearts of an amazing world with products of her native home. With our network of railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, a home free to each of the adult citizens of our country, with our coffers groaning under the weight of our precious treasure, we defy the world to refute our claim that America is the most propitious land upon which a benignant sun doth shine to-day. We are patriots. We love our country. We have a country worthy of our love. From the most remote antiquity man, whose soul ever stirred with patriotic emotions, has gone forth at his country's call, and has staked his life and his sacred honor in his devotion to her cause. The war songs of every age and nation have awakened the strongest passions and have stirred the deepest emotions of her warriors. In the glorious achievements of those who have suffered in humanity's cause, the bard has awakened the slumbering chord of his noble lyre and called forth the beatific strains which still float upon the tide of time. The grandest monument which can commemorate the deeds of men is that which the patriot erects in the affections of his countrymen. [Applause.]

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, this is undoubtedly one of the most important subjects that has come before Congress for many years. That proposition is conceded on all sides. Why is it important? It is important because the great life-insurance companies of this country have been reaching forth their hands and filching from the pockets of our people all over the land. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] stated the other day, it has become the occupation of thieves and the pastime of scoundrels. It is a question of so much importance that our President has seen fit to call the attention of Congress to it again and again. He called the attention of the Fifty-eighth Congress and called our attention to it in the Fifty-ninth Congress, repeating only and emphasizing his advice to the Fifty-eighth Congress. But it has been said that the President is not a lawyer. That may be true; but he is surrounded by lawyers. He has a Department of Justice, and there there are able, thoroughgoing lawyers who have undoubtedly examined this question and examined it carefully and have advised the President as to its legal status. After this advice has been considered, he sees fit to call the attention of Congress to the subject.

Now, I assume that it is the opinion of the President of the United States and the opinion of the Department of Justice, and that it has been their opinion for some time, that Congress has jurisdiction and power to deal with this subject; otherwise it were folly for the President to repeatedly call our attention to it.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania the other day said that he himself had discussed the constitutionality of the question with an Assistant Attorney-General of the United States and had been assured that in the opinion of that gentleman there was no question but what Congress had power to deal with the subject.

I am aware of the fact that a great many gentlemen believe that Congress has no jurisdiction and power. That opinion is founded entirely upon a few decisions rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States, the first being Paul against Virginia, rendered in 1868, or nearly forty years ago. I submit, gentlemen, that at that time the insurance proposition was not what it is to-day; that in the years that have elapsed since 1868 to the present time insurance has come to be a vastly different proposition from what it was when the opinion in the case of Paul *v.* Virginia was rendered. We did not at that time have any Hydes, McCalls, and McCurdys, and others whose names have now become quite familiar to the American people. The other day I read, and I presume that other gentlemen have done so, that this young man of Equitable fame gave a dinner costing twenty or thirty thousand dollars to Sarah Bernhardt. At the same time perhaps some poor woman and babies may have been dying of starvation in the same precinct where he was giving his dinner. Had he used the money for the purpose of buying them some of the comforts and necessaries of life we might applaud and not complain, but we have a right to complain when he blows in that much money to make a good fellow of himself with Sarah Bernhardt, because it is our money that he is using when he does it.

I was saying that insurance is a different proposition now from what it was some years ago. The Supreme Court of the United States has declared that what is an article of commerce is determinable by the usage of the commercial world. That is held in the case reported in 125 United States, page 465. As stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts the other day, the case of Paul *v.* Virginia was practically overruled in the case of Champion against Ames. The court held there that a lottery ticket, while of only nominal value, was a subject of commerce, and where it has been sent from one State to another that it is the subject of interstate commerce. An insurance policy may not be a lottery ticket; but I assume as a matter of fact that a policy written by any of the solvent insurance companies of this country ought to be of equal value with a lottery ticket, ninety-nine out of every one hundred of which are absolutely worthless, and only blanks. Then a policy of insurance is a thing of value. I submit that it is a commodity, and I submit that it is commerce. The effect of the ruling in Champion *v.* Ames has practically overruled the principle involved in Paul against Virginia, upon which gentlemen claim that insurance is not commerce.

Again, it has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the sending of a telegram is commerce, and that the sending of a telegram from one State into another State is interstate commerce. That was held in the case of the Pensacola Telegraph Company against the Western Union Telegraph Company. Now, then, I desire to give what Justice Field, who, I think, wrote the opinion in the case of Paul *v.* Virginia, has to say concerning the effect of the decision in the case of the Pensacola Telegraph Company against the Western Union Telegraph Company.

> By the decision now rendered Congressional legislation can take this control from the State and even thrust within its borders a corporation from other States in no way responsible to it.

The effect of the opinion in Paul *v.* Virginia was that this could not be done. In the latter case it has been held that it may be done, and one of the able judges who rendered the opinion in Paul *v.* Virginia recognizes the fact.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague permit a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to know what case it is from which you have read the extract?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is from the case of the Pensacola Telegraph Company *v.* The Western Union Telegraph Company, which arose in this way: The Pensacola Telegraph Company was authorized by the State and given an exclusive franchise. The Western Union Telegraph Company entered that State, and the question arose as to whether the Western Union had any authority to enter the State and transact business there when an exclusive franchise had been given to the other company.

Mr. NORRIS. The Western Union being a foreign corporation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; and the Supreme Court of the United States held that the Western Union might do so, and Justice Field used the language which I have just quoted.

It may be true, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] has just said, that the mere statement of this proposition is preposterous; but I do not think so. What is the definition of commerce? It is defined as trade, traffic, and intercourse. Now, when a gentleman from New York goes into Nebraska and

undertakes to sell life insurance or any other kind of insurance, I submit that he is trading with our people. I submit that the business he is engaged in is trade and traffic with our people. I submit that it is intercourse with our people, and if it is not I want to know what it is.

The Iowa court has held that insurance is a commodity. You will find this in 102 Iowa, at page 602, and the Supreme Court of the United States has held that commerce is an exchange of commodities, and an exchange of commodities between citizens of different States is interstate commerce. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that the power to determine what articles may become subjects of commerce is in Congress—that is, that Congress has the power to determine what subjects may become articles of commerce.

Now, I would be as reluctant as any gentleman on the floor of this House to see the Federal Government usurp the functions of a State or the powers of a State, or venture upon the domain of States rights. I can not agree with the gentleman that the nearer the Government is to us the purer and more perfect that Government is. I believe that there are subjects that the Federal Government can deal with more effectively than State governments can deal with them, and I believe that this is one of the subjects. At any rate it must be conceded, notwithstanding what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] has said concerning the wise and beneficent laws of his State, that the State governments have made a most dismal failure in their attempt to regulate and control insurance corporations. Why do I believe that? Because, notwithstanding the laws which we find on the different State statute books, some of which have been there for many years, all of the evils, all of the wrongs, and all of the abuses that our people complain of have developed while those laws have been in existence. Some of the best, wisest, and strongest of the insurance commissioners from those States where they have the best laws, have admitted that State control has proved an absolute failure, and they are the ones who have recommended that Federal legislation be enacted upon this subjcet.

The Supreme Court has held that the courts can not hold that any article which Congress recognizes as the subject of interstate commerce is not such, and I have no doubt that should Congress enact a law declaring insurance to be commerce, and transactions between citizens of different States to be interstate commerce, the Supreme Court would sustain that law.

Now, perhaps nothing is pertinent at this time unless it is confined strictly to the pending motion, and I submit that this part of the President's message should be referred to a committee that is willing to act upon it and not to a committee that has already prejudged the case, that has already decided that, notwithstanding the suggestions of the President, this body has no jurisdiction and no power to act.

I submit that it is proper to refer this subject to the Interstate Commerce Committee. That is the committee that ought to consider the question, in my opinion. There is a committee of fair-minded gentlemen, of able gentlemen, many of whom are lawyers, and an opportunity will undoubtedly be given to every member of the Judiciary Committee, and to every lawyer who is a Member of this House, to appear before that committee and submit any statement of fact or legal conclusions desired. And there is no question but what the subject will be carefully, thoroughly, and learnedly considered by that committee. I do not believe that a tax upon these insurance companies will afford adequate relief. In my opinion all that the companies will do is simply to pay the tax and add that much to the premiums which they require their policy holders to pay. It is the man way down at the bottom who, in the last analysis, pays the taxes in every instance.

I might cite instances where the Federal Government has dealt more thoroughly with problems than have the local governments. If it be true that the nearer the government to the people the purer and wiser and better the government, how is it that the rottenest specimens of government that we can find or ever heard tell of are found right at home, in our own municipalities where we live? No other form of government is to be compared with them for corruption. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOOD of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the greatest question before the American public to-day is, in my opinion, that in reference to the regulation of interstate railroad and interstate terminal rates. The President of the United States very wisely gave this subject a very prominent place in his message, and in that document, while calling the attention of Congress to the railroad-rate question, did not fail to call attention to the necessity of Federal legislation in reference to interstate terminal evils. [Applause.]

The city of St. Louis is to-day recognized as the greatest railroad center in the world from the standpoint of mileage. There is a greater railroad mileage centering at St. Louis than there is at any other city in the world. More than twenty great railroads pass through St. Louis. In fact, there is scarcely a transcontinental line but touches St. Louis; and yet, notwithstanding that fact, St. Louis, in one sense the greatest railroad center in the world, is nevertheless not on the railroad map. Some of the gentlemen present would probably not understand what I mean when I say that St. Louis is not on the railroad map. But when I tell you that if you will go to the depot here at Washington and try to ship a barrel of flour to St. Louis you can not do it, but, on the contrary, you would be compelled to ship it to East St. Louis, Ill., and from East St. Louis reship it to St. Louis, and pay a charge for the second shipment at an abnormally high rate, you will understand partially what I mean. But to this I shall refer again later on.

All of the railroads of which I speak must cross the Mississippi River somewhere in the vicinity of St. Louis. Some years back there was constructed between the cities of East St. Louis, Ill., and St. Louis, Mo., across the Father of Waters, that magnificent structure known as Eads Bridge. The Eads Bridge was controlled by a holding company, and the rates were considered to be arbitrary. To prevent this evil another bridge was constructed, called the Merchants' Bridge. In the charter granting the privilege of constructing this second bridge across the Mississippi River, Congress especially specified that there would be no combination between it and the first bridge or between the Eads Bridge and the Merchants' Bridge; and, further, especially provided that in the event that there was any such combination that the charter should be forfeited.

Notwithstanding these wise provisions in the charter, not many years rolled around before a holding company was formed, and this holding company acquired the control of the Eads Bridge and also of the Merchants' Bridge; and, not satisfied with this, acquired also the control of the bridge at Alton, some 30 miles up the river, and, still not satisfied, this holding company secured also the control of all the interstate terminals on either bank of the river, and eventually acquired control of all the ferries plying across the river for many miles along its shores. To show you the extent to which this holding company went in order to acquire a complete monopoly of all accesses to St. Louis, I tell you that in purchasing the control of the ferries across the river it paid as high as from fifteen hundred to sixteen hundred dollars per share for stock which had never been valued at more than from two to three hundred dollars per share.

Thus it has developed that an immense combination of corporate interests, known as a holding company, has the absolute control of all the bridges, of all the ferries, and of all the interstate terminal facilities for miles up and down the Mississippi River, and in this way controls every avenue of trade leading into the city of St. Louis; and, worse than that, controls the avenues of trade leading from the East to the West. This combination of corporate interests is the master of a gateway at the center of the nation, and, in its absolute dictatorship of this gateway at the crossing of the roads of national commerce, restrains the interstate trade from the East to the West, injuring at the same time the manufacturing industries of New York and New Haven and the shipper of wheat, corn, and cattle in the West and Southwest.

This immense corporation is not composed, as a general thing, of St. Louis citizens, but is rather composed, controlled, and dominated by men who live in New York and Philadelphia, in England and in France.

Fourteen great railroad corporations have combined to form this gigantic trust. Fourteen great railroads have joined to form this holding company, and so complete is the monopoly that they have acquired and so vast are the revenues that they are enabled to exact from the commerce of the nation that the proceeds derived are almost sufficient to satisfy, even when divided by fourteen, these great railroads; is almost sufficient to meet the demands of the multimillionaires living in New York, London, and Paris.

No greater conspiracy against trade and commerce can be discovered in the history of the past. Never before did a combination of corporate interests so completely obtain a controlling hold upon commerce and trade as has this holding company obtained upon the commerce which crosses the center of our nation. This holding company, conscienceless, remorseless, merciless, has demanded its pound of flesh from the manufacturer, the merchant, and the tiller of the soil with like impunity.

Not satisfied with these so-called "legitimate victims," and forgetting the old adage of "honor among thieves," this combination of fourteen great railroads has, in years past, and is

to-day, squeezing and harassing all the other railroads that have the audacity to attempt to compete with them in the trade of the Southwest. A few years back the Rock Island Railroad Company, an independent line, a line not having a finger in the terminal pie, a line not recognized as one of the fourteen conspirators, attempted to purchase its own terminals, and to this end attempted to buy the Wiggins Ferry, with its terminals leading into St. Louis, so that it might have free access into the city and be relieved thereby of paying tribute to this terminal company. But the great Rock Island Company—great and powerful and controlled by wealthy and ingenious financiers as it was—did not realize the task that it was undertaking. In order to checkmate the purpose of the Rock Island system, this terminal association trust paid five times the value of the Wiggins Ferry system to prevent its falling into the hands of the Rock Island company. The result was that the Rock Island failed in its attempt to gain a free access into the city of St. Louis, and was compelled to bend the knee and to contribute also its mite to the already overflowing coffers of this terminal trust. Even great railroad systems are powerless to contend against so giant an aggregation of capitalization, which is not composed of millions nor of tens of millions, but the capitalization of this great terminal railroad combination is expressed in nine figures. It is a matter of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Having thus acquired a complete monopoly of all the avenues of trade leading into St. Louis and from there to the great southwestern territory, this combination of parallel competing lines, which could only exist by virtue of violations of the Sherman antitrust law, began at once to violate the interstate-commerce laws by fixing and collecting arbitrary rates on all freight and passenger traffic entering St. Louis or billed to the Southwest. It is impossible for man, woman, or child to enter St. Louis from the east or to leave St. Louis going toward the east without paying a poll tax to this trust, for they charge so much a head for man, woman, and child entering or leaving St. Louis, just as they charge so much a head for horses, cattle, and swine that are shipped across the river from the great cattle fields of the Southwest. But this is by far the least of the injuries. It is impossible to ship a pound of butter, a dozen of eggs, or a carload of coal into the city of St. Louis without paying, forsooth, an abnormal terminal tax. Worse than this, you can not ship these goods into St. Louis at all except at the will of this terminal trust, which has chosen the fair city of St. Louis as its special prey and the great Southwest as its own domain.

I have some figures here. It costs just 4 cents per ton to bring coal 60 miles to East St. Louis from points in Illinois, and then it must be reshipped across the river to St. Louis at a cost of 30 cents per ton. Think of that! It costs more than seven times as much to ship a ton of coal 2 or 3 miles across the Mississippi River than it does to ship it 60 miles across the country from a point in Illinois. From the coal fields of the State of Illinois last year 6,000,000 tons of soft coal were shipped across the river, and the price paid for that one item for that one State, going one way at 30 cents per ton, was $1,800,000. If the tax thus levied at this price on this one item of soft coal from one State in one year is $1,800,000, what, then, must the tax have been on all the various products that go across that river? What must it have been when the sum total of all the taxes levied upon all the passengers that go across the river is also computed?

You will be astonished when I tell you that if you buy a ticket from here to California on any of the railroads that are not in the trust you will be charged, without knowing it yourself, but you will be charged, nevertheless, or the railroad from whom you buy the ticket will be charged, 25 cents for your passage across the river, and if you go via one of the railroad companies that are in the trust you will be charged just 5 cents. And, gentlemen, the total amount of real property involved in these terminals and bridges is not very great, comparatively, while the tax levied on the people by this terminal trust is vastly greater than the total valuation of all the property that they own.

The voice that you now hear is not that of one crying in the wilderness, but is rather the echo of a complaint that has been loud, long, and lasting, and comes to you from the business men and the manufacturing industries of St. Louis and the Southwest. Not alone for myself do I speak. I am speaking for the thirty associations of business men organized in St. Louis. These associations have petitioned for redress from the crimes against interstate commerce committed by this holding trust. I am speaking for thirty business associations, whose membership comprises several thousand of the best business citizens of St. Louis, who ask that Congress, by the power granted to it by the Constitution and by its inherent power to correct a wrong to interstate commerce and trade, step in and with a controlling hand remedy the evil that has been done. [Applause.]

Do you ask why the business men of St. Louis and the Southwest are complaining against this great injury? If you lived in St. Louis you would not need to be told the reason why. If you lived in St. Louis you would find that it would be impossible for you to leave the city toward the East without paying tribute. If you lived in St. Louis you would understand that the growth of the city, the growth of the commerce of the Southwest, is being restrained by this combination of corporate interests and that an unlawful tax was being imposed upon one and all alike.

Nor is the question a local one. The coal shipper of West Virginia, the merchant who ships out the boots and shoes of New England, the manufacturers of Chicago who trade with the Southwest are alike taxed and hampered by this company, for all the products and industries of the nation that pass through the avenues of trade in the vicinity of St. Louis are subject to a tax imposed by this terminal trust.

Having an absolute arbitrary, the charges are, in many instances, extortionate. And who, you ask, fixes these charges? Are they passed upon by the Interstate Commerce Commission? No. Are they examined by the railroad authorities of the State of Missouri or of the State of Illinois? No; there is no power in such authorities to regulate this combination, this question of interstate commerce. It is a national question. The sovereign people of the various States can fix the railroad charges within their State lines, but they can not govern the rates to be charged across this river between two sovereign States. And so, as years have passed, as the power of this company grew, as it discovered that its position was arbitrary, the rates that were charged upon the commerce, trade, and travel were fixed by people living on the Hudson, or the Thames, who were guided only by that maxim "all the traffic will stand."

And who pays this tax ultimately? It must come sooner or later from the consumer. It must come from the cattle raiser of the Southwest, from the man who goes early in the morning to sow the corn and wheat on our Western farms, and who, after months of toil, in the golden dusk of evening, gathers in the harvest as a contribution to this terminal combine. The uncrowned (so-called) American king, the farmer, the cattle raiser, the small producer, ultimately pay for all this, and in so doing pay into the coffers of this great holding trust all of these illegal charges, from whence it is divided among these fourteen railroads and in turn distributed to the men who live in princely villas.

This absolute trust, unfortunately holds the key to every access to the city of St. Louis, and without its assent neither person nor freight can enter. There is but one "open sesame" to the metropolis of the Southwest, and that is the will of this corporate combination.

And now, I wish to get to another and still more astonishing evil that arises from this violation of the Sherman Anti-trust Act, and from this violation of the expressed law of the nation in reference to interstate commerce. It is this: This holding company, this company that controls every avenue of trade or travel into the city of St. Louis, and from whose jurisdiction there is no escape, this company to whom all must bend the knee, is in a position to favor certain shippers and disfavor others. You have heard on the floor of this House during the last few days statements showing how, by means of private car companies, by means of rebates, and by other devices, certain shippers are favored by railroads, but with all the astonishing statements that you have heard, there is none that shows the flagrant outrages and direct violations of law that are put in force by this holding trust. There are several ways in which it can be done. There are one or two ways in which it is done.

As I have already stated, freight is not shipped directly to St. Louis, but is shipped to East St. Louis, Ill. It so happens that there is a great congestion at the terminals on the Illinois side. Freight arrives from the East at East St. Louis and is there stopped. Now, if you are so fortunate as to be a favored shipper of this company, if you are on their list as a favored patron, your freight is speedily sent across the river, but if you are not a favored shipper your freight will probably be sidetracked, and, although you will be astonished to hear my words, weeks and sometimes months pass before you would get your freight at all, and the excuse that would be given would be the congested conditions that exist.

Gentlemen, think of a modern city with a Chinese wall built around it! Think of a modern city having a tollgate at its portals! Think of the metropolis of the Louisiana purchase

locked behind a gate with the key in the hands of a soulless trust!

In ancient times, in the days of classic Greece and Rome, men built walls about their cities for protection, to keep out invading hordes of robbers and thieves, to keep out invading armies, if you like, but by the strange caprice of modern commerce in the days when men have departed from chivalry and have bent their time and energies in the pursuit of avaricious conquest, we find here a modern city, more splendid than any that graced the plains of Greece, with a modern wall built around it for a far different purpose. A wall without form, invisible, but from the mere fact of its invisibleness, more difficult to pull down, and existing there not for the protection of the citizens, nor to keep out an invading army, but placed there to keep out the traveling public and the products of the manufacturers until a tax is paid. In ancient times there were no such walls as this. The ancients welcomed the commerce that came to their cities, and opened up the gates of their cities to the booty that their conquering armies had brought; but here is a modern city which is shut out and restrained from legitimate and free commercial intercourse.

Last Wednesday I introduced in this House a resolution providing for a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, especially appointed to investigate these conditions. In introducing this resolution I did not act on my own initiative alone. In doing so, I was a mere agent of some seven hundred thousand people of the city of St. Louis. I believe in doing so that I was also the agent of the manufacturers of the East and of the West and of the traveling public. I am, I know, the direct agent of 23 leading business organizations of St. Louis, for 23 of the leading business associations of St. Louis have united in requesting that action be taken in this matter, and at their request I introduced the resolution. They are to-day appealing to Congress and at this moment I have the honor to be their mouthpiece. [Applause.]

The citizens and business associations of St. Louis have come to you with this appeal. They are telling you that the growth of the fair city of St. Louis is unlawfully restrained by this combination of corporate interests which has grasped the very life of the city. They are telling you that manufacturers are leaving the city on account of the poor shipping facilities and on account of the arbitrary charges imposed by this trust on all freight that they may receive or send out. They are telling you that the great city of St. Louis, located as it is on the Father of Waters, near the juncture of the Missouri, the Illinois, and the Ohio rivers, is destined by nature to be the great gem of the interior of the American continent. Situated as it is at the very crossing of the highways of our nation, it is the gateway and emporium of the fertile Southwest, which is the great and future coming country. Having tributary to its commerce fields with all kinds of grain, quarries with all kinds of stone, mines with all kinds of minerals, and forests with all kinds of timber, St. Louis is destined by its situation to be the great central city of our nation.

That the progress of this city should be restrained by a master more tyrannical than any of which we read in fabled story is a travesty on the modern laws of commerce. Its citizens will always protest against the blighting of its destined career by this terminal monopoly, whose greed is measured and equaled only by the richness of the country it holds tributary.

Let us hope that there is not one law for the poor and another for the rich; let us hope that the law of our land will not send to jail a poor tramp who steals a ride on one of the cars owned by a trust, while at the same time it honors and commends the officials of the same trust who have stolen the wealth of a city. [Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the resolution that I introduced last Wednesday is as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 46) providing for the creation of a joint committee to investigate the combination of corporate interests controlling the bridges across the Mississippi River in the vicinity of the city of St. Louis, in restraint of free interstate traffic and trade.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a committee of nine members, to consist of four Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to be known as a special committee of the Fifty-ninth Congress for the investigation of the combination of corporate interests controlling the bridges, ferries, and terminal facilities across the Mississippi River between the States of Illinois and Missouri in the vicinity of the city of St. Louis in violation of free interstate traffic and trade, be, and the same is hereby, created.

It shall be the duty of said committee to investigate and inquire into the complaints made by the citizens and business associations of the States of Missouri and Illinois against the Terminal Railroad Association, of St. Louis, in the following particulars:

First. The complaint made by the citizens and business associations of the States of Missouri and Illinois that said Terminal Railroad Association, of St. Louis, is a combination of corporate interests controlling all the bridges and ferries across the Mississippi River in the vicinity of St. Louis between the States of Missouri and Illinois and all interstate terminal facilities on either bank of said Mississippi River in violation of the express law of the nation in reference to trusts and combinations of corporate interests.

Second. The complaint made by the citizens of the said States that the said combination of corporate interests controlling all the avenues of commerce across the said Mississippi River is charging arbitrary rates on all freight and passenger traffic across the said river in violation of the law of the nation in reference to interstate commerce and trade and in restraint of free interstate traffic.

In performance of its said duties the said committee shall have power to sit during the term of the Fifty-ninth Congress, to compel the attendance of witnesses, and the production of books and papers, and to do and perform all things necessary to accomplish the fulfillment of its said duties.

The said committee shall report its findings in writing to the Senate and House of Representatives and to the Attorney-General of the United States.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WOOD of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask if the business associations of St. Louis have appealed to the Interstate Commerce Commission for relief; and if so, what was the result?

Mr. WOOD of Missouri. In answer to the gentleman's question I will state that they have appealed in all directions. Not very many days ago there came to Washington a petition signed by many thousands of the business people of St. Louis, in which they appealed to the President of the United States. And one of the requests I received from St. Louis was to introduce a resolution in this House, which I would be glad to do, commending and thanking and approving the course of President Roosevelt, who, I believe, is a citizen who fears none and who does recognize equal rights to all; because President Roosevelt not more than thirty days ago took up this matter and instructed the Attorney-General of the United States to commence suit at St. Louis to disrupt this trust. That suit is about to be commenced, I believe. What its end will be I know not; but I will state that we have made in the past other attempts. The business men of St. Louis are to-day circulating and agitating the question of building a free bridge across this river. In years past, for more than a decade, the business men of St. Louis have appealed in every direction, but it seems that their efforts have been futile. They have appealed to the Interstate Commerce Commission and in every other direction, and at times success seemed to be within their reach; but in every event the final victory, the final result was that the grip of this trust was fastened more firmly upon the city, because it attained the final verdict. So to-day the people of St. Louis are reaching down into their own pockets and propose to build a free bridge, costing several millions of dollars, across that river and open the bridge to all the people of the world, so that they may go across without charge; so that the commerce of the Southwest may go without tax to the Northeast; so that the disgrace of having a tollgate at the center of our nation may be removed. I say that the question is being agitated, and I believe that we will have our free bridge; but I will say this: The people of the city of St. Louis ought not to be compelled to reach down into their pockets and raise millions of dollars to build this bridge, and thereby recognize that the laws of this nation can not be upheld, and thereby recognize that a trust, however great it may be, is greater than the law. The law should be enforced, free bridge or no free bridge. [Applause.]

I tell you that in St. Louis hardly a night goes by but there is a meeting held discussing this question. All through the city public meetings have been held, and within the next few months the question of bonds or no bonds for the building of this bridge will be submitted to the people. In this fight the municipality has to contend with a combination of corporate interests that has hundreds of millions at its disposal and usually has its way in politics. In speaking these words I am probably sounding my own political knell; but as to this I care not. Though it might mean my own political ruin, I still would say that some action ought to be taken in this matter by this body in behalf of the people of St. Louis. This combination of corporate interests and all other industries should be told by the firm voice of the law that in America all must bend the knee to but one sovereign power, and that is the will of the people as expressed by the law of the land. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Chairman, the discussion that has taken place on the resolution now before the committee has certainly taken a very wide range. The whole subject of insurance and the proper regulation of the great corporations engaged in that business have been most thoroughly and completely covered by the debates which have already taken place on this floor. It is not my purpose, Mr. Chairman, at this time to enter upon an elaborate discussion of the insurance question. As introductory to what I desire to say upon another subject, I simply wish to

call the attention of the committee to the divergent views that have been expressed in regard to the regulation of insurance companies.

We heard the other day a very clear and logical discussion of the question by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], who argued in favor of a more strict regulation of the companies by State authority, and whose arguments finally developed into a complete discussion of the relative growth of the powers of the national and of the State governments. We listened with a great deal of pleasure to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], and if at times he overlooked some established facts, we readily forgave him, because we all fully realize that an orator can not at all times be hampered by such commonplace things as facts, but must, like a poet, be permitted on occasions to give his imagination full swing. [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman seriously urged upon the floor of this House that Congress ought to consider whether it should not exercise the power given to it by the Constitution to guarantee a republican form of government to the different States, and that in the exercise of that power, because of the growth of these insurance companies, the Congress of the United States ought to go before the world to-day with an investigation to determine whether or not the growth of these great business institutions did not threaten the very life of the Republic, as a remedy for all the evils and the abuses that we all deplore and condemn and which have been brought to the attention of the American people in a startling manner by the investigation now taking place in New York. He proposed that the insurance companies should be limited in the transaction of their business to the States where they had been incorporated. We listened yesterday to a most entertaining and in some respects very persuasive argument by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS] in favor of a measure which he has introduced in this Congress to gain control of these corporations by regulating the transaction of their business in the District of Columbia, the Territories, and in our insular possessions. It has also been mooted in the debate that we should exercise our undoubted power of taxation either for the purpose of obtaining revenue by taxing insurance companies or using the taxing power for the indirect purpose of controlling them in the transaction of their business. It has also been proposed in this debate that we should use the control of the mails and the post-office facilities of this country for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance companies. There may have been some other propositions advanced upon this floor that I did not happen to hear, but I have at least mentioned enough to satisfy any careful man that sentiment certainly has not up to this time crystallized in favor of any given proposition.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps it would be the part of wise statesmanship to digest the information now being gathered before entering upon the field of constructive legislation for the regulation of these companies. It is not, however, my purpose, as I stated in my opening remarks, to determine which path Congress ought to pursue. It is not our duty or our province at this particular time to legislate upon this question. The sole question now before this committee is the proper reference of that portion of the President's message relating to the insurance problem.

For myself, I shall vote in favor of referring that portion of the President's message to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. In doing so I do not feel that I am committed to the proposition that insurance is commerce, and neither do I feel that the House of Representatives, should it take that action upon that part of the message, is committed to that proposition. I am largely influenced in the conclusion I have reached upon that question by the language of the message itself. The President refers to the insurance problem in connection with interstate commerce. It is his message that we are now discussing, and trying to determine to which of the standing committees of the House it should be referred.

I certainly shall not vote in favor of referring that portion of the message to the Committee on Ways and Means. There is not a suggestion in the message of the President concerning the raising of revenue by taxing insurance companies, or any suggestion that we can control or regulate the business of the insurance companies by exercising our undoubted power of taxation. Neither do I think that this is the appropriate time to refer that portion of the message to the Committee on the Judiciary. It may be that before this Congress adjourns, if any of the standing committees of the House should report a bill upon the insurance question, that this House may desire the opinion of the Judiciary Committee upon the constitutional questions involved. It will be then, and only then, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it will be proper to refer this portion of the message to the Judiciary Committee.

But, as I said, Mr. Chairman, it was not for the purpose of discussing the insurance question that I have claimed the privileges of the floor at this time. The discussion by this committee has covered pretty nearly every subject referred to in the message of the President. I realize that the insurance question is a very important one, and one which I trust will receive the careful and statesmanlike consideration of this House.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is one question referred to in the President's message which, to my mind, is far more important than the insurance problem. It is the most important question, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that could engage the attention of the Congress. It is most important, sir, because it lies at the very foundation of the proper solution of all other questions. The tribunal to which all questions, under our form of government, must in the end be submitted is the American electorate. Unless that electorate, in the exercise of the elective franchise, shall be protected from fraud and corruption—the most insidious foes in all history to republican forms of government—we can not hope for a proper solution of any of the great problems that agitate the American people.

The President of the United States, in his message to the Fifty-ninth Congress, as in his message to the last session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, referred to this question. He makes two distinct recommendations in his message to the present Congress, one in reference to the control of Federal elections, and the other regarding contributions by corporations to political parties when Federal officers are to be voted for. In the message as it comes to us we find on page 20 the following recommendation:

> In my last annual message I said:
> "The power of the Government to protect the integrity of the elections of its own officials is inherent and has been recognized and affirmed by repeated declarations of the Supreme Court. There is no enemy of free government more dangerous and none so insidious as the corruption of the electorate. No one defends or excuses corruption, and it would seem to follow that none would oppose vigorous measures to eradicate it. I recommend the enactment of a law directed against bribery and corruption in Federal elections. The details of such a law may be safely left to the wise discretion of the Congress, but it should go as far as under the Constitution it is possible to go, and should include severe penalties against him who gives or receives a bribe intended to influence his act or opinion as an elector; and provisions for the publication not only of the expenditures for nominations and elections of all candidates, but also of all contributions received and expenditures made by political committees."
> I desire to repeat this recommendation—

says the President.

Mr. Chairman, while we have been discussing the question whether we could extend the power of the Federal Government under the interstate-commerce clause or some other clause of the Constitution to control the business of insurance, here is a power delegated to us by the Constitution of the United States, and which we have absolutely at the persent time, but have failed to exercise. There can be no question of the right of Congress in the election of its own officers to provide what wrongs shall constitute a crime against the National Government, and to provide for the punishment of those guilty of those wrongs in the courts of the United States. It is an anomalous condition, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this great Government has not upon its statute books a statute making an offense out of wrongs committed at elections by those guilty of fraud in the election of its own officers.

I know that some gentlemen will say that the various States have laws governing these matters, and that the States can be depended upon to take care of that proposition. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it does not comport with the dignity of the National Government that it should be dependent upon any other sovereignty for the protection of its own honor and its own integrity. By the Constitution of the United States, by section 4, Article I, of the Constitution, we are given this power in express terms.

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may, at any time, by law make or alter such regulations except as to the places of choosing Senators.

It is not my purpose to enter into the details of such a law as I think should be passed under this power. I introduced at the last session, and have reintroduced at this session, a bill which does show what I believe should be the character of legislation enacted by Congress. I would not have the Federal Government take any supervision or control over elections. I would, in short, simply provide that bribery or any form of corruption at the election of Representatives or Presidential electors should constitute a crime against the Federal Government, and that these crimes should be prosecuted and punished through the Federal courts and by the Federal officers.

It is no longer an open question as to whether we have the right to pass and enact such laws. The Supreme Court of the United States has spoken in no uncertain terms upon this propo-

sition. In the case known as Ex parte Siebold (100 U. S., 387), the Supreme Court uses the following language:

It is objected that Congress has no power to enforce State laws or to punish State officers, and especially has no power to punish them for violating the laws of their own State. As a general proposition this is undoubtedly true; but when, in the performance of their functions, State officers are called upon to fulfill duties which they owe to the United States as well as to the State, has the former no means of compelling such fulfillment? Yet that is the case here. It is the duty of the States to elect Representatives to Congress. The due and fair elections of these Representatives is of vital importance to the United States. The Government of the United States is no less concerned in the transaction than the State government is. It certainly is not bound to stand by as a passive spectator when duties are violated and outrageous frauds are committed. It is directly interested in the faithful performance by the officers of election of their respective duties. Those duties are owed as well to the United States as to the State. This necessarily follows from the mixed character of the transaction—State and national. A violation of duty is an offense against the United States for which the offender is justly amenable to that Government. No official position can shelter him from this responsibility. In view of the fact that Congress has plenary and paramount jurisdiction over the whole subject, it seems almost absurd to say that an officer who receives or has custody of the ballots given for a Representative owes no duty to the National Government which Congress can enforce, or that an officer who stuffs the ballot box can not be made amenable to the United States. If Congress has not, prior to the passage of the present laws, imposed any penalties to prevent and punish frauds and violations of duty committed by officers of election, it has been because the exigency has not been deemed sufficient to require it and not because Congress had not the requisite power.

The court also says in this same case:

The true doctrine, as we conceive, is this, that whilst the States are really sovereign as to all matters which have not been granted to the jurisdiction and control of the United States, the Constitution and constitutional laws of the latter are, as we have already said, the supreme law of the land, and when they conflict with the laws of the State they are of paramount authority and obligation. This is the fundamental principle on which the authority of the Constitution is based, and unless it be conceded in practice as well as theory, the fabric of our institutions, as it was contemplated by its founders, can not stand. The questions involved have respect not more to the autonomy and existence of the States than to the continued existence of the United States as a Government to which every American citizen can look for security and protection in every part of the land.

We think that the cause of commitment in these cases was lawful, and that the application for the writ of habeas corpus must be denied.

That case, Mr. Chairman, went before the Supreme Court at a time when we did have some statutes upon the Federal statute books regulating what offenses at elections of Federal officers constituted a crime against the National Government. In the repeal of the force bill, apparently without proper consideration, not only were all the provisions of that bill which gave to the National Government power to supervise and control elections repealed, but also those other provisions which did not partake in the slightest degree of force were wiped out at the same time. So at the present time there are no statutes upon the national statute book regulating what constitutes crime against the National Government in the election of its own officers.

It requires no argument, Mr. Chairman, to demonstrate the necessity for legislation of this kind. At every session of Congress we are called upon to pass upon half a dozen, and sometimes many more, election contests. These contests frequently arouse very bitter partisan feeling; and yet, after we are through with the contest, after we have determined by the contest that Mr. A. or Mr. B. is entitled to his seat in this body, the National Government, whose honor and whose integrity has been violated by the commission of the crime, has no power whatever to reach out its strong arm and bring those who have been guilty of that wrong and that crime against the National Government to the courts of this Government for punishment. The necessity for legislation of this character is made apparent from the records of Congress. The power to legislate upon the question is given to us by the Constitution as it has been construed by the Supreme Court. I have referred to one case, and I shall refer only to one other, and shall read only a paragraph or two from that decision. In the case of Ex parte Yarbrough (110 U. S., 651) the Supreme Court again said:

That a government whose essential character is republican, whose executive head and legislative body are both elective, whose most numerous and powerful branch of the legislature is elected by the people directly, has no power by appropriate laws to secure their election from the influence of violence, of corruption, and of fraud, is a proposition so startling as to arrest attention and demand the gravest consideration.

If this Government is anything more than a mere aggregation of delegated agents of other States and governments, each of which is superior to the General Government, it must have the power to protect the elections on which its existence depends from violence and corruption.

If it has not this power it is left helpless before the two great natural and historical enemies of all republics, open violence and insidious corruption.

* * * * * * *

Will it be denied that it is in the power of that body to provide laws for the proper conduct of those elections? To provide, if necessary, the officers who shall conduct them and make return of the result? And especially to provide, in an election held under its own authority, for security of life and limb to the voter while in the exercise of this function? Can it be doubted that Congress can by law protect the act of voting, the place where it is done, and the man who votes from personal violence or intimidation and the election itself from corruption and fraud?

* * * * * * *

It is as essential to the successful working of this Government that the great organism of its executive and legislative branches should be the free choice of the people as that the original form of it should be so. In absolute governments, where the monarch is the source of all power, it is still held to be important that the exercise of that power shall be free from the influence of extraneous violence and internal corruption.

In a republican government like ours, where political power is reposed in representatives of the entire body of the people chosen at short intervals by popular elections, the temptations to control these elections by violence and by corruption is a constant source of danger.

Such has been the history of all republics, and, though ours has been comparatively free from both these evils in the past, no lover of his country can shut his eyes to the fear of future danger from both sources.

If the recurrence of such acts as these prisoners stand convicted of are too common in one quarter of the country and give omen of danger from lawful violence, the free use of money in elections, arising from the vast growth of recent wealth in other quarters, presents equal cause for anxiety.

The note of warning has been sounded not only by the executive branch of the Government, but also by the judicial department. The attention of Congress has now twice in twelve months been called to the condition by the Chief Magistrate of the nation. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Fifty-ninth Congress will not, as did the Fifty-eighth Congress, pass into history without placing upon the statute book of the Federal Government legislation which will be competent to prevent the repetition of these crimes at the election of its own officers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have succeeded in any degree whatever, by what I have said upon this floor, in calling attention to the importance of this question and to the power that is vested in us by the Constitution, I have accomplished all that induced me to claim the attention of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, although so much of the President's message as refers to insurance has been discussed until the subject is almost threadbare, and it is somewhat embarrassing to speak upon it at this stage of the proceedings, the discussion has not been in vain. It has served the purpose of showing the contempt and the disgust that all honest men feel toward the disclosures of high officials touching their management of insurance companies. It shows that the American people are still honest at heart and that the magnitude and the enormity of the crimes have not blinded them to virtue. So much of the message as refers to insurance, in my judgment, should go to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report back whether or not Congress has constitutional warrant to legislate upon this subject. In my own view we have no such authority. Personally, no matter what the committee may report as to the constitutional power of the House, I would not be willing to vote for any measure that would take the right away from the States to control these corporations. It is clear, Mr. Chairman, that if you take the power from the States and lodge it in the Federal Government the people will be in worse plight than they are now. This jurisdiction can not be concurrent. It will be exclusive in one government or in the other. As was so admirably suggested yesterday by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS], it is proper for Congress to legislate and to provide for the regulation of insurance in the District of Columbia, and I hope when we have such legislation it will be so wise and so beneficent as to prove a model for every State legislature in the American Union; but, sir, I believe there is sufficient wisdom, sufficient virtue, and sufficient honesty in every State to protect the people against further spoliation.

The legislatures have absolute and supreme power over this question. They can prescribe such conditions and such limitations as they see fit. I desire to call attention to a significant fact. The agitation in favor of the Federal Government assuming control of insurance companies was begun by the insurance officials themselves. In the testimony before the Armstrong committee one of the high officials of the insurance companies, in testifying, touching the vast expenditures that have been made at Albany and other State capitals, added to his testimony this significant remark: "When we get Federal regulation, this difficulty will be obviated." The insurance officials who have clamored for Federal control are the men who do not want any control at all. They want to get out from the power and the jurisdiction of the forty-five legislatures of the forty-five sovereign States. They want a lax, easy, nominal control that will not control. Speaking of the enormous expenditures that were made at Albany and elsewhere, as Mr. McCall alleged, for the purpose of preventing blackmail and vicious legislation, I believe that that statement is as false as the man who uttered it is corrupt.

I do not believe that blackmail and vicious legislation could pass the scrutiny of both houses of the New York assembly, nor

do I believe that such legislation could pass the legislature of any State in the American Union. Almost every member in those legislatures is himself interested in insurance. The American people are not opposed to insurance. They want the companies honestly and economically managed. I think that the kind of legislation the insurance officials were watching to prevent was honest, wholesome legislation in the interests of the policy holders that would stop their speculation and spoliation. That is the kind of legislation they wanted to prevent. Now, when the question arises in the various State legislatures, as it is soon to do, because these disclosures have opened the eyes of the American people to the enormity of the crimes of their heretofore trusted trustees, the question will be discussed in all of its phases. The States whose control is absolute, whose power is supreme, can fix conditions and limitations which all companies must comply with to do business in those States.

It has been suggested in the course of this debate that different States might provide conflicting conditions, and hence a company could not possibly comply with the conditions of both States; that in complying with one it would necessarily violate the conditions of the other. In reply to that suggestion, I know of no overpowering necessity that would compel an insurance company to do business in every State of the American Union. If it should come to pass that the State of Nebraska and the State of Mississippi should provide conflicting conditions with which no company could comply, it would be the pleasure of the insurance company to decide which State it would operate in, and let the other severely alone. The States of this Union have the same right—the same legal right and the same moral right—to prescribe upon what terms corporations or citizens can do business within their borders as any gentleman upon this floor has to prescribe upon what conditions his fellow-man can enter his house. If the conditions fixed are too hard, if the limitations fixed are too narrow, and the companies do not want to enter the domain, let them stay out. Suppose they do stay out. In the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], by which we were all charmed and electrified, the happiest suggestion, to my mind, was the proposition to confine corporations of insurance to the States that gave them their charters. Can you conceive of any reason why the great State of Illinois should be dependent upon the State of New York for her insurance companies any more than she should be dependent upon New York for her savings banks?

You have men of ability equal, I know, to the ability of any man who has graced an insurance office, and God knows I hope far superior in integrity, in every State and in every township of the American Union who could take charge of these insurance companies, manage them economically and honestly for the policy holders, invest their money at better rates of interest and keep it within their own borders and build up their own great industries and resources. The greatest source of the money poured into the great city of New York from all sources that contribute to it is the life insurance premium. Even in times of panic it pours in with undiminished strength, in undiminished volume, representing the toil and thrift and industry of the American people. When it goes there instead of being used for legitimate business purposes it has been used in questionable ways and in vicious enterprises. But if it shall come to pass that any State in this Union prescribes conditions that the insurance people are not willing to comply with, that State is to be congratulated. It is not pertinent now and here to discuss the question as to what conditions the various States may prescribe.

If I had the honor to be a member of the legislature of any State in the Union I would endeavor to prescribe conditions that would revolutionize the business. I would provide that no company could do business within the borders of my State which gave any man a salary, either directly or indirectly, in excess of $25,000 a year. Why, in these insurance companies, one man—one of these insurance dignitaries—is considered equal to all the Representatives of the great State of New York on this floor. Their sons, their sons-in-law, their nephews, and their cousins, who have never been heard of in the business world, are drawing princely salaries, $50,000, $75,000, or a hundred thousand dollars a year. The answer to that is the old maxim that the thing is worth what it will fetch. Well, I would like to know what these fellows would fetch if they were put on the market. There are thousands of dry-goods clerks in the city of New York who are the equal of these men in business ability. They are there not by reason of great business reputation that they have made, but they are there by the favoritism of those who have charge.

I was reading in the report of the Armstrong committee the other day this remarkable statement that one of the great companies, not one of the big three, because the millions with which they deal are beyond the comprehension of most men, but one of the companies since its organization has paid out in premiums and death losses $92,000,000 and in the same period of time has paid $130,000,000 in expenses. Forty-one per cent plus had gone to beneficiaries and 58 per cent plus had gone to the officers. I do not care, Mr. Chairman, if you limit the companies to the borders of the State and provide that no company should pay any commission for new business. Review the spectacle now of these great companies going out after business actually at a loss, using funds that have been made and saved and buying new business. The business they are now getting does not pay for itself.

Mr. Chairman, one of the strongest and best of insurance companies in Great Britain employs no agents at all. If a person desires insurance in that company he writes to the home office. He is furnished an application blank, which he fills out. When it reaches the home office, if his family history indicates that he is probably a good risk, then one of their physicians examines him. On the coming in of that report, if he is found to be sound, he is notified that he is accepted, that his premium is a certain amount, and he sends it to the company by mail and they send him a policy. The only expense incurred in the transaction is the physician's fee and a few pennies for postage. Now, Mr. Chairman, these are questions that the States can all deal with in their own way and in their own time. We have not been so fortunate; we have not been so happy in our management of corporations as to encourage the hope that we would have better success with insurance companies. It has been suggested here to-day that the States had signally failed. Unfortunately the States have hitherto legislated upon the assumption that the management of the companies was honest and they were guarding against insolvent companies. Hereafter they will throw safeguards around the companies doing business in their borders; they will make the limitations narrow and the conditions hard; and I believe that out of all this great discussion there will come relief for the American people. But, sir, it will come through the sovereign legislatures of the sovereign States. There is sufficient wisdom, there is sufficient virtue, and there is sufficient honesty in every State in the American Union to protect its own citizenship against spoliation and fraud. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CONNER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 480) entitled "An act supplemental to an act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans,' approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriations for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes."

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SULZER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] desires to have the floor again. When he spoke on a former occasion he reserved the balance of his time.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I introduced into this House the following resolution, which I now send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it has been published in the newspaper press of the country, and is now generally believed, that the Secretary of the Navy has recommended and contemplates the breaking up and the absolute destruction of the last vestige of one of the most famous historical relics of the United States, namely, the frigate Constitution, lovingly, patriotically, and popularly known as Old Ironsides; and

Whereas the patriotic people of the country regard such contemplated destruction of Old Ironsides with the most profound sorrow and regret, and as an irreparable loss, because Old Ironsides can never be replaced and her like can never be looked upon again if once totally destroyed; and they believe that if only one of her planks remains it should be sacredly saved and preserved as an historic relic: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to send to the House of Representatives as soon as possible all information upon the subject of the contemplated destruction of the frigate Constitution, popularly known as Old Ironsides, and in the meantime to await such further action as the Congress may deem proper to take to prevent such destruction; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby respectfully and earnestly requested to promptly intervene and recommend such measures as shall secure the permanent preservation of all that now remains of the frigate Constitution as one of the most sacred historical relics remaining to the people of the United States.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, that is a patriotic resolution and it speaks for itself. I am in favor of it, and I believe it should pass this House without delay. It was introduced by me for the purpose of getting definite information and finding out, through the Secretary of the Navy, as soon as possible, just when, and how, and where, and why the Secretary of the Navy proposed, intended, or contemplated the destruction of the frigate *Constitution*, popularly known to the American people as "Old Ironsides," and what authority, if any, he has in the premises to destroy this historical relic of the American Navy.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SULZER. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. Do I understand that it is offered as a resolution to be passed on by the committee?

Mr. SULZER. Not at all. It has just been read by the Clerk for the purpose of giving the House notice of what I am going to talk about.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, all right.

Mr. SULZER. I introduced the resolution for the purpose of getting information from the Secretary of the Navy about the frigate *Constitution* and her proposed destruction. It is privileged under the rules and will come up ere long in the regular way. We do not know just how the old *Constitution* is to be shot to death, but if it is going to happen, I think the House is entitled to have this information from the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. DALZELL. All right.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the patriotic people of the country were very much surprised a short time ago when they read in the public prints that the Secretary of the Navy proposed to destroy "Old Ironsides," the flagship of Hull and Preble, of Bainbridge, and of gallant Charles Stewart, the grandfather of Charles Stewart Parnell. The Secretary said, if the reports in the newspapers are correct, and I doubt not they are, that this old frigate, the *Constitution*, now lying at Charlestown Navy-Yard, in Boston Harbor, was of no earthly use, and the best thing that could be done with her was to tow her out to sea and make her a target for American naval gunners to shoot to pieces. Think of it! Imagine, if you can, this official vandalism! It shocked public sentiment. It aroused American patriotism. I can hardly believe it to be true, but if it is true I trust the Secretary of the Navy has heard the indignant remonstrance and the patriotic protest which has rolled into Washington from every part of the country, and that he will do nothing further in the matter. His action has aroused the spirit of the nation. The American people will never consent to the wanton destruction of the frigate *Constitution;* and, in fact, sir, I doubt if the Secretary of the Navy has any authority to order her demolition. She belongs to the people of the United States, and they will never sell her or give her up; and the Secretary has no more right to destroy her than he has to order the destruction of this Capitol. I think that the Congress has something to say about what shall be done or not done with the people's property, and I hope the Secretary will refrain from further action in the premises until this Congress can act in the matter. Her fate is in our hands. She can not be shot and sunk without our consent. We must stop this sacrilege. The venerable old frigate *Constitution* should not be destroyed. She is sacred to the American people, and as long as one of her timbers remains she should never be demolished. She was launched in the harbor of Boston in 1797. Her story on the sea is American history, and time can not dim her greatness nor sully her glory. She belongs to Boston, and there let her rest in peace with the Stars and Stripes floating from her masthead until she shall crumble and rot away and be no more. [Applause.]

Once before, Mr. Chairman—a long time ago, away back in 1830—a certain former Secretary of the Navy also proposed the destruction of "Old Ironsides." Is the present Secretary of the Navy familiar with that incident? Does he remember what then happened? Has he forgotten the storm of protests, the white heat of popular indignation, that aroused the people and stirred the very depths of American patriotism? The people then saved the *Constitution* and the storm of outraged popular sentiment subsided; but at its height there came a flash of poetic lightning, the inspiration of Oliver Wendell Holmes, who wrote this poem on "Old Ironsides:"

Ay, tear her tattered ensign down!
Long has it waved on high,
And many an eye has danced to see
That banner in the sky.
Beneath it rung the battle shout
And burst the cannon's roar—
The meteor of the ocean air
Shall sweep the clouds no more.

Her deck, once red with heroes' blood,
Where knelt the vanquished foe,
When winds were hurrying o'er the flood
And waves were white below,
No more shall feel the victor's tread
Or know the conquered knee—
The harpies of the shore shall pluck
The eagle of the sea!

Oh, better that her shattered hulk
Should sink beneath the wave;
Her thunders shook the mighty deep,
And there should be her grave;
Nail to the mast her holy flag,
Set every threadbare sail,
And give her to the god of storms,
The lightning and the gale!

[Applause.]

That gem, sir, from the pen of dear old Doctor Holmes did much in the long ago to save the day and preserve intact "Old Ironsides." As I sat here to-day thinking about the contemplated action of our present Secretary my memory went back to that other time. It seemed like history repeating itself, and I wondered if our Naval Secretary—poor benighted man—had ever read that patriotic poem by one of America's most gifted authors. But no matter; suffice it now for me to say that from that day in the distant past down to the present more practical time no sacrilegious hand has ever been raised to strike a blow against "Old Ironsides." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this may be a practical age, but American sentiment is not dead, and it is well that there is enough left to arouse the people in protest against destroying in a most unpatriotic way the gallant old ship *Constitution*. If only a sentimental value is left of all her greatness, it is enough to save her, and it is a very beautiful sentiment, and one altogether creditable to the hearts of the American people. This sentiment fights our battles, wins our victories, and preserves our liberties. Sentiment—deep-rooted, patriotic sentiment—is the progressive life of every people, and I trust the day will never come in our land when it will slumber so soundly that an unsympathetic act of vandalism can not arouse it to protest and action and indignation. The doom of the Republic will be knelled when American sentiment dies. So, sir, I say that for sentimental and patriotic reasons the frigate *Constitution* must not be destroyed. No act of vandalism must ever profane "Old Ironsides." Her glorious ensign must never be hauled down. She is the most valuable relic historically, and the most priceless possession to-day, in the American Navy. No wonder the patriotic people of New England, and elsewhere, were grieved and shocked when they learned that the Secretary of the Navy, in the most matter-of-fact way, intended to have this historic old ship of war towed out to sea and shot at for a target—shot to death with American gunpowder and by the Navy she made possible and did so much to embellish. But it shall never happen—perish the thought—because I believe I voice the patriotic feelings of all true Americans everywhere when I say we shall never give up the ship—we shall never destroy "Old Ironsides." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am a friend of the Secretary of the Navy. I have no disposition to harshly criticise that distinguished official. I think in this matter that he has been, to say the least, indiscreet, and has mistaken the patriotic sentiments which animate the American people, especially when some object of their reverence is assailed. Hence I believe it is only necessary for us to suggest to him that we are opposed to the destruction of this good old ship in order to preserve her as a common heritage for future generations. And that is for us to do—our work and our duty. Let us then meet the expectations of the people of our country, and put into the naval appropriation bill a provision that will carry a small annual appropriation for the care and the maintenance of this venerable old ship *Constitution*, and that will end the doubts as to her future most effectually for all time to come.

And now, sir, I want to read another poem anent this matter. After I had introduced the resolution just read by the Clerk, my dear old friend, the good gray poet of Washington, a son of old Kentucky, and as gallant, as warm-hearted, and as lovable a man as ever lived—Col. John A. Joyce—inspired by the subject as his prototype, Oliver Wendell Holmes, was on a former and similar occasion, dashed off the following poem and sent it to me to read when this matter came up for discussion. I take great pleasure in reading it:

Spare, oh, spare, the *Constitution;*
Grand old battle ship of ours.
Let it live in song and story,
Festooned with the fairest flowers.

Leave it as an object lesson
To the children of this land,
Teaching loyalty and valor,
Lessons they must understand.

Hull and Prebel, Bainbridge, Stewart,
Fired thy guns in battle roar.
Slaughtered Albion's bravest sailors—
Sunk and drove them from our shore.

Congress true and patriotic
Will not let thy glory die;
But be "target" for all praising
Like the stars in yonder sky.

Once you fought on stormy ocean,
"Target" for the tyrant foe;
Must "Old Ironsides" be shattered,
Friendless in its age and woe?

No! Let it shine in Boston Harbor,
Down the ages, by the sea;
Veteran of our naval glory—
Emblem of our liberty!

[Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, all honor to Colonel Joyce. He is now, and always has been, a true poet and a pure patriot. And now a few words more, and I am done. I want to say, in conclusion, that I am a friend of the American Navy. I glory in its brilliant and illustrious achievements. In every war and on every sea its valor and its heroism have illumined the pages of American history. There is no blot on its heraldic shield. The patriotic soul of every school boy in America has been fired by the valor, the bravery, and the glory of our naval heroes. Their motto is, and was, and ever will be, "Don't give up the ship;" and we, the Representatives of the American peopl in Congress, reechoing that heroic and patriotic sentiment, send greetings to our constituencies, and notice to the Secretary of the Navy, that we won't give up the ship; that we won't sacrifice "Old Ironsides;" that we won't destroy the *Constitution*—the oldest and the grandest and the proudest ship that ever nailed her colors to the mast in all the glorious history of the American Navy. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. PAYNE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MACON. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I understood the gentleman to say privately, a few minutes ago, that he had no objection to waiting until to-morrow morning before he continued his speech.

Mr. MACON. I said that to the chairman, in response to a question.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman yield now for a motion that the committee rise?

Mr. MACON. Yes; with the understanding that I may have the floor in the morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The understanding of the Chair is that the gentleman will have the floor the first thing in the morning.

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly. He has the floor in his own right, and, as I understand it, no one can deprive him of that right.

The CHAIRMAN. Will it be agreeable to the gentleman to yield at this time?

Mr. MACON. Certainly. I like to be accommodating when I can. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House resolution 42, relating to the distribution of the President's message, and had come to no resolution thereon.

PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report and the statement of the managers upon the part of this House, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa presents a conference report and asks unanimous consent for its present consideration. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not understand the request. Is it just for the printing of the report?

Mr. HEPBURN. No; I ask for the present consideration of it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report. Perhaps it would be well enough to have it read, and then the request submitted. If there be no objection, it will be read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, is it not usual for these conference reports to be printed and go over until the next day?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think the gentleman from Mississippi understood the proposition. It is to have the conference report read, subject to objection. Of course it would have to go over under the rule, and be printed in the RECORD, if objection is made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then it can come up to-morrow.

Mr. PAYNE. The proposition now is to have it read, subject to objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does that carry with it the request for present consideration?

Mr. HEPBURN. Not until after it is read.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and myself misunderstood it.

Mr. SULZER. It is to be read for information only.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reading of the report?

There was no objection.

The conference report was read. The conference report and statement are as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 480, an act supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3 and from its amendment to the title of the bill.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following:

"That the two per cent bonds of the United States authorized by section eight of the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June twenty-eighth, nineteen hundred and two, shall have all the rights and privileges accorded by law to other two per cent bonds of the United States, and every national banking association having on deposit, as provided by law, such bonds issued under the provisions of said section eight of said act approved June twenty-eighth, nineteen hundred and two, to secure its circulating notes, shall pay to the Treasurer of the United States, in the months of January and July, a tax of one-fourth of one per cent each half year upon the average amount of such of its notes in circulation as are based upon the deposit of said two per cent bonds; and such taxes shall be in lieu of existing taxes on its notes in circulation imposed by section fifty-two hundred and fourteen of the Revised Statutes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. P. HEPBURN,
SERENO E. PAYNE,
L. F. LIVINGSTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

W. B. ALLISON,
EUGENE HALE,
H. M. TELLER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Statement of managers on the part of the House.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 480, supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and submitted in the accompanying conference report on the amendments of the Senate, namely:

On amendment numbered 1: The effect of this amendment is to restore in other language the provisions of the first section of the House bill.

Amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are merely verbal.

The seventh amendment strikes out the provision requiring persons appointed or employed by the President in connection with the construction or operation of the canal to furnish information to Congress, or either House of Congress, when called upon.

Amendment numbered 8 provides that the estimates submitted to Congress shall cover all annual salaries paid to persons employed on the work, excepting laborers and skilled laborers.

Amendment numbered 9 is merely verbal.

Amendment numbered 10 strikes out the provision authoriz-

ing the use of the moneys received in the ordinary course of business and from the operation of the Panama Railroad and property and rights appertaining thereto in defraying the expenses of such operation and maintenance without being covered into the Treasury of the United States.

The Senate recedes from its amendment to the title of the bill.

W. P. HEPBURN,
SERENO E. PAYNE,
L. F. LIVINGSTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman now asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the matter take the usual course. It will come up to-morrow morning, when the conference report is printed and in the hands of everybody.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would say that there is no material change in the bill from the form in which it passed the House. The substance of it is nearly the same.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no idea that I shall make any objection to its consideration to-morrow.

Mr. HEPBURN. There is a desire to get this matter finished, so that the funds can be moved down to the Isthmus as soon as possible. They are needed there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the gentleman will agree that going over until to-morrow will not hurt anything.

FRED M. CAMPBELL.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 41.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the widow of Fred M. Campbell, late a messenger, Doorkeeper's department of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months' pay at the rate of compensation received by him at the time of his death; and further sum, not exceeding $250, for funeral expenses, said amount to be paid out of the contingent fund.

The following amendments recommended by the committee were read:

In line 5, after the word "and," insert the article "a."

In line 7, after the word "expenses," insert the words "of said Fred M. Campbell."

In line 7 strike out the word "amount" and insert the word "amounts."

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is the usual amount paid to employees?

Mr. CASSEL. This is the usual amount and the usual form in which payment is made to the employees of the House who have died.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HENRY ROBINSON.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I also offer another privileged report of the same character from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 59.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the widow of Henry Robinson, late disbursing clerk of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months' pay at the rate of compensation received by him at the time of his death, and a further sum, not exceeding $250, on account of expenses of his last illness and his burial, said amounts to be paid out of the contingent fund.

The following amendment recommended by the committee was read:

In line 7 strike out the words "his last illness and burial" and insert the words "the funeral expenses of said Henry Robinson."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ISA BLACK.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following report from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 106.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the widow of Isa Black, late a doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months' pay at the rate of compensation received by him at the time of his death, and a further sum, not exceeding $250, on account of expenses of his last illness and his burial, said amounts to be paid out of the contingent fund.

The following amendments recommended by the committee were read:

In line 3 strike out the word "doorkeeper" and insert the word "messenger."

In line 6, before the word "expenses," insert the words "the funeral."

In lines 6 and 7 strike out the words "his last illness and burial" and insert the words "said Isa Black."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

DANIEL P. HICKLING.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I have another privileged report of the same character from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 87.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Sarah A. Hickling, widow of Daniel P. Hickling, late locksmith of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months' salary as locksmith, and a further sum, not exceeding $250, to defray the expenses of the last illness and funeral of said Daniel P. Hickling.

The following amendments recommended by the Committee on Accounts were read:

In line 5, after the word "the" where it first occurs, insert the word "funeral."

In lines 6 and 7 strike out the words "the last illness and funeral of."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution from the Committee on Accounts:

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution No. 80.

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint an additional clerk to said committee to serve during the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress, at the per diem compensation which in the aggregate shall equal the sum paid session committee clerks whose employment is provided for by law.

Mr. CASSEL. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not an increase in the force of this committee. As I understand it, it is the same amount that they had last year.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for its present consideration?

Mr. CASSEL. If it is not a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. It does not provide for payment from the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, pending unanimous consent, I would like to ask the gentleman if this is a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. CASSEL. It is, and I think all the minority members were present this morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection.

The following amendment recommended by the Committee on Accounts was read, as follows:

In line 5, after the word "compensation," insert the words "of six dollars."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

JANITOR TO COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills is hereby authorized to appoint a janitor to said committee room and to the engrossing room of the House, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, at the rate of $60 per month, during the present Congress, until otherwise provided for by law.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

LABORER IN LADIES' RECEPTION ROOM.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and he is hereby, empowered to employ a laborer in the ladies' reception room at a salary of $75 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, and for the session only.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

In line 3 strike out "seventy-five" and insert "sixty."

In line 4 strike out the word "and."

In line 5 strike out the words "the session only" and insert the words "sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress;" so that it will read:

"At a salary of $60 per month, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House for the sessions of the Fifty-ninth Congress."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is this the usual resolution?

Mr. CASSEL. This is a new appointment, to take charge of the new room which has been established on the minority side of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is this an additional clerk to the force carried last year?

Mr. CASSEL. No; it is a new janitor to take charge of the new room which has been established on the other side of the building as the ladies' reception room.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is this janitor to take care of this hallway out here in which there have been some chairs put? I think I shall object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it is a privileged resolution. The amount is payable from the contingent fund, which renders the resolution privileged.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like the gentleman to explain to the House the necessity for the new rule, if it is a new rule, and the additional force, if it is an additional force.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the room has been ordered equipped as a place where Members can receive visitors who come here from time to time to see them on business, and that it is especially a place where ladies can wait until a Member can see them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where is the room?

Mr. CASSEL. It is directly beyond that door in the lobby.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, is it this hallway right here?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes; the hallway there which has been fitted up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ever since I have been here people have sent in cards from there, ladies have come there when they wanted to, and they have been received there. It seems to me it is unnecessary to have a janitor in a hall where Members go out to see people who send in their cards to them.

Mr. CASSEL. Well, the room must be taken care of, and it has been recommended by the Doorkeeper of the House as a necessity, and was so presented to the Committee at its hearings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is there necessary to be done there in order to take care of this hallway? It has always been swept up and kept in order since I have been here without any additional janitor.

Mr. CASSEL. Well, I am doubtful whether the room has been kept in proper condition for the visitors of the House to wait in from time to time, and it is nothing more than is customary in every other room in the House which has been equipped for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not a fact that about the only change made is to place a table there and a few chairs?

Mr. CASSEL. I suppose it is; but there are more people gathering there at the present time than there were formerly, because they know it is a waiting place.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if this is the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. CASSEL. It is the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was the committee fully attended when it was reported?

Mr. CASSEL. Fully attended. I think there were eight members of the committee present at the meeting this morning, and it was considered very carefully and reported upon favorably by all of the members of the committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSEL. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I think the House ought to have some knowledge of just what is proposed to be done by this resolution. One of the hallways opposite the entrance to this House on this side, during the past six years, the time that I have been a Member of the House, has been about the only place where the Members on this side could receive their friends while the House was in session. Through the activity of some official of the Capitol a half dozen chairs and a table have been placed in this corridor, and from time to time one or two Members of the Capitol police, in the performance of their duty, walk through that corridor to see that the Members of the minority do not conduct themselves in an improper manner while receiving friends. [Laughter.] With his eye upon the contingent fund of the House, and with a desire to place some constituent—no doubt a deserving one—some enterprising gentleman saw an opportunity to utilize the services of some man as a janitor in this corridor, which, if I am not mistaken, is under the control of the Capitol police.

What are the police in this Capitol for, I would like to know, if not to keep order in the corridors. To what extent are we to multiply the men paid from the contingent fund of the House? I am not one of those opposed to the employment of the necessary help proper in the conduct of the business of the House or necessary for the convenience of its Members, but I do hope that the House will not inaugurate a system of janitors for the corridors about this Capitol. This is an entering wedge, and I am astounded that any eight men from one committee should be able to come in here with a unanimous report in favor of such an absurd proposition. Why, Mr. Speaker, I would invite the Members of the House to go out and see just where they wish to place a janitor. It is about 20 feet from the door of the House to the outside door of the Capitol. There are, as I have said, perhaps a half dozen chairs and a table there, and to take care of that reception room it is proposed to put a janitor on the rolls of this House at the rate of $60 a month. I am not posing here as a rigid economist, yet I do not wish to be put in the position of being an "absurdist," if I can coin that word, and I hope that the House in the exercise of an intelligent discrimination will vote down this resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. CASSEL and Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much surprised at the base ingratitude of the minority side of the House. The House sets apart a receiving room for the benefit of the minority and the members of the majority are required to see their friends in the hall, with no chairs and no table——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And no janitor.

Mr. MANN. But through the magnanimity of the House controlled by the majority we set apart a corridor, tables, and chairs, with opportunity for people to sit down, and then these people, when we wish to keep it clean, decline to have the place kept clean. [Laughter.] The majority side of the House would be glad for any opportunity to receive their friends without standing up in the halls, but the minority, I regret to say, seem to be full of ingratitude at the magnanimity which we display. [Laughter.] I have no doubt it is only the enterprising minority who believe in keeping this place in good order out here. We give you the best we have got, and still you kick. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. CASSEL. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy I was very familiar with a motto which hung on the wall of many homes. It was "God bless our home." Recalling that, I think we might properly say in reply to the gentleman from Illinois, "God bless the magnanimity of the majority of this House." [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, one more innocuous observation, suggested by the gentleman from Illinois. If this were a corridor provided for the use of the majority of the House instead of the minority, then, judging by recent political history, we could understand just precisely why it was strictly necessary to have somebody on the pay roll to keep it clean [laughter and applause]; but this is a corridor for the minority, which can very well take care of itself without this special cleaning service. As long as I have been here ladies have come here, Members have gone out to see them, and there never was this special janitor before, and I have never noticed anything out of order there. It seems to me that this is an unnecessary appropriation, but at the same time, if the spirit of the appropriation be as the gentleman from Illinois has indicated, I do not know but what it would be worth the amount of money to be taken out of the Treasury as a mere memorial [laughter] of the new and chivalrous manner in which we will be dealt with in the future. It might be well to offer an amendment providing that the same amount of money should be used for the erection of a memorial there, a small pedestal with a little bit of a statuette, let us say, of the Speaker of the House, with a scroll, and on it the words, "Fifty-ninth Congress; to the minority with the compliments of the majority." [Laughter and applause.] But if the only object is that there may be decency and order the minority does not need the janitor.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. CASSEL)—ayes 29, noes 53.

So the resolution was rejected.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

STENOGRAPHER FOR JOURNAL CLERK.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer another report from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk is ordered to employ a stenographer to assist the Journal Clerk, at a compensation not exceeding $75 per month, during the sessions of this Congress.

With the following amendment: In line 2, after the word "Clerk," insert the words "out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided for by law."

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the committee, if the present law does not prevent the payment of any salary out of the contingent fund of the House?

Mr. CASSEL. Well, I would say that there is a difference of opinion as to the meaning of that law, as to whether one Congress can control a contingent of another Congress, and that will be up to the officials of the Treasury Department to decide.

Mr. TAWNEY. The appropriation for the contingent fund of the House for the present fiscal year expressly provides that no part of it shall be used for the payment of salaries. I do not know anything about the necessity for the employment of this clerk, but I think that provision of the law is binding upon this House. I know that no resolution of the House can either expressly or by implication repeal any existing law. Of course the House has it in its power to provide the compensation for any person whose employment it authorizes. But that is the law, and it expressly provides that no part of that contingent fund shall be used for the payment of salaries.

Mr. PAYNE. If that is the law, why would not it take away the privilege of these resolutions to pay salaries out of the contingent fund of the House, and make it a matter of unanimous consent, at least?

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, as I said before this is a matter which will have to be decided by the Treasury Department as to the meaning of the law. There have been two or three different decisions given from time to time. The majority would say that no Congress can control a succeeding Congress in the expenditure of their contingent fund.

Mr. DALZELL. I would like to ask whether or not this is a new officer?

Mr. CASSEL. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] can answer that question. It is not a new position, as I understand it, at all.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask unanimous consent to consider this resolution?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes; if necessary I ask unanimous consent. I do not believe it is necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SESSION CLERKS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I also offer another report from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That clerks to committees of the House during the session, provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, be, and they are hereby, allowed and assigned for the present Congress to the following committees, namely:

To the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, a clerk.
To the Committee on Education, a clerk.
To the Committee on Enrolled Bills, a clerk.
To the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, a clerk.
To the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, a clerk.
To the Committee on the Militia, a clerk.
To the Committee on Mines and Mining, a clerk.
To the Committee on Patents, a clerk.
To the Committee on Railways and Canals, a clerk.
To the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, a clerk.
To the Committee on Invalid Pensions, an assistant clerk.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASSEL] yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. CASSEL. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I would like to know if any of these are new positions that are being created?

Mr. CASSEL. These are exactly the same appointments that were made a year ago by the House, and to the same committees. These eleven clerks are provided for by law, and the Committee on Accounts have the awarding of them to the different committees. The committees have followed the precedent of the last year's committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

STENOGRAPHER TO COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I have another resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws is hereby authorized to appoint a stenographer to said committee, to serve during the Fifty-ninth Congress, whose compensation shall be $6 per diem.

With an amendment, in line 5, after the word "the," to insert the words "sessions of the."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if this commission to revise the laws is a perpetual body or not?

Mr. CASSEL. It is a committee which has been appointed by the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it a House committee?

Mr. CASSEL. It is a House committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thought it said the "commission."

Mr. CASSEL. No, sir.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to know what business that committee has before it this session. It is not usually overburdened with work.

Mr. CASSEL. I am told that they intend to take up and codify all the laws.

Mr. TAWNEY. As I understand it, that commission has not yet made its report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is what I wanted to find out—when it is going to make its report.

Mr. TAWNEY. I am told that it is going to make its report some time during this Congress, but it has not yet been made.

Mr. CASSEL. I will call on the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOON] to more fully answer concerning the matter.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with reference to that, the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota is true, that the entire report has not yet been made by the commission. We have held two sessions of the committee, one of them this morning, and members of that commission have been before the committee at both sessions, and they told us that the completed report, the substantive law or the civil code, will be ready some time during the early spring, but that two sections of the law, to wit, the penal code and the judiciary code, are now ready to report. There has been presented to our committee in the past these two codes, and bills have been presented here for consideration, but no time has ever yet been allowed for that purpose. The important and responsible duty is imposed upon us at this time to present these bills.

Now, we already have before us, practically in the form of a bill, the judiciary code and the penal code. These require examination and a large amount of work on the part of this committee. It is not necessary for me now to occupy the time to tell you or to go into all the details, but the work is all of great importance.

It has been reported, and we must verify it all; we must pass upon it, examine it, and probably draw new sections and amend it to a very important extent. This is the present work of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, and I think no committee of the House can have a larger amount of work devolving upon it at the present time than has this committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. Now, this Commission to revise the laws is nothing but a codification commission, is it?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Well, it is practically a codification committee, and at the same time it is something very much more.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is not a legislative committee?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Only in the sense that where the law has been changed and where an amendment is necessary to the law in order to make a complete law the duties of this Commission require it to make those amendments and to report new enactments when necessary for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a minute now.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Permit me to answer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. An amendment necessary in your opinion?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Or in the opinion of the Commission. I can not go into details. But there are numerous cases where the laws have been abrogated or rescinded, and there does not exist a coherent scheme of law on that subject. That omission has frequently been found, and the Commission consider it their duty, where this condition exists, to supply all such omissions, and there were a great many of them, I can assure the gentleman, in the report thus far made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, when your committee goes

to work on this report of the revisionists, if that is the proper term, then you revise their work, do you?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Well, we must examine it, pass upon it, and revise it before we can bring it to the House for consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then Congress has got to go to work to reenact this whole business, has it?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. There is no other method by which this work can be done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then I would like to know what was the sense of appointing this Commission at all.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. In reply to the gentleman from Missouri, I would say that it does not seem to me that it would be possible for a committee of this House to have ever performed the voluminous labor that has devolved upon this Commission. There has been no revision of the laws since 1874, or, to be more accurate, since 1878. In 1874 there was a revision, but that revision was so incomplete and so imperfect that it was suppressed. There were found to be hundreds of mistakes, and a commissioner, Mr. Boutwell of Massachusetts, was appointed to revise the revision, and therefore the revision of 1878 practically took the place of the suppressed revision of 1874, because the work was not thoroughly done by the Commission, not exhaustively examined by the committee, and not carefully scrutinized by this House.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. This revisory commission submits its report by chapters to your committee, does it not?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. The bill requires it to submit its report as a whole, unfortunately. It never has submitted chapters. If the gentleman will permit me to answer, it has submitted two titles, that upon the penal code and that upon the judiciary code, but the bill really requires it to be presented as a whole.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. The law creating the revisory commission?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Now, they submit their report in typewriting to your committee, do they not?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. No; in print.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. In print. Then your committee proposes to take that up chapter by chapter and go over it?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. And you will make your report, as I suppose, to the House by chapters. Is that the purpose?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. No; by titles, really. We are going to make it as a whole; but it would be impossible ever to ask this House to sit continuously to consider 10,000 sections of the law, which there will be in this complete report. Therefore, it is our purpose now to bring in first the title of the penal code, which will cover something short of 500 sections; secondly, the title of the judiciary. That is the present plan; not by chapters, but by titles.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Now, I want to ask you this additional question: Has your committee a clerk and a stenographer already?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. It has a clerk, but not a stenographer.

Mr. TAWNEY. A session clerk or an annual clerk?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. An annual clerk; and the duties of that clerk are serious. We propose to divide that committee into subcommittees, as you can readily understand we must do. The clerk that I have to that committee is a lawyer, and I hope to get a great deal of aid and assistance from him in comparing the revision with the existing law. He will be expected to render service to these subcommittees whenever such service is required. It seems to me that in the progress of this work the committee needs the assistance of a stenographer.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I beg to submit this additional remark, that I have very considerable apprehension that the work of your committee will not be so great as you now think it will be, because I apprehend that the revisory commission is not going to dump very much down on you before this session of Congress adjourns.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Well, we had an assurance this morning from the Commission of an early report. We have had them before us twice, and I want to say on behalf of the committee that we have been very imperative in demanding of them speedy action.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. We have been having it a good while now.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. We are not unmindful of the fact that this Congress at its last session practically placed the absolute responsibility of this matter upon our shoulders, with the understanding that otherwise there would be a bill introduced to abolish this revisory Commission.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is aware, I suppose, that the House provides a corps of committee stenographers, some one of whom will be at the service of the gentleman's committee at almost any time.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. I am not aware of that. I will say in response to the gentleman that I have not had sufficient experience here to know that fact. Most of you know that this is my first experience as a committee chairman.

Mr. MANN. I think every Member of the House is perfectly willing to give the gentleman's committee every opportunity to make a report upon the revision of the laws. The gentleman proposes to have a stenographer to the committee at the rate of $6 a day.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The House now pays its committee stenographers at the rate of $5,000 a year, I believe, and they ought to be better stenographers.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. I did not understand that they were available for this work.

Mr. MANN. There are four committee stenographers.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. I submit to the gentleman's superior knowledge.

Mr. MANN. And these gentlemen are at the disposition of the committees of the House. I dare say the gentleman would have no difficulty at all in having one of these stenographers at his service almost any time, both during the sessions of the House, if his committee has leave to sit, and before the session of the House commences any day. Now, of course, if the gentleman's committee needs an extra clerk, that is another thing, but so far as the work of a stenographer is concerned, the gentlemen of this committee can do what the other committees of the House do, send word downstairs that they want a committee stenographer, and they will get one.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois knows full well that the committee stenographers are employed by various committees having hearings before them, and they are constantly engaged from the beginning to the close of the session, and if this committee, in the codification or making up of the report they are required to make up, need a stenographer, the committee stenographers being otherwise engaged, they would have to bring in some one from the outside, and the expense would be a great deal more than to employ a regular stenographer.

Mr. MANN. Oh, my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, assumes that the committee stenographers are busy all the time. That is a violent assumption, and is not the case.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the Committee on Ways and Means about half the time has an outside stenographer, because the committee stenographers claim to be busy when we send for them.

Mr. MANN. I have often defended these stenographers on the floor of the House when the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from New York were attacking them. We frequently have two of these stenographers in our committee at the same time, and if they are so busy it seems to me that we might get along with one instead of having two reporting the same thing at the same time.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, that may account for it; there may be two stenographers in the room of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and when we want one in the Committee on Ways and Means we have to take an outsider. I know that the bills before our committee are simply enormous for outside work. I think these bills would pay $6 a day for a long time for a stenographer for this committee. As far as this committee is concerned I think it is a question whether they need this additional clerk at the present time. It is not for what they have now, but what they expect and hope to have in the future. I do not see why this thing should not go over until they get that large number of chapters from the commission for consideration before that committee, and then if they need the additional clerk the House will vote for it.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman pardon me? Does not the gentleman from New York think that the Committee on Ways and Means is likely to have more use for a stenographer than the Committee on the Revision of the Laws?

Mr. PAYNE. I think so. So far as the Committee on Ways and Means is concerned, I think it would be cheaper for the House to employ one at $6 a day than to pay the bills that we have to pay.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from New York, respecting the work now before the committee, while, strictly speaking, there is not any report before the committee, but conscious of the important amount that will come before it immediately after the holidays, we are proceeding to examine the previous reports presented by the Commission, particularly upon the subject of the penal statutes that was before the last committee. We have had the assurance of the Commission that very few changes have been made in it, only supplying a few omissions and bringing it down by incorporating the laws passed at the last Congress, and therefore we are at present at work——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. What is the stenographer going to do?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. When four subcommittees are at work going over the matter reported to the committee, amendments will be suggested, and there may be considerable dictation to that stenographer. There will be practically four committees at work at the same time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman's committee is going to receive a revised title from this Commission upon which the members of the Commission have spent a number of years' work. Does his committee then intend to hold hearings?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Not hearings in the sense of bringing witnesses before it, but a careful examination of all the work, and an examination of the previous statutes, and an examination of all the changes and amendments that are proposed, and an examination of new law that is submitted will involve considerable labor and dictation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It seems to me that what the committee needs is a good lawyer and not a stenographer.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. Oh, we are vain enough to think that we have one or two of them on the committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to this fact. I do not recall how long the Commission has been in existence, but last July a well-known law-book concern issued an invitation to Members of Congress to purchase a set of the Federal Statutes, revised and annotated. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania any knowledge of how this law-publishing concern was able to get this out so quickly while our Commission has been dragging along for so many years?

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. I do not think the gentleman expects me to answer that question. Of course I have no knowledge, and do not know to what revised edition the advertisement alludes.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Speaker, I call for a vote on the proposition.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASSEL] has the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know, but what is it he is trying to do?

The SPEAKER. To get a vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to say a word about this subject of the revision of the laws.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSEL. I will yield for a short time. I am in no hurry myself, but there is other business before the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I either want the time now or want this thing to go over until morning.

Mr. CASSEL. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want over five minutes.

Mr. CASSEL. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that Congress ever intended that the men who were appointed to revise the laws—and I am not talking about this committee of the House—should ever resolve itself into a legislative body. All that Congress ever intended that those three distinguished gentlemen, drawing $5,000 a year each for nine years, should do was to codify the laws of Congress, and at the rate they are going now we will die of old age before we ever get a codification of the laws. Another thing. If they come in here and report a lot of new laws, and then the committee of which my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOON] is chairman is to go through those laws and report them back to the House and we have then to consider every one of them, you could not read those 10,000 sections in this House to save your life in two sessions of this Congress. So we are just exactly now where we were in February, 1897, when Congress passed the law to appoint these three revisers to draw $5,000 a year each for the purpose of codifying the laws.

I do not mind giving this committee this stenographer if it needs it; but if we are ever going to have a revision of those laws I want it in this Congress, and I want the revisers, if that is the proper title to give them, to be restricted to the simple office of codificaion. They may be great lawyers, but they are not legislators. They were appointed to find out what the laws are and to get them together in a convenient form, so that people can consult them conveniently and expeditiously, and if they go on in the way they have been going they will succeed each other in perpetuity and that committee on revision will last as long as the Congress of the United States lasts. Unless they bring in that revision before this session closes, I intend to move that they be discharged and their salaries be cut off.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, Mr. Speaker, I understand there was an agreement last Congress that that course would be taken if they did not report.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. That is true. I may say that when we came in here at the last session of Congress—some one from our committee, I think the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]—to ask that the Commission be permitted to report the three portions of the law at the same time, viz, the penal code, the judiciary title, and the civil code, this House then raised that question. All that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has so well said was said then. I have no argument to make against his reasonable demand. The agreement was entered into, or the statement was made, that unless that Commission were prepared to report during this session—and, indeed, I think they said the earlier part of this session—a bill would be introduced abolishing the Commission; and I only want to say that the Committee upon the Revision of the Laws, mindful of this injunction of the House, have had that Commission before them twice already and have stated in no uncertain terms their intention to put into force that pledge that was made to the House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

COUNCIL CITY AND SOLOMON RIVER RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. BRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 99) to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the bill in full.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCNARY. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for batteries at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a draft of a legislative provision relating to the sale of down timber and hay in the Chippewa, of the former Indian reservation in Minnesota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the astronomical investigation of the Texas, New Mexico, and Oklahoma boundary lines—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of the Sacramento and San Joaquin and Feather rivers, California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of the Mississippi River Commission and a board of engineers of a survey of a 14-foot

waterway from Lockport, Ill., to St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BABCOCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 71) requiring the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare a report upon the improvement of the Anacostia River Flats, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 9); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2, Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 77) requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish information relative to deposits of public money, etc., reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 8); which said resolution and report were ordered laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9299) providing for the promotion of warrant officers, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALLACE: A bill (H. R. 9300) to annex the Choctaw and Cherokee nations of the Indian Territory to the State of Arkansas—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9301) to destroy Bayou Bartholomew as a navigable stream in the State of Arkansas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9302) authorizing the State of Arkansas to fix its western boundary—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9303) to regulate the practice, pleadings, forms, and mode of proceeding in civil causes in equity in the circuit courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 9304) to extend the public alley in block 23, subdivision known as Columbia Heights, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 9305) authorizing the extension of Meridian place NW.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 9306) to authorize the sale of a portion of the Lower Brule Indian Reservation, in South Dakota, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 9307) to enable the Indians on the La Pointe or Bad River Reservation to obtain title to the lots occupied by them in the village of Odanah, Wis., and to have said village surveyed, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9308) to amend the act of Congress approved February 11, 1901, entitled "An act providing for allotments of lands in severalty to the Indians of the La Pointe or Bad River Reservation, in the State of Wisconsin"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 9309) for the erection of a public building at Rouses Point, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 9310) to increase the pay of letter carriers on rural free-delivery routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 9311) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in Christian County, in southwestern Kentucky—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 9312) giving authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to consolidate and reorganize the customs districts, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9313) for the erection of a public building at Indiana, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9314) for the erection of a public building at Clarion, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9315) for the erection of a public building at Kittanning, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9316) for the erection of a public building at Brookville, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9317) for the erection of a public building at Punxsutawney, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9318) for the erection of a public building at Reynoldsville, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 9319) authorizing the President to increase maximum duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 9320) prohibiting the issuing of special-tax stamps to retail dealers in liquors in prohibition districts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9321) to reestablish the United States mint at Dahlonega, Lumpkin County, Ga.—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 9322) to provide for the erection of a public building at Delaware, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 9323) for the erection of an addition to the post-office in the city of Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9324) to authorize the Fayette Bridge Company to construct a bridge over the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania, from a point in the borough of Brownsville, Fayette County, to a point in the borough of West Brownsville, Washington County—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 9325) to acquire ground for a Government reservation—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9326) for the widening of Mills avenue NE. from Rhode Island avenue to Twenty-fourth street—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9327) providing for procurement of site and erection of a public building at Masillon, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GILBERT of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9328) to regulate the granting of restraining orders in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 9329) to amend an act approved February 28, 1903, entitled "An act to provide for a union station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9330) to provide for filling in that portion of the naval station at Honolulu, Hawaii, known as the Reef—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9331) to provide for filling in the United States quarantine station at Honolulu, Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9332) to amend section 3646, Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by act of February 16, 1885—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 9333) for a public building for a national museum of war at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KAHN (by request): A bill (H. R. 9334) to provide for the construction and operation of a deep waterway between the cities of Chicago, Ill., and St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 9335) authorizing the extension of Second street NW. to Trumbull street, and W street westward to Second street NW.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 9336) to authorize the Baltimore and Washington Transit Company, of Maryland, to extend its street railway in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 9337) to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 3, 1903, to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9338) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public

building thereon at Bowling Green, State of Kentucky—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9339) to place upon the free list steel beams, plates, angle irons, rivets, shaftings, propellers, castings, and other material imported for the purpose of being used and being actually used in construction of American ships—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 9340) to appropriate $10,000 to carry on demonstrations under the directions of the Secretary of Agriculture that will suppress fungus and insect pests that are ravaging our fruit interests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 9341) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Kentucky—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 9342) granting authority to the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to dismiss midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9343) providing for the resurvey of certain townships of land in the county of Baca, Colo.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 53) providing for a survey of the Savannah River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 54) relating to the holders of medals of honor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: A resolution (H. Res. 109) authorizing the chairman of Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River to appoint a janitor to said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LEVER: A resolution (H. Res. 110) directing the Clerk of the House to pay to Butler B. Hare a certain sum of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MORRELL: A resolution (H. Res. 111) authorizing the chairman of Committee on Militia to appoint a janitor to said committee—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A resolution (H. Res. 112) directing the Secretary of the Interior to furnish information pertaining to the removal of restrictions upon allotted lands in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A resolution (H. Res. 113) for the appointment of a clerk to the Committee on Pacific Railroads—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 9344) for the relief of the estate of James H. Ambler—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9345) for the relief of W. M. Gibson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9346) for the relief of John W. Simpson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9347) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Chapman, of Pickens County, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9348) for the relief of Edwin Calhoun—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9349) for the relief of W. F. Parker—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9350) for the relief of M. C. Dickson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9351) granting an increase of pension to Marie Graves Bonham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 9352) granting an increase of pension to Mary Van Blarcom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9353) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Loxley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9354) granting a pension to Patrick Mullin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9355) granting a pension to Joseph L. Herron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9356) granting a pension to Ernest T. Etchells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9357) granting a pension to Fannie E. Yost—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9358) granting a pension to Mary E. Fraser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9359) granting a pension to Neil Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9360) granting a pension to Catharine Flynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9361) granting a pension to Frederick Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9362) granting a pension to Annie Hines—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9363) granting a pension to George Ihnath—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9364) for the relief of George F. Fuller—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9365) for the relief of George C. Ellison—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9366) to remove the charge of desertion now existing on the records of the War Department against John McKeon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9367) to remove the charge of desertion now existing on the records of the War Department against John McKeon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9368) to remove the charge of desertion now existing on the records of the War Department against Thomas Dawson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9369) to amend record and grant honorable discharge to Joseph S. Oakley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 9370) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Duffey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 9371) granting an increase of pension to Phineas P. Trowbridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9372) granting an increase of pension to William J. Bastian—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9373) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9374) granting an increase of pension to Silas J. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9375) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. McKenney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9376) granting an increase of pension to William H. Courser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9377) granting a pension to Eleanor Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9378) for the relief of Isiah P. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9379) for the relief of Lincoln C. Andrews—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9380) for the relief of Hercules Vancourt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 9381) granting a pension to Charlotte Osborne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9382) granting a pension to Mariam T. Shreve—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 9383) granting a pension to Henry M. Serena—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 9384) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander Andrea, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9385) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles D. Murdock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9386) for the relief of Henry Hirschberg—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9387) to correct the military record of George A. Rowley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9388) granting an increase of pension to John F. Cluley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9389) granting a pension to Magdalena Banholzer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9390) granting an increase of pension to William Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 9391) for the relief of Elizabeth E. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9392) granting an increase of pension to Malinda C. Clouts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9393) for the relief of William Worley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 9394) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of those civilian employees of the Government who were killed by the explosion of gunpowder and 13-inch shell at the United States naval magazine, Iona Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9395) to reimburse John Waller, late postmaster at Monticello, N. Y., for moneys expended in carrying the mails—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9396) to refund legacy taxes illegally col-

lected from the estate of Jacob R. Moore—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9397) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9398) granting a pension to Margaret B. Houston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 9399) for the relief of Emma H. Worley, widow, and the heirs at law of Nathaniel T. Worley, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9400) granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Macloon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9401) granting an increase of pension to John W. Blum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9402) granting an increase of pension to Adam S. Van Vorst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9403) granting a pension to Kate E. Hanna—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9404) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Chaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 9405) granting an increase of pension to John Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9406) granting an increase of pension to Francis W. Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 9407) for the relief of the estate of John H. Piatt, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9408) granting a pension to Martha Tonquet—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9409) granting a pension to Richard M. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9410) granting a pension to Ida Arthur—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9411) granting a pension to Dock W. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9412) granting an increase of pension to Ella F. Stoddard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9413) granting an increase of pension to Alexander McCombs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9414) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9415) granting an increase of pension to John E. Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9416) granting an increase of pension to Jacob M. Longsworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9417) granting an increase of pension to George A. Havel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9418) granting an increase of pension to Delano Morey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9419) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Rose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9420) for the relief of Clara A. Carter, widow of Martin J. Carter, late consul of the United States to Yarmouth, Nova Scotia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 9421) granting an increase of pension to George Dent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 9422) for the relief of Frank Freitas—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 9423) for the relief of Capt. M. R. W. Grebe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 9424) granting an increase of pension to John Shelt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9425) granting a pension to Lucinda Vincent—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9426) granting a pension to Lydia A. Irwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9427) granting a pension to Mary Ann Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9428) granting an increase of pension to James A. Crocker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9429) granting an increase of pension to Harvey C. Button—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9430) granting an increase of pension to Albert D. Davey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9431) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hubbs—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9432) granting an increase of pension to Peter A. Wiltse—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9433) granting an increase of pension to William A. De Hart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9434) granting an increase of pension to Herman W. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9435) granting a pension to James Edward and Ida May Bryant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 9436) for the relief of Mrs. Louisa Dornier—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 9437) granting an increase of pension to Myron L. Fales—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9438) for the relief of Ira Hall—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 9439) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Coates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 9440) for the relief of Jeremiah Lombard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9441) granting a pension to Clara N. Scranton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9442) granting a pension to Dora C. Walter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9443) granting a pension to Mary E. Congdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9444) granting a pension to Arthur W. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9445) granting a pension to Ida E. G. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9446) granting permission to Maj. Rogers Birnie, of the United States Army, to accept a decoration from the President of the French Republic—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 9447) granting an increase of pension to John L. Edmondson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 9448) granting an increase of pension to F. B. Hockey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 9449) for relief of F. M. Rhineheardt, H. R. Cook, and Joseph S. Ruland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 9450) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 9451) granting an increase of pension to Frederick N. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 9452) granting a pension to Mary B. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 9453) for the relief of J. C. Creed—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9454) for the relief of Mrs. J. W. Yates—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9455) for the relief of James M. Bullock—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9456) for the benefit of the estate of B. S. Hamilton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9457) for the relief of the estate of Mary Philips—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9458) for the relief of Jake T. Patrick, of Salyersville, Ky.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9459) for the relief of A. J. Ward—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9460) for the relief of Dillard Martin—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9461) for the relief of Dillard Martin—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9462) granting a pension to Ollie McChain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9463) granting a pension to Hannah Calhoon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9464) granting a pension to Absolem Hobbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9465) granting a pension to Ella Q. Parish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9466) granting a pension to Catharine Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9467) granting a pension to John A. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9468) granting a pension to Henry Lawless—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9469) granting a pension to James Caudill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9470) granting a pension to Daniel J. Shoemaker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9471) granting a pension to Lucreasy Cassady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9472) granting a pension to Ellen Holbrook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9473) granting a pension to William Pack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9474) granting a pension to Lucinda Stamper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9475) granting a pension to Robert Sewell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9476) granting a pension to Frances Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9477) granting a pension to Evaline Elrod—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9478) granting a pension to James B. Kilgore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9479) granting a pension to Selie Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9480) granting a pension to James H. Rainey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9481) granting a pension to Emma Sparks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9482) granting a pension to Woodford M. Shoemaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9483) granting a pension to James Obrien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9484) granting a pension to John Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9485) granting a pension to T. J. Treadway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9486) granting a pension to Greenville R. Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9487) granting a pension to James S. Walters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9488) granting a pension to Howard Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, bill (H. R. 9489) granting a pension to Jasper Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9490) granting an increase of pension to William W. Fergusen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9491) granting an increase of pension to R. L. Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9492) granting an increase of pension to James Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9493) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Atkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9494) granting an increase of pension to John M. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9495) granting an increase of pension to James K. Nickell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9496) to correct the record of William Shepherd and grant him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9497) correcting the record of Moses Adams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9498) correcting the record of Jonathan Chaney and granting him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9499) correcting the record of James Mitchell and granting to his widow a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9500) correcting the record of James Grooms and granting him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9501) to correct the record of Isaac Stephens and grant him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9502) correcting the record of Allen Daniels and granting his widow a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9503) to correct the record of James Stone and grant him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9504) correcting the record of Harison Pack and granting him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9505) correcting the record of D. B. Porter and granting him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9506) correcting the record of J. H. Porter and granting him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9507) to pay Elijah Patrick, of Salyersville, Ky., for two years' service in late war as a captain of a company of volunteers, and granting him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9508) placing the name of J. R. Mann, of Salyersville, Ky., on the muster rolls of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9509) giving military record to John F. Rudd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9510) giving military record to William R. Flannery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9511) granting an increase of pension to Philip Hamman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9512) granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Cassity—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9513) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Steelman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9514) granting an increase of pension to John W. Puckett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9515) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Strong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9516) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9517) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Dixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9518) granting an increase of pension to John D. Jameson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9519) granting an increase of pension to Nancy E. Rowland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9520) granting an increase of pension to John P. Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9521) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9522) granting an increase of pension to Solomon May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9523) correcting the military record of Levi Carpenter and granting him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9524) correcting the military record of Henry Craig and granting him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9525) correcting the military record of G. W. Perkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9526) to correct the military record of George Coburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9527) correcting the military record of E. M. Walters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 9528) to reimburse Fred Dickson for loss of his tools through the fire which destroyed the engine house at Fort Duchesne, Utah, on September 19, 1902—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUBBARD: A bill (H. R. 9529) granting an increase of pension to William Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 9530) granting a pension to Catherine Casey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9531) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9532) for the relief of the estate of Richard G. Reece, deceased, late of Harborton, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9533) for the relief of the heirs of Richard S. Rew, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9534) for the relief of Edward Nock—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9535) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9536) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. S. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9537) granting a pension to Esther G. Whorton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 9538) for the relief of former occupants of the present military reservation at Point San Jose, in the city of San Francisco, and to repeal an act entitled "An act to refer the claim of Jessie Benton Frémont to certain lands and improvements thereon in San Francisco, Cal., to the Court of Claims," approved February 10, 1893—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9539) for the relief of Maj. Ormond M. Lissak—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9540) for the relief of Walter L. Stowell, of San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9541) granting a pension to Frank Klein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9542) granting a pension to Thomas O'Toole—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9543) granting an increase of pension to Amanda M. P. Brock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9544) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Franklin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9545) to reimburse the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, for moneys paid by said city and county to Adolph L. Rehfeld upon a judgment recovered by him against said city and county for damages to his property inflicted by soldiers of the United States Army—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9546) to provide an American register for the barkentine *Andromeda*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 9547) granting a pension to James R. Stroup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9548) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9549) granting a pension to Elizabeth Stambaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLEPPER: A bill (H. R. 9550) granting a pension to Thomas Brachter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 9551) granting an increase of pension to Catherine C. Lay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9552) for the relief of John Cathman—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 9553) granting a pension to Marvin Cashun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9554) granting an increase of pension to John McLaughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEGARE: A bill (H. R. 9555) granting an increase of pension to Frederick P. Deuel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9556) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9557) granting a pension to Mary E. Bird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 9558) for the relief of Robert M. Williamson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 9559) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah C. Bryan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9560) granting a pension to Frances McGraw—to the Commitee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9561) granting a pension to Clara I. Ashbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9562) granting an increase of pension to John Behymer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9563) granting an increase of pension to James G. Higgins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9564) granting an honorable discharge to Hermann Hirt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9565) granting honorable certificates of discharge to certain officers and enlisted men of the United States volunteer service who were called out by the proclamation of Gen. Lewis Wallace, issued September 5, 1862—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 9566) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles H. Upham and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 9567) granting an increase of pension to Henderson Rose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMORRAN. A bill (H. R. 9568) granting an increase of pension to Egbert W. Cribbens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 9569) for the relief of the Compagnie Française des Cables Télégraphiques—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 9570) for the relief of Willoughbly L. Wilson, administrator of the estate of Willoughbly Wilson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9571) for the relief of Benjamin P. Loyall—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER: A bill (H. R. 9572) for the relief of the heirs of Pierre Sauve—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9573) for the relief of the legal representatives of the late firm of Lapène & Ferré—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 9574) granting an increase of pension to Franklin R. Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 9575) for the relief of James E. Byram—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9576) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wagner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9577) for the relief of Charles H. Stockley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 9578) granting an increase of pension to A. B. Menard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9579) granting an increase of pension to John G. Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 9580) granting an increase of pension to Burrel G. Hart—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9581) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Monroe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9582) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9583) granting an increase of pension to August Siederman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9584) granting an increase of pension to Reuben G. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9585) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. O'Neil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 9586) for the relief of Addison C. Fletcher—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 9587) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9588) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 9589) granting an increase of pension to John Hayden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9590) granting an increase of pension to John Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 9591) granting an increase of pension to John S. Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9592) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Whitley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9593) granting a pension to C. M. Priddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9594) for the relief of Simon Motz, late custodian of the Fort Hays Military Reservation—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9595) granting a pension to John C. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9596) granting a pension to D. M. Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9597) granting a pension to W. H. Denham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9598) granting a pension to Nannie Vanarsdall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9599) granting a pension to Jacob F. Napier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9600) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9601) granting an increase of pension to John B. Page—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9602) granting a pension to Robert Dearing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9603) granting an increase of pension to Levi M. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9604) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Epley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9605) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hendrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9606) granting a pension to Martha Jewell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 9607) for the relief of the estate of James H. Schilling, of the parish of Washington, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 9608) granting an increase of pension to Alfred L. Heuston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 9609) granting an increase of pension to Jesse M. Auchmutz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCROGGY: A bill (H. R. 9610) granting a pension to Sallie Morey Witherspoon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9611) granting a pension to Robert N. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9612) granting a pension to Irene Pennington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also ,a bill (H. R. 9613) granting a pension to Lovina Helser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9614) granting a pension to Thomas Leever—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9615) granting a pension to John Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9616) granting a pension to Cornelia E. Newsom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9617) granting an increase of pension to David A. Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9618) granting an increase of pension to Charles Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9619) granting an increase of pension to Augusta Leellyett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9620) granting an increase of pension to John Hiett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9621) granting an increase of pension to John E. Hawthorn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9622) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9623) granting an increase of pension to William H. Feu—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9624) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Iliff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9625) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Jacks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9626) granting an increase of pension to James W. Dakin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9627) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9628) granting an increase of pension to John M. Bromagem—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9629) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Kavanagh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9630) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Cowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9631) granting an increase of pension to Phillip Willis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9632) granting an increase of pension to William A. Aultman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9633) granting an increase of pension to James C. Rigdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9634) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Weeks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9635) granting an increase of pension to Silas Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9636) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Supinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9637) granting an increase of pension to John F. Searight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9638) granting an increase of pension to George R. Archer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9639) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Alexander D. Patton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9640) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Bruno Nohle—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9641) to correct the military record of John C. Herron—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9642) to correct the military record of William F. Elliott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9643) to correct the military record of Thomas J. Sutton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9644) for the correction of the date and place of discharge of Edward McKenzie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 9645) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. May—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9646) granting a pension to Henry P. Conn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9647) granting an increase of pension to David G. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9648) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Wilhoit—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9649) to remove the charge of desertion from Ellis J. J. Counterman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 9650) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Bostwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPIGHT: A bill (H. R. 9651) granting an increase of pension to C. S. Word—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9652) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Proctor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9653) granting an honorable discharge to Jerome Salisbury—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9654) granting an increase of pension to William A. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9655) granting an increase of pension to William Crooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9656) granting a pension to Elias Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9657) granting an increase of pension to William E. Hilliker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHARD: A bill (H. R. 9658) granting an increase of pension to George Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9659) granting an increase of pension to Abraham V. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9660) granting a pension to Henry C. Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9661) granting a pension to Charles R. Hill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9662) granting a pension to Hiram Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9663) granting a pension to John McLain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9664) granting a pension to E. C. Durfey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9665) granting an increase of pension to H. K. Brooker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9666) granting an increase of pension to Allen S. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9667) granting an increase of pension to Columbus C. Parish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9668) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shafer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 9669) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 9670) authorizing a patent to be issued to Stephen Teichner for certain lands therein described—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9671) granting an increase of pension to Carrie M. Hickman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9672) granting a pension to Margaret Lyndall Goddard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9673) granting a pension to Oliver H. Griffin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9674) granting a pension to William E. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9675) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Fleming—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9676) to correct the military record of Cornelius Hardin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9677) to correct the military record of William H. Feaster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9678) granting an increase of pension to William R. Milot—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9679) granting an increase of pension to Adam Kaufman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9680) granting an increase of pension to Florence N. Leathem—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9681) granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9682) granting an increase of pension to Washington G. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9683) granting a pension to Fred C. Lockhart—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9684) granting a pension to Leonard Lawrence—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9685) granting a pension to William Maroney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9686) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9687) to remove the charge of desertion against Andrew Luff, and granting his widow, Maria, a pension of $24 per month—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9688) to remove the charge of desertion against Peter C. Lawyer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9689) to correct the military record of Charles H. Jessup—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9690) to correct the military record of Joseph Joiner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9691) granting a pension to George R. Huntley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9692) granting a pension to Hiram Roe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLACE: A bill (H. R. 9693) for the relief of Asa Townsend—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9694) for the relief of Nathaniel S. Word, deceased, late of Ouachita County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9695) for relief of estate of Joshua Hill—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9696) for the relief of S. N. Caughey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9697) for the relief of the heirs of William T. Stone, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9698) for the relief of J. C. Karr—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9699) for the relief of the heirs of John C. Eckels—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9700) for the relief of the heirs of John W. Barton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9701) for the relief of E. C. Young, O. P. Young, and the estate of J. A. McGinnis, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9702) for the relief of William Crow—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9703) for the relief of Jacob P. Stroope—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9704) granting a pension to Eraster Coyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9705) granting a pension to George W. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9706) granting an increase of pension to William Jackson Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9707) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9708) granting an increase of pension to James W. Ferrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9709) granting an increase of pension to Wiley H. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 9710) to complete the military record of Wiley Fender and for an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9711) to complete the military record of Allen Fender and for an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 9712) for the relief of Charles F. Wood—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9713) for the relief of Hattie P. Spicer—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9714) granting an increase of pension to George Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of directors of the Denver Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade, favoring Mesa Verde National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Phoenix and Maricopa County Board of Trade, of Phoenix, Ariz., against joint statehood with New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the National Firemen's Association convention at Kansas City, against the Dryden bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of the General Assembly's Permanent Committee on Temperance of the Presbyterian Church in America, against sale of liquor in Indian territories—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Civic Club of Philadelphia, favoring President Roosevelt's recommendation that Niagara be kept as a national park—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Henry Veon and J. M. Hays, for immediate passage of the Penrose and Dalzell bills relative to ex-prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Corwin M. Holt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Civic Club of Philadelphia, favoring support of the President's recommendation as to Niagara being kept a national park—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of the Phoenix and Maricopa County Board of Trade, of Phoenix, Ariz., against joint statehood with New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of 60,000 American residents of Alaska, for representation in Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Hazlewood Lodge, No. 130, Knights of Pythias, of Pittsburg, and James C. Gross and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Civic Club of Philadelphia, favoring the President's recommendation relative to Niagara—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of Mizpah Rebekah Lodge, No. 15, of Britton, and Grace E. Hinkley and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Maine, favoring a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of the American Society of the Isle of Pines, against treaty ceding Isle of Pines to Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Grange, against tax on alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Greenville (Ohio) Board of Trade, for legislation on railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of John Elliott and Sobercus Cromleigh, for immediate passage of the Penrose-Dalzell bill relative to pensioning ex-prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petition of officials of various temperance organizations, against sale of liquor in Territories—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Layton Council, No. 343, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 8825) for relief of Thomas H. Kent—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of South Butte Camp, Modern Woodmen of America, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of the board of trustees of the New York State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, for reestablishment of the canteen at the Home—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FASSETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Stacy B. Warford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the Phoenix and Maricopa County Board of Trade, against joint statehood with New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Home Mission of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, favoring purchase of small holdings for landless Indians of northern California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John L. Edmunds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Civic Club of Philadelphia, favoring the President's recommendation relative to Niagara—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GUDGER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of F. M. Rehenheart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of J. A. Reagan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of W. N. Hedden—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of the Stamford Harbor Improvement Association, for a new survey of Stamford Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary B. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Gilmore Council, No. 56, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Torrington, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Fred Dickson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLINE: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 113, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Birnville, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 99, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Wernersville, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Cathman—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of M. Glatfelten and others, fa-

voring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alcia Adams—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of 60,000 American residents of Alaska, for representation in Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Modisco Irrigation Association, of San Francisco, against that city obtaining a reservoir site in Yosemite Park—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of Orbisonia (Pa.) Camp, No. 374, Patriotic Order Sons of America, and George W. Hicks and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Washington Camp, No. 145, of Hegins, Pa., and Washington Camp, No. 72, of Delano, Pa., Patriotic Order Sons of America; Harry E. Shafer, of Delano, Pa.; Niobrara Tribe, No. 373, Improved Order of Red Men, of Tremont, Pa., and Reiner City Council, No. 370, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAINEY: Resolution for relief of William R. Payne—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. A. McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of E. P. Maconaughey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of Red Cross Commandery, R. and I. O. K. of M., No. 27, of Milton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHARTEL: Petition of citizens of Missouri, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Seminole tribe, favoring independent statehood for Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: Petition of the board of supervisors of Yavapai County, Ariz., against joint statehood with New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of Putnam Council, No. 19, Independent Order United American Mechanics, of Wallingford, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Wallingford, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Municipal Art Society of Hartford, Conn., against commercial spoliation of Niagara—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Municipal Art Society of Hartford, Conn., for preservation of American forests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the court of common council of Hartford, Conn., favoring a Government forest reserve in New Hampshire—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Benjamin Proctor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Bremer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Petition of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress, for improvement of harbors on the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific coast; also of the Columbia River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., against revision of the present tariff law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the United Confederate Veterans, for an appropriation to care for graves of soldiers who died in prisons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John A. Layton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: Resolution of Washington Camp, No. 458, of Quakertown, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Richard Grange, No. 1206, Patrons of Husbandry, of Richland Center, Pa., for amendment to act to define butter, approved August 6, 1886, by striking out the word "knowingly" from section 6—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of L. Sanford Yost, C. E. Bartholomew, and other citizens of Quakertown, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 658, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, of Bryn Mawr, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 658, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, of Bryn Mawr, Pa., for free alcohol in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Montgomery Council, No. 18, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Lansdale, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Wilfred O. Stover and other citizens of Lansdale, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of G. H. Larimer and other ladies of the Current Events Club of Wincote, Pa., for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George Ramsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEMS: Petitions of Summit Council, No. 222, of Lewisville; Steubenville Council, No. 144, of Steubenville; Barnesville Council, No. 190, of Barnesville; White Prince Lodge, No. 742, of Neffs; Martins Ferry Council, No. 39, of Martins Ferry; Hannibal Council, No. 28, of Hannibal; Ohio Valley Council, No. 21, of Bellaire; Toronto Council, No. 10, of Toronto; Enterprise Council, No. 331, of Bridgeport, and Hand-in-Hand Council, No. 36, of Charington, all in Ohio, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of George M. Glassier and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Maynard Council, No. 61, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Maynard, Ohio, and T. E. Boyd, jr., and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of Local Union No. 362, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, of West Newton, Mass., for free denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Alex Sims and others, favoring legislation for a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Owosso Chamber of Commerce, against reduction of the tariff on sugar from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 20, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. TELLER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

FINDINGS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Cornelia A. Jones, administratrix of John L. T. Jones, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MISSISSIPPI INDIAN RESERVATION IN MINNESOTA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of letters from the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, together with the draft of a proposed paragraph for incorporation in the Indian appropriation bill, providing for the sale of the down timber and hay on the ten sections of land in the former Chippewa of the Mississippi Indian Reservation, Minn., reserved from sale or settlement under the act of June 27, 1902; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

SEAL ISLANDS OF ALASKA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th inst., copies of all the reports of the agent in charge of the seal fisheries of Alaska made during the years 1904 and 1905, inclusive, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The VICE-PRESIDENT reappointed Mr. MARTIN a director, on the part of the Senate, of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-In Asylum, Washington, D. C., under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1872.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. DRYDEN presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Orange, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the Charity Organization Society of Paterson, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Charity Organization Society of Paterson, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate child labor in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MONEY presented a memorial of the General Board of Adjustment, Illinois Central System, Order of Railway Conductors of America, of Canton, Miss., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad-rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Stoneware Potters' Union of Red Wing, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LODGE presented memorials of Boston Division, No. 61, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Boston, Mass.; of Boston Division, No. 122, Order of Railway Conductors, of Boston, Mass., and of Boston Division, No. 41, Order of Railway Telegraphers, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad rate bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Citizens' Trade Association of Cambridge, Mass., praying for the ratification of reciprocity treaties between the United States and European countries; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Aldermen of Somerville, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the Jews in Russia; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Second Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Boston, Mass., and a petition of the Woman's Board of Missions of Boston, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Framingham, Mass., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SPOONER presented the petition of W. S. Matteson and sundry other citizens of Wonewoc, Wis., and a petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 61, American Federation of Labor, of La Crosse, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Waupun, Edgerton, Afton, Beloit, Shopiene, Menasha, Watertown, Reeseville, Milwaukee, Middleton, Hancock, Baraboo, Tiffany, Oshkosh, and Waupaca, all in the State of Wisconsin, and of sundry citizens of Santa Rosalia Heights, Isle of Pines, West Indies, remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BURKETT presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 861) granting an increase of pension to Thomas O'Conner; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 880) granting an increase of pension to Michael Brannan; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 884) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mann; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry affidavits relative to the claim of S. L. Andrews for pension; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

UNITED STATES VS. ATCHISON, TOPEKA AND SANTA FE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I present a statement, being contempt proceedings in the circuit court of the United States for the western division of the western district of Missouri in the case of The United States of America, plaintiff, *v.* The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, defendant. I move that the statement be printed as a document.

The motion was agreed to.

GRAVES OF CONFEDERATE DEAD.

Mr. FORAKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1234) to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederate army and navy who died in northern prisons and were buried near the prisons where they died, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

MESSENGER FOR COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL EXPOSITIONS.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by himself on the 19th instant, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. SPOONER. I am moved partly from curiosity and partly, I think, with some reference to public duty, to inquire of the Senator from New Jersey, the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, how many committees of the Senate there are left that have not messengers? Some such resolution, I think, comes on every day, and seems to pass nem. con. I endeavored in the beginning to stem the tide, but it was an impossibility. If there are any committees left which have not messengers, why not supply them and thereby rid ourselves of this daily treat?

Mr. HALE. That is the intention.

Mr. KEAN. That is the intention of this resolution. This is only one. I believe there are three other committees that have not messengers.

Mr. SPOONER. What committees are they?

Mr. KEAN. The Committee on the Potomac River Front and the Committee on National Banks, and possibly one other.

Mr. SPOONER. That leads me to inquire of the Senator from New Jersey why this discrimination?

Mr. KEAN. The Senator from New Jersey has no intention to discriminate——

Mr. SPOONER. I know it.

Mr. KEAN. But the Senator from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] has been very anxious that the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions should have a messenger, and it has been done, and I think very properly done.

Mr. SPOONER. Not to do it would be a discrimination.

Mr. KEAN. I think it would, and I do not want to discriminate in anyone's favor or against anyone.

I will say further that in the reorganization of the committees of the Senate two committees that did have messengers were dropped, and therefore this is no increase whatever in the messenger force or in the expenses of the contingent fund.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator does not mean that the messengers were dropped, but the committees were dropped?

Mr. KEAN. The committees were dropped and that dropped the messengers. Both the messengers and the clerks to the committees were dropped.

Mr. HALE. I suppose the Senator has no doubt that the other two or three committees will strike the surface before long. Will they not?

Mr. KEAN. They will be on hand; they are already.

Mr. HALE. The Senator will hear them?

Mr. KEAN. I expect to do so in a very short time.

Mr. HALE. I hope so.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 2319) to amend the Code of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 2320) to amend the Code of the District of Columbia, relating to dower; and

A bill (S. 2321) for the opening of Fessenden street NW., District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 2322) to provide for the control, administration, and support of the public schools of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 2323) to determine and regulate the salaries of

officers, teachers, and other employees of the board of education for the public schools of the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 2324) to amend the act relating to the organization of the board of education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. CULLOM. I introduced yesterday a bill for the relief of Mr. James D. Vernay. I find that it was wrongly prepared, and I introduce the same bill in a corrected form.

The bill (S. 2325) for the relief of James D. Vernay was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2326) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hickey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2327) granting an increase of pension to Sidney F. Mullen;

A bill (S. 2328) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Franklin Bigelow; and

A bill (S. 2329) granting an increase of pension to Knud Targerson.

Mr. FLINT introduced a bill (S. 2330) making appropriation for the erection of a monument to the memory of the sailors who lost their lives in the *Bennington* disaster; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2331) granting a pension to Cornelia S. Swaine;

A bill (S. 2332) granting an increase of pension to Ashley A. Youmans; and

A bill (S. 2333) granting an increase of pension to Charles Clark.

Mr. ALGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2334) granting an increase of pension to Judson M. Francis;

A bill (S. 2335) granting an increase of pension to Patrick H. Burke;

A bill (S. 2336) granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Smith; and

A bill (S. 2337) granting an increase of pension to Ellen S. Larned.

Mr. DRYDEN introduced a bill (S. 2338) granting a pension to Emma H. Benham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SPOONER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2339) granting an increase of pension to Albison Shaw; and

A bill (S. 2340) granting a pension to Frances H. Eldridge.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced a bill (S. 2341) for the relief of George A. Bartlett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2342) to correct the military record of Wallace M. Metcalf, alias Monroe E. Clough; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2343) granting a pension to Hannah A. J. Cooper; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 2344) granting an increase of pension to Albert C. Andrews; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KNOX introduced a bill (S. 2345) to provide for the erection of a public building at Charleroi, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SUTHERLAND introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2346) granting an increase of pension to John W. Reed; and

A bill (S. 2347) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Burton.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2348) granting an increase of pension to Newton S. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 2349) granting an increase of pension to Edward Yarton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2350) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Plattsmouth, Nebr., and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 2351) granting an increase of pension to Antionette A. Darnall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 2352) granting a pension to David A. Montgomery; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLARK of Montana introduced a bill (S. 2353) to provide for condemnation of an underground right of way in the working and development of mining claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 2354) to authorize the construction of dams and power stations on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Alabama; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2355) to reorganize the corps of dental surgeons attached to the Medical Department of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MARTIN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2356) for the relief of the heirs of Lewis Tucker, deceased (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2357) for the relief of George A. Nowland, administrator of James B. Beavers, deceased;

A bill (S. 2358) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Fredericksburg, Va.;

A bill (S. 2359) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Warrenton, Va.;

A bill (S. 2360) for the relief of the Salem Baptist Church, of Clarke County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2361) for the relief of the Methodist Protestant Church;

A bill (S. 2362) for the relief of the trustees of Barea Christian Church, of Spottsylvania County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2363) for the relief of Edgar M. Wilson, administrator of Thomas B. Van Buren, deceased;

A bill (S. 2364) for the relief of the heirs of William Samuel Custis; and

A bill (S. 2365) for the relief of the Seaboard Air Line Railway.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 2366) for the erection of a keeper's dwelling to be attached to the fog-signal station at the harbor of Cape Charles, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 2367) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Boyle, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2368) for the relief of the Postal Telegraph Cable Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2369) to correct the military record of Joseph A. Swope; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2370) granting a pension to Annie Valerie Stockton;

A bill (S. 2371) granting a pension to William H. Rogers;

A bill (S. 2372) granting an increase of pension to John Oursler;

A bill (S. 2373) granting an increase of pension to W. L. Johnston;

A bill (S. 2374) granting an increase of pension to N. Warren Pulsifer;

A bill (S. 2375) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel McMichael;

A bill (S. 2376) granting a pension to Julia A. Roberts;

A bill (S. 2377) granting a pension to Clara T. Leathers;

A bill (S. 2378) granting an increase of pension to Maria Leuckart;

A bill (S. 2379) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Lee;

A bill (S. 2380) granting an increase of pension to David B. McCreary (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2381) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Harris (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 15) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the commencement and termination of Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 16) directing to be made a preliminary examination and survey of Savannah River from Savannah, Ga., to Petersburg, Ga., improving the navigation of said river; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, there is a great demand for Senate Document No. 69, being the hearing before the Committee on Appropriations in reference to the Panama business. The edition is exhausted, and I ask that fifteen hundred additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate.

There being no objection, the order was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That 1,500 additional copies of Senate Document No. 69, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session, "Hearing before the Committee on Appropriations to accompany the bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans,' approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes," be printed for the use of the Senate.

HARBOR OF REFUGE, BLOCK ISLAND, RHODE ISLAND.

Mr. WETMORE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made and estimates to be submitted with a view to securing a greater navigable depth and a larger anchorage area at the Harbor of Refuge, Block Island, Rhode Island.

NORA E. SNEDDON.

Mr. SPOONER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Nora E. Sneddon widow of John Sneddon, late a messenger of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ASSISTANT CLERK AND LABORER FOR COMMITTEE.

Mr. CARTER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That beginning on January 1, 1906, the Committee on Organization, Conduct, and Expenditures of the Executive Departments be authorized to employ an assistant clerk at $720 per annum and a laborer at $720 per annum, in lieu of the messenger provided by the resolution of January 31, 1902.

STENOGRAPHER FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to employ a stenographer, at an annual salary at the rate of $900 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

MESSENGER TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. NIXON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on National Banks be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

EMPLOYMENT OF MESSENGER.

Mr. SUTHERLAND submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Select Committee to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the Calendar of General Orders is in order.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, before the Calendar is proceeded with, as reflecting on the present state of the law with respect to the regulation of railway rates. I desire to have printed in the RECORD two or three documents.

The first is an article from the Washington Post of December 13, 1905, giving the order recently issued by the Attorney-General to the district attorneys of the United States, directing them to institute proceedings to prevent and punish rebates. If there is no objection, I shall simply ask that it may be incorporated without reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The paper referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, December 13, 1905.]

TO BREAK UP REBATES—SPECIAL ORDERS ISSUED TO DISTRICT ATTORNEYS—MOODY GIVES INSTRUCTIONS—FEDERAL OFFICIALS DIRECTED TO START INVESTIGATION OF COMPLAINTS—WHERE EVIDENCE WARRANTS OFFENDERS ARE TO BE INDICTED FOR CONSPIRACY—SHIPPER AND CARRIER ARE BOTH TO BE PROSECUTED.

A sweeping order to all Federal district attorneys in the United States has been sent out by Attorney-General Moody, with a view of breaking up the practice of railroad rebates. The attorneys are directed to act upon their own initiative without waiting for specific directions from the Attorney-General. Furthermore, they are instructed to prosecute for conspiracy and for punishment by imprisonment instead of by fine whenever possible.

The letter of the Attorney-General, which bears date of December 8, follows:

"An act entitled 'To further regulate commerce among foreign nations and among the States,' approved February 19, 1903 (32 Stats., 847), commonly known as the 'Elkins Act,' is directed against rebates and other discriminatory practices by common carriers. It makes such practices misdemeanors and provides for their punishment by fines. It further provides for their prohibition by the unjunctive process of the courts. There is no provision that criminal prosecution shall be by the special direction of the Attorney-General, but in section 3 it is provided that proceedings for injunction shall be begun 'whenever the Attorney-General shall direct.'

TO INVESTIGATE COMPLAINTS.

"You are directed diligently to investigate all complaints which may come to you from any source of violation of this law, and, upon your own initiative, to make investigations if there appears to you to be any reasonable ground for suspecting violations of this law. In every case in which you can secure sufficient evidence you will submit that evidence to the grand jury with a view to securing an indictment. Whenever it is practicable it is desirable that indictments should be returned both against the shipper and the carrier. In some cases, however, it may be impossible to obtain sufficient evidence without the aid of the testimony of one of the guilty parties to the transaction. In such a case it would be wise to use such testimony, of course, affording to the witness or witnesses immunity from prosecution.

"Under the Elkins law the only penalty for its violation is a fine. I suggest to you, in all cases where the evidence would warrant it, that an indictment for conspiracy to commit an offense against the United States, based upon section 5440 of the Revised Statutes, be obtained.

RULING OF SUPREME COURT.

"The Supreme Court has held, in Clune *v.* United States (159 U. S., 590, 595), that a conspiracy to commit a crime, itself punishable only by fine, may be punished by imprisonment. In the event of obtaining a conviction upon a charge of this kind you are directed to present to the court the desirability of inflicting the penalty of imprisonment, to the end that these unlawful practices, which have received almost universal condemnation, may be discouraged and prevented as far as existing laws will accomplish that result.

"Your attention is especially directed to that part of the act which renders unlawful 'any rebate, concession, discrimination in the respect of the transportation of any property in interstate or foreign commerce * * * whereby any such property shall, by any device whatever, be transported at a less rate than that of the tariffs published and filed.'

"I desire to impress upon you the importance of using every effort to execute these directions. You will report to the Department from time to time any action which you may have taken upon this subject."

Mr. FORAKER. I offer, in the second place, a decision rendered on the 20th day of November, 1905, by Judge Bethea, of the United States circuit court for the eastern division of the northern district of Illinois, in a very celebrated case, brought at the instance of the Interstate Commerce Commission against a large number of railroads, to test the question as to whether or not there was discrimination against live stock shipped from points on the Missouri and other points to Chicago as against the dressed product. I ask that that may be incorporated in the RECORD. It is a very long opinion. I shall not take the time now to read it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The paper referred to is as follows:

[Chicago Legal News, Vol. XXXVIII. December 2, 1905. No. 16.]

United States circuit court, eastern district of northern district of Illinois. Opinion filed November, 1905. In equity.

Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* The Chicago Great Western Railway Company; The Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway Company; The Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company; The Chicago & Alton Railway Company; The Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company; The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company; The Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company; The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company; The Hannibal & St. Joseph Railroad Company; The Illinois Central Railroad Company; The Iowa Central Railway Company; The Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs Railroad Company; The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company; The Missouri Pacific Railway Company; The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company; The Quincy, Omaha & Kansas City Railroad Company erroneously sued as The Omaha, Kansas City & Eastern Railroad Company; The Wabash Railroad Company, and The Wisconsin Central Railway Company, defendants. No. 27723.

Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* The Chicago Great Western Railway Company; The Burlington, Cedar Rapids & Northern Railway Company; The Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway

Company; The Chicago & Alton Railway Company; The Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company; The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company; The Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Company; The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company; The Hannibal & St. Joseph Railroad Company; The Illinois Central Railroad Company; The Iowa Central Railway Company; The Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Bluffs Railroad Company; The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company; The Missouri Pacific Railway Company; The Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railway Company; The Quincy, Omaha & Kansas City Railroad Company erroneously sued as The Omaha, Kansas City & Eastern Railroad Company; The Wabash Railroad Company, and the Wisconsin Central Railway Company, original defendants.

Sioux City Stock Yards Company; St. Joseph Stock Yards Company; St. Paul Union Stock Yards Company; Railroad and Warehouse Commissioners of the State of Minnesota; T. M. Sinclair & Company, Limited; and The Union Stock Yards Company of Omaha, Interveners. No. 27829.

1. *The act to regulate commerce—Its objects.*—The principal objects of the interstate commerce act were to secure just and reasonable rates; to prohibit unjust discriminations in the rendition of like service, under substantially similar circumstances and conditions; to prevent undue or unreasonable preference to persons, corporations, or localities; to inhibit greater compensation for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line; and to abolish combinations for the pooling of freight.

2. *Same—Same—Competition.*—The act to regulate commerce was not designed to prevent competition between different roads, but rather to encourage it.

3. *Section 1 of the act to regulate commerce.*—Section 1 of the act to regulate commerce requires that all charges made for the transportation of property shall be reasonable; and the evidence shows that the rates in controversy in these cases are reasonable.

4. *Same—Factors to be considered in fixing reasonable rates—Value of service to the shipper.*—There are a great many factors and circumstances to be considered in fixing rates; and, among other things, is the value of the service to the shipper, which includes the value of the goods and the profits which the shipper can make by having them transported from one point to another. The evidence and authorities in the cases show that this method of rate making is not only ideal but practical when not interfered with by competition; and it is based on an idea similar to taxation. Case cited: I. C. C. *v.* B. & O. R. R. Co., 43 Fed. Rep., pp. 37, 53.

5. *Same—Same—Cost of service to the carrier.*—The evidence shows that the cost of service to the carrier would be an ideal theory for rate making; but it is not practical. Such cost can be reached approximately, but not accurately enough to make this factor controlling. It is, however, worthy of consideration and is a very important factor. Cases cited: I. C. C. *v.* B. & O. R. R. Co., 43 Fed. Rep., pp. 37, 53; Ransome *v.* E. C. Ry. Co. (1857), 1 C. B., p. 437; 26 L. J. C. P., p. 91; Judson on Interstate Commerce, sections 148, 149; W. U. Tel. Co. *v.* Call Pub. Co., 181 U. S., p. 92; D. G. H. & M. R. R. Co. *v.* I. C. C., 167 U. S., p. 633.

6. *Same—Same—Weight, bulk, and convenience of transportation.*—The weight and bulk of the article to be transported, and the convenience or inconvenience to the carrier in transporting it, may be considered in rate making.

7. *Same—Same—The amount of the product or commodity offered for transportation.*—The fact that there is a large amount of a product or commodity in the hands of a few persons under almost one control, which is offered for shipment at stated intervals, in fixed and continuous quantities, may be considered in rate making; thus recognizing the principle of selling cheaper at wholesale than at retail. Case cited: I. C. C. *v.* B. & O. R. R. Co., 145 U. S., pp. 263–272.

8. *Same—Same—The general public good.*—The general public good may be considered in rate making. This includes the welfare and advantage of the great body of the citizens of the United States, who constitute the producers, shippers, and consumers; and it also includes the welfare and advantage of the various localities, and of the common carriers. Case cited: I. C. C. *v.* B. & O. R. R. Co., 145 U. S., p. 263; see also T. & P. Ry. *v.* I. C. C., 162 U. S., pp. 218–219.

9. *Same—Same—Competition.*—Competition may be considered in rate making. The authorities, as well as the experts in these cases, recognize that competition may be a controlling factor. Cases cited: Pickering, Phipps & Co. *v.* L. & N. W. Ry. Co., 2 Q. B. D. (1892), p. 229; I. C. C. *v.* B. & O. R. R. Co., p. 263; C. N. O. & T. P. Ry. *v.* I. C. C., 162 U. S., p. 184; I. C. C. *v.* Ala. Midland Ry. Co., 168 U. S., p. 164; L. & N. R. R. Co. *v.* Behlmer, 175 U. S., p. 648; E. T. V. & G. Ry. *v.* I. C. C., 181 U. S., p. 1; T. & P. Ry. Co. *v.* I. C. C., 162 U. S., p. 197; I. C. C. *v.* L. & N. R. R. Co., 190 U. S., p. 273.

10. *Same—Same—No one of the above factors is alone controlling.*—None of the above factors alone are considered as necessarily controlling. Neither are all of them controlling as a matter of law. It is a question of fact, to be decided by the proper tribunal in each case as to what is controlling. In every case the Supreme Court has held that competition may be controlling. In only one case has it, as a matter of fact, been held not to be a defence.

11. *Section 3 of the act to regulate commerce—Its objects.*—The object of section 3 of the act to regulate commerce was to prevent undue preference or advantage to any person, company, firm, corporation, or locality or any particular description of traffic.

12. *Same—Same—Undue or unreasonable preference or advantage.*—The statute does not define the phrase "undue or unreasonable preference or advantage." Whether a preference or advantage is "undue" or "unreasonable" must be determined by the circumstances of each case.

13. *Same—Same—Inequality of charge.*—Mere inequality of charge does not constitute undue or unreasonable preference or advantage. Railroads are only bound to give the same terms to all persons alike, under the same conditions and circumstances; and any fact which produces an inequality of conditions and a change of circumstances justifies an inequality of charge. Case cited: I. C. C. *v.* B. & O. R. R. Co., 145 U. S., p. 372.

14. *Same—Same—Same.*—It is proper under the third section to give a preference or advantage or to discriminate between persons, localities, or traffics, provided such preference, advantage, or discrimination be not undue or unreasonable. Cases cited: I. C. C. *v.* Ala. Midland Ry., 168 U. S., p. 144; C., N. O. & T. P. Ry. *v.* I. C. C., 162 U. S., p. 184.

15. *Same—Same—Same.*—In passing upon the question of undue or unreasonable preference or advantage, it is not only legitimate but proper to take into consideration, besides the mere differences in charges, various elements, such as the convenience of the public, the fair interest of the carrier, the relative quantities or volume of the traffic involved, the relative cost of the services and profit to the company, and the situation and circumstances of the respective customers with reference to each other, as competitive or otherwise. Case cited: I. C. C. *v.* B. & O. R. R. Co., 43 Fed. Rep., p. 37; affirmed, 155 U. S., p. 263.

16. *Same—Same—Same—Competition.*—In considering the question of undue or unreasonable preference or advantage prohibited by the third section, competition may be considered. Cases cited: E. T., V. & G. Ry. Co. *v.* I. C. C., 181 U. S., p. 1; I. C. C. *v.* Ala. Midland Ry. Co., 168 U. S., p. 144; Judson on Interstate Commerce Law, sections 175 to 183; I. C. C. *v.* Atlantic Ry. Co. et al., 93 Fed. Rep., p. 83.

17. *Same—Same—Same—Originating competition.*—Even if one of the defendants (the C. G. W. Ry. Co.) had originated the competition in these cases it would be immaterial. Why a defendant can not begin the competition is not apparent. Some one must begin, and why not a defendant, if it is losing the business. A contrary construction would discourage competition, which the act to regulate commerce, as well as the antitrust act, was intended to encourage. Cases cited: E. T., V. & G. Ry. Co. *v.* I. C. C., 181 U. S., p. 1; I. C. C. *v.* Southern Ry Co., 105 Fed Rep., 703.

18. *Same—Same—Same—Distinction between originating competition and reducing rates.*—The C. G. W. Ry. Co., by its contract of August 8, 1902, reduced the rates on live-stock products, but it did not originate the competition in those products.

That competition was going on between these different defendants and other railroad companies with which said contract was made. Each company was striving to get what business it could; and the C. G. W. Ry. Co. reduced the rates in order to get its share of the traffic for which all of defendants had been and were then actively competing.

19. *Same—Same—Same—Reduction of rates—When not voluntary.*—The reduction of rates made by the C. G. W. Ry. was forced upon it, as it could not otherwise have continued to successfully compete for the business. Said reduction therefore was not "voluntary" on its part, within the meaning of the law. Case cited: E. T., V. & G. Ry. Co. *v.* I. C. C., 181 U. S., p. 1.

20. *Same—Same—Same—Distinction between "real" and "possible" competition.*—The fact that defendants might, if they choose to do so, bring about a severe competition in live stock, as in its products, is immaterial. It is sufficient that real and substantial competition is not as severe in live stock as in its products; and it is useless to inquire whether it might be possible to make competition as severe in the one case as in the other. Case cited: I. C. C. *v.* L. & N. R. R. Co., 190 U. S., p. 273.

21. *Same—Same—Same—Particular description of traffic.*—The construction of the phrase "undue or unreasonable preference or advantage" when applied to "any particular description of traffic" must be the same as when applied to "any particular person, company, firm, corporation, or locality." All of said terms are contained in a single sentence of the third section, and the same construction must be given to all of the sentence that is given to a part of it.

22. *Section 3 of the "Elkins Act," approved February 19, 1903.*—Section 3 of the "Elkins Act" provides a remedy in court, without going before the Interstate Commerce Commission, for any discriminations forbidden by law, including the discriminations or preferences prohibited by sections 1 and 3 of the act to regulate commerce.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

Case No. 27723 was brought by the Interstate Commerce Commission against the above-named defendants, under sections 1 and 3 of the interstate-commerce act of 1887, on the 26th day of April, 1905. In that case a petition was filed before the Commission, on March 31, 1902, and a hearing was commenced on January 22, 1903, wherein the testimony of about twenty witnesses was taken. As the result of that hearing, an order was entered by the Commission on the 7th day of January, 1905, that, in accordance with a report and opinion of the Commission in said matter, the relation of rates then maintained and enforced by said defendants in that certain territory described in the petition, whereby their rates for transportation were higher on live cattle and live hogs than upon dressed meats or prepared products of cattle and hogs, on the shipments thereof to Chicago, in the State of Illinois, from points on the Missouri River, Sioux City, in the State of Iowa, to Kansas City, in the State of Missouri, inclusive, and from South St. Paul, in the State of Minnesota, or from points in the territory between the Missouri River or South St. Paul and Chicago, constituted a wrongful prejudice and discrimination in violation of the provisions of the act to regulate commerce; and that said defendants, and each of them, were notified and required to cease and desist on or before the 15th day of February, 1905, from maintaining or enforcing the said unlawful relation of rates, and from further continuing said unlawful prejudice and discrimination.

Proper notice was served upon the defendants, and they refused to obey said order. Thereafter this proceeding was begun in this court.

On the 17th day of July, 1905, the Interstate Commerce Commission began suit No. 27829 against the above-named defendants, under section 3 of an act to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States, which took effect February 19, 1903, and known as the "Elkins Act."

Answers were filed by the defendants therein, in each case, and issue joined on or before the 15th day of September, 1905, at which time the above-named interveners filed their petitions for intervention, and issue was joined upon them. Pleas of former suit pending were filed and overruled. An order was then entered in this court combining the two causes.

The prayer of the petitions in these suits is substantially the same, the object in the first suit being to enforce the order of the Commission, and in the second suit to require a discontinuance of the discrimination alleged in said petition. The substance of the allegations of the two petitions is that the defendants were common carriers from the Missouri River and St. Paul to Chicago; that before August 8, 1902, the published rates of the defendants as to fresh meats and packing-house products from the Missouri River and St. Paul to Chicago were the same as were the rates on live cattle and hogs from the same points to Chicago; that upon the mentioned date, the defendant, The Chicago Great Western Railway Company, made a contract with certain owners of packing houses in Kansas City, St. Joseph, and other Missouri River points, in consideration of receiving a certain percentage of their business for seven years; that for that period the said railway company would transport from the Missouri River points and St. Paul to Chicago fresh meats and packing-house products at the following rates:

Statement showing rates on cattle, hogs, packing-house products, and fresh meats, carloads, from Missouri River and other points to Chicago, Ill.

[Rates in cents per 100 pounds.]

To Chicago, Ill., from—	Cattle.	Hogs.	Packing-house products.	Fresh meats.
Kansas City, Mo	23.5	23.5	20	20
St. Joseph, Mo	a20	a20		
Atchison, Kans	b18.5	b18.5	c18.5	c18.5
Leavenworth, Kans				
Council Bluffs, Iowa				
Omaha, Nebr	23.5	23.5	20	20
South Omaha, Nebr			c18.5	c18.5
Nebraska City, Nebr				
Sioux City, Iowa	25	23.5	20	20
			c18.5	c18.5
St. Paul, Minn., or south	25	27	15.7	17
St. Paul, Minn		a17.5	c14.6	c15.7
Ottumwa, Iowa	22	21	16	
Des Moines, Iowa	22	23.5	18.5	
Marshalltown, Iowa	22	21	16	
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	21	18.5	13.5	

[a] Applies on shipments originating beyond.
[b] When originating beyond and destined beyond the Illinois-Indiana State line.
[c] Destined to points east of Illinois-Indiana State line.

and that at that time, and since, the local rates on live cattle and hogs from said points to Chicago were as above set forth. And they further charge that such condition of rates had existed from that time until the filing of these petitions; that said rates were unreasonable under section 1 of the interstate-commerce act; and the result of such condition of rates was that under sections 3 of the interstate-commerce act, and of the Elkins Act, the defendants were committing an unlawful discrimination against said live cattle and live hogs, the shippers thereof, and the locality of Chicago, and thereby giving an undue and unreasonable preference or advantage to the traffic of fresh meats and packing-house products over said live cattle and hogs.

The Chicago Great Western Railway Company generally denied the violations of the law and set up that the rates were reasonable and gave no undue advantage; that they were caused by competition and justified by the cost of service, and that the order of the Commission was illegal.

The other defendants denied said charges in their answers and claimed, among other things, (1) that the said rates for live cattle and hogs were unreasonably low; (2) that there was not undue or unjust prejudice or advantage under section 3, because there was no relation or similarity between the traffic in fresh meats and packing-house products on the one hand and live cattle and hogs on the other, nor was there undue preference of any kind; (3) that when the cost of service was considered it was reasonable to carry the dressed meats and packing-house products cheaper than the live stock; (4) that packing-house products and fresh meats did not compete in any market with the live stock; (5) that when the commercial necessity of the situation was considered there was no undue prejudice against live stock in the rates; (6) that while the value of the service to the producer of the fresh meats and packing-house products was greater than that to the shipper of live stock, yet the risk of its carriage was very much less; (7) that the rate given to the producer of the packing-house products and fresh meats was caused by necessary competition; (8) that the complainant before the Commission had no interest in the business and no right to complain; (9) that the contract made by the Chicago Great Western Railway Company with the packers prevents the raising of the price of the products of the packers, and that the railroads could not be forced to lower live-stock rates. The interveners filed their petitions objecting to the prayer of the original petitions, and setting out facts tending to show injury to them.

Upon these issues testimony was taken in open court on most of the days from September 15, 1905, to October 14, 1905, and over forty witnesses were examined, and all but four were witnesses who had not been before the Commission. The testimony taken before the Commission was admitted in evidence, and portions of it read to the court, and all of it considered by the court.

The Commission came to certain conclusions as to the facts that are fully set forth in their opinion in the case found in 10 I. C. C. R., 428, which findings of fact the court assumed in the beginning of this hearing and in his consideration of the case to be the real facts in the case, as required by the statute. The court also considers the conclusions of the Commission to be the proper conclusions unless overcome by other testimony produced upon the hearing, although perhaps not required to do so.

The testimony taken before the court was in part to the following effect:

1. Upon the question as to whether the rates upon live cattle and hogs from Missouri River points and St. Paul to Chicago were reasonable or unreasonable, witnesses for the defendants, George H. Crosby, freight traffic manager of the C., B. & Q. Railroad Company; William A. Gardner, general manager C. & N. W. Ry Co.; William E. Keepers, general freight agent of the northerp and western lines of I. C. R. R.; Fletcher C. Rice, general inspector of transportation for the C., B. & Q. R. R.; J. H. Hiland, 3d vice-president C., M. & St. P. Ry. Co.; R. M. Calkins, assistant general freight agent C., M. & St. P. Ry. Co.; J. N. Tittemore, freight traffic manager of the Minneapolis and St. Louis Railroad and the Iowa Central Railroad; A. B. Stickney, president of The Chicago Great Western Railway Company; George E. Simpson, superintendent of transportation C., M. & St. P. Ry.; Harry Gower, assistant freight traffic manager C., R. I. & P. Ry. Co.; John M. Daley, Illinois Central Railroad car accountant, and H. R. McCullough, 3rd vice-president, C. & N. W. Ry. Co., testified that such rates were not only reasonable but were too low. Edward P. Ripley, president A., T. & S. F. Ry. Co., and James Peabody, statistician for said company, also testified that such rates were too low; T. W. Tomlinson and five or six shippers testified on the part of the Commission that such rates were unreasonably high.

2. Upon the question of the comparative cost of the service to the carriers in carrying dressed meat and packing-house products and live cattle and hogs, a great deal of testimony was taken on both sides. This subject was gone into by experts far more fully than had ever been done before. Many of the above witnesses on the part of the defendants made complete and accurate statements of the different items that they thought ought to be considered in determining the cost of service of carriage. The result of all those statements is that it cost far more to carry live stock than it cost to carry fresh meat and packing-house products. They considered, upon the part of fresh meat and packing-house products, the expense of the cost of the refrigerating car, figured at one cent a mile; the terminal charge, in some cases, two or three dollars a car, and the extra expense in hauling a heavier load, etc.; and upon the part of the live stock, the extra cost of service incurred by carrying men to take care of the cattle on the way to the market, and return transportation for said men; the extra expense of providing stock yards at every shipping place, costing from $800 to $1,200, and $1,400; amount of damages paid by the railroad companies because of delays in reaching the market, and because of the destruction of the property in case of wrecks, etc.

All the above-named witnesses for railroads substantially agreed upon these different items. On the part of the Commission, Edward P. Ripley and his statistician, James Peabody, made comparative statements of the net results from the carriage of these different commodities, upon basis of average cost of all business, per gross ton mile, which is concurred in by the witness Tomlinson, who made further statements, which figures show that it is more expensive to the company to carry fresh meats and packing-house products than live stock; but they did not consider all the burdens peculiar to live stock. All the witnesses agreed in the showing that the cost of service in proportion to the value of both kinds of commodities was greater in carrying live stock.

3. Upon the value of the service to the shipper the testimony of all the witnesses substantially agreed that the value of fresh meats was nearly twice as much as that of live stock, and that of packing-house products a large percentage more than that of live stock. It was also substantially agreed by the witnesses that the risk of carriage, notwithstanding the double value of fresh meats, was not as great in carrying fresh meats and packing-house products as in carrying live stock. This is true on account of the damages for delay to live stock, and additional damages in cases of wrecks. There is not much danger of wrecks in either class of business on account of the good condition of the roadbed and equipment of the railroads.

4. Upon the subject of a proper basis for making rates it was substantially agreed by the witnesses that the following facts were to be considered in fixing a rate:

(*a*) That it had been the practice for years, and was proper, for railroads to *exact all the traffic would stand.* By this, meaning not to arbitrarily demand certain rates, but what in the wisdom of the railroad officials they thought they could get from the traffic, taking into consideration the future business of the railway, the prosperity of its patrons, the length of haul, the cheapness and kind of commodity, and other matters of that kind. This is the "*value of service*" *theory.* Experts and commissioners have agreed that this is a very important factor, and ought to be the most important unless interfered with by competition. It is like the theory of taxation. This includes the consideration of the value of the goods shipped and the profit shippers can make by the carriage.

(*b*) The cost of service of the carriage. This has not been an important factor in the opinion of the railroad companies in the past, nor their practice, but in this case all seemed to agree that the cost of service ought to be an important factor in determining the rate. Mr. Stickney was of the opinion that the cost of service arrived at intelligently by a body of experts would be the proper basis upon which to determine fairly to everybody the rate to be adopted, and this could be mathematically figured out all over the country. The other witnesses stated that this cost could not be obtained at all accurately, only approximately.

(*c*) The weight, bulk, and convenience in handling commodities.

(*d*) Commercial necessity. It was agreed by all that rates must often be made lower than they would mathematically figure out from cost of service or value to the shipper, because the shipper could not move the commodity unless he got a lower rate than the railroads ought to give him when considering the cost of service.

(*e*) They all agreed that competition was the greatest factor in determining a rate.

(*f*) The testimony was all to the effect that, as to commodity traffic and large shipments subject to competition, no skill or science was required in making rates; that rates were forced on carriers by their competitors, regardless of what they ought to be.

5. The testimony showed that the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, the Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company, Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, of the defendants, extend west from the Missouri River; that the other railroad companies extend to the Missouri River points; that cattle and hogs originating west of the Missouri River, and carried to said river by the first named railroads, come to Chicago and eastern points either upon the balance of the through rates or upon what is called a proportional rate, and that such proportional rate from Missouri River points and St. Paul to Chicago was equal to or less than the rate upon fresh meat and packing-house products. That the local rate from Missouri River points on live stock to Chicago was according to above schedule; that the rate extended for 100 to 150 miles this side of the Missouri River and St. Paul to all points in that zone; that such rates reduced on going to the east until they got to the Mississippi River; and that the average Iowa rate to Chicago was twenty-one cents. The evidence also tended to show that quite a large number of cattle were driven in from points east of the Missouri River and east of St. Paul, to the Missouri River and St. Paul.

6. The undisputed evidence showed that the published rate on fresh meat and packing-house products and live stock from Missouri River points and St. Paul to Chicago were the same up to August, 1902, and that before the railroad injunction referred to in the evidence of March, 1902, the actual rate on live stock was twenty-three and one-half cents from Missouri River points, and on fresh meat and packing-house products rebates were given, making such rates below eighteen cents; that when the said injunction was issued the railroad companies for a time followed the published rate on cattle of twenty-three and one-half cents from Missouri River points and twenty-five cents from St. Paul; that the packing houses at Missouri River points and St. Paul are few in number; that they shipped large quantities of their products at regular intervals; that on account of such large quantities owned by a few shippers they demanded lower rates than the published rate and negotiated with the defendant railroads. The result of the negotiations was that Mr. Stickney, president of the Chicago Great Western Railway Company, in August, 1902, entered into a contract with them for seven years, providing that said

railway for that period have a certain proportion of all said packers' business monthly, and it should carry the same for twenty cents per hundred pounds from the Missouri River points, Kansas City, and St. Joseph to Chicago, and eighteen and one-half cents from such points to the Indiana and Illinois line on freight going east of Chicago. That, as stated by Mr. Stickney, the object of his making said contract was to get more of the business, to get what he called his proportion of the business. It appeared that Mr. Stickney's road was the longest route from Missouri River points to Chicago, and that in order to obtain the traffic, or any substantial portion of it, it was necessary for him to make some special arrangements with the packers. Then it became necessary for the other defendant railroads to ship at the same rate in order to get business. It appears from the testimony of all the railroad witnesses on both sides that these rates, according to their judgment, were caused by competition in rates.

7. The effect of the present rates upon the shippers of live stock from intermediate points in Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri to Chicago and to the Missouri River points and St. Paul was considered. Evidence was taken upon this subject, schedules and tables were put in evidence upon this as well as almost every other rate subject. The substance of that evidence tends to show that a majority of the cattle within 150 miles east from the Missouri River and St. Paul went to Chicago rather than to the Missouri River and southeast from St. Paul upon the present rates; in other words, that the Chicago market is not injured by the present rates.

8. The testimony showed that the Chicago market was the best market; that it controlled the price of all other markets between the Missouri River points and St. Paul; that the Chicago market fluctuated from five cents to fifty or seventy-five cents in a day.

9. The testimony showed that the Santa Fe Railroad Company had cut its live-stock rate to twelve cents for a short period after August, 1902, when the above rates in question went into effect, and that such lowering of the rates of that company did not increase its business to Chicago.

The above is comparatively a very brief statement of the pleadings, the issues arising thereon, and of over 1,000 pages of testimony taken before the Commission and about 3,000 pages of testimony taken before the court in addition thereto, together with a great many tables, statements, and reports prepared by experts.

Bethea, district judge, after making the above statement, announced the following opinion:

The court has considered all of the evidence in the case, and finds the following facts:

FINDINGS OF FACT.

First. That the live-stock rates are reasonable in themselves. All live stock from points west, southwest, and northwest of the Missouri River and St. Paul are shipped on a proportional rate from the Missouri River or St. Paul to Chicago. These rates are equal to or less than the rates on dressed meats and packing-house products between the same points. There can be and is no complaint as to such traffic. The local rates from the Missouri River and St. Paul and from 150 miles east to Chicago are as shown in above schedule. These rates gradually decrease until the Mississippi River is reached, and the average Iowa rate is twenty-one cents. The great weight of evidence indicates that these rates are at least reasonably low.

Second. That the cost of carrying live stock is greater than that of carrying dressed meats and packing-house products.

Third. That the value of the service of carriage is greater to the packers because of the higher price of a car of dressed meats or packing-house products. Dressed meats and packing-house products are in value worth nearly twice as much as live stock. This factor is important, in ordinary cases, however, in part, because of the greater risk of carriage of high-priced commodities. In these cases as to the particular commodities in question, the evidence shows that the defendant railroad companies pay out a much larger amount in damages for losses arising from the carriage of live stock than they do for losses arising from the carriage of dressed meats and packing-house products, in proportion to the value of the products carried, and more in damages per car regardless of the value. This makes the risk of carriage greater for live stock. The result is that the value of the service is not such an important factor in this kind of a case as it is considered to be in ordinary cases.

Fourth. That the rates in question given to the packers at Missouri River and St. Paul were the result of competition. The product of the packers at these points was large in quantity, was certain and continuous in amount, was in the hands of a few people, and for years before the Federal injunction of March, 1902, had been competed for so strenuously by the railroads reaching and passing through these points as to cause the cutting of rates and the giving of secret rebates in large amounts. Four of the defendant companies, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad Company, the Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, and the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company, passed through these points into the territory west of the Missouri River and St. Paul. Four other of the defendant companies, the Chicago, Great Western Railway Company, the Chicago & Alton Railway Company, the Illinois Central Railroad Company, and the Wabash Railroad Company, reached the Missouri River points and St. Paul, competing for this business. Other railroads running south to the Gulf of Mexico also competed more or less for said business, including the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway.

After said injunction was granted the defendant railroads obeyed it, and until August of that year the said traffic was carried under competition between the defendant at the rate of twenty-three and one-half cents from Missouri River points to Chicago, and twenty-five cents from St. Paul to Chicago, etc., as set out above. As a result of such competition, the Chicago Great Western Railway Company became dissatisfied with the proportion of the business it received, and in order to get what it claimed as its share, cut the rate to twenty cents to Chicago and eighteen and one-half cents to the Indiana line for eastern business, and published the same. This it did under a contract with the packers running for seven years. The Chicago Great Western Railway Company was the longest route from Chicago to the Missouri River points. The other railroad defendants, to meet the rate made by the Chicago Great Western Railway Company, as a result of competition, met and published the same rate. These rates were not made voluntarily, but from necessity arising from competition. The necessity being that of carrying the goods at the lower rate or losing the business to which the officers of said companies thought they were entitled. This cutting of the rate by the Chicago Great Western Railway Company was not the origin of competition; that had existed legally since March, 1902, between defendant railroads and also between them and the Atchison, Topeka & Sante Fe Railway Company.

There was not competition enough at said points to lower the rate as to live stock. There was little and different competition on rates as to live stock at points between the Missouri River and St. Paul and Chicago. *The only places where the opportunities for competition existed as to live stock the same as to packing-house products were immediately at Missouri River points and St. Paul, and there only as to live stock driven in on foot from the surrounding country.* There is comparatively a small amount of this stock. If it was exactly the same kind of a commodity as that furnished by the packers there would be an opportunity for competition in this at these points alone.

Fifth. That the competition in question did not result from agreement of the defendants, but was actual genuine competition.

Sixth. That the present rates have not materially affected any of the markets, prices, or shipments; that they are reasonably fair to Chicago and to the shippers; that the shipments of live stock from points between Chicago and the Missouri River and St. Paul are as great in proportion to the volume of business as before the present rates were made; that the majority of the live stock comes to Chicago from points as near as 150 miles this side of the Missouri River and St. Paul, and that the lower rate given to the packers does not seem to directly influence or injure the shippers of live stock.

Seventh. That the rates for carrying packers' products and dressed meats were remunerative. They did not pay any portion of the fixed charges and interest of the railroad companies, nor its full share of the operating expenses, but they did pay more than its cost of movement and leave something to apply upon operating expenses.

Eighth. That the welfare of the public, including the shippers, consumers, and all localities and markets, does not seem to be materially affected by the present rates.

Ninth. That the usual custom is for railroads to charge a higher rate for the finished product than for the raw material, and this, as a rule, has been applied to live stock and its finished products. This is not universal, however. There are many commodities where the raw material is charged more for carriage than its finished product, as in the case of the raw material of cotton and the compressed cotton, straw, unbaled and baled, pig iron and its products, and many other commodities.

It also appears that for sixteen years out of twenty-three, between Missouri River points and St. Paul and Chicago, the published rates on live stock were higher than on dressed meats and packing-house products. Many witnesses testified that the ideal rate for the finished product would be higher than the raw material. This, however, was based on the presumption that competition or commercial necessity did not interfere, and that the cost of service and value of the products would be greater in case of the finished products than in that of the raw material.

THE LAW.

What is the law applicable to the above facts? These petitions were filed to enforce sections 1 and 3 of the interstate-commerce act and section 3 of the Elkins Act. They are as follows:

Sec. 1. "All charges made for any service rendered or to be rendered in the transportation of passengers or property as aforesaid, or in connection therewith, or for the receiving, delivering, storage, or handling of such property, shall be reasonable and just; and every unjust and unreasonable charge for such service is prohibited and declared to be unlawful."

Sec. 3. "That it shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the provisions of this act to make or give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, company, firm, corporation, or locality, or any particular description of traffic, in any respect whatsoever, or to subject any particular person, company, firm, corporation, or locality, or any particular description of traffic, to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever."

Elkins Act, Sec. 3. "That whenever the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have reasonable ground for belief that any common carrier is engaged in the carriage of passengers or freight traffic between given points at less that the published rates on file, or is committing any discriminations forbidden by law, a petition may be presented alleging such facts to the circuit court of the United States sitting in equity having jurisdiction," etc.

The questions are: Do the facts in these cases show that the defendants have under section 1 of the interstate-commerce act furnished reasonable rates? Have they, under section 3 thereof, given any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, company, firm, corporation, or locality, or any particular description of traffic in any respect whatever? Have they, under section 3 of the Elkins Act, committed any discriminations forbidden by law? Or, in other words, did it make an undue preference in favor of the packers, or their products, at the Missouri River points and St. Paul or unjustly discriminate against live stock, the shippers thereof, or against Chicago, for the defendants to lower the rates for the packers without making the same or a greater reduction for the shippers of live stock?

I. The evidence above shows that section 1 has not been violated; the rates were not unreasonable.

II. Section 3 of the Elkins Act covers the same questions as do sections 1 and 3 of the original interstate-commerce act. That section provides a remedy without going before the Interstate Commerce Commission for the commission of any discriminations forbidden by law. Those forbidden by law, so far as the questions involved in these cases are concerned, are the prohibitions in sections 1 and 3 of the interstate-commerce act. Section 1 is disposed of. Section 3 will hereafter be discussed.

III. Does the evidence show a violation of section 3 of the interstate-commerce act?

A. The principal objects of the interstate-commerce act, as shown by the many cases in the Supreme Court of the United States, were to secure just and reasonable charges for transportation; to prohibit unjust discriminations in the rendition of like service under similar circumstances and conditions; to prevent undue or unreasonable preference to persons, corporations, or localities; to inhibit greater compensation for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line, and to abolish combinations for the pooling of freight. It was not designed to prevent competition between different roads, but rather to encourage competition. The railroad companies under the decisions of the courts in England and the United States are only bound under this act to give the same terms to all persons alike under the same conditions and circumstances, and any fact which produces an inequality of condition and a change of circumstances justifies an

inequality of charge. Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, 145 U. S., 272.

The object of section 3 was to prevent undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any person, company, firm, corporation, or locality, or any particular description of traffic. The statute does not define undue or unreasonable preference or advantage. That must be left to the circumstances of each case. It is proper, under this section, to give a preference or an advantage, or to discriminate between persons, localities, or traffic; but not make them undue or unreasonable. (Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Alabama Midland Railway Company, 168 U. S., 144; Cincinnati, New Orleans and Texas Pacific Railway Company *v.* Interstate Commerce Commission, 162 U. S., 184.)

B. What is meant, then, by "undue" or "unreasonable" preference or advantage

Judge Jackson, in the case of Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company (43 Fed. Rep., 37), stated that "These words necessarily involve the idea or element of comparison of one service or traffic with another similarly situated and circumstanced, and require that to be undue and unreasonable the preference or prejudice must relate and have reference to competing parties, producing between them unfairness and an unjust inequality in the rates charged them respectively for contemporaneous service under substantially the same circumstances and conditions. In determining the question whether rates give an undue preference or impose an undue prejudice or disadvantage, consideration must be had to the relation which the persons or traffic affected bear to each other and to the carrier. When and so long as their relations are similar or 'substantially' so, the carrier is prohibited from dealing differently with them in the matter of charges for a like and contemporaneous service." * * *

"The English cases referred to above, and others that might be cited, establish the rule that in passing upon the question of undue or unreasonable preference or advantage it is not only legitimate, but proper, to take into consideration, besides the mere differences in charges, various elements, such as the convenience of the public, the fair interest of the carrier, the relative quantities or volume of the traffic involved, the relative cost of the services and profit to the company, and the situation and circumstances of the respective customers with reference to each other, as competitive or otherwise."

This opinion was affirmed in 145 U. S., 263, and followed in other opinions of the Supreme Court.

(*a*) A careful examination of the opinions of that court, as well as the evidence taken in these cases, shows that there are a great many factors and circumstances to be considered in fixing a rate. Among other things:

1. The value of the service to the shipper, including the value of the goods and the profit he could make out of them by shipment. This is considered an ideal method. It includes the theory so strenuously contended for by petitioners, the Commission and its attorneys, of making the finished product carry a higher rate than the raw material. This method is considered practical, and is based on an idea similar to taxation. Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* B. & O. Ry. Co., 43 Fed Rep. 37, 53. 2. The cost of service to the carrier would be an ideal theory, but is not practical. Such cost can be reached approximately but not accurately enough to make this factor controlling. It is worthy of consideration, however. Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* B. & O. Ry. Co., *supra;* Ransome *v.* Eastern Railway Company (1857), 1 C. B., 437; 26 L. J. C. P., 91; Judson on Interstate Commerce, sections 148, 149; Western Union Telegraph Co. *v.* Call Publishing Co., 181 U. S., 92; Detroit, Grand Haven & Milwaukee Railroad Co. *v.* Interstate Commerce Commission, 167 U. S., 633. 3. Weight, bulk, and convenience of transportation. 4. The amount of the product or the commodity in the hands of a few persons to ship or compete for, recognizing the principle of selling cheaper at wholesale than at retail. Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* B. & O. Ry. Co., 145 U. S., 263. 5. General public good, including good to the shipper, the railroad company, and the different localities. Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* B. & O. Ry. Co., 145 U. S., 263. 6. Competition, which the authorities, as well as the experts, in their testimony in these cases, recognize as a very important factor. Pickering Phipps *v.* London & Northwestern Railway Company, 2 Q. B. D. (1892), 229. (This case construes section 2 of the English act of 1854, which is almost like section 3 of our interstate-commerce act.) Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* B. & O. Ry. Co., supra; Cincinnati, New Orleans and Texas Pacific Railway Company *v.* Interstate Commerce Commission, 162 U. S., 184; Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Alabama Midland Railway Company, 168 U. S., 144; Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. *v.* Behlmer, 175 U. S., 648; East Tennessee, Virginia & Georgia Railway Co. *v.* Interstate Commerce Commission, 181 U. S., 1; Texas & Pacific Railway Co. *v.* Interstate Commerce Commission, 162 U. S., 197; Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Louisville and Nashville Railroad Co., 190 U. S., 273. The Supreme Court has also held that it may be presumed that Congress, in adopting the language of the English act, had in mind the constructions given to the words "undue preference" by the courts of England. Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* B. & O. Ry. Co., 145 U. S., 284.

None of the above factors alone are considered necessarily controlling by the authorities. Neither are they all controlling as a matter of law. It is a question of fact to be decided by the proper tribunal in each case as to what is controlling. In every case the Supreme Court has held that competition may be controlling. In only one case has it, as a matter of fact, been held not to be a defense.

C. Counsel for the Commission strenuously contend in able arguments that competition does not apply to section 3 of the interstate commerce act. The authorities, however, are to the contrary. The question was raised in substantially all of the above and others of the Supreme Court cases wherever section 4 was considered. In the following cases the Supreme Court has held that this principle of competition applies to section 3: East Tennessee, Virginia and Georgia Ry. Co. *v.* Interstate Commerce Commission, 181 U. S., 1, and cases cited; Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Alabama Midland Railway Company, 168 U. S., 144, and cases cited from English court; Judson on Interstate Commerce, sections 175 to 183; Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Atlantic Ry. Co. et al., 93 Fed. Rep., 83.

D. But it is further claimed by petitioners' counsel that competition should not have any effect in settling the questions involved in these cases, because one of the defendants originated the competition. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in its opinion, considered the facts as to competition and found they did not control the fixing of rates. Its opinion, and the concurring opinion of Commissioner Knapp, show, however, that the majority of the Commission acting in this case (Fifer and Prouty) thought that it was not a case to which competition applied. Their position is that competition can not apply to this case because one of the defendants (the Chicago Great Western Railway Company) originated the competition in rates. They argue that in all of the other cases decided by the Supreme Court the competition resulting in the cutting of rates was begun by some transportation company not a defendant in the hearing before the Commission and the court, and that the identical question involved in this case has not been passed upon by the Supreme Court. They further argue that in those cases the question as to the construction of the words "particular description of traffic" was not raised or disposed of. In reply it may be said that the questions of undue preference against persons or localities were in the decided cases, and those questions are in these. Besides, an undue preference can not be given to a "particular description of traffic" without giving it to a "person" also. The same principle must apply to the traffic, the same construction must be given to all of the sentence that is given to a part of it. One sentence in section 3 applies to persons, localities, and particular descriptions of traffic. The same words "undue preference" apply to all those conditions, and the words "undue preference" must mean the same when applied to one condition as to another. It may be that the cases passed upon by the Supreme Court were cases where the railroad company starting the lowering of the rate was not a defendant. But the courts have held that where the rate is first lowered by competitors subject to the interstate-commerce law the competition must be considered. (East Tennessee, V. & G. Ry. Co. *v.* Interstate Commerce Commission, 181 U. S., 1; Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Southern Railway Company, 105 Fed. Rep., 703.) If counsel's contention was correct, the right of the railroad companies to set up competition as a defense could be removed by making the company starting the reduction of rates a party defendant. This construction would also discourage competition, which the act, as well as the antitrust act, was intended to encourage. (East Tennessee, V. & G. Ry. Co. *v.* Interstate Commerce Commission, 191 U. S., 1; Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Southern Railway Company, 105 Fed. Rep., 703.) Why a defendant cannot begin the competition is not apparent. Some one must begin. Why not a defendant, if he is losing the business?

The facts in these cases show that competition was going on between these different defendants and other railroad companies that were not defendants (particularly the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company), before the granting of the injunction in March, 1902, and that such competition was going on under the law after March, 1902, down to August 8, 1902, when the Chicago Great Western Railway Company's contract was made and the above rates fixed. Each company was striving to get what business it could. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, which is not a defendant here, was a very formidable competitor and had perhaps the shortest route between the points in question. The other railroad companies, who had longer routes, as did the Chicago Great Western Railway Company, in order to get business, were forced to do something to accommodate and please its patrons. That was going on during all the time mentioned, and was competition. So it can not be said that competition was originated by the Chicago Great Western Railway Company. That company lowered the rates, and competition forced the other defendants, including the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, to lower their rates. It is the duty of the officers of a railroad company to get business in the interest of its stockholders.

It appears then, under the facts, that the reduction of rates was not voluntary, according to the definition and description thereof in the case of East Tennessee, V. & G. Ry. Co. *v.* Interstate Commerce Commission, *supra,* and other cases, but was caused on the part of the Chicago Great Western Railway Company by the necessity of competing for business which under the law they were required to do.

E. The evidence shows that the rates were (1) remunerative, (2) reasonable, (3) that competition was not the result of agreement, and (4) that the carrier must reduce the rate or lose the business.

There was then a meeting here of all the four conditions required by the law to make competition a factor in the fixing of these rates. This is set out by Mr. Judson in his work on interstate commerce in a discussion of section 3 and effect of competition on it in the following language:

"But under the decisions of the Supreme Court the application of the competitive rule is subject to the following qualifications: First, the competition must compel the lower rate—that is, the competition must be controlling; the carrier must either reduce its rates or lose the business; second, the competition must not be created by the carrier—that is, the preference must not be affected through an agreement or combination of the carrier with other carriers stifling competition; third, the competitive rate must be at the preferred point remunerative to the carrier; fourth, the rates must be reasonable in themselves."

That author shows in section 183 how materially competition has affected the enforcement of section 3 of the interstate-commerce act.

It must be remembered in reference to this question of competition that there are more railroads competing for the packers' products than for the live stock, as shown in the findings of fact, *supra.* There are four railroads west of the Missouri River carrying live stock east to Chicago, besides the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company. There are eight of the defendant railroads competing for the packers' products at the Missouri River to carry it east to Chicago. There are other railroads running south from the Missouri River that may make more or less competition. As to the live stock east of the river, there is much less and an entirely different kind of competition from that arising at the Missouri River points and St. Paul for the packers' business. Upon the principles announced in the above authorities, if the different commodities were exactly the same, as if it were all live stock or all packers' products, the railroads would have a right to consider, east of the Missouri River and St. Paul, the stronger competition at Missouri River points and St. Paul in fixing their rate the same as they do under section 4, or the long-and-short-haul clause.

So we are limited to the live stock driven into the Missouri River points and St. Paul, in determining whether that commodity is there entitled to the same rate as packers' products shipped from those same points.

F. The contention is that because the defendant companies have reduced the rate there as to packers' commodities they must reduce it at the same identical points as to live stock. But there is strong competition at all those points as to packers' products—competition in rates—and there is no such competition at the same points as to live stock. It is argued that because they compete as to one kind of a commodity they must compete as to other kinds of commodities at the same points.

This is substantially the same question that was raised in the case of Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company (Lagrange), 190 U. S., 273. In that case the Interstate Commerce Commission held that because the defendant companies competed at one point they must compete at another, but the Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice White, said: "In the report of the Commission a suggestion is found that Lagrange should be entitled

to the same rate as Atlanta, because if the carriers concerned in this case in connection with other carriers reaching Lagrange choose to do so, they might bring about competition by the way of a line between Macon and Lagrange, which would be equivalent to the competitive conditions existing at Atlanta. We are unable, however, to follow the suggestion. To adopt it would amount to this: That the substantial dissimilarity of circumstances and conditions provided by the act to regulate commerce would depend, not as has been repeatedly held, upon a real and substantial competition at a particular point affecting rates, but upon the mere possibility of the arising of such competition. This would destroy the whole effect of the act and cause every case where competition was involved to depend, not upon the fact of its existence as affecting rates, but upon the possibility of its arising.

The same principle must apply here. The construction is of the same sentence. In that case it was a portion of the sentence that referred to localities or certain shippers, or a certain kind of a particular description of traffic, if you please. In these cases it refers to a "description of traffic" and "to shippers."

G. In passing upon this question of competition it is the duty of the Commissioners and the court to take into consideration, in determining whether the circumstances and conditions are the same, and whether prejudice is undue or not, the quantity of the traffic in each case. While this may not be controlling, still it ought to be considered. In the Party Rate case, *supra* (145 U. S., 272), it was held controlling as to passengers. In the English cases above cited it has been held a very important factor as to freight. The facts show there is a large amount of packers' products to be shipped at stated intervals, fixed and continuous quantities, in the hands of a few people, under almost one control. The live stock is not in such hands, and can not and does not create such competition.

After considering as far as possible all the surrounding circumstances and conditions, and considering the rates between the two classes of products involved in these suits and the law as announced by the Supreme Court, this court holds that lawful competition must be considered as a factor in determining the questions of fact as to undue preference and unjust discrimination.

APPLICATION OF THE LAW.

The court is bound to consider all of the above facts and factors with others in determining whether the preference and advantage in question is "undue" or "unjust." In such consideration there appears in favor of the preference and advantage given to the packing-house products the cost of service, the damage to the commodities, the quantity of the commodity in the hands of a few persons, the less bulk, the interest of the railroad companies, the interest of a majority of the localities and consumers, the general dissimilarity of conditions, and competition; while there is in favor of the live stock the less value of the product and of the service in the carriage, the interests of Chicago and its markets, the stock yards, and dealers in live stock there. The evidence shows that in substantially all cases the factor of competition alone controls the rate. The Supreme Court in all cases has held that competition may be controlling. In only one case (Social Circle) has competition as a matter of fact been held not to make a defense to the charge of discrimination or undue preference. When all the factors are considered together the conclusion must be reached that the preference and advantage in question is not "undue" or "unjust," and sections 3 of the interstate-commerce act has not been violated; nor has section 1 of that act nor section 3 of the Elkins Act. Upon a consideration of all the evidence the court holds that the *prima facie* case made by the findings of the Commission has been overcome by the evidence offered before the court. The order of the Commission in the first case is not lawful and should not be enforced, and the prayer of the petition in the second case should be denied. The petitions of the Interstate Commerce Commission are dismissed with costs.

L. A. Shaver, esq., C. B. Morrison, United States district attorney, S. H. Cowan, esq., for the complainant.

Ed. Baxter, esq., associate counsel for B., C. R. & N. Ry.; C., St. P., M. & O. Ry.; Chicago & Alton Ry.; C. & N. W. Ry.; C., B. & Q. Ry.; C., M. & St. P. Ry.; C., R. I. & P. Ry.; Hannibal & St. Joseph Ry.; Illinois Central R. R.; Iowa Central Ry.; K. C., St. J. & C. B. Ry.; M. & St. L. Ry.; Omaha, Kansas City & Eastern Ry., defendants.

C. A. Severance, esq., for the Chicago Great Western Ry. Co., defendant, and the St. Paul Union Stock Yards Co., intervening petitioner.

S. A. Lynde, esq., for the C. & N. W. Ry. Co., defendant.

Chester M. Dawes, esq., for the C., B. & Q. Ry. Co.

James C. Jeffery, esq., for the Missouri Pacific Ry. Co., defendant.

Charles A. Clark, esq., for T. M. Sinclair & Co. (Limited), intervening petitioner.

Milchrist & Scott, for the Sioux City Stock Yards Co., intervening petitioner.

Ira B. Mills, esq., for the Minnesota Railroad and Warehouse Commissioners, intervening petitioner.

F. T. Ransom, esq., for the Omaha Packing Co., intervening petitioner.

Mr. FORAKER. I next offer an analysis of that decision, stating in part what it shows, by a member of the bar of the city of Chicago, Mr. Blackburn Esterline.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator just announce the name of the gentleman who gave the last opinion?

Mr. FORAKER. I have just given the name of the gentleman who sent me the analysis of the decision.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The paper will also be printed in the RECORD, as the Senator requests, if there is no objection.

The paper referred to is as follows:

An analysis of the above decision, stating in part what it shows, by Blackburn Esterline, esq., a member of the bar of the city of Chicago.

(In the circuit court of the United States, northern district of Illinois, eastern division.)

(No. 27723.—Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Numerous railway companies.)

(No. 27829.—Interstate Commerce Commission *v.* Numerous railway companies.)

The above cases, in which about twenty railway companies were represented, were decided by Hon. S. H. Bethea, sitting in the circuit court of the United States, on Monday, November 20, 1905, and the bills filed by the Interstate Commerce Commission were dismissed.

The defendants are carriers from the Missouri River and St. Paul to Chicago. Prior to August 8, 1902, the published rates of the companies for carrying fresh meats and packing-house products from the points named to Chicago were the same as the published rates for carrying live stock from the same points to Chicago. On that date the Chicago Great Western Railway Company, which had the longest route, in order to secure business entered into a contract in good faith with the Missouri River packers, in which it cut the rate on fresh meats 3 cents per hundred pounds. This inaugurated a stiff competition on the part of all the roads for the fresh meat and packing-house products, on which the rates were severely cut, though the rates on live stock remained unchanged. The Interstate Commerce Commission held that this was in violation of the interstate-commerce act and that it constituted a wrongful prejudice and discrimination; the carriers were accordingly ordered to lower the rates on live stock also, and to cease and desist, etc., on or before February 15, 1905, wherein they failed, and the Commission commenced the suits.

By counsel for the Commission it was contended that the rates were unreasonable under section 1, and that the defendants were committing an unlawful discrimination against the locality of Chicago and against live cattle and live hogs and the shippers thereof, and that they were giving an undue and unreasonable preference or advantage to the traffic in fresh meats and packing-house products, in violation of section 3 of the interstate-commerce act and the Elkins Act. The railway companies denied the charges, contending that there was no relative similarity between the products and the live stock; that when the cost of service was considered they could carry the products cheaper than the live stock; that the risk of carriage of the former was lower, and that the difference in rates was the result of competition.

The hearing lasted a month and 4,000 pages of testimony were taken and considered, together with many tables, etc. The case generally and the opinion of the court hinged largely on the question of competition, which became the controlling factor. It was said by counsel for the Commission that competition was not a factor to be considered in determining the question of fact as to undue preference and unjust discrimination, but the court held that it was. In other words, it held that the question of undue preference and unjust discrimination against one place over another is secondary to the question of competition of railway companies when the competition is not the result of agreement, but is carried on in good faith in order to get business and the rates reasonable and remunerative to the company.

Judge Bethea, in his opinion, declared that he had given as full consideration to all the facts and circumstances in the case as it was possible for him to give; and, after such full consideration, he held that the prima facie case as made by the findings of the Commission had been overthrown by the evidence taken before him.

The very important feature about it all is this: That if the Interstate Commerce Commission had had the power, on February 15, 1905, to enforce the order it entered on that date to lower the rates on live stock also, the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company, as shown by the sworn testimony, based on the business of the past year, would have sustained an actual and direct loss, during the time which elapsed before the court set aside the erroneous order, of $300,000; the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railway Company a like sum, and the Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company a like sum, and all the other defendants an actual and direct loss equal to that sustained by the three companies named, making a total of $1,800,000. It also appeared that the indirect losses of all the companies would have doubled the latter sum.

Mr. FORAKER. Now, in addition to what is thus made to appear, I wish to call attention to the fact that it appears from this opinion of the court and from the record that complaint in this case was filed before the Interstate Commerce Commission March 31, 1902; that the hearing upon that complaint was not commenced before the Commission until January 22, 1903, and that the Commission's decision on that complaint, finding that there was discrimination and ordering a discontinuance of it, was not rendered until January 7, 1905. When rendered it was ordered that it go into effect February 15, 1905. The order was disregarded by the railroads, and subsequently, upon the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, suit was brought against them to enforce the order of the Commission on the 29th of April, 1905. The Commission afterwards brought an additional suit under the Elkins Act, July 17, 1905. The court thus being appealed to took up the cases, as it was required to do under the law providing for a summary proceeding in such a case, heard many witnesses, the testimony in the aggregate amounting to something like 4,000 pages, and rendered a final judgment November 20, 1905.

I introduce all this simply to show, if I may be allowed to add a word, the state of the law with respect to remedies against certain of the evils that are complained of, and showing also, not only that there is a remedy in court ample for most of the evils that are complained of, but the expedition with which that remedy can be arrived at in the court. Instead of a proceeding pending for two or three years, as this did before the Commission, by the reference of it to the court as provided in at least one of the bills that have been introduced, that the court shall proceed summarily and hear it, the court proceeded and considered the whole case, and all the cases, and rendered final judgment which, when you come to look at the opinion of the court, you will see, covered every aspect of the case and accomplished it all in something like five or six months from the time when the suit was commenced in the court.

Mr. CULLOM. In brief, what was the decision of the court?

Mr. FORAKER. I did not expect to speak of that, for I did not want to comment on it at any length and take the time of the Senate now; but the court reversed the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, finding that it was erroneously made, and that there was no such discrimination as the Commission had found.

In the analysis of the case which I have filed, made by Mr. Esterline, it is shown that if the order had gone into effect at the time when it was made by the Interstate Commerce Commission, or at the date fixed by the Commission, February 15, 1905, for it to take effect, it would have cost the railroads in loss of revenue, and wrongful loss, according to this decision, almost $2,000,000 by actual computation based on sworn testimony.

I put this in the RECORD to show the character of legislation that is being proposed, and in order to show the remedies we now have, in order that before we provide others we may know what we have.

I ask that the decision of Judge Bethea and the accompanying statements may be also printed as a document.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. I understand that one of the papers introduced by the Senator from Ohio—at least offered by him for publication in the RECORD—constitutes the instructions issued by the Attorney-General quite recently to the district attorneys of the United States throughout the country. I understood the Senator to say, in some remarks which he submitted a week or so ago in the Senate, that there was no longer any complaint respecting rebates by railroads.

Now, I will ask him this question: Pursuant to those instructions of the Attorney-General did not a grand jury at Philadelphia and at Chicago last week return a number of bills of indictment against officials of railway companies for granting rebates, and if the Senator has that information will he not also insert it in the RECORD to go along with his statement?

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator inserting in the RECORD anything he may desire to have inserted in the RECORD.

With respect to the statement I made about rebates, the Senator has not accurately quoted me. Inadvertently, of course, the inaccuracy crept into his statement.

What I said about rebates, as I now recall my language, was that it was generally conceded that since the passage of the Elkins law rebates had been practically discontinued, and if not discontinued the law was ample, if properly enforced, to compel the discontinuance of rebates.

The States have very good laws against arson, against burglary, against murder. The legislatures of the States have done all they can reasonably do to prevent those crimes; but notwithstanding the law they will be and are committed.

I did not say there were no rebates. I did not say there were no excessive rates. I said there was provision by law against rebates and against excessive rates and against discrimination, and that so far as rebates are concerned, if not discontinued, all the Attorney-General had to do was to enforce the law and he would come as near breaking up the practice as you can come by enforcing any law to break up any criminal practice.

If some Senator will point out to me what I said on that subject I will read it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FORAKER. Certainly. I was just looking to find what I said.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I do not remember, of course, exactly what I said a moment ago, but I think I said the Senator stated in a former speech in the Senate that there were no complaints at this time against the system of rebates. What I desired was to call his attention to the question as to whether he was not mistaken in that statement. Of course it is a mere expression of opinion to a degree, but that there were complaints is shown by the instructions of the Attorney-General of the United States quite recently, and that acting upon those instructions it had been discovered by the grand juries at Philadelphia and at Chicago that rebates had been granted by railroad companies within very recent times.

I was simply calling attention to it to show, if I could, that the Senator was mistaken in the opinion he expressed, that there were now no complaints against the system of rebating since the passage of the Elkins law.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me, I will now quote from the speech I made a few days ago in the Senate to which he referred, so that I may in that way put before the Senate exactly what I did say:

So far as rebates are concerned, we legislated on that subject three years ago now almost—in February, 1903—when we passed the so-called "Elkins law." In that measure we provided a remedy against rebates. Up to that time the giving of rebates was justly regarded as the worst abuse practiced by the railroads of this country upon the shippers of this country. I had the honor to be a member of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce then, as I have now. I had something to do with the putting of that act in the form in which it was finally passed and in which it became a law. We undertook then to deal with rebates and with discriminations. What is the result? According to the testimony of every man who has spoken on this subject before our committee—every man on both sides of this controversy, I think without exception, since that law was enacted and put into force—rebates have practically been discontinued; and, if not discontinued, all unite in saying that the statute thus put upon the statute books by the Congress of the United States is all the legislation that it is necessary to enact in order to provide a legislative remedy full, ample, and complete against that kind of abuse.

So the Senator will see I did not say there were no rebates being granted now. I have no doubt there are some violations of this law, as there are violations of every law on the statute books. These railroads extend all over this country; the rates number into the millions; shippers are every day sending their products over these roads not only by thousands but by hundreds of thousands. It would be quite singular if there were not some violations.

What I was calling attention to is the fact which stands uncontradicted—no man can successfully contradict it—that the Congress has undertaken to provide a complete remedy against that abuse, and I think it will be found to be a sufficient remedy if the Attorney-General will only continue, as he has now started in to do, to enforce the law vigorously, rigidly, as the Congress expected him to do when it was enacted.

But however that may be, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] well suggests, the mere fixing of a rate, a maximum rate or a minimum rate or any other kind of a rate, will not afford any remedy for the granting of rebates.

But I did not want to engage in any discussion at this time of this subject. I wanted to put in the RECORD, where it will be available to all who may desire to read it, that which I think is very pertinent to be considered at this time as showing the state of the law with respect to this whole subject.

I take it the Congress does not want to legislate unless there is some necessity for it. My opinion is, as I have said over and over again, that the legislation which is needed is not something that is revolutionary in its character, but a mere amending and strengthening of the law that is now on the statute book. In that way every abuse that is complained of can be reached and can be successfully dealt with, in my opinion.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, the purpose I had in view, and the only purpose, was to draw attention to the fact that railroad companies quite recently have granted rebates and have been indicted for that offense.

The speech of the Senator from Ohio a week or so ago had a distinct purpose in view. He was arguing against any legislation on this subject. He was stating reasons which, in his opinion, rendered any further legislation upon the rate question useless and unnecessary. Among other propositions he made was the proposition with reference to rebates that no other legislation was necessary for two reasons. One was that rebates had practically ceased, and the other was that we have a sufficient law upon the subject already. All the purpose I had in the inquiry I made of the Senator from Ohio, Mr. President, was to show that in his statement that rebates had practically ceased by reason of the Elkins law he was simply mistaken.

It is true the Senator from Ohio has introduced a bill in the Senate providing, in effect, as I construe the bill, that the courts of the United States may fix rates that shall be operative in the future, because that proposed law, as I construe it, provides that the courts shall discriminate between what part of the rate is unreasonable and what part is reasonable, and shall restrain the operation of the unreasonable part, leaving the remainder of the rate in force, which, as I understand the English language, means that these courts shall, in effect, establish a rate which shall operate in the future.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that, as I understood the object of the Senator from Ohio a week or two ago, he was opposed to any legislation upon this subject. That statement apparently was rather broad and probably too broad, because the Senator himself, as I knew at the time and I ought to have stated at the time, has introduced a bill upon the subject.

What I intended to state, Mr. President, was that the Senator was opposing any additional legislation upon the subject of rebates upon two grounds, I reiterate, the first of which was that rebates had practically ceased and that the legislation existing upon the subject at this time was sufficient. I did not intend to provoke any debate upon this subject, but I wanted the statement to go along with his statement in the RECORD with reference to the instructions of the Attorney-General, that those instructions had brought forth fruit and had secured the indictment of a number of railway officials, as I understand it, at Philadelphia and Chicago for this illegal conduct.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, the Senator entirely misunderstood me if he got the idea from anything I said when I spoke here a week or ten days ago, or from anything I have said at any time, that I did not think it necessary to have any additional legislation. On the contrary, I have all the while advocated additional legislation. The only difference between the Senator and myself, and the only difference between other Senators and myself, is as to the particular remedy which we shall undertake by law to provide to correct the abuses that are being practiced.

The remarks I made the other day were upon the bill introduced by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. I was complimenting him upon the simplicity of his measure and upon the fact that it did not undertake to deal with a lot of subjects that had already been satisfactorily dealt with, in my opinion; and I did call attention to the fact that, so far as rebates were concerned, it is the commonly expressed opinion that since the Elkins law was enacted rebates have been practically discontinued. And why discontinued? Because the railroads and the shippers alike knew that there was a law since that time on the statute book which by its mere enforcement would bring punishment upon them if they granted or accepted rebates. I did not pretend to say that there have been no rebates granted since the enactment of the Elkins law; I did not pretend to say that the railroads were not giving rebates to-day. On the contrary, I said that, if not practically discontinued, as had been suggested by witnesses and as we had been told by everybody who has discussed this subject, there was a law, and it was ample, if properly enforced, to break up and discontinue the practice. That is all there was of that.

I do not want to drift into a general discussion of this subject this morning, but the Senator made some remarks about the lack or want of power in the courts to enjoin what is an unreasonable or an excessive rate that is being charged. That is a pretty broad subject.

I read an interview, or what purported to be an interview, with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] in regard to my bill shortly after it was presented to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, in which he disposed of that subject with a great deal more facility and confidence than I was able to dispose of it when I commenced to investigate it.

I have been surprised, Mr. President, to see how many constitutional lawyers there are editing newspapers and writing articles for the newspapers. Every day almost I see some great constitutional question disposed of by some man who does not pretend to be a lawyer, but only a newspaper or magazine writer.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the Senator permit me a question?

Mr. FORAKER. Presently. I want to say a few words in answer to the Senator before I quit, and then I shall yield to any question.

What my bill provides, Mr. President, is not that the courts shall make a rate. I took particular pains when speaking here a week or ten days ago to say that the court—I agree with the Senator in that—has no power to make rates; the court can exercise only judicial power; and the making of rates for the future is a legislative act; but it is a judicial function to make inquiry to ascertain whether or not a railroad is charging an unlawful rate, and if it be charging an unlawful rate it is a judicial power to restrain the collection of anything in excess of that which is lawful. It does not make any difference that the court has to hear witnesses and inquire and ascertain what is lawful instead of turning to the statute and reading the figures written down there to express what the lawful rate shall be. The court, in the case the Senator suggests, would simply ascertain, upon complaint being made, what is the lawful rate fixed by the statute. There is a lawful rate fixed for every railroad in this country by a statute now in force, and a statute that has been in force ever since the interstate-commerce act was enacted in 1887, just as there was before, according to the rule of the common law, which is now a statutory provision, however, declaratory of the rule of the common law, that no railroad shall be allowed to charge in excess of what is reasonable and just, and anything in excess of what is reasonable and just shall be deemed unreasonable and unlawful. That fixes a lawful rate. The courts have held, whenever they have had occasion, that that provision fixed a lawful rate. When somebody complains to a court of equity and says, "I am a shipper; I am shipping every day; I am charged excessive rates, and I should not be required to go into court to sue in an action at law to recover damages; to avoid a multiplicity of suits I come into a court of equity. If I am charged a rate in excess of the lawful rate prescribed by statute, the court has a right, and I ask it, to inquire what is a lawful rate." If it had been written down in some statute the court could turn to and read—I mean if it had been written down in so many figures there would be no trouble—the case would be easy and clear—but having been written down simply by the prescription of a standard, the court must make inquiry. That does not change the nature of the case; that has been a judicial function ever since the common law was administered. A similar question has arisen from almost every exercise of the police power to make inquiry into and determine what is reasonable; and when it determines what is reasonable as to a rate it determines what is the lawful rate.

Applying that proposition to rates, therefore, when the court restrains all in excess of the lawful rate, the court does not make a rate; the rate is already made by the statute; and the court simply gives effect to the rate which the statute has prescribed as the lawful rate.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I do not know how much of the Senator's remarks are intended to apply to me in what he said with reference to constitutional lawyers and constitutional writers, but——

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator will certainly allow me to say that I would not, even in the most indirect way, reflect upon the Senator, or criticise him as a lawyer or as a gentleman. We all acknowledge his very distinguished ability.

Mr. CULBERSON. I was simply going to say, Mr. President, that, so far as the constitutional question is concerned, I am perfectly willing that its determination, so far as the Senate is concerned, shall await a full discussion on this floor.

Passing from the constitutional question, Mr. President, and going back to the point which I had in view at the outset—that is to say, whether or not there are any rebates being granted now, and whether the law on the subject of rebates is sufficient, I want to call the attention of the Senator—not that it is necessary to do so, but in order to get this provision in the RECORD—to this clause in the Elkins law:

> In all convictions occurring after the passage of this act for offenses under said acts to regulate commerce, whether committed before or after the passage of this act, or for offenses under this section, no penalty shall be imposed on the convicted party other than the fine prescribed by law, imprisonment wherever now prescribed as part of the penalty being hereby abolished.

Now, I will ask the Senator, in the first place, if he believes that the original law ought to have been modified to that extent; and, second, whether or not it is his opinion that a repeal of this part of the Elkins law and the reinstatement of the original law for punishment by imprisonment would not add to the efficacy of the law against rebates?

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I should have no objection to that amendment being made, if the Senator from Texas and other Senators, after consideration, think it is a proper amendment. I think the imprisonment clause was dropped out because the law was made to apply by the Elkins Act to corporations, and it would be rather difficult to put a corporation in the penitentiary. So it was thought by some who were on the committee, in their simple-minded view of the matter, that punishment should be the same to all for the same offense. That is all there was of that, except it was also thought that the imprisonment clause stood in the way of an effectual enforcement of the law in the matter of securing evidence.

It was not thought, Mr. President—the Senator may think differently, and we shall be glad to hear from him on that at the proper time—it was not thought by the committee, nor by the Senate at that time, that we could for the same offense have different punishments, and inasmuch as we were undertaking to reach the corporation itself, as well as the individual, the imprisonment feature was dropped out. But I personally had nothing to do with that part of the Elkins law; I think every member of the committee will sustain me in that statement. I simply adopted the views of others in that respect.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think I must call for the regular order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Calendar under Rule VIII is in order. The first bill on the Calendar will be stated.

Mr. HALE. Has the request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] for printing certain papers been passed upon?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The request of the Senator from Ohio has been granted.

IMPORTATION OF IMPURE AND UNWHOLESOME TEA.

Mr. HALE. Let us have the regular order, then, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The first bill on the Calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 1548) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the importation of impure and unwholesome tea," approved March 2, 1897, was announced as first in order.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, is there a report accompanying that bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that there is a report accompanying the bill. It will be read at the request of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] who has the bill in charge is not in his seat, and it will be impossible to now complete its consideration. So I think it had better go over in the absence of the Senator, and then I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will go over.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HALE. Now, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 21, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 20, 1905.

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSIONER.

Joseph Bucklin Bishop for appointment as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, provided for by the act of Congress aproved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans."

CONSULS-GENERAL.

Alfred L. M. Gottschalk, of New York, now consul-general at Callao, to be consul-general of the United States at Mexico, Mexico, vice James R. Parsons, jr., deceased.

Frank Dillingham, of California, now consul at Aix la Chapelle, to be consul-general of the United States at Coburg, Germany, vice Henry D. Saylor, resigned.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

Samuel Platt, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada, vice Sardis Summerfield, whose term will expire January 12, 1906.

MARSHAL.

Leo E. Bennett, of the Indian Territory, to be United States marshal for the western district of Indian Territory. (A reappointment, his term expiring January 9, 1906.)

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Alfred L. Sharpe, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Paso del Norte, in the State of Texas, to succeed Patrick F. Garrett, whose term of office expired by limitation December 19, 1905.

Charles M. Webster, of Montana, to be collector of customs for the district of Montana and Idaho, in the States of Montana and Idaho. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Arthur H. Swain, of California, to be receiver of public moneys at Visalia, Cal., his term having expired December 18, 1905. (Reappointment.)

Nathaniel H. Alexander, of Alabama, to be receiver of public moneys at Montgomery, Ala., to take effect January 19, 1906, at the expiration of his term. (Reappointment.)

PENSION AGENT.

William R. Warnock, of Urbana, Ohio, to be pension agent at Columbus, Ohio, vice Joseph W. Jones, term expired and resigned.

POSTMASTERS.

DELAWARE.

John A. Jolls to be postmaster at Middletown, in the county of Newcastle and State of Delaware, in place of John W. Jolls, deceased.

ILLINOIS.

Harold E. Chadwick to be postmaster at Ashton, in the county of Lee and State of Illinois, in place of Cassius K. Northrup, removed.

William R. Jewell to be postmaster at Danville, in the county of Vermilion and State of Illinois, in place of William R. Jewell. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1905.

Charles W. Warner to be postmaster at Hoopeston, in the county of Vermilion and State of Illinois, in place of Charles W. Warner. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1905.

INDIANA.

William L. Bryan to be postmaster at Boonville, in the county of Warrick and State of Indiana, in place of William L. Bryan. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

William A. Dennerline to be postmaster at Aurora, in the county of Dearborn and State of Indiana, in place of Ernest H. Niebaum. Incumbent's commission expires January 9, 1906.

James F. Lawson to be postmaster at Spencer, in the county of Owen and State of Indiana, in place of James F. Lawson. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

Morris B. Pote to be postmaster at New Harmony, in the county of Posey and State of Indiana, in place of Morris B. Pote. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

Rankin C. Walkup to be postmaster at Crawfordsville, in the county of Montgomery and State of Indiana, in place of Marshall M. Nye. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

IOWA.

William F. Stahl to be postmaster at Lisbon, in the county of Linn and State of Iowa, in place of William F. Stahl. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

John H. Wegerslev to be postmaster at Alta, in the county of Buena Vista and State of Iowa, in place of Christian H. Wegerslev, resigned.

John M. Wormley to be postmaster at Kingsley, in the county of Plymouth and State of Iowa, in place of Luther Conklin, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Frank P. Goss to be postmaster at Hyannis, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts, in place of Frank P. Goss. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

George W. Jones to be postmaster at Falmouth, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts, in place of George W. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

Francis Norwood to be postmaster at Beverly, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in place of Francis Norwood. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

NEW YORK.

Dwight H. Bruce to be postmaster at Syracuse, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York, in place of Dwight H. Bruce. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

Orley W. Closson to be postmaster at Schuylersville, in the county of Saratoga and State of New York, in place of William S. Ostrander, resigned.

George W. Hitchcock to be postmaster at Ripley, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York, in place of George W. Hitchcock. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

NORTH DAKOTA.

John I. W. Durston to be postmaster at Bisbee, in the county of Towner and State of North Dakota. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Harry H. Roberts to be postmaster at Tower City, in the county of Cass and State of North Dakota. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

OHIO.

Charles E. Hixson to be postmaster at Leesburg, in the county of Highland and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

OKLAHOMA.

Bess L. Bailey to be postmaster at Snyder, in the county of Kiowa and Territory of Oklahoma, in place of George S. Bailey, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Albert H. Stites to be postmaster at Sioux Falls, in the county of Minnehaha and State of South Dakota, in place of George Schlosser. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

TEXAS.

George W. Hoeffert to be postmaster at Schulenburg, in the county of Fayette and State of Texas, in place of Gustave Cranz, resigned.

VERMONT.

Collins M. Graves to be postmaster at Bennington, in the county of Bennington and State of Vermont, in place of Arthur J. Dewey. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 20, 1905.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

Alfred L. M. Gottschalk to be consul-general of the United States at Mexico, Mexico.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

Stanton J. Peelle, of Indiana, to be chief justice of the Court of Claims.

JUDGE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

Samuel S. Barney, of Wisconsin, to be judge of the Court of Claims.

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

Charles B. Morrison, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois.

Thomas Lee Moore, of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia.

Harry Skinner, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina.

MARSHALS.

Thomas J. Alcott, of New Jersey, to be United States marshal for the district of New Jersey.

William A. Dunlap, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Tennessee.

William P. Warner, of Nebraska, to be United States marshal for the district of Nebraska.

ASSISTANT TREASURER.

Joseph Bosler, of Pennsylvania, to be assistant treasurer of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Charles M. Webster, of Montana, to be collector of customs for the district of Montana and Idaho.

Alfred L. Sharpe, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Paso del Norte, in the State of Texas.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Theodore S. Lanz to be postmaster at Florala, in the county of Covington and State of Alabama.

Daniel McDonald to be postmaster at Carbon Hill, in the county of Walker and State of Alabama.

IOWA.

George L. Robb to be postmaster at Albia, in the county of Monroe and State of Iowa.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Frances Norwood to be postmaster at Beverly, in the State of Massachusetts.

NEW YORK.

Abram E. Depuy to be postmaster at Mariner Harbor, in the county of Richmond and State of New York.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Charles W. Betts to be postmaster at Newhope, in the county of Bucks and State of Pennsylvania.

Samuel C. Seaber to be postmaster at Lititz, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania.

J. Clayton Whitby to be postmaster at Rosemont, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Albert H. Stites to be postmaster at Sioux Falls in the State of South Dakota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 20, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on H. R. 480.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the conference report on House bill 480. Does the gentleman desire the statement to be read in lieu of the report?

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to have the statement read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the same.

The Clerk read the report.

[For conference report and statement, see page 608, House proceedings.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the formal reading of the conference report will be dispensed with. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I caught the reading aright, one of the Senate amendments strikes out the provision of the House bill requiring these officers to report to Congress at any time that Congress might demand. Is that correct?

Mr. HEPBURN. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What amendment is that?

Mr. HEPBURN. That is the tenth amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman propose the House conferees shall recede from their position upon the question?

Mr. HEPBURN. That is the recommendation of the conference committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we ought to have a vote upon that.

Mr. PAYNE. Might I suggest right there that Congress has the right to call upon these people for information, and what is the use of putting it into this law?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Congress has that right "in a way," and nobody knows better than my friend from New York what that way does. It may bring a reply at any time that in the opinion of the Executive it is "contrary to public policy," like a resolution of mine in the last Congress asking if any steps had been taken to prosecute the men engaged in the Northern Securities deal and anthracite deal. Now, if the language remains as the House left it in the bill that Executive reply could not be returned. Congress would have the right regardless of that. Can not we have a separate vote upon that particular proposition?

Mr. HEPBURN. I think not, sir. I think the conference report is a whole.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman if he can yield to me for about three minutes?

Mr. HEPBURN. I will yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that we ought on this side of the Chamber to allow this matter to go without at least an explanation. I have just called to the attention of the House one feature in the report which will be adopted, if the report is adopted, which I think ought not to be. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a very objectionable feature, to which attention was called the other day, to wit, the issue of bonds running posterity in debt, as well as the present generation, rather than to "disturb the equanimity" of national-bank favorites who are depositories of the Government at this moment. Notwithstanding all that, however, such is the interest on this side of the Chamber in the speedy construction of the Panama Canal, such is its sincere desire not to *appear* even to throw any obstacles in its pathway, so much greater does it think the great end to be achieved than any means—even objectionable—pursued in arriving at it, that I at any rate will not oppose the adoption of the conference report at this time. I did, however, want to call the attention of the country to these things, so they would understand that while adopting it, it is in a manner under protest that we do it. We can not stand everything always.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HEPBURN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 93. An act to amend section 2326 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to mining claims;

S. 68. An act for the widening of a section of Columbia road east of Sixteenth street;

S. 55. An act for the widening of Bladensburg road, and for other purposes;

S. 51. An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia;

S. 1370. An act for the relief of William H. Hugo, deceased;

S. 955. An act authorizing the city of Nome, a municipal corporation organized and existing under chapter 21, title 3, of an act of Congress approved June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," to construct a free bridge across the Snake River at Nome City, in the Territory of Alaska;

S. 653. An act to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Illinois;

S. 280. An act to provide a life-saving station at or near Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island; and

S. 312. An act to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across the Missouri River at Yankton, S. Dak.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 312. An act to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across the Missouri River at Yankton, S. Dak.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 280. An act to provide a life-saving station at or near

Greenhill, on the coast of South Kingston, in the State of Rhode Island—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 653. An act to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Illinois—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 955. An act authorizing the city of Nome, a municipal corporation organized and existing under chapter 21, Title III, of an act of Congress approved June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," to construct a free bridge across the Snake River at Nome city, in the Territory of Alaska—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 51. An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 55. An act for the widening of Bladensburg road, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 68. An act for the widening of a section of Columbia road east of Sixteenth street—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 93. An act to amend section 2326 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to mining claims—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

STENOGRAPHER FOR COMMITTEE.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions be authorized to appoint a stenographer for said committee for the Fifty-ninth Congress, at a salary of $6 per day, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SULLOWAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

RAILROAD IN ALASKA.

Mr. BRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for present consideration of House bill No. 99.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for present consideration of House bill No. 99, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time of the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company to comply with the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of chapter 299 of the laws of the United States, entitled "An act extending the homestead laws and providing for the right of way for railroads in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved May 14, 1898, in acquiring and completing its railroad now under construction in Alaska, is hereby extended as follows:

First. That the time to file the map and profile of definite location of its first section of at least 20 miles with the register of the land office in the district of Alaska, as provided in said sections 4 and 5, is hereby extended to and including the 31st day of December, 1906.

Second. That the time to complete the first section of at least 20 miles of its railroad, as provided in said section 5, is hereby extended to and including the 31st day of December, 1906, and the time for completing its entire railroad, as provided in said section 5, is hereby extended to and including December 31, 1909.

Third. That it shall be lawful for the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company to hereafter operate its railroad in the district of Alaska for a period to and including December 31, 1909, without the payment of the license fee of $100 per mile per annum on each mile operated, as provided in section 29 of chapter 1 of the act entitled "An act for making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if this bill has been reported favorably by a committee?

Mr. BRICK. It has been unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Territories sitting as a full committee.

Mr. SULZER. I would also like to know, Mr. Speaker, where this railroad is to be built in Alaska.

Mr. BRICK. It is built on the Seward Peninsula, proposed to run from Council City to Solomon City, about 50 miles, with the ultimate idea of building farther from that after this line between those two cities has been completed.

Mr. SULZER. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman make an explanation of the necessity for this legislation—the reason for it.

Mr. BRICK. Mr. Speaker, in stating the reason for this bill at this time I will have to go back to the last session, at which time the privilege was given that this railroad would build 10 miles a year, and that privilege was given releasing it from taxation up to the time it was built and could obtain revenues, so that they would at least have the equity of having the railroad running at the time they were being licensed and paying a license tax. Now, they built 18⅝ miles up to December this year under the last statute. They should have built 20 miles to comply with the statute, and for that reason it has been desired to get unanimous consent and to give them an extension of a year, so that they would not forfeit the million dollars they have already spent in building the 18⅝ miles when it was contemplated by the statute to build 20 miles up to this December. The reason they did not finish the 20 miles was that last year, instead of having the ordinary time that the climate of Alaska gives them of four months, they only had three months. The cold weather came a month earlier than anticipated. There was a great flood also, which washed away 2½ miles of their railroad and 150 feet of their bridge of eight or nine hundred feet across the Solomon River, so that they were precluded by the weather from carrying out their contract. They now have ties and railroad iron sufficient upon the ground to build 35 miles of railroad. They have expended a million dollars. If there is any one thing in the world that Alaska needs, it is people who are in good faith trying to build railroads there. A million dollars expended in 18⅝ miles shows the good faith of this company, and so for that reason it has seemed to your committee proper that they be given an extension of one more year in order to save themselves.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. This extension of time is not for the purpose of giving them authority to build, is it? The time limit in which they may build has not yet expired, I think.

Mr. BRICK. It expires if they do not finish their 20 miles this December.

Mr. MANN. How does the gentleman mean that it expires? Will they not still have the right to build the road?

Mr. BRICK. No; they will forfeit their right.

Mr. MANN. So the time in which they were to build the road limits it within a certain time?

Mr. BRICK. To finish 20 miles was limited.

Mr. MANN. To December this year?

Mr. BRICK. To finish 20 miles in order to obtain something.

Mr. MANN. But the right to build the road was not limited, was it?

Mr. BRICK. Yes; the statute of last year limited their rights of franchise—their rights to build the road—unless they built 10 miles a year, and they had already built 10 miles, and the 10 miles this year would make it 20 miles up to December, which is the termination of their rights.

Mr. MANN. This statute also extends their right to be exempt from the license fee, I take it.

Mr. BRICK. Just for one year.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. In the course of my mail I received a circular letter, which I read. Undoubtedly the gentleman received it. I do not know whether he happened to read it or not. It was from somebody interested in the Alaskan roads. It was for the purpose of obtaining subscriptions for stock or something of that kind, hence it may be viewed with some suspicion; but in it the statement was made—and I am not sure whether it came from the people behind this road or not—that a road already opened to a certain point had more than paid for its whole cost in sixty days.

Mr. BRICK. That is not this road.

Mr. MANN. Well, I think the statement was either made about this road or else the circular was about this; but there were two roads, were there not?

Mr. TAWNEY. Is not that the White Pass road?

Mr. MANN. I do not know the names of the railroads, I will say to the distinguished gentleman. But here is a circular letter, I am inclined to think of the people behind this road, for the purpose of selling their stock, telling how very profitable it had proved. In the circular it was stated the road which had been built there was so profitable that, in the course of sixty days, the receipts more than paid the total cost of construction. Now, if the road is so profitable as that I do not think it is necessary to exempt them from the payment of the license fee.

Mr. BRICK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is mistaken as to the road. This road has not made any such profit. It is the Valdez road that the circular referred to. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] to make a statement about it.

Mr. MANN. The circular referred to two roads. The circular was endeavoring to sell the stock of one road, as I remember it, and cited the instance of the other road. How many roads are there?

Mr. PAYNE. The other road is the White Pass road, which is about 110 miles long.

Mr. BRICK. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois I know from credible and the best information possible that it is

not true as to this road, whatever they put in their circular. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] was over this road last summer, and I would ask him to make an explanation about it.

Mr. MANN. Did the gentleman receive such a circular as I refer to, or does he recollect it?

Mr. BRICK. I do not recollect any such circular being sent to me.

Mr. MANN. Has he heard of such a circular being sent?

Mr. BRICK. I have heard of the circular.

Mr. MANN. Was it a circular sent out in behalf of this road?

Mr. BRICK. Oh, no. It is the Valdez road, as I stated before.

Mr. MANN. I am not able to differentiate between the Valdez road and this road.

Mr. BRICK. This is the Seward Peninsula road, running to Solomon City.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BRICK. I do.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw any objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LACEY. I think there ought to be some explanation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I was about to ask the gentleman——

Mr. LACEY. A few words of explanation in regard to this road. This road is a little road about 13 miles long, leading from the Solomon River in the direction of Council City. I was over that road this year. I came over it going to Chinik and by way of Fish River and Neukulue River to Ophir Creek, and going back by way of East Fork, and from East Fork to Bering Sea at Solomon River this little road is 13 miles long and of standard gauge.

Mr. BRICK. Eighteen miles.

Mr. LACEY. There are some side tracks that I presume they count in the length of the road. There is the White Pass road, which goes through the White Pass and by sled stage in winter from White Horse to Dawson, and by the Yukon River in summer. This road, to which the gentleman is referring as having paid for itself, has only about 23 miles in the United States; the balance of the 110 or 116 miles are in the Yukon Territory in the British possessions. That road has not only been very profitable, having paid large dividends from the time it started, but will continue to do so as long as the business of that whole country passes over it. The little road in question is intended to connect the mines on Ophir Creek with the sea. It is a road that will not pay so much. The White Pass road runs to a country where there is winter mining, and on the Ophir Creek it is purely surface mining and therefore work can not be done in the winter. As to the road to which the gentleman alludes, the proposed road from Valdez, going out in the direction of the copper country, no part of it has been built, but I understand some clearing of the timber has been done, but no part of the railroad has yet been built. The other road to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] refers, commences at Resurrection Bay, and they built 25 miles of it last year and this year built 25 or 30 more, and they have much material on the ground for extension next year.

There is nothing carried over this new road except the material to construct the road. It has not reached the coal mines, and it has, as yet, no business in the interior. It is still 150 or 200 miles from the copper mines, and during the next two or three years its business will be confined to the shipment of its own rails, its own ties, and its own supplies.

We are trying to get railroads and wagon roads in Alaska, and we have by legislation said that a road like this while being constructed must pay a license tax of $100 a year for every mile of road. The White Pass road is paying about $2,300 a year, because there is that much of the line in the United States. The other roads pay $100 a year per mile, which is a partial embargo against the construction of new roads in that region.

Gentlemen from Alaska met in convention not long ago in Seattle and passed a resolution asking this Congress to entirely relieve all of these roads during the period of their construction from the payment of this tax, so as to encourage the building of railroads in Alaska. This exception to the White Pass road might well be made, because that is an old road built years ago and very prosperous, very successful in its business, and does business throughout the entire year.

The little Solomon River road, to which my friend from Indiana refers, is one in competition with the flatboat transportation on the Neukluk River during the summer. I made the trip last summer, going up in a flatboat to Council City, and then by a little branch road, 8 miles to Ophir Creek, coming back across the tundra to East Fork, and thence by this railway to the sea. This road begins where there is no population and runs out this far into the interior in the direction of Council City. It ought to be built clear through to Council City, but they ought not to have the penalty of paying $100 a mile on that little road while in the process of construction.

Mr. BRICK. I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD].

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, under existing law in Alaska every railroad is required to pay $100 per mile license for every year during the time it is being built. A bill was before the last Congress providing that this little road now under construction should be exempted from the tax for five years, within which it was expected the road could be constructed. They required it, however, to build 10 miles each year, in order for it to get the benefit of that exemption of tax. During the summer they undertook to construct that 10 miles. They contracted for 13 miles instead of 10, and, if they had carried out their plans, they would have had 23 miles instead of 20. But, a few days after beginning their work, a great flood, the greatest flood in that portion of the country for years, washed out a mile and a half of the road already constructed, and also washed out a part of two of the principal bridges which they had along the road already constructed. By the time the flood was over and they got the repairs made on that part which had already been built, it was impossible for them to construct the 13 miles of road. Another remarkable thing occurred. That country froze up nearly thirty days earlier than is usual; it froze up in September instead of October, and after the freezing it was impossible for them to construct any part of the road. So, up to the present time they have 18⅔ miles of road instead of 20 miles of road. The sole purpose of this bill is to permit an exception to apply to them notwithstanding they have not built the 10 miles of road this year.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BRICK. Does the gentleman from Missouri wish for more time?

Mr. LLOYD. I would like time to answer the question.

Mr. BRICK. I yield sufficient time for the gentleman to answer the question.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri what would happen to the road if this bill does not pass? They will not tear up the track, will they?

Mr. LLOYD. I suppose not; I imagine the road will go on. As far as the committee is concerned, we are aware of this fact, and the gentleman from Illinois may not be. There have been repeated efforts made to get the United States committed to the aiding of roads in Alaska. There were three bills before Congress in the last session applying for the aiding or helping by financing bonds to the extent of $20,000 a mile on roads to be constructed from Valdez up into the Copper River country. Three different companies were before our committee for that purpose. Thus far the committee has been able to keep down anything that means any expense on the part of the Government for the relief of railroad enterprise that is sought to be carried out; but where there is money actually expended, without any expenditure on the part of the Government, we are disposed to say that they ought to have every encouragement the Government can give them without the expenditure of money to aid them in this enterprise.

Mr. MANN. Now, I have no doubt that the gentleman thinks he answers the question, and I know that he endeavors to, but what he says does not convey to my mind at all an answer to the question that I asked.

Mr. LLOYD. Your question is——

Mr. MANN. What effect it will have on the road if this bill does not pass?

Mr. LLOYD. The road will be required to pay the tax.

Mr. MANN. Then this bill is practically a bill to relieve the railroad from the payment of the tax?

Mr. LLOYD. From the payment of the tax for one year; yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Do they pay a tax to anybody else?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir.

Mr. MANN. There is no tax paid by the railroad company?

Mr. LLOYD. Nowhere else; no, sir.

Mr. MANN. What this bill seeks to do is to relieve the railroad company from any form of taxation.

Mr. LLOYD. Not forever, but just for this year.

Mr. MANN. Whether for one year or not, it is to relieve the railroad company from any form of taxation for the present.

Mr. LLOYD. Yes; this road which is under construction.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman is able, with his policies

and the policies of his party, to favor that proposition? If the gentleman is able to do that, I know he must have good reason for it.

Mr. LLOYD. As far as the "gentleman" is concerned, he is not favoring the railroad, but he is desirous of developing Alaska. If the railroads wish to build their own roads, without asking anything from the Government, the gentleman is willing to help them in every way he can. Now, the law of last year, which was passed, as I understand it, without any objection on the floor of this House, limited the exemption from taxation to five years, and provided that if this road built 10 miles of track each year——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken in saying there was no objection on the floor of the House. There was considerable discussion on this subject on the floor of the House.

Mr. LLOYD. I think you are mistaken about there being any objection to this particular proposition.

Mr. MANN. I remember the discussion very well. The House did pass the bill, however.

Mr. LLOYD. The question is not now whether there was a discussion or not, but the question is whether, the road having met with these misfortunes, the House is willing to exempt this company from the tax which would not be imposed if they had built 10 miles of road. They have 18⅜ miles of road built, according to the testimony that came before us, and if there were 20 miles built there would have been no question about their being exempt from this taxation; but since they only have 18⅜ miles, it becomes necessary for them to pay the tax unless they are exempted by Congress. As their misfortunes came by the act of God, it looks as though it is nothing but right that the company should have the benefit of this exemption.

Mr. MANN. If they had paid the tax and had come before Congress to have the tax refunded they would not receive the consideration of anybody on this side of the Chamber and very few on the other side.

Mr. LLOYD. I rather think that proposition is true.

Mr. MANN. What is the difference between a proposition to relieve them from the payment of a tax which the law requires them to pay and, because of exceptional circumstances, a proposition to refund a tax which has been paid?

Mr. LLOYD. I do not understand what the gentleman is seeking to reach in this particular matter.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to ask a question.

Mr. LLOYD. As far as I am concerned, and speaking for the minority on the committee, who have investigated the matter, we are willing that this company shall be exempt from the tax and that they shall be excused from the building of the 1⅝ miles of road this year.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to ask the gentleman whether, with the exception of the White Pass road, which, so far as Alaska is concerned, is fully completed and entirely successful, all the other railroads projected and being built there ought not to be relieved from taxation for the next five years?

Mr. LLOYD. I am not willing to go that far.

Mr. LACEY. And is it not true that the extension of these roads is discouraged by this license tax?

Mr. LLOYD. The White Pass road, as far as I understand, is a paying investment; and if it is, there ought not to be any exemption from taxation. The White Pass road is already constructed.

Mr. LACEY. I say the roads, with the exception of the White Pass road, ought to be relieved, ought they not, at least during the period of their construction?

Mr. LLOYD. Well, there is no other road——

Mr. LACEY. Yes; there is the Wildgoose road on Ophir Creek; there is the Nome Arctic road, from Nome north; there is the Valdez road, from Valdez; there is the Resurrection Bay road, and there are a number of roads projected there, all of them either in process of construction or are soon to be, and they must be built a long distance before they can realize anything. Some railway lines are asking subsidies in Alaska. Certainly these roads not asking aid might be very properly relieved from a license tax during the period of construction.

Mr. LLOYD. That question is not before the House. When it is I will be glad to answer the question the best I can. We have not investigated that proposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask a question about this bill.

Mr. BRICK. Very well, I will answer it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The act of January, 1905, exempted this railroad from taxation for five years after the passage of this act.

Mr. BRICK. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Requiring the road to build 10 miles each year.

Mr. BRICK. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This bill, I understand, first removes the necessity of building the 10 miles during this present year. Does it extend the period of exemption beyond the original five years?

Mr. BRICK. No; it extends for this 10 miles which is not fully completed for this year, and requires the whole road to be built by 1909, and it only asks that the taxes or license fee be exempt while they are earning no money, while they are building their road. I think that answers the question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it does not. The act of January, 1905, provides that this railroad shall be exempted from taxation for the period of five years after the passage of that act. It requires that in order that the road should get the benefit of that exemption it should complete 10 miles each year, and if it built more than 10 miles in any one year certain buildings should be credited to the succeeding year. This bill before the House now removes from the company the necessity of having at the end of this year 20 miles of the road. Does it also extend the period of five years during which the road will be exempt from taxation?

Mr. BRICK. It extends it one year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Beyond the original five years?

Mr. BRICK. Beyond the original five years, because it can not be completed and because the act of God swept away their track and they could not complete their 20 miles within this year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. BRICK. Just a moment, Mr. Speaker. I submit that it is too late for the objection to come. We have debated the question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But I reserved the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent was not given.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I submit that debate followed after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] withdrew his objection, before there was any objection, or any right to object reserved.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] immediately reserved the right to object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserved the right to object when I got the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman proceeded by unanimous consent in effect to answer the questions. The right to object was reserved, and the House did not give the unanimous consent up to this time. The Chair was watching pretty closely, and if he had had an opportunity to say that the House gave unanimous consent the Chair would have announced that very promptly. Objection is heard.

PHILIPPINE REVENUE.

Mr. PAYNE, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, reported a bill (H. R. 3) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 8, 1902; which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying reports, ordered printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill which has just been reported, it was agreed in committee, and I wish to have the agreement spread upon the RECORD so that there may be no danger of misunderstanding, that the minority upon the committee shall have until Thursday at 5 o'clock p. m., whether the House be then in session or not, to file the minority substitute bill and the minority report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the minority shall have until Thursday afternoon next, at 5 o'clock, to file its views with the Clerk of the House, whether the House be in session at 5 o'clock or not. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I desire to say that I shall call this bill up and try to proceed to its consideration on January 4, 1906, when the House meets after the holiday recess.

I now move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House resolution No. 42, and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all general debate on this resolution close to-day when the committee rises.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not insist upon that, and for this reason: There is a question to be determined of reference, and a great many Members of the House have gone home already for the holidays and many more

will go to-morrow, so I hope the vote upon the question of reference will not be taken until after the holidays when they return.

Mr. PAYNE. I will say to the gentleman I do not propose to press that; I do not think I could if I wanted to, as I do not think there will be a quorum, but I would like to close general debate and then there will be opportunity for debate on the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman suggest to close general debate to-morrow, say, at 5 o'clock?

Mr. PAYNE. I said to-day, anticipating many may not be here to-morrow.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Suppose the gentleman modifies that request and make it to-morrow at 5 o'clock.

Mr. PAYNE. I will make that request, and say that to-morrow afternoon when the House adjourns general debate shall be considered as closed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to close general debate in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on House resolution No. 42 to-morrow at adjournment, whether the committee sits or not. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

So the motion was agreed to; and thereupon the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House resolution No. 42, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House resolution No. 42, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] is recognized.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, inasmuch as I do not want to be out of fashion, I propose to make my remarks along the lines that others have made theirs since this discussion began, and you may therefore prejudge that they will embrace a medley of subjects. In the matter of the reference of that part of the President's message that refers to insurance, that has been under discussion for several days, I, in common with others, have my individual views.

If it were not, Mr. Chairman, that we thought differently, there would be no questions for us to assemble here to dispose of from time to time, because our similar ideas would lead to but one conclusion, no dissension anywhere, and hence we could dispose of the subjects that we are sent here to dispose of by proxy and let them go at that.

In my humble judgment, the insurance feature of the President's message ought to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary as a business proposition. When we come to legislate, we ought to do it on a business plane, along business lines, not in a scattering or guesswork manner, as it were. It strikes me that if we refer it to the Committee on Ways and Means it would be a guesswork proceeding. No member of that committee seems to know what to do with it, unless it be that when they get it they could evolve something out of it that would produce revenue. I can not see how taxing the insurance companies will amount to anything in controlling them, unless it be that they are to be taxed out of existence. To simply lay a tax upon them would do the companies no hurt, for if you taxed them $10,000,000 each per annum the policy holders and not the companies would have to pay it.

Such a tax would add considerably to the revenue of this country, and we would all be glad to welcome $10,000,000 into the Treasury at this particular time of revenue shortage from each of these companies if it came out of their fraudulent coffers instead of out of the orphan's penury and the widow's mite.

But there is no danger of the insurance business being legally regulated by taxation, for nowhere within the lids of the Constitution of the United States is there anything that tends to indicate that the Congress has authority to tax individuals or corporations for the purpose of regulation. Therefore it seems that it is unnecessary to argue longer that the Ways and Means Committee is not the proper committee to which to refer this particular question of insurance, to which the President has so lucidly referred in his annual message to this body.

But, sir, it has been claimed that it ought to go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I can not see why. Certainly under the decisions of the Supreme Court insurance is not commerce, and inasmuch as the Interstate Commerce Committee has no other authority than that of dealing with the commerce of the country it seems entirely out of place to talk about sending this part of the message to that committee. I think it would be wiser to refer it to the Post-Office Committee than to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, because there they might deal with it along the lines of the get-rich-quick propositions. We notice, Mr. Chairman, that the post-office authorities have power, whenever they know of any concern that is organized, corporation or otherwise, for the purpose of getting rich quick by defrauding those who patronize such institutions, to issue a fraud order and in that way get rid of the obnoxious imposition. Sir, if the proceedings of the insurance companies, the three great insurance companies of the United States, for the past several years, according to the evidence that has been adduced before the committee that is now investigating them in the city of New York, do not show them to be get-rich-quick concerns, then I do not know the meaning of the term. They have certainly been getting rich quick according to the reports that have come to our ears, telling of the vast sums that have been illegally appropriated to the use and benefit of the companies and their thieving officers, to the eternal injury of the policy holders and their beneficiaries. Their officers have defrauded the policy holders by the misappropriation of trust funds, and hence are embezzlers under the laws of any State of the Union. If that does not call for a fraud order, I would like to know what sort of conduct would call for one.

But, sir, it seems to be a doubtful question as to whether this Government has any authority whatever to deal with the great insurance corporations. Therefore, as long as there is doubt about that, there can be no doubt about the committee that the insurance part of the President's message should go to. It has always been the rule in all legislative bodies, whenever legislation is initiated that indicates that it would be in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, or of the States, that the Judiciary is the proper committee for it to be referred to, where questions of that kind are considered and determined and the proper report made thereon. Therefore the motion, which I understand is to be made, to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee, with instructions to report back to this body its findings, will be the proper motion, in my judgment, and it ought to prevail.

Certainly, sir, the insurance companies need some check upon their reckless course. If they have misappropriated trust funds, they have been profligate in the use of money that was placed in their hands to be given back to the policy holders or their beneficiaries as a dividend, and, sir, when they misappropriate trust funds by way of paying excessive salaries; when they misappropriate by way of speculation, or when they misappropriate it by placing it in the campaign fund of a political party to corrupt voters, their officers have simply committed the heinous crime of embezzlement and ought to be shrouded in stripes the balance of their unworthy lives. And the strong arm of the law of the proper jurisdiction should take hold of the companies themselves and either regulate or banish them.

But, from the arguments that have been presented here by learned lawyers, and the knowledge we all have of the Constitution of the United States, and of the powers reserved by the States to themselves when the Union was created, we are satisfied that it is within the province of the State, and not of the nation, to control insurance companies. In my own State, sir, we have an insurance law that prohibits the transaction of business by any insurance company that is in a pool to fix prices, made anywhere on earth for the purpose of doing business anywhere on earth, in Arkansas, as long as that pool exists. Sir, that has driven the old-line insurance companies that are in a pool to fix insurance prices from the borders of our State; and if the State of Arkansas has the power to do that as to the fire insurance corporations, why has it not the power to enact a law that will do the very same thing for the life insurance companies? I will answer the question myself, sir. It has the power, and so has every other State in the Union of States.

Sirs, I am persuaded that the disclosures made by the legislative committee in New York in their examination of this great question will awaken the conscience of the legislators of that State, to the end that a law may be enacted at the next session of the legislature that will either control or banish the insurance companies that are now organized and doing business in that State. If that is done this whole matter will be settled; the question will be solved, and insurance will come back to what it was wont to be in its incipiency, a protection, and not a fortune-making business.

Sir, again, I am inclined to think that the new officers that have been selected to preside over the destinies of these companies will certainly be a little more careful, will be a little wiser in the discharge of the duties they have assumed, and especially so the president of the Equitable Association, who was given a certificate of good character by the President of the United States when he sent him from his Cabinet to become president of that institution. Sir, he will not be unmindful of the certificate of good character that the President gave him, to the extent of being willing to commit any act that will reflect upon the certificate or the man who so cordially gave it.

But, Mr. Chairman, this question, as I said, ought to be settled by the States. It is a States rights question that none of us can get away from, and that none of us who believe in the doctrine of independence ought to be willing to take from the States and give to any other power on earth. The States have complete power, under existing constitutions, to deny a corporation the privilege of doing business within its confines upon any terms, and hence have power to say upon what terms they shall do business within them. To take such power from the States by amendment of the National Constitution would be a long step toward centralization of government, and a well-aimed blow at the liberty-revering principle of States rights. I for one, am not ready to believe the people's Representatives, who command the confidence of eighty million loyal patriots, would rob their respective Commonwealths of the power that they have under their own constitutions and under the Constitution of the nation. Being a States rights advocate, wanting to preserve every privilege and every power to the States that I possibly can that is consistent with good order and good government throughout the nation, I protest against the thought of conceding the right of this Government to control the insurance institutions of this country.

A gentleman of the committee said very properly the other day—the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY]—that if you take the insurance control out of the hands of the States, then and there you take the adjudication of all causes with them out of the local courts. And, sir, the widows and orphans who are to be benefited by the policies of insurance would have to go into the United States court to collect them whenever payment, from any technical or vicious cause, was refused. To do so would often take them great distances from their homes, at great expense and inconvenience to themselves. I think adjustments ought to be made by local courts upon questions of this kind, and not put upon litigants the burden of having to go among strangers, at great inconvenience and expense, in order to get their rights adjudicated, when they, and those from whom they take, have lived up to every feature of the contract that they are forced by a soulless corporation to sue upon.

We know the character of these great corporations. Whether they believe they can defeat a claim or not, they will litigate in many instances for the purpose of delay, for the purpose of withholding the money, possibly to force a compromise that would be to their advantage. Sir, I am violently opposed to any action that would bring about such an unfortunate and unfriendly condition to the insurance beneficiaries of my own proud State, and hence protest most seriously against any effort on the part of Congress to commit an act that would for a single moment take from the States of this Union any of the power they now have to control the insurance associations of the land that come to their borders for the transaction of insurance business.

Mr. Chairman, I will now leave the insurance question to the better judgment of the members of the committee and proceed to discuss the subject of railroad-rate legislation for a short time. I am in hearty sympathy with the President of the United States in his desire to have the Interstate Commerce Commission given power to regulate rates whenever it finds them to be unreasonable, unjust, or discriminatory in their character. Sir, I applaud his every utterance upon that line, because they are right; and I care not from whom righteous utterances come, they are to be commended by an honest political foe as well as by friend. I believe the President of the United States intends to do right upon all questions. I believe his every purpose is to be President of the whole people of this Union regardless of locality or condition, and his only shortcoming seems to be that he sometimes allows the great corporations and trust interests of the country to "pull the wool over his eyes" for a season; for instance, when he allowed the "stand-patters" upon the subjects of the tariff and railroad-rate regulation to prevent him from calling an extra session of the Fifty-ninth Congress, in accordance with his openly and often expressed purpose.

In his recommendation to this body the President in his message to Congress says, in terms, that the Interstate Commerce Commission "ought to be given the power to substitute a just and reasonable rate whenever, upon hearing, it finds that the railroads have fixed an unjust and unreasonable rate, such rate so substituted by the Interstate Commerce Commission to remain the rate unless and until it is reversed by a court of competent jurisdiction."

That sounds right in every sense of the word. It is true that the railroads take issue with him. Why not? I have never known a corporation, or an individual, so far as that is concerned, who was engaged in wrongdoing, who was exceeding the authority that he or it possessed, but what complained whenever any authority, any power, saw fit to call a halt upon their wayward course. Take a criminal, and he does not think the legislatures of the States ought to pass any law that would interfere with his wicked acts. Take the evilly disposed corporations, and they think they ought to be given a loose rein, that the bridle ought to be taken off so far as they are concerned and they left to do their worst.

They argue ingeniously in many instances when presenting their cause. Note some of their objections. The president of the Southern Railroad some months ago undertook to prejudice the Representatives of the South against the Esch-Townsend bill by saying that to pass that measure would take from the people of the South the right by State legislation to provide for separate coaches for the two races. I wonder if he thought we were a lot of fools in the South. Certainly he did not believe that we were destitute of legal learning. We are wedded to the proposition of separate coaches for the two races, and we have sense enough to know that under the Constitution of the United States, and under he constitutions of our own States, we have power to pass and enforce a law providing for separate coaches and that Congress can not interfere therewith.

Therefore, sir, I have no fear upon that ground, and there is nothing in that idle threat to deter us in our determination to stand by the President in his declaration upon the subject of railroad-rate regulation. It is consistent with every declaration of the Democratic party upon the subject, and hence there is no reason why we should be deterred in the performance of our duty simply because a Republican President indorses the position of our own party upon the subject.

But the railroads, in their arguments, proceed on the theory, Mr. Chairman, that if the power be given to the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates they will go into the rate-making business specifically. Nobody contemplates any such authority being given it. Nobody understands for a moment that if it is given such authority as the President recommends the Interstate Commerce Commission is going to get right down to rate making as a business. It is understood that the Commission is to have only such power as will permit it to substitute a reasonable or just rate whenever it finds that the railroads have fixed a rate whereby any community or individual will be prejudiced.

The Commission must be given power to say to the railroad, "You shall not discriminate against this community in favor of that, or in favor of this business as against that business." That far it will go, and no farther. And yet the railroads proclaim from the house top that the Government is going into the rate-making business, and that in doing so it is fixing to destroy them; that whenever the Commission is given the power to fix and substitute rates their property will be confiscated; that their rights and privileges will be taken from them. Nothing of that kind is intended by anyone who is in favor of rate regulation.

The railroads contend, Mr. Chairman, that they know more about rate making than anyone else. I suppose they do. Persons who have been long engaged in a given business are better informed concerning everything that pertains to that business than are others; but we find that we have learned men in this country who can very easily adapt themselves to different kinds of business when called upon to do so.

Therefore a President chosen by the people will, in my judgment, select only the kind of men that will be able to enter into the matter of fixing substitute rates that will be fair to both railroad and shipper without material delay or unusual embarrassment.

For nearly ten years the Commission thought it had power to substitute a reasonable or just rate for an unreasonable or unjust one, and it proceeded tc substitute without let or hindrance wherever it found them to be discriminatory in their character, but in no instance did rates substituted by the Commission become confiscators of railroad property or railroad rights.

The railroads seem to forget, Mr. Chairman, that the people have any rights at all when it comes to dealing with powerful corporations. They seem to think that they have rights that are paramount to the rights of the people whenever their interests clash in any degree.

Sir, they forget that they have been kindly given certain privileges under the law that human beings do not enjoy. They forget that by law they are given a perpetual life—something that God in His goodness did not accord to man. They forget, sir, that they are exempt from many of the petty persecutions or prosecutions to which man is subjected. They forget that they are excused from unhappy conditions that require the benefit of clergy, but they do not seem to understand that we know that the reason of it is because the peculiar office of clergy is to administer to souls. [Applause and laughter.]

The railroads, sir, forget that we by law have given them the

right to extend their selfish trail through homes that are as sacred to the owner as the grave. They forget that we have given to them the right to ignore all boundary lines and all directions. The individual can not ignore the sacredness of the home or ignore the boundary lines of his neighbor without suffering the severe pains and penalties of the law.

It is true that the railroads must go into court to obtain such benefits, but they get them whenever they petition for them. Angels could get no more at the hands of the courts. Is it possible that beneficiaries who have received such superior benefits at the hands of the people are now afraid of their generous benefactors, or is it that they have grown so greedy and great that they now propose to declare themselves their masters and give them a kick at every turn of the road?

Sir, their arguments against rate substitution by the Commission are so transparent and inconsistent that it easily enables us to understand and appreciate that they are simply trying to hoodwink the people of this country, so that they will not become aroused to the point of studying the question for themselves, knowing full well that if they do enter upon an investigation of the conditions as they actually exist they will rise up in their might and scourge them from their temple of usurped and arrogant power.

I have before me one of the various "missionary tracts" which they have sent to the various Members of Congress. I suppose each and every one of you have received as many as a quarter of a dozen of these. I did, and I have received many pounds of this sort of literature. One book, I remember, was gotten up very much like a novel, as if it were a publication of that attractive character.

One of the arguments presented in this little "tract" is that we ought not to interfere with the railroads by giving the Commission power to substitute rates because we would prevent their making special rates here and there in order to build up certain industries and give value to certain materials or products. I will read from this pamphlet a few of their fallacious reasons as to why their rates should not be interfered with. It is styled "The facts about railroad rates."

One of the countless forms of this means by which railroads develop traffic occurred not long ago in Indiana.

Perhaps some of the Indiana Representatives may know of this transaction.

A resident of that State acquired control of an invention for making butter dishes from shaved veneer cut from timber. It was discovered that sweet gum, a previously worthless wood, was best adapted to the new industry. A study of the needs of the new business showed that to enable it to be successful a rate 25 per cent lower on this timber than on other kinds was necessary. Such a rate was promptly made, with the result of building up a new and profitable industry, giving employment to labor and capital, and giving value to a natural product that had previously had no value.

Mark these words, gentlemen: "To a natural product that had previously had no value."

Sir, I live in a State where we have a great quantity of sweet gum, about which they write. I know that we have not been able to buy a single thousand of the lumber cut from this particular kind of natural product without paying $10 per thousand for it since the Dingley bill became a law. Therefore, when they say that within the last few years they have discovered that they could give value to a natural product that had heretofore had no value they state something, gentlemen, that they do not expect the people generally to believe; but they think that by making the broad declaration that they have enabled this particular concern to build up its business by giving a 25 per cent cut they will encourage some one to think that his particular locality, or his particular business, will be given a cut which will enable him to increase the value or production of his business, and thereby "catch a sucker" with that sort of selfish bait.

Sir, that is a fallacious statement, because sweet gum could not be bought in the wildest territory in the State I come from for less than $10 a thousand before the Indiana enterprise was organized. It had that value before the rate-making question was a subject of serious discussion. It had a good value long before they thought of producing this kind of argument. It has such a value now that the sawmill owners are growing independent, while the people who buy the lumber are impoverished in proportion to the extra price they have to pay for the gum lumber that they must have to build the ordinary cabin that protects them from the blasts of winter and the floods that fall from God's sky. Mr. Chairman, the Republican high tariff has done more to make the price of gum lumber go up than all of the 25 per cent reductions the railroads have given all of the lumber concerns in the world.

But, sir, let us look at some more of their funny argument. I suppose they wanted to scare the Congressmen from Georgia when they put this particular thing in their little pamphlet:

A merchant in Marietta can ship certain goods to Chattanooga for 15 cents per hundred; to Knoxville for 19 cents per hundred. To ship the same goods to Atlanta he must pay 30 cents per hundred; to Macon, 70 cents per hundred. Atlanta is 20 miles from Marietta, Chattanooga is 128 miles, and yet the Chattanooga merchant pays just one-half the freight the Atlanta merchant does. Why? Because Chattanooga is out of the State and Atlanta is in it. This is merely one of a hundred instances where Georgia points are placed at a positive disadvantage in freight rates because they are located in the State.

I suppose they meant to say that because Atlanta and Macon are located in a State where they have a railroad commission is the reason for this state of things. Sir, if this argument is true, I want to say that Georgia certainly has an inferior railroad commission, because it surely has the power to control all of the rates for the shipment of freight from one point in the State of Georgia to another, and it strikes me that wherever their attention was called to the fact that they had to pay for a distance of 20 miles twice as much as persons living in Chattanooga, 120 miles away, they would call a meeting of the commission at once and change the infamous rate, and say to them, "You can not rob the people of our State in any such way; if you are able to carry a commodity for people of another State 128 miles for 15 cents, 'by the Eternal,' you can not come to our State and rob our people by charging them twice as much for a 20-mile haul." Gentlemen from Georgia, what kind of railroad commission have you in your State?

Why, sir, look at the inconsistency of their argument. Why, if that were the case, are they complaining against giving the Interstate Commerce Commission power to fix rates? Why should they howl about that? They have a commission in Georgia with power to fix rates, and the railroads argue that it is hampering the material interests of that State because they do have the commission. Why is it, if they can get higher rates for themselves in Georgia with a commission than they indicate they could get if there were no commission there, that they do not throw their arms wide open and welcome the proposition of giving the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to regulate unjust discriminations in freight rates? It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that that is the course they ought to pursue if they want to be consistent.

They also reach far out in their funny argument, Mr. Chairman, and talk about governmental ownership of railroads, or tell us what happened in Canada, where they have governmental ownership. They say:

Things don't always pan out as the theorists think they will. The government of Canada, after operating the Intercolonial Railway for years at a loss, has just announced an increase of rates all along the line, to the disgust of persons who imagine government ownership means lower rates.

Why that argument? Who is there in this Congress, either branch of it, that is advocating government ownership of railroads?

Sir, if I understand it aright, those of the Members of this body who are favorable to railroads—and I believe all of us are—are trying to keep them from going into the hands of the Government. None of us want the Government to own a single line of railroad. We want the corporations, or the individuals wherever they possess them, to operate them, but we want them to operate them in accordance with wisdom, in accordance with justice to every man alike, recognizing that none should have favoritism extended to them as against their fellows.

They also argue, Mr. Chairman, that we are blessed with lower rates in this country than they are in any other country. That is no argument. I expect we have the best of most everything that is going, so far as that is concerned, because we have a superior citizenship and a Government that surpasses that of any other nation on earth. Therefore I apprehend that because we have lower rates than they have in other countries is no argument at all as to why we should not have the power to fix a given rate when we find that the railroads have fixed an unjust rate; when we find that they have fixed an unreasonable rate; when we find that they have fixed a discriminatory rate.

Sir, one reason we have better rates in this country than they have elsewhere is that the hauls are better here than in other countries. There is no nation on earth that has such long hauls as we have, and they do not have as great hauls as ours in quantity. Where our hauls are measured by the thousands of miles, theirs are measured by the hundreds, and where our freight is measured by carloads or trainloads, theirs is measured by the hundred pounds or the ton. Sir, it looks to me as though we ought to have better rates here than elsewhere if we can furnish them better conditions to haul on than they can elsewhere. Therefore, sir, their argument along that line is not worth the consideration of an idler, even.

I am reminded that they also argue that they are not unjust in fixing their rates, that they are trying to do right, and are doing right according to their contention; but, sir, I am just in receipt of a letter from the Fort Smith traffic bureau, of my

State, that gives a different statement of facts to those presented by the railroads, and as they are interested in a sense, not financially interested to the extent the railroads are, I am bound to take their conclusions or their findings in this matter in preference to the conclusions or findings of the railroads upon the subject. I read on page 3 of the letter:

The traffic problem is not that all rates are in themselves too high, but that gross and damaging discrimination exists as result of unequal adjustment between cities and communities. The duty of a common carrier is to receive and transport, without favoritism or discrimination, goods from one point to another, transportation being subject to such reasonable rules and regulations as may be required.

Cities like St. Louis, Memphis, Kansas City, and Chicago are given a very low basis of freight rates into a certain territory, while, for the same distance, the rates from Little Rock, Fort Smith, Texarkana, etc., are from 25 to 50 per cent higher. Such basis acts as a direct discrimination in restraint of interstate commerce against the smaller cities to the benefit of the larger.

To illustrate, we will take the dry-goods interests, five large wholesale houses being located at Fort Smith, with more than one-half million capital invested. Cotton piece goods is an important item in this line, the major portion of which originates in New England, moving through New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, via rail and ocean, to Memphis, St. Louis, Fort Smith, Little Rock, etc., by way of Savannah, Ga., or Galveston, Tex.

Fort Smith is 300 miles farther west than is Memphis, the distance from Galveston to Fort Smith being less than to Memphis or St. Louis, yet the rate on cotton piece goods from New York and points taking same route to Fort Smith is 31 cents in excess of the rate applying to Memphis.

Take Hobart, Okla., which is 487 miles from Fort Smith and 720 miles from Memphis; the rate applying on cotton piece goods from Memphis to Hobart, is $1.03; from Fort Smith to Hobart, $1.34.

You will note that while Fort Smith is 233 nearer Hobart, Okla., than is Memphis, the rate applying on cotton piece goods from Fort Smith is 31 cents in excess of the rate applying from Memphis.

Sir, tell me that that is not a fair evidence of an unjust rate; tell me that it is not clear as the sunshine to the naked eye when all cloud and mist have been removed. The idea of charging 31 cents more to take a commodity from a given community to another community when it is 233 miles nearer than it is to the other shipping point is so unjust that it strikes me on its face that any man, I care not who or how biased he may be, ought to be able to say that it is discriminatory in an extreme degree.

Yet they come to us and indicate that they are doing nothing that prejudices any community, that prejudices any individual, and that their purpose is to do right under any and all circumstances. Sirs, none of you can hold to that belief if you will investigate the matter yourselves and see where these discriminations exist.

"From Memphis to Catoosa, Ind. T., 453 miles, the rate applying on cotton piece goods is 85 cents; the rate on the same commodity from Fort Smith for a distance of 453 miles is $1.23;" thus giving to the community of Memphis a discriminatory rate as against the community of Fort Smith.

In the district that I represent the railroads make glaring discriminations. They give a rate of 25 cents per barrel of flour from St. Louis to my home town, Helena, Ark., while they charge more than twice that much to a point in the district 125 miles nearer St. Louis. Such a discrimination is nothing short of robbery committed against the citizens of the nearer point. I want my home folks to do well on all occasions, but I do not want them to prosper if other people who are just as good must be robbed in order that they may do so.

Ah, gentlemen, these things speak for themselves; and it seems to me that under no circumstances could a man believe that the railroads are doing right when we find such discriminations as these.

But their arguments go further, and they endeavor to show that they are conducting themselves correctly now. I will read just a little of the evidence they are using to support their contentions. Mr. E. P. Bacon, who is the chief legislative agent of those who wish to confer rate-making authority upon the Commission, on December 9, 1904, while addressing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, was asked whether he had heard of any proceedings against the railroads in the matter of rebate, and he replied as follows:

I have not heard of any occasion for proceedings. It [meaning the Elkins law of February, 1903] has been so generally observed by the railroads since its passage that there has been no occasion for prosecution.

Now, the railroads knowing that we understand that Mr. E. P. Bacon is on the side of the President; on the side of all right-thinking individuals of this nation; on the side of the Democratic party as declared in three national platforms upon the subject of regulating rates; knowing that we know that his purpose is to give the Interstate Commerce Commission power to fix rates, I can not understand why they give us this little snatch of his testimony before that committee and withhold the other. We all know, in spite of what Mr. Bacon said to the committee, that these same railroads are being indicted to-day for giving rebates; indicted in Kansas City, Mo., in Philadelphia, and God only knows in how many other places they could be indicted if people would tell the truth and officers do their duty. I can not realize why they give this sort of testimony, unless it is for the purpose of confusing our minds and leading us who do not have everyday transactions with them to believe that they are doing the correct thing in the matter of fixing rates.

Railroad rates, like the Dingley tariff, are fixed too high is why rebates can be given and yet a profit be made on the freight transported. Let the railroads fix and publish a proper, reasonable, and just rate and the Interstate Commerce Commission will never make a rate, no matter how great their power to do so.

Railroads certainly would not give a rebate that would work a loss to them. Therefore the rebate rate must be just and remunerative to them, and they certainly ought not to complain if the Commission wishes to adopt a rate that they themselves have promulgated as a reasonable and just rate.

They also tell us that we ought to allow competition to regulate rates. Mr. Chairman, there is no known power of prophecy about me, but I possess some of the elements of guessing. Therefore I will not attempt to prophesy, but will venture the guess that railroad competition in this country is a thing of the past. Yes, sir; I believe it has taken the wings of the morning and flown to the uttermost parts of the sea.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one other subject that I desire to refer to, with no intention whatever of wounding the feelings of anyone in connection therewith, and that is in reference to a bill that was introduced at a former day of the session of this Congress by Mr. BENNET of New York, in which he seeks to reduce the representation of the State of Arkansas from seven to five Congressmen.

I represent a portion of the State of Arkansas, and I entered into a solemn compact with myself a great many years ago never to know of its being reflected upon by anyone without undertaking to explain the situation that brought about the reflection, or else to repudiate the reflection if it was false.

Sir, this bill seeks to reduce the representation of the State of Arkansas from seven to five. For what purpose? The bill goes on to indicate that it is because the legislature of the State has violated, in the enactment of our election laws, the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Sir, this matter has never been carried to the Supreme Court of the United States from our State for determination, but there is a provision in our election law that provides that a citizen, before he shall become a voter or have the privilege of the ballot, shall pay $1 for a poll tax. In other words, he must pay a poll tax before he can vote. The money received for the poll tax goes into the educational fund of the State, and the voter's children are educated, partially, with it. That is the only qualification that the Arkansas statute possesses that under any circumstances would be held to restrict the vote of any male human being after he has arrived at the age of 21 years, except where convicted of a crime of heinous character.

Now, sir, that is all that Arkansas has done. In what sense has she violated the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States? I understand that other Southern States have the same provision in their election laws and that the question has been before the Supreme Court of the United States from those States, and that it was held to be constitutional, and not in conflict with the provision of the amendment that I have just mentioned.

If the poll-tax provisions are not in violation of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, how can Arkansas's provision be? I find, sir, in other States of the Union, that certain provisions are within the statutes of those States that seem to me would come nearer conflicting with this provision than ours, and yet no one has seen fit to introduce a bill to reduce their representation.

For instance, the State of New Hampshire requires the payment of all taxes assessed against a voter for a period of one year before voting and will not allow paupers to vote. There they not only have to pay a poll tax, but they have to pay all their taxes. We do not require that other taxes be paid. We do not prohibit the voter from voting because he is poor. A man may be ever so humble, be ever so poor, if he has a dollar with which to pay the poll tax he can walk up to the polls and vote like a king.

Massachusetts requires that the voter shall be able to read the constitution of the Commonwealth in the English language and to write his name, except where precluded from reading or writing by reason of physical defects, or he had the right to vote on the 1st day of May, 1857.

It strikes me, gentlemen, that there is a clear "grandfather" clause in the election law of that State, and a clause requiring a voter to be a scholar, and yet we hear of no one wanting to reduce its representation in Congress.

Connecticut requires a voter to be able to read a section of the constitution or a section of the statutes of the State before he can vote.

Pennsylvania requires all county or State taxes to be paid before her voters can vote, except when the voter is dead at the time he votes, while poor old Arkansas, as stated, simply requires the voter to pay a poll tax of $1, with which his children are to be educated, so that they will be qualified to vote when they see fit to change their domicile from Arkansas to Connecticut or Massachusetts. [Applause.]

I can not, to save myself, understand the heart or head of a Representative that could want the representation of Arkansas reduced, when she requires no more of a voter than that he pay the small sum of $1 to help educate his own children before he exercises the privilege of voting, and at the same time oppose the reduction of representation of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Pennsylvania, that require so much more of their voters.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, I suppose the difference is to be found in the fact that Arkansas is in the South and Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Pennsylvania are in the North, and the gentleman who introduced the bill comes from the North.

If northern Representatives can afford to father such a partisan species of legislation, we of the grand State of Arkansas can stand it. We do not want to control the elections of any other State, but, by all of the powers that a just God has given us, we will control our own; and we will do it for the best interests of all of the people of the State.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am done with the unpleasant subject; but, sir, in closing, permit me to slightly paraphrase the effusions of the verse maker and say:

Let the howlers howl and the growlers growl,
Let the prowlers prowl and the gaudy gewgaws go it;
For behind the night there is plenty of light,
And the people of old Arkansas are all right—thank God—
And I know it.

[Applause.]

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, we have resolved ourselves into the most important committee of the House of Representatives. There has been referred to this committee the message of the Executive, one of the coordinate branches of the Government. We are now in the discussion of the reference of the message to the proper committees of this House. There has been discussion with reference to which committee the question of insurance should be referred. I have listened very carefully and with pleasure to many suggestions made by Members on both sides of the Chamber as to the reference of this matter. However, I am constrained to the belief that it would be far better for this House to create a new committee, to be known as the "Committee on Insurance," to which this matter could be more properly referred.

In the discussion of the question of insurance, some excellent gentlemen in this House have referred to the manner in which the insurance companies should be regulated. Some of them have referred to national supervision or examination, and that thought as expressed causes me to turn to a great branch of our domestic commerce, if you see fit to so call it, in which the Government is now engaged in supervising by virtue of examination. That great branch is the national banking system.

Last Monday the House and the country, aye, yes, other countries, were startled by the announcement that a great bank in the second city of the Union, in one of the great marts of trade of the world, had closed its doors by reason either of the conduct or misconduct of the officials in charge of that great bank. Associated with that bank and under its management were two other banks, under the control and management of the State of Illinois. Concurrently the great State of Illinois, through its auditor, sent an examiner there to look after the interests of the State of Illinois upon that question. Moving at the same moment and along the same line, the splendid Comptroller of the Currency of the United States sent a national officer there to examine the bank. Whether it happened by an act of coincidence, whether it was purposely prepared or not, I am not here to say, for I do not know; but the result of it was that the banks were found not to come up to the standard requirements of the laws of the State of Illinois and the Federal laws upon the statute books of our country. But to the credit of the great banks of the city of Chicago, that are patriotic, whose men desire to serve the commercial interests of that city and of the country, the associated banks of the city of Chicago came to the rescue of that bank, and as a result no depositor will lose a dollar of money by reason of the mismanagement of the officials of the institution that failed in that city. But that does not take from this House and from the country the fact that the national bank failed. Why? Was it due to the failure on the part of the National Government through its Comptroller, acting through his officers as bank examiners, that this bank was permitted to run along and accept the public funds? Was it the fault of the National Government that such conduct was disclosed in that bank? I am frank to say that it was not. I am frank to say that the Government through its officers did its full duty so far as it could under the conditions that existed at that time.

Now, what do we find? The national-bank act became a law of the land on February 25, 1863. From that date up to October 10, 1905, there have been 460 national-bank failures.

These failures incurred a loss to the individual depositors of those banks of $32,000,000. Now, this sounds large when we put it in the aggregate, but when you take into consideration the millions and billions of money that these banks have handled for depositors in the course of their business it is a small amount of loss as compared with the amount that they have handled justly and properly for the benefit of this great and growing country. The banks now in existence number 5,585. These banks under the law must be examined at least twice a year. We have given a force of 78 men to enable the Comptroller of the Currency to do this great work. There is a fault somewhere; perhaps we have not done our full duty and not given the Comptroller of the Currency a large enough force to do the work of examining these banks for the benefit of the depositors of the national banks.

Ah, my countrymen, the people have great faith in the Government; they have great faith in its officers. They have a right to believe that when a national bank examiner goes to a bank and reports that the conditions of that bank are stable, that proper examinations have been made, that our people may feel they can trust the examiner and his statement, and that they can safely put their money into the hands of that bank. Therein lies the mischief, if any there be, in not having a proper number of men to thoroughly examine and report in reference to the condition of the national banks in the United States. Now, as I have stated, the fault is not with the bank examiners, but with the bank officials to prevent trouble in this regard. I have the law before me, and I will read two sections that bear upon this question with reference to bank officials and the performance of their duty. Section 2500 of the Revised Statutes reads:

The total liabilities to any association, of any person, or of any company, corporation, or firm for money borrowed, including, in the liabilities of a company or firm, the liabilities of the several members thereof, shall at no time exceed one-tenth part of the amount of the capital stock of such association actually paid in.

Do you believe that if the law I have read had been properly enforced with reference to the management of that bank that one man connected with that bank could have borrowed the enormous amount of money that it is reported in the public press he borrowed out of the bank, of which he was an official?

Mr. GILLESPIE. If the gentleman will permit me. Does not the Comptroller of the Currency say that he himself has set aside that law because the penalty is too severe? I refer to the law forbidding national banks from lending more than 10 per cent of the capital stock to any one person. Is that his report you have there?

Mr. PRINCE. No, sir; it is the law.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Does the gentleman remember that the Comptroller of the Currency says that he has not undertaken to enforce that provision of the law because, in his mind, the penalty is too severe?

Mr. PRINCE. No, sir; I do not; but I do say this, that I do not believe it is given to me in my official life, when I have taken an oath to do my duty, that I can cheerfully set it aside because I do not like the law. A distinguished gentleman, one of the most distinguished men that this country ever produced in war or in peace, said: "The way to get rid of a bad law is to enforce its provisions." I would most cheerfully recommend that policy, that we should enforce this law, and if it be found hurtful upon the banks or the public and private funds of this country, let him come to this House through a proper communication and state the necessity for a modification, and then the fault, if fault there be, is upon us and not upon an official of this Government. There is no man who should set aside the

solemn judgment of the House of Representatives upon a question of law.

Mr. GILLESPIE. That is correct.

Mr. PRINCE. Let me read further from section 5209:

Every president, director, cashier, teller, clerk, or agent of any association who embezzles, abstracts, or willfully misapplies any of the moneys, funds, or credits of the association, or who, without authority from the directors, issues or puts in circulation any of the notes of the association; * * * and every person who with like intent aids or abets any officer, clerk, or agent in any violation of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be imprisoned not less than five years nor more than ten.

If the facts as reported in the public press of our country in reference to these failures in Chicago be true, it seems to me that this might be a proper matter for the Department of Justice to investigate and find out whether these sections have been violated by any officer connected with that or any other bank of the United States. I have no patience with a man who is not forced by stress of poverty or by circumstances, that holds a position as trustee of the people's moneys, to so far forget his duty that he does not take care of the trust funds placed in his hands to the fullest extent of the law, or, in the language of another distinguished gentleman, who represents the views of the minority about a public trust in this House, "that a public, or quasi public, trust ought not to be a private snap for anybody."

I take this opportunity to condemn the practice on the part of the Government of placing its funds in the hands of Wall street speculators whenever they seem to want more money to carry on their financial schemes. I congratulate Secretary Shaw that of late he has refused to place the people's money, at the request of high financiers, in the financial maelstrom of Wall street. I hope he will continue to refuse their requests for public money to be used by them for private gain.

I call the attention of the House and the country to this question, because it is pertinent to the issue that we have been discussing. It is along the line of Government control. It is along the line of exercising power by the Government. It is along the line of publicity. It is along the line of better service, and I am frank to say to you that I believe our Government officials are seeking to do their full duty. I believe that the Comptroller of the Currency is an honorable man, that he is seeking to do his full duty under the law as he sees it. If current reports in the newspapers are true, it may be that kindness of heart has led him to be a little more lenient than he ought to have been, but I am not prepared to say that had I been in his position I would have acted differently from what he did. We have no right to criticise him, and I do not, but the press says that he called attention to these loans, that he asked that they be reduced, that the promise was made that it would be done. It was not done, and later he acted wisely, justly, and lawfully, and did his full duty in this matter.

Now, when we come to discuss these other questions at the right time, we should bear in mind that when we ask a Government officer to examine a corporation of any kind, and that Government officer examines that corporation and puts upon it the great seal of the approval of the United States, he does an important act. He should do it guardedly, carefully, conscientiously, fully, freely, and fairly, and when the seal is so implanted by him, as one of the executive officers of the Government, the people have a right to put their trust in the acts he has done, and to believe in the corporation that he has approved. Therein lies the great responsibility which will fall on these executive officers, whether in examining insurance corporations or banking corporations, or in whatever capacity they may be engaged.

Returning to the question under discussion, I repeat that I am in favor of the Speaker of this House, through a proper resolution, appointing a committee on insurance that will have charge of the whole matter in all its various phases, and if under the Constitution of the United States we have any power, right, or authority that we can exercise, let all bills go to that committee, let them be considered, and bring in all the remedies that we can exercise, whether through interstate and foreign commerce, whether through the Committee on Ways and Means, or no matter what may be our right and authority to exercise a control over insurance. Let it go to one committee that shall have sole and exclusive control of the matter. Let that committee be composed of the best men in this House, irrespective of party. Let them study this great question, let them collect data, let them call to their aid the best minds there are in the House, and prepare a bill which will meet with the approval of the House and the country, and at the earliest moment let legislation be enacted in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief Executive of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, I saw an article in this morning's Washington Post that appealed rather strongly to me, and I thought I would like to make some comments upon the situation revealed by that article. I send it to the Clerk's desk to have it read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PENROSE ON NEW RATE—WILL VOTE FOR BILL EMBODYING PRESIDENT'S VIEWS—HAS A TALK WITH CASSATT—PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY'S PRESIDENT ALSO CHATS WITH SENATOR KNOX AND ASSURES HIM HE IS IN SYMPATHY WITH ROOSEVELT'S IDEAS ON THE NECESSITY FOR READJUSTMENT OF RAILWAY AFFAIRS.

After a conference at the Senate Monday with A. J. Cassatt, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Senator PENROSE announced that he would vote for the administration's rate-regulation bill.

Mr. PENROSE did not specify what he understood the Administration's bill to be or what he thought was favored in detail by Mr. Cassatt, but merely contented himself with the statement that he was now convinced that the principle of some form of railroad reform under the supervision of the Federal Government was correct and demanded.

Mr. Cassatt had a conference with Senator KNOX prior to seeing Senator PENROSE, and the railroad president assured Mr. KNOX that he was now of opinion that the position of President Roosevelt, as defined to him by Mr. KNOX, was agreeable to the interests and policies of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

NEVER OPPOSED PRESIDENT.

Mr. Cassatt has never been an outspoken opponent of President Roosevelt's railroad policy. On the contrary, he has been rather favorable to the main contention of the President, which, as popularly understood, is that there is a demand for remedial legislation affecting the present conditions in the railway management of the country, particularly in the matter of rebates.

While the Elkins law is generally supposed to have put an end to rebating, still it is the view of many of the supporters of the President's railroad policy that the evil still exists to a greater or less extent, and that this can be wholly stopped, or at least greatly minimized, by a law that will invest the Interstate Commerce Commission with the power to supervise the making of rates in general on complaint of shippers, with the right of appeal to the courts by the railroads attacked.

Whether or not Mr. Cassatt approves the maximum principle enunciated with great force and insistency by President Roosevelt in his Raleigh speech is not known, though in view of the fact that he declared he was willing to accept Senator KNOX's judgment as to the form of railroad legislation that should be enacted at this session is taken to mean that he is no longer averse to the investment of the Interstate Commerce Commission with the power to fix maximum rates in particular cases, with the understanding that the statute is distinctly to provide that each case is to stand on its own merits.

NOT A "CONVERT."

It is held by persons who say they know what Mr. Cassatt's attitude has been from the inception of the agitation of the railroad question that his announcement of a willingness to accept Senator KNOX's judgment in the matter is not to be taken as the "conversion" of the Pennsylvania Railroad's directing genius to the President's railroad policy, since they contend that Mr. Cassatt all along has been favorably inclined to the President's main contention. These same persons also hold that Senator PENROSE's announcement is exactly on a par with that of Mr. Cassatt, so far as the "conversion" feature is concerned.

Based upon the visit of President Cassatt and the resultant announcements as the attitude of himself and Senator PENROSE, considerable impetus has been given to the popular speculation as to the final outcome of railroad legislation in Congress this winter. As pointed out by The Post frequently since Congress assembled, it seems now reasonably certain that a regulation bill acceptable to President Roosevelt will be passed at this session.

But that measure will not contain all of the features of the original Esch-Townsend bill, which had the hearty indorsement of President Roosevelt, nor will it contain all the features of the bill prepared by the Interstate Commerce Commission at the request of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. It is well understood that Mr. Roosevelt views the latter measure more favorably at this time than the original Esch-Townsend bill, though it is equally as well understood that the President is averse to Congress considering any measure at this session in the same way as the Esch-Townsend bill was handled by the House at the last session, which was that it was the Administration's bill distinctly and irrevocably.

In a few words, it is known that the President does not desire to give his assent outright to any measure dealing with the railroad question which will be spoken of in Congress and by the public generally as the Roosevelt railroad bill.

In his annual message he was careful to impress upon Congress his belief that the lawmaking authority should handle this question with great care, and should see to it that a law is passed at this session affording relief from railroad exactions wherever it can be shown to a competent tribunal that exactions exist.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that article so clearly and forcibly reveals the condition of affairs that we find at the national capital, so far as legislation is concerned, that I thought it my duty, representing the people of my district, simply to stand up in my place and call attention to it. Now, what is it? A United States Senator being approached by the president of a great railroad system in this country, having a conference with him, after that conference says in effect: "Why, yes, all right; I am in favor of certain legislation pending before Congress, so I will yield."

Mr. Chairman, the President, at the last session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, sent a message here on the rate question, and we hailed him as a Democrat on that proposition; we tried to run over each other to do honor to the President of the United States and welcome him into the ranks of the Democratic party. The House passed a bill in that session which went to the other branch of this body, and there it died. The agitation,

however, kept up. The President made his famous southern tour, and at Raleigh, N. C., he dropped a word that seemed to quiet all fears.

I want to call attention to that one word because I believe it explains this calm that has now succeeded to all that agitation; it is the word "maximum." The President in his message to Congress upon that subject, when he first referred to it, did not have the word "maximum" in it. Now, it seems that everybody is agreed. We are going to have a bill pass this House, it is going to pass the Senate, and the question will be settled.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in my humble view, if that bill passes the Congress of the United States and receives the signature of the President, and goes to the country as the law upon that question, the railroads will have gained all they want from this legislation and the people of the country will have gained nothing by the legislation. A maximum reasonable rate! If I have been able to understand any of the testimony that has been brought out upon that subject, if you apply that standard to any rate now established there is not one of them that could be overturned. If we are to take the highest rate back of which strong reason may be presented, I say if that is to be the standard, there is not a rate now in existence that could or ought to be changed.

Now, suppose we are investigating a rate. Here is testimony, plenty of it, supporting a 40-cent rate; there is testimony supporting a 50-cent rate; there is testimony supporting a 60-cent rate. Now, under the President's former message and the position he originally took on this question, what would be the duty of the railway commission sitting in judgment on that testimony? Why, they could average it up, and they could say that we will select the 50-cent rate. But, under the President's message now, what will that commission be required to do? Why, to fix the maximum, go as high as the evidence before them will justify, and they would be bound to fix the 60-cent rate. I do not believe there is a rate that can be touched if you apply that standard to it. I do not wonder that the President of a great railroad company comes and talks with his friend the Senator, and that the result of that conversation is a kind of agreement and understanding that the President is to have no opposition in getting this rate legislation through the Senate of the United States.

Why, gentlemen, we expected a different result than that on this question in the other branch of Congress. We knew that through the summer rumblings had come from the great railroad interests of the country that they were going to demand the support of the manufacturers of the nation. They said to the tariff baron, "Look here; you are protected." They said to the United States Steel trust, "Why, look at what you are taking from the people of the country, and now, if you do not give us your influence to defeat the President of the United States in his demand for the use of all the powers of Congress to protect the shipper we will use our influence against you upon your stand-pat demand." That is what the railroads want, to keep the rate-fixing power in their own hands. Why, they said to the steel trust, "You have got your hands in the pockets of the people; we have got as much right as you have, and you have got to assist us to fight the President of the United States and fight him off and overcome him." Well, what happens? The result is going to be that if this legislation passes, in my humble opinion, the United States Steel Corporation will continue its plundering of the people, the railroad will continue in possession of their rate fixing, and also plunder the people. I can not see any other end to this great calm that has all at once taken possession of the national capital, so far as the tariff barons and railroad magnates are concerned.

Another thing. You read the proceedings before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Commission, and you will see the claims of the men who demand the ship subsidy. What is the basis of their demand? They say to the United States Steel Corporation, and they say it in unmistakable terms which no man reading these hearings can fail to see, that they plant themselves upon this proposition: "You have got your hands in the pockets of the people; you are collecting an enormous tariff rate; you have got to give up; you have got to come to our demand." If that suggestion is ever carried out, if the shipbuilding industry is purchased to support the Dingley tariff protection rates, they will stand there shoulder to shoulder with the steel trust fighting tariff revision. The railroads, through this legislation, if it succeeds, will be in the combine, and we see already that the national banks of the country are getting in their work greatly on the floor of this House. They are getting privileges and benefits through national legislation, and the result of it is that the combination between the tariff barons and the shipbuilders of the country, the railroads of the country, the national banks of the country, will be one grand combination against the American people, and you can not touch one without its calling on the other for support. That is the situation threatened in American politics to-day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I thought it was my duty not to remain further quiet, but to stand up and voice my protest not only in behalf of my people, but of the people of this country, against this unholy alliance—and I refer to the article that appears in the morning paper—in order that the people of this country may see just what the conditions are, because it presents it in such clear and strong light that I do not see how a human being of sense enough to read and write can fail to realize the real situation. It is against this that I wish to protest.

As to the particular matter before this House, I believe this question ought to go to the Judiciary Committee to settle the jurisdictional question involved in this legislation; but it seems to me, instead of discussing here the proposition of increasing the powers of the Federal Congress, we would be more profitably employed in discussing the proposition of the increase of the powers of the different States of the American Union. I believe it would be more profitable. The very reverse remedy appeals to my mind to that suggested by some Members on this floor. I believe in order to protect the people of this Union the power of Congress under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution ought by amendment to be curtailed rather than enlarged. What have we? We have these immense trusts and combinations rearing their heads in every part of this Union. There is not a State in the Union that does not see its danger, that does not realize the destructive and disastrous effects these combinations are having upon its own citizens, that does not realize that through this power these foreign corporations are coming into the State and robbing its own citizens, and the State is powerless because of this clause of the Constitution to protect its own citizens. It looks to me a good deal like the quarantine question referred to by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON]. The interests of the citizens as to the health and welfare of the citizens of the State come under the police power of the State. The Federal Government can not touch that; but in the case of these corporations the governor of every State, the legislature of every State, the supreme court of every State, can see and does see that these combinations are coming in and robbing the people, destroying competition, retarding the progress of the States and their development, and yet the State is powerless under this clause of the Constitution to protect itself. I say we would be more profitably employed if we were considering seriously the question of curtailing the power of the Federal Government under that clause of the Constitution rather than of enlarging its powers.

I do not believe in a palsied, in a paralytic democracy. I believe in the full exercise of the powers given to this Congress under the Constitution, and I believe that the country is looking for a democracy full of vitality, full of life and energy. Let us see to it that the people are not disappointed in this rate legislation. We ought to stand up for the rights of the people of the country, to stand as one man and defend the best we can the shippers of the nation. Let the legislation on this subject be definite, certain, and effective. The only relief to the shipper is in the plain, definite, and completely effective use of the rate-making power of Congress. Let us have no uncertainty on this point. The railroads will get all they ask out of this legislation on other questions. We ought to protect the people. That is the voice of democracy. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Chairman, it has not been my custom to take the time of the House simply for the purpose of delivering a speech when there can not be any useful purpose served thereby, and especially any immediate effect grow out of what might be said; but simply for the purpose of showing that I am not indifferent to this great question which is involved in this debate I have seen fit to take a short time for the purpose of having my views preserved in this RECORD. I appreciate the fact that this country is approaching a class of legislation with which the fathers had nothing to do and which undoubtedly is contrary to the constitutional views held by the early fathers with reference to the respective jurisdiction of the States and the General Government. It can not be otherwise, because in the early history of our country industries were provincial, and it was thought that the State power was peculiarly suited to deal with well-nigh every economical and certainly every business question, save alone that which pertained to the collection and disbursement of national revenues. The collection of taxation in that early day was not dreamed of being exercised for the purpose primarily of controlling the operations of certain lines of business and incidentally only for the

purpose of revenue, save perhaps the policy of a protective tariff. But from the completion of the Pacific railways business began to take on new proportions.

The progress of American invention, of resulting larger production by reason of machinery and inventive genius, the spreading out of lines of transportation, and the specializing of manufacturing enterprises converted the business of this country, both commercial and manufacturing, into national enterprises. To-day one portion of the country, forced not by legislation but by the logic of events, devotes its energies to the peculiar business that that location qualifies it for, and recognizes the fact that according to wise laws of economics the people of that locality ought to content themselves with devoting their resources and energies toward that particular business to which that particular locality is suited. Then follows the necessary sequence of disposing of the great surplus. The first object of the manufacturing business was for the purpose of supplying the needs of the immediate community where it was located, but finally the great business began to be to meet that demand which could be economically reached and advantageously made and sold through the large lines of transportation. Hence industrial activity has been going through a process of nationalism, until to-day there is hardly a business that can be looked upon as provincial or local in its character.

The fathers would have undoubtedly sought to prevent the accomplishment of the very things which are thought necessary to-day through the medium of the national branch of the Government, and conservative men upon this floor to-day have not been able to entirely free themselves from the notion that we are perhaps tending too much toward relying upon the national political power for the purpose of solving every problem that confronts us and of curing every evil from which the people are supposed to suffer. But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if any business can be looked upon as national in its character, from necessity, it is that of insurance. Its need is not confined to any particular class of business nor any particular class of individuals. It is recognized as a universal necessity, and there is probably not a man who has the smallest resources but who thinks that, among other things in which he is called upon as a matter of ordinary precaution to invest, insurance of necessity must be one of them. Hence the country, high and low, have taken a deep interest in the investigations which have been carried on in the State of New York through the authority of a committee appointed by the legislature of that State. The immediate object of that investigation was for the purpose of finding whether the funds of the companies had been properly safeguarded. The result of that investigation has shown, first, a most outrageous disregard of common rules of honesty and much more of violation of the ordinary rules of business decency. But, notwithstanding the startling disclosures which were made in connection particularly with the three properly safeguarded. The result of that investigation has there came with that information the equal assurance that with the peculations, large as they seemed and shameful as they were, there was really no danger to the security of the policy holders in any of the three companies that were examined.

Now, I took some interest in ascertaining the view point which a large number of policy holders in my home city took concerning that investigation. They were intelligent and they soon arrived at the conclusion that these peculations were comparatively so small that there would not be any considerable diminution of the capital of these great companies, and that instead of that it had indirectly the effect of advising the country that all those three companies were amply equipped with capital for the purpose of giving perfect assurance to the policy holders of those three companies that the companies would continue through all their existence to be able to meet fully every obligation. But the real interest which the policy holders took with reference to that investigation was naturally how it would affect their individual interests, and there were made some disclosures which bore upon the relations between them and the policy holders with reference to the methods of arriving at the conclusion as to the amount that would be due them under the terms of their policies outside of the question of the amount payable at death, which was fixed and certain. It was developed in that investigation that the amount of dividends which were due to the various policy holders was not arrived at by any mathematical calculation whatever. It was admitted by the actuary of one of those companies that the question of the amount of dividend which was to be paid to any policy holder at a period during the lifetime of the policy holder under the terms of many policies when a partial settlement is made under his election was determined by the actuary simply allowing a sum which in his judgment seemed adequate and at the same time the company could afford to pay under existing business conditions. But even that broad and uncontrolled exercise of judgment by the actuary in being willing to pay what he thought was fair did not seem to be satisfactory even from that standpoint, because the subsequent testimony of that same actuary developed the fact that with an increase of business of those large companies, coupled with an increase of profit of the companies, the dividends shrunk with the increase of volume of business and the increased amount of profits. In other words, that millions of policy holders all over the United States are holding policies with insurance companies which they themselves not only could not find out how much was legally due them under its terms, but upon which according to its terms it could not sue in a court of law with any assurance that they could recover any particular sum outside of the sum payable at death, which was fixed and certain. Business men, who under no circumstances would enter into any other form of contract in its terms so uncertain involving any sum approaching to the sum which they were willing to invest with these great companies in policies of life insurance, would take a policy of the great companies and put it in their safes with no assurance that they had any fixed or certain rights under that policy which would be recoverable in a suit at law, but dependent upon the benevolent spirit of the actuary when the day of settlement rolled around.

It seemed to me that even more important than the development of the reckless management of the funds of these companies were two disclosures. One of these was that the general management of those companies, with reference to their direct business of insurance, was only incidental to a larger and more important purpose to them. It developed that the large insurance companies were primarily and first above all institutions for the purpose of gathering the policy holder's money from all parts of the United States and from all classes of people for the purpose of massing it together for investment in speculative enterprises and promoting schemes. It seems to me that the cursory view I have been able to give to this subject is that if we are to have regulation of the life-insurance business through national control it ought to be a full and adequate power which we exercise; that the simple power through some of the different methods which have been proposed, to examine these companies and publish their liabilities and resources, will not meet the needs of the people of the United States. These insurance companies have entered into the domain of the legitimate business of savings banks. They have entered into business that ought only to be exercised through trust companies. They offer policies which hold out delusive hopes, entertained by men who are conservative in any other branch of business, that by some sort of magic an insurance company is going to produce at the end of a given number of years, and that, too, voluntarily and not compulsory, returns largely in excess of legitimate investments. This led the insurance companies wisely to divert the attention of the people who were patrons of life insurance from comparing legitimate life insurance from the standpoint of competitive rates. Each company has its peculiar and delusive scheme to present whereby we can, with a very small investment, secure to ourselves and our family a large and most satisfactory investment to care for them during the balance of their lives, accompanied not only by a fixed sum, but by that more dangerous hope that we are going to get a certain further undefinable return called "dividends."

What has been the result? The result has been that there has been practically no competition between the different companies concerning the rate to be paid upon life insurance because of this very fact. But I believe that if the nation is to exercise Federal control over life insurance, if we expect it to be effective and beneficial, we ought to have so full a power that we can regulate their methods of doing business as we do that of the national banks, so that we can compel life insurance companies to confine themselves to legitimate life insurance itself, and not be permitted to confuse the people with schemes connected with it which have no legitimate relation to straight life insurance, an insurance which is a necessity under present conditions. Now, then, there have been suggested during the course of this debate some four different propositions. There have been those who have thought that our only power under the Federal Constitution upon which we could base authority for this legislation was the taxing power in that document. There have been those, secondly, who have thought that we had no power under the Constitution except the power of inspection, if voluntarily accepted, in their own interest, by the insurance companies themselves. In other words, that the insurance companies would be glad to have the benefit of inspection under a law outlining a method; and with a bureau here authorized to undertake that inspection upon definite lines

laid down, that it would be advantageous for that company to submit itself to that inspection and get the benefit of its results upon a good showing, and that when one large insurance company submitted itself voluntarily to a national inspection, others, its competitors, would be compelled to submit to the same authority. And the suggestion made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS] to provide that no insurance company be permitted to do business in the Territories if it did not submit itself to national inspection is practically upon the same lines as the one to which I have alluded. It is based upon the moral effect that such a readiness of the Government to inspect would offer to the companies. For myself I sincerely hope that it will develop that we have the power under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. The reason why I hope, notwithstanding some decisions which seem now to tend to the contrary, that power will be found to be properly given by that clause of the Constitution is because it will give us a fuller power to exercise complete control in the premises.

So far as the question immediately pending before this Committee of the Whole House is concerned, I believe I will vote for the original resolution and vote against the pending amendments, if it is the parliamentary situation that upon those amendments being voted down the vote will recur upon the original resolution before the House; and the reason I do that is because I do not want this House to be guided by self-interest of Members with reference to a particular committee in deciding the question as to what committee shall have charge of this legislation.

I desire to give the Speaker of this House power in the premises to refer that portion of the message of the President to the proper committee as he understands it under the rules of the House. If I had the power to send it to any committee which I prefer, I would say the Committee on the Judiciary. The reason why I prefer the Committee on the Judiciary is because it is natural that if this portion of the message is referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, for instance, and power given to that committee to consider the bills concerning the regulation of insurance, that they would be inclined to look at it from the standpoint of the peculiar jurisdiction which is vested in the Committee on Ways and Means; and if we should decide to send it to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it is natural that the members of that committee, having had all through their experience, especially bills pertaining to this power given by the Constitution, they naturally would be prejudiced in looking for relief along the line of the peculiar jurisdiction of their committee. Because there is at the very inception of the discussion of this question a doubt as to whether we have any power, and if we have power, which clause of the Constitution gives it to us, I would prefer to refer it to the Committee on the Judiciary, who in the initiative would commence an examination of this question at the proper place in the discussion, and that is to look out for the source of power from which they believe we can constitutionally have a remedy.

Mr. HASKINS. Mr. Chairman, the discussion which the resolution now pending before the committee has evoked seems to have taken a very wide range, but in the brief time I shall occupy I shall confine my remarks to the question of the proprosed Federal supervision of insurance. The question as to whether insurance, life, fire, or marine, can be brought within Federal control is not to be determined upon the amount of insurance that has been written in one State upon the application of citizens of another State; nor is it to be determined upon the basis of the honesty or the dishonesty of the officers and agents of the companies soliciting and engaged in the business of insurance, but for the reason, and that only, that the Constitution of the United States has conferred upon Congress the power to regulate and control the business of insurance. No one claims that Federal control can be exercised over insurance companies that do business only within the State where located under the terms of their charter; the action must be justified, if at all, upon the ground that they do business in other States and, therefore, by reason of its interstate character it comes within the provision of the Constitution with reference to interstate commerce. As yet no one on the floor of this House has advanced a convincing argument nor cited any authority to demonstrate such proposition to be true, nor has the President done that in his message. He simply advises action in that direction, subject always, of course, to constitutional limitations.

I do not think I misrepresent the position of laymen in general when I say that they are very apt to construe the Constitution and the law to be such as they severally would like to have it, while the lawyer, whether sitting as a court or as a legislator, is, or at least should be, governed in his construction by the evident intention of the framers of the Constitution, well-established precedents, and the decisions of the courts.

Insurance rests in contract between the parties thereto. The life-insurance company, upon the application of the assured and the performance of certain conditions on his or her part, promises to pay upon the happening of an event a certain sum of money to the assured or to the beneficiaries named in the policy or contract.

The fire and marine insurance companies, in case of loss by fire or water or other casualties, agree to pay a sum of money to the assured, etc.; and although the parties to the contract may reside in different States, involving a sort of commercial intercourse between two or more States in the regular transaction of their business, it is a bold lawyer who will contend that these contracts of insurance are merchandise or commodities of transportation that come within the provision of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution.

If it be true that such transactions constitute interstate commerce which Congress may regulate, what may not Congress do in this direction? The savings banks of the country, and especially those of that section from which I come, hold in trust millions of money, the property to a very large extent of laboring men and women and of widows and orphan children. Millions upon millions of this money has been and constantly is being invested in real estate mortgage securities in many of the other States by the officers of these institutions. These loans, like transactions of insurance, constitute contracts between parties residing in different States, and involve transportation between the States by means of the United States mail in the transmission of letters, mortgages, trust deeds, money, and checks. If the Federal Government under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution has the right to extend its paternal hand for the protection of the individual in the matter of insurance, it certainly has the same right in the matter of the savings banks. The transactions of both alike rest in contract and only in contract, and does not constitute that kind of commercial intercourse that does the sale of merchandise in one State which to complete the transaction requires to be transported into another State. Policies of insurance, like the promissory note and mortgage, are not articles of merchandise, but simply the written evidence of a promise to do something.

Great corporations manufacture commodities for sale and delivery into other States as well as in the State of their creation, and yet the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that the affairs of the corporation can not be regulated by Congressional enactment, but that it is the manufactured article only which Congress can interfere with when it commences its journey across State lines. The Supreme Court has solemnly adjudicated in several well-considered cases, cited by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, that the writing of policies or contracts of insurance and the delivery of them to parties in another State was not interstate commerce.

The Commissioner of Corporations, in his report, just published, says:

> In view of the decisions of the Supreme Court I have not felt warranted in trying to assume jurisdiction over insurance companies for the purpose of investigation. The fact that State supervision has failed to prevent great abuses in the management of some companies does not of itself justify Federal action. It must be shown, first, that insurance is subject to Federal regulation under the commerce clause of the Constitution; second, that Federal supervision would be of such a character as to correct existing abuses and prevent future ones, and, third, that such supervision would result not only in greater security to policy holders, but would relieve them, through their companies, of the great and unnecessary expense of duplicate inspections and investigations by different States. Seemingly the most effective way to settle the question is for Congress to so legislate upon the subject as to afford an opportunity to present to the Supreme Court the question whether insurance as now conducted is interstate commerce, and hence subject to Federal regulation.

This is the hope and prayer of those who would invoke Federal interference with many of the common transactions of life, including insurance, that if Congress will obey public clamor gone wild and enact a measure declaring insurance corporations subject to Federal control the Supreme Court may reverse itself and declare the enactment constitutional.

While the justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, like the judges of the several State courts, are human, still the members of that greatest of all earthly tribunals never have, and may this Capitol crumble into dust whenever they do, adjudge any law of Congress constitutional, not in response to their own high conception of duty and understanding of the law and Constitution, but at the demand of great popular clamor. They were not moved by any such base influences, which may be termed by some the vox populi, when they decided the income-tax law enacted by Congress to be unconstitutional, and may the day be far distant when, by Congressional enactment or

judicial decision, the authority of the States over their own corporations shall be entirely destroyed.

I am a policy holder in both the New York Life and the Mutual Life of New York, and I feel that my holdings are more valuable by reason of the investigation of the Armstrong legislative committee. If evils have existed or do exist in the manner in which these companies have conducted their business, and no one doubts it, those existing evils can be remedied much more promptly and effectively under State than under Federal supervision.

The righteous indignation, an outraged public sentiment sure to exist among the people of the State that created the corporation, and will certainly be made manifest upon the disclosure of the least evidence of evil doing, will demand in no uncertain sound that its officers and legislators shall correct the wrong, and the demand will become effective long before the National Government, its officers and agents, have awakened from a sound and dreamy sleep. I represent, in part, a little State way up among the green hills, having a population according to the last census of a little over 343,000 souls. It has 42 savings banks, carrying the deposits of over 140,000 men, women, and children, amounting to over $47,000,000, with an undivided surplus of over $3,000,000. It has 49 national banks with a paid-up capital of $6,185,000. The former, notwithstanding they are constantly loaning money in other States, are under the exclusive jurisdiction and supervision of the State, where they should always remain. Each of these banks are thoroughly examined by the State inspector of finance twice a year and his report made public annually, and again biennially. Bankruptcy or voluntary liquidation is a thing unknown among them, by reason of the conservative, careful, and honest management of their officers. The 49 national banks are, of course, under exclusive Federal control, and while no present unsoundness is known to exist, yet within the last twenty-five years I have known of at least 5 that have been obliged to close their doors by reason of their insolvency, and the insolvency of at least 2 of them had been of long standing, notwithstanding the inspections of the national-bank examiner.

We have another institution in our State of which every Vermonter is proud. It is the National Life Insurance Company, at Montpelier, chartered by the State over fifty years ago, organized and for years managed by Dr. Julian Dewey, the father of our present great Admiral. It has well-invested and secured assets, in round numbers, of $32,000,000; its insurance in force amounts to over $135,000,000; its annual cash income meets its yearly liabilities, leaving an annual "saved income," according to its last year's report, of nearly $3,000,000. Its present president was for many years the actuary of the company, and no man has a better understanding of life insurance than he. He is paid a salary of $15,000 per year, and its other officers a reasonable but in no sense an exorbitant compensation. The affairs of the company are conservatively and carefully managed in the interests of its policy holders, and they require no Federal supervision.

Vermont's secretary of state and State treasurer are its insurance commissioners, who examine and report upon the condition of the company, as they do of its fire insurance companies. The State supervision which these corporations have, to my mind, is far superior to any supervision that could be given them, were it constitutionally permissible to place them under Federal control. Believing as I do that Congress has no constitutional authority to legislate upon the subject of insurance, but that it belongs to the States exclusively to create, supervise, and control, I shall vote, if the opportunity offers, to commit that portion of the President's message to the Committee on the Judiciary. [Loud applause.]

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 480. An act supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes.

DISTRIBUTION OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have read first the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it is a matter of general knowledge, published in almost all the reputable daily newspapers of the United States, that Midshipman Jerome Pettus Kimbrough, of the fourth class of the United States Naval Academy, at Annapolis, Md., was viciously hazed and brutally treated in said hazing by being compelled to stand on his head until he became unconscious; and

Whereas Midshipman Warren Abbe Van De Veer, according to said accounts, while on duty at said academy observed said occurrence and failed to report the same; and

Whereas it is a fact, ascertained by recent court-martial sitting at Annapolis, that Midshipman James R. Branch, jr., a midshipman at said academy, recently met his death in a fist fight with Midshipman Minor Meriwether, also a midshipman at said academy; and

Whereas it appeared to be fairly well ascertained from the testimony before said court-martial that the practice of fagging, hazing, and fighting were common at said institution, and that the same was winked at and connived at by the officers of said institution, whose duty it is to maintain discipline among the midshipmen attending there and to train and perfect them for service as officers in the Navy of the United States, and to protect said midshipmen during their attendance at said institution in their health and life, and that the fault in these cases and the failure to maintain such discipline as would render such occurrences impossible lays more at the door of the officers of said institution than upon the shoulders of the midshipmen attending there: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, requested and directed to report all information in his possession concerning the said hazing of the said Jerome Pettus Kimbrough and the fight between Midshipman Branch and Midshipman Meriwether and the result of any investigation that he may have made to the House of Representatives, together with such recommendations as he may care to make by which the conduct and management of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis may be so changed and reconstructed that conditions thereat may be created under which such occurrences as are hereinbefore referred to may be impossible.

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members of the House of Representatives be appointed by the Speaker to have full power to send for persons and papers, and, if necessary, to proceed to the Naval Academy at Annapolis and elsewhere to thoroughly investigate the foregoing subject, and especially to inquire and ascertain what officials of said institution, if any, are responsible for a laxity of discipline which permits such disgraceful and disastrous occurrences, and to report to the House of Representatives within thirty days the result of such investigation, with such recommendation as may seem to said committee to be advisable to establish a condition of discipline among both the officers in charge of said institution and the midshipmen attending thereat as will certainly and forever prevent a possible repetition of such events; and to especially recommend such action as may lay the blame in such cases where it belongs, so that in such cases hereafter the result may not end with the mere dismissal of promising young men from the institution, but may bring to book and visit proper penalties upon the trained officers in charge of such institution for the conduct of which they must be held responsible.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I have had this resolution, which was introduced by Mr. PEARRE, of Maryland, on December 16, read from the Clerk's desk, in order that it might be directly brought to the attention of the Members on the floor of this House. It presents a question for our consideration which, in my judgment, should appeal to each man here present. It not only reaches every Congressional district throughout the United States of America, because I take it that there are few, if any, Representatives here who have not at this time an appointee in the Naval Academy at Annapolis, in whom they feel a personal interest, but it reaches the sacred confines of some home in every district and touches the heart of the mother in that home, who is daily looking with loving tenderness and patriotic pride at the career of her boy—a student in the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

That it appears throughout the public press of this country, as is recited in this resolution, that there is hazing existing at the academy is beyond a doubt. Not only is it asserted in the newspapers, but there is no question that it is absolutely true that it does exist at this academy, and exists in a very marked degree. That there should be placed some check upon it, in order that the scenes which have recently been enacted there may not again transpire, is important not only to us as representatives of the people, but is important to the young men who are students in this academy. This resolution proposes, in my judgment, a remedy which will be effectual to bring about, in case it is adopted, that result, and therefore I sincerely hope it will be adopted by this House.

It provides, in the first place, after the recitation of the facts, that we call upon the Secretary of the Navy to give to us whatever information he may have in his possession in reference to any hazing which has taken place, and then goes further and provides for the appointment by the Speaker of a select committee of five who shall have authority to sit at the Capitol, or the Naval Academy if they prefer, and send for persons and papers and make a thorough, full, and complete investigation of the conditions which are now existing there.

Officers and students are seeking for some excuse for the recent deplorable occurrences at this academy. They want some reason to justify these terrible conditions which have been brought about by a code which is the unwritten law, they say, of this institution. In their great desire to find some reason for it that would justify them, they are pointing to the fact that Congress authorized the reinstatement in the Navy of three midshipmen during the last session of this House, and that this was done in response to a special message which was sent by the President of the United States to this body recommending that such action be taken. It is true that Congress did,

by law, authorize three young men to be reinstated in the Navy who had been expelled from the Naval Academy, and that the President, to this House in a message, did recommend that it be done. We all know that in every State in the Union the governor has the right, when he believes that circumstances and conditions justify him, to extend a pardon to a man whom he feels ought not to have visited upon him the severe penalty prescribed by law for the offense of which he has been convicted. Under the circumstances under which these young men were expelled from this academy the President of the United States and a majority of the Members of Congress believed that they should have clemency extended to them and be reinstated. I am frank to say to you that I did not agree with them, and therefore for that reason I did not vote for that bill, but, on the contrary, I voted against it in the Fifty-seventh Congress when it was placed upon its passage, and I also again voted against it at the last session of this House. If it were to do over I would vote against it again, because I believed good discipline was necessary at the academy and that it could only be obtained by rigid and just enforcement. The majority of the House differed from me and agreed with the President of the United States and with the recommendation of the Naval Committee on this question, which was unanimous, and passed the law authorizing their readmission into the Navy. But I desire to say that in my judgment there is in that fact no justification or valid excuse for the conditions that exist in the academy to-day; and why? For the reason that hazing existed there prior to the time that these young men were readmitted; it has existed since that time, and the conditions now are not different from what they were prior to the time that the President of the United States sent that message to Congress, and they are not different from what they were prior to the time that Congress enacted the law that authorized the readmission of these young men into the Navy. Therefore it can not be given as a valid reason for hazing there now and is no answer to the charge.

If hazing in the academy had been unknown up to the time this action was taken by the President and Congress, possibly then there would be some justification for saying that the action of Congress contributed to bring about the present conditions, but with hazing there before the above action was taken and with hazing there since it can not be maintained that Congress is responsible for it.

The granting of a pardon to somebody who has violated the law is no justification and no excuse for the commission of another or similar crime by somebody else. Therefore, so far as that question is concerned, it is absolutely without foundation or reason to say that we, the Congress of the United States, are responsible for the conditions which now exist there and which are so greatly deplored not only by the Members of this House, but by the people of the United States.

The fact that recently one young man met his death in an encounter brought about under the unwritten code that governs the students in that institution, and the further fact that this young man referred to in this resolution, Jerdone Pettus Kimbrough, was recently made to stand upon his head until he fainted and had to be carried to the hospital in order that he might be resuscitated, has startled the people of this country, and they are demanding that through their Represenatives some remedy be devised that will forever put an end to existing conditions. [Applause.] It is necessary that prompt action be taken that the sons of our constituents who are there may be protected and have the same rights extended to them upon admission to that institution that are extended to the young men already there, regardless of the length of time they have been there. I want to say to you that because one young man occupies a lower class in that school than another makes no difference, and it does not make the higher-class man any better than the lowest-class man. [Applause.]

I know that the splendid young man I had the honor to send there only a short time ago, and who is a lower-class man, is just as good and deserves to receive the same courtesies and consideration as are extended to any man in any other class. He is named for the first Admiral of the Navy, John Paul Jones, for whose body we sent to foreign shores and brought it back to our country by an escort sent especially from our Navy for that purpose, and whose remains now rest upon the school grounds at Annapolis.

My appointee is Paul Jones Peyton, and I believe, in course of time, if given the same opportunities, he has the manly traits in him to rise to the same rank and fill it in the same dignified manner that the original John Paul Jones did.

Mr. WACHTER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. CANDLER. I am always ready to yield to my good friend from Maryland.

Mr. WACHTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question. There are gentlemen upon the floor of this House who meet other gentlemen upon the floor of this House who oppose hazing by telling them that a boy who has not been hazed will be brought up a mush-and-milk admiral. I want to ask the gentleman in perfect good faith whether he thinks that hazing makes a cadet any more brave than he otherwise would be, in reply to those gentlemen who think that men who are not given hazing are mush-and-milk men? [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER. I certainly do not think so.

Mr. WACHTER. Neither do I.

Mr. CANDLER. I do not believe that any kind of brutality, no matter what it may be, contributes to develop manhood along right lines. [Applause.]

Mr. WACHTER. I am with you.

Mr. CANDLER. On the contrary, I believe that those things which do contribute to build up and properly develop American manhood and manhood throughout the world are those ennobling traits of character—kindness, forbearance, love, esteem, and respect for the rights of others. They appeal to the finer feelings of our natures and generate confidence in our fellowmen, and create within us laudable ambition for higher, nobler, and better things. What we oftentimes yearn for is encouragement, a tender word, a glad hand, a bright face, and a genial heart to bid us godspeed in an effort to press onward and upward and reach a sphere among our fellow-men where we may stand for the glory of the country and for the honor of our God, who loves and takes care of us all. [Applause.]

Mr. RIXEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. CANDLER. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, I agree fully with what the gentleman has said upon this subject. I think that the resolution which the gentleman was reading was introduced by Mr. PEARRE.

Mr. CANDLER. I wanted to give him credit for it, and think I did.

Mr. RIXEY. There is another resolution, which I think was introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD].

Mr. CANDLER. I have read that resolution.

Mr. RIXEY. Both resolutions were referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Rules, of which he is chairman. They have both been there for some days, and they are not reported out of that committee. I think we can reasonably assume that it is not the intention of the Committee on Rules to report any of those resolutions. I want to ask the gentleman as to what he proposes, and how he expects to get this investigation by this House unless that committee will consent to make its report.

Mr. CANDLER. Of course, Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to pass any bill or resolution in this House under the rules as they exist to-day unless you can get a resolution reported back from the committee to which it is referred, or unless you can get the recognition of the Speaker and secure the unanimous consent of the House. I doubt very seriously the effectiveness of our persuasive powers to get a report from the committee on this resolution or to get the Speaker to recognize its author to call it up for passage, but notwithstanding all that, the country is interested in this question, and it may do good for the country to know that there has been such a resolution proposed upon the floor of this House, and if passed would bring about the appointment of a select committee to make a thorough and full investigation of conditions existing in the Naval Academy, and that somebody is or will be responsible if some such resolution is not passed by this House, because this school belongs to the people and is conducted by their paid employees, and I believe they want to know all the bed-rock bottom facts in reference to this whole situation. The time is coming and will speedily arrive in my judgment when the boys of this country, not on account of any personal fear, but because they don't want to be forced to kill somebody even for self-protection, will hesitate—yea, even decline—to go to this institution and engage in the service of their country because of existing conditions there. It may be that some manly boy would be perfectly willing to go there in order to stand off some of the hazers and teach them a lesson if they undertook to haze him. Such a thing was done at one time at the Military Academy at West Point. There was a brave, a courageous, a noble young man there who did not propose to be humiliated, who did not propose to be made a menial of by people simply because they arrogated to themselves that they were better than somebody else, and that therefore they had the right to haze somebody because of that fact, and this young man

promptly informed them that if they ever attempted to haze him they might take the result, and they did attempt to haze him and they took the result, and the result was the death of one of the men who attempted hazing upon him.

Now, then, it may be possible that there may be others that would pursue the same course, but I dare say there is no man upon this floor, that there is no citizen of the United States of America, that wants to see any such condition as that exist. They do not want their boys, the young men of this country, put in an attitude where they will feel that the necessity of the occasion demands for their own self-respect and for their own protection that they shall resort to any such means. But if this continues that result will follow, because I dare assert upon this floor now that there are plenty of boys in the United States of America to-day that if sent to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, rather than be humiliated and degraded, would resort to the means I have just referred to and protect themselves, even to the taking of life. Let us save the boys in the future from such a possibility.

Now, I am frank to say that I do not censure boys who are there, under existing conditions, so much for engaging in encounters like the Meriwether-Branch affair, for they fought in the open upon equal terms to settle their differences, and the unwritten code required them to fight or suffer disgrace and ostracism. It was a lamentable affair, and we should take prompt action to prevent its recurrence. But for the hazing of Kimbrough there is no excuse or justification—none on the face of the earth. This resolution recites his name "Jerome Pettus Kimbrough." His name is Jerdone Pettus Kimbrough. When I was younger than I am now, I went to school to the grandfather of this young man and with his uncle. His uncle, Dr. Jerdone Pettus, for whom he was named, was my classmate. He is to-day in the Marine-Hospital Service.

When John C. Pettus, my old preceptor and the grandfather of this young man Kimbrough, brought him to the city of Washington on his way from the old Volunteer State of Tennessee to enter him at the academy, he brought him to the hotel where I board and introduced him to me. I looked into his bright and manly face. His heart was aglow because he believed he was going to enter an institution where he would have an opportunity to seek honor among his fellows, and that at some future time he might have occasion to defend the flag of his country. He was a noble and splendid specimen of young American manhood. He was not afraid to risk the bullets; but it seems he suffered at the hands of the "bullies," simply because he was physically unable to contend with the numbers by which he was surrounded, and was compelled to submit to the indignities that were visited upon him or suffer worse. When I contemplate the scene and remember the gray head of that noble old grandfather, whose hope and ambition centered in the boy, I am filled with indignation. Hon. M. R. PATTERSON, of the Tenth district of Tennessee, appointed Kimbrough to the Academy, and here is how he feels about it. I clip this from the Commercial-Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn.:

"BRUTAL," SAYS PATTERSON.

LEBANON, TENN., *December 16, 1905.*

I have just learned of the hazing of Kimbrough. This offense is much worse than the Meriwether affair. Meriwether fought openly, and it was an equal contest. Kimbrough was taken advantage of, and his treatment was both brutal and cowardly. I hope Kimbrough's friends and relatives will not ask to withdraw him from the academy. Those who took advantage of him should be punished and Kimbrough should remain.

M. R. PATTERSON.

As I said a moment ago, I do not censure the boys so much who are there now for having engaged in such an encounter as Meriwether and Branch engaged in, because of the fact that there is the unwritten code, so I understand, in that academy, that requires under certain conditions and certain circumstances that the young men shall meet upon this so-called "field of honor," and shall settle their differences in the brutal manner in which the differences were sought to be settled between those two young men, and which cost one of them his life and cast a blight over the life of the other one, from which he will not escape through all the coming years of his existence. Nobody could have read his testimony before the court-martial whose heart would not go out to him with sympathy when he said, in substance, that he believed Branch was better off than he was, sleeping where he was asleep, than to be left like him with a blight upon him, with a shadow over him, with the darkness surrounding him, from which he would never escape.

I say that I do not censure them so much, for the reason that they must, as the matter now stands, engage in these practices under "the code" or be isolated and ostracised in disgrace and stamped as cowards, and no man of manhood or spirit will wear that stigma. Therefore, because of the existence of this unwritten code, they are compelled to fight. The difficulty, my friends, consists not in the young men there. There is as noble a class of young men there, I have no doubt, as there is in this country, because I do not presume that any Member of Congress would knowingly send a young man there whom he did not believe was possessed of high principles and noble aspirations. Therefore, I take it to be true that the young men there come up to the standard of any similar number in any institution anywhere.

The trouble is in this system, in this "code." The trouble is in an unwritten law of some kind that exists there to-day, and which they say has existed there for a long time. What we want to do is to dig that up root and branch, and relieve the students of its baneful influences and deplorable requirements, and put all the young men there upon a common plane of American manhood, and let every one of them stand as an American, equal in rights, privileges, and opportunities with any other man, no matter to what class in school he belongs. [Loud applause.] That is what we need to-day. So long as this "code" exists, so long as these environments continue, these scenes of brutality will be reenacted. Men may overcome their surroundings, and often do, but we must not place these young men where they will be humiliated and their spirit to some extent crushed.

I understand that a lower-class man, when he goes to the table, is not even permitted to look at or speak to an upper-class man; he must sit and look in his plate and bow his head in the presence of his superior, and thus recognize the grandeur of him whose head is crowned with the honor of being an upper-class man.

Not only that; I am informed, also, that a lower-class man is not permitted to visit in the same circle of society that an upper-class man moves in. He is not permitted to visit the same young ladies where an upper-class man sees proper to go; and if the upper-class man finds the lower-class man there the lower-class man must at once retire, and he is not even permitted to speak to him there, offer a suggestion, or even make an apology to the young lady in his presence for his departure; but without ceremony and without standing upon the manner of his going he must depart at once from the presence of this overshadowing grandeur and conglomerated greatness. I will tell you what I believe. I believe that there is nothing better in all the world than patriotic, brave, and chivalrous American manhood except the loveliness, the purity, and the beauty of American womanhood. [Loud applause.] Some one has said that when God made the American girl, "He sent His angel messengers throughout all the star-strewn realms of space to gather all there was of beauty and brightness, of enchantment, of glamour. When those angels returned from their harvesting of beauty and threw down their glittering burden at His feet, He began in their wondering presence the fashioning of the American girl. He wrought with the gold and the gleam of the stars, shifting glories of the rainbow hues, and the pallid silver of the moon. He wrought with the crimson which swooned in the rose's rubied heart, with the pure sweet snow which gleams from the lily's petals, and the fires and the flames which flash and leap from jewels' depth. Then glancing deep into His own bosom, He took of the love which gleamed there like some rare pearl beneath the wind-kissed waves of a summer sea, thrilled into the form He was fashioning, and all heaven and earth rejoiced, for, lo! He had wrought the American girl." [Continued applause.]

Such girls should have the right to make their own selection and choose their own associates, under the interested and loving advice of mother, without any dictation of extraneous influences of self-assumed censors of society. I am informed, however, that to such an extreme has this rude and unwarranted dictation of these upper-class men gone that they not only visit a penalty upon the lower-class men but upon the young lady herself by ostracizing her from society whenever she permits a lower-class man to visit her when she has an opportunity to receive the attentions of an upper-class man. Such a snobbish conception of the rights of others is un-American and deserves the condemnation of every patriotic lover of this Republic.

I have never been blest by having a son in my home, but I thank God that He has given me three bright-faced, blue-eyed, rosy-cheeked girls, who are the pride and sunshine of my life. Should they in the future go out from my home to one of their own I shall be happy indeed if their lives are committed to the care and protection of a plain American citizen who has an honest hand, a pure heart, and a clean life—a man of integrity and character, devoted to his country and to his God. To be the queen in such a home is woman's God-given and highest sphere.

I had rather see my daughters associate with a young man who is possessed of those priceless virtues, though he may not have a dollar in the world, than to see them shine in so-called "high society," with somebody who can boast nothing except some exalted position or inherited wealth cast upon them, without merit or worth on their part, by favored circumstances surrounding them.

In other words, what I admire is true worth in the man himself. I do not care what his position is so far as classes are concerned or where his field of activity may be in this life. It is not position or wealth or honors in the world that constitute a man in the truest and highest sense, but it is nobility of character, purity of aspirations, cleanliness of life, devotion to country, and obedience to God. A man in whose heart throbs those sublime conceptions is a patriot, and no matter what his trade, calling, or vocation in life may be he is one of nature's noblemen and entitled to the highest respect, confidence, and esteem of his fellows.

Princes and lords are but the breath of kings,
An honest man's the noblest work of God.

[Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CANDLER. With pleasure.

Mr. SIMS. I should like to ask you if you do not think such a young man as you have described, who has educated himself, is far above, in meritorious consideration, any young gentleman who is sent there at the expense of the Government to learn how to abuse and brutalize the lower-class men you refer to?

Mr. CANDLER. I do not think it makes so much difference as to whether a man educates himself, although that is always to his credit. Any man who has the manhood, grit, and determination to press forward in life and overcome difficulties and accomplish something for himself and "work out his own salvation," as we sometimes say, is entitled to very great credit; but I have seen splendid young men educated in our free schools who were an honor to themselves, their families, and their country. I would not draw the line there. What I am emphasizing is that we should look to the man himself, and the inherent merit that is in him, and not to the veneering on the outside. In other words, as I understand it, there is but one overshadowing general rule in this world. God Almighty made that rule, and that is a rule of righteousness. That is where He placed the standard. It was written by the divine finger of inspiration upon the pages of the "Blessed Book" that shed forth their luminous light and grow brighter and brighter the more we read them, the more we study and meditate upon them. That is the standard that is there fixed for men and for women. Some people act like they believed there was one standard for a man and another for a woman, but there is not. "The Book" requires no more of my wife than it does of me, no more of my mother than it requires of my father; it is the same rule of righteousness for all. Therefore, I do not care what a man's surroundings may have been, if he rises as near to the perfection of that divine standard which has been fixed by the great Teacher of all the world as his human foibles and weaknesses will permit, then he is as good as anybody else who does not acquire greater perfection. If I do right and you do right, I am as good as you are and you are as good as I am. If you do right and I do not do right, you are that much better than I, because at last it must be a test of true merit, of righteous living, and of correct principle. American manhood has always stood for the recognition of the standard of right and demanded that it be higher than in any other country in the world.

I want to see the time come when the American woman will recognize the fact that the American man is the best in all the world, and then there will be no American woman waiting for some one to cross the ocean with a title to woo her hand and heart. I want them to recognize that "American manhood" in its true sense is the highest title that any man can possess in all the world, and that he that reaches the standard of true and genuine American manhood has reached the loftiest pinnacle that any man can reach in all the universe of God. To be the uncrowned queen of an uncrowned king in an ideal American home is the consummation of human happiness, in comparison with which the titles offered "for sale to the highest bidder" by the empty heads and the heartless lives of the worthless adventurers who visit our shores with matrimonial intentions dwindle into contempt and oblivion. God save our American girls from such a fate. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SIMS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CANDLER. Always glad to do so.

Mr. SIMS. I want to state to the gentleman that not long since I was talking with a gentleman in my own county about appointing his son to the Naval Academy. He thanked me, but said he had rather his son would do without these advantages which I had explained to him than to go there and have to suffer the humiliations he would have to suffer by being hazed, as he understood all were hazed without exception, and declined the appointment on that account.

Mr. CANDLER. I remarked only a few moments ago that I thought that would be the result if these conditions were permitted by the Representatives of the American people to continue in this academy.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. CANDLER. Always glad to have a suggestion from my splendid friend from Kentucky.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I concur in a great deal of what the gentleman from Mississippi has said; he has said it eloquently and well, but the phase of the matter that I would like to hear discussed is, how are we to prevent these cruel practices that have been obtaining in these institutions so long? There seems to be no doubt but that it is a practice that has been observed in the institutions ever since their creation almost. There ought to be some way by which it can be overcome. If we have to have a separate place for the first classmen, we had better have it than to have these disgraceful occurrences. I would like to have the gentleman from Mississippi, and others who have thought upon this subject a great deal more than I have, to give some expression to the House of what they think is the proper remedy.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Kentucky is very pertinent. The resolution which I am now discussing, if adopted, would secure the appointment of a special committee by the Speaker of this House, to consist of five members, to make a thorough, full, and complete investigation into the conditions existing at the Naval Academy in reference to hazing, and report back to this House an adequate and efficient and complete remedy to prevent it in the future. My judgment is that if we would pass a statute providing for the prompt expulsion of every cadet who is found guilty of hazing, and for the prompt discharge of every officer, teacher, or employee of the academy who permits or condones hazing, or such fighting as is had under the so-called "code," then we would hear no more of these outrageous and shameful occurrences.

Since the investigation of the Military Academy at West Point and the passage of the act against hazing that was put upon the statute book, which applies to the Military Academy but not to the Naval Academy, there has not been any hazing there. Whenever the young men in this academy find out that the American people through their Representatives on the floor of this House are determined to see that discipline is maintained in that institution, that every violator of the law shall suffer speedily and certainly the penalty of the offense, and that he will not be permitted to return, I believe the end will come, and that they will recognize that the lower-class men have some rights in the academy which they can enjoy without interference by the upper-class men. I want to say further that, in my judgment, these conditions in the Naval Academy are absolutely un-American. Why? Because if there is one principle upon which this great Republic is founded, it is "equal rights to all, special privileges to none;" that every citizen shall have the same consideration as each and every other one—have equal opportunities and assume equal responsibilities. For upper-class men to domineer over lower-class men is at variance with every American sentiment and ideal.

If there is any other one principle upon which this Government is founded, it is the individual right of every citizen to enjoy absolute liberty within the law. He must not go beyond the law, but he is entitled to the greatest liberty within the limits of the law, and when one classman denies to some other classman in a lower class privileges which he enjoys, by assuming and enforcing the right to do so he strikes at the foundation of American institutions. He assumes "special privileges" and denies "equal rights," and tramples under foot "individual liberty." These are sacred rights to every American citizen and cost the blood of the fathers. I want to stamp my disapproval and voice it upon this floor of the proceedings that have been going on there, and I want to say that I hope this House will take some action which will bring about a different condition of affairs. I want everybody treated right. I would not take away from anyone any rights or privileges consistent with the rights and privileges of others; but I do want to

take away from this institution any law or rule of conduct that makes a difference in the classes there, that makes a difference in the sphere in which these young men shall move. I want them all put upon the identical same level and given equal opportunities to acquire their education in this institution, each one having accorded to him the rights that every other one enjoys, and let it be a contest of merit, let it be a contest between American men worthy of being American citizens. I want them to realize that by reason of the fact that they are students in this great academy that they owe something to the Government and they owe something to the constituency of the man who sent them there; they owe something to the honor of the United States, and to the flag that floats above them. Let them do nothing that will place one single blot upon a single star or stripe, but may they add new luster day by day to its honored folds. Let them say to the world we know what chivalry is and we know how to respect the rights of others and to show courtesy and kindness to all, and simply because my brother is in a lower class than I does not make him any less entitled to consideration. We are all Americans, with patriotism beating in our hearts, with the love of country and the honor of the flag uppermost in our minds.

Mr. Chairman, if we can create such a condition as that in this academy it will indeed and in truth be what it was intended to be, a great Government institution where true American ideals prevail, and the young men who attend it will in their lives and by their conduct exemplify the highest type of American citizenship. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. BOWIE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to send to the Clerk's desk to have read a resolution recently introduced into the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the resolution sent up by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 45) directing the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish certain information concerning the cotton crop of the season of 1905 and 1906.

Whereas the estimate of the growing cotton crop made and published by the Agricultural Department on December 4 indicated a total production in the United States for the season of 1905 and 1906 of 10,167,818 bales of 500 pounds each, gross weight; and

Whereas the census returns of the cotton ginned in the various States up to the 1st of December, 1905, show that in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Oklahoma the yield for the entire season as estimated by the Agricultural Department had been more than ginned; and

Whereas neither the picking nor the ginning of cotton in the States named, or in any other of the cotton-producing States of the United States, is completed by the 1st of December, and that therefore the estimate of the Agricultural Department as to the yield of cotton in the States named is plainly an underestimate and likely to mislead, and damage the cotton interests of the United States; and

Whereas in various other States where the picking and ginning is known not to have progressed toward completion even as fully as in the four States named the amount of cotton ginned up to the 1st of December shows that the Agricultural Department's estimate of the yield is unquestionably an underestimate; and

Whereas it is a matter of the first importance to the people of the United States that they be supplied with a more accurate estimate of this season's cotton crop: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to proceed immediately to collect such data as may, in his opinion, be necessary for a more correct estimate of the season's crop, and to publish the same on the 10th day of January, 1906, together with a full and complete statement of the method by which the estimate is arrived at and of the details of the various reports comprising said estimate.

SEC. 2. That the sum of $20,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, as a special fund to defray the expense of collecting and publishing such a revised report.

Also, the following:

Whereas there is great dissatisfaction and want of confidence in the reports on cotton acreage and production by the Department of Agriculture, especially to the last report, made on December 3, 1904: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested to forward to the House of Representatives all data, in detail, upon which said last report was made and published, said report to cover all sources and kinds of information upon which said report was based.

Mr. BOWIE. Mr. Chairman, the first of these resolutions was introduced a few days ago into this House by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LOVERING], claiming that the Bureau estimate of the Department of Agriculture of the amount of the cotton crop as of the 1st of December, 1905, was an underestimate thereof.

The last of these resolutions was introduced about a year ago by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who claimed that the Department's estimate at that time was an overestimate of the crop. So that we see that the Department's estimates have been assailed both from the South and from the North. They have been assailed on the part of the consumers of cotton and likewise on the part of the producers of cotton, and this brings before the consideration of this Congress a very important question.

The cotton crop is the most valuable crop produced in the States of the South and one of the most valuable crops produced in the United States of America. When you consider its value after it has been manufactured, it is the most valuable and important of all the crops grown in this country.

The Department of Agriculture, in pursuance of an act of Congress, is required every year, on the 1st of December, to make an estimate as to the probable yield of the crop for that year, and the question that comes home to us, as raised by these resolutions, is whether or not that law of Congress should be amended or repealed, or whether we should stand upon the law as it exists; and this question involves chiefly the fairness and accuracy of the work of the Statistical Bureau of the Department of Agriculture.

Now, I want to say at the outset, when a year ago the Department's estimate was made of over 12,000,000 bales of cotton the price of cotton went down and a great complaint came from all over the South. I took the position in the public press at that time and on the floor of the House that notwithstanding the fact that the price of cotton fell upon the publication of that report, I believed it was in the main accurate and true, more so than any other report coming from any other source, and that I thought the system ought not to be abolished; and when the gentleman from Massachusetts now assails that report upon the ground that it is an underestimate I take the same position, and I say that, representing in part the people of the South and voicing the views of such of its representatives as I have had the honor to consult, we of the South only want the Department of Agriculture to give a fair, honest, and impartial report upon the conditions of the crop and the amount raised, and when they do that we are satisfied. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Department has done that very thing last year and this year.

The basis of the assault upon the estimates of the Department of Agriculture is that in the past they have widely missed the mark. It has been contended that they made a mistake amounting to 10 per cent of the crop of last year.

It has been contended that they made a mistake of from 5 to 10 per cent in the previous ten years.

I desire to put into the RECORD the absolute proof, which shows that the Department, instead of missing it from 5 to 10 per cent during the last six years, has come within an average of seven-tenths of 1 per cent in its estimates.

The Census Bureau is charged with the duty of publishing the exact amount produced after the crop has been entirely ginned. It is also charged with the duty of publishing every two weeks the exact amount ginned up to that time, and its final report at the end of the season includes every pound of cotton ginned in the United States, the substantial accuracy of which no man has ever successfully disputed.

Now, then, the Census Bureau's report shows that for the year 1899 the Department of Agriculture on the the 1st of December of that year had made an underestimate of the crop of 3.1 per cent; in 1900, that the Department of Agriculture had made an overestimate of two-tenths of 1 per cent; that in 1901 the Department had made an underestimate of five-tenths of 1 per cent; that in 1902 the Department had made an overestimate of four-tenths of 1 per cent; that in 1903 the Department had made an overestimate of 3.9 per cent; that in 1904 the Department had made an underestimate of 4.2 per cent. Averaging up these amounts, we find that during the period of six years, including last year, the actual difference between the Department's estimate made on the 1st of December and the final result as shown by the Census Bureau is that the Department is within seven-tenths of 1 per cent of being correct. It has missed the truth, averaging the six years, to the extent of only 74,680 bales per annum.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. What is the annual number of bales?

Mr. BOWIE. The average number of bales is about ten and one-half millions for the past six years. Now, I insist that for all practical purposes the departmental forecast, taking the period of six years as a basis, coming within seven-tenths of 1 per cent of the total—in other words, reducing it to bales, if they come within 75,000 bales a year of the true amount of cotton—has vindicated not only the honesty of those reports, but the substantial accuracy thereof.

The popular impression that these estimates have been further from the result than I have just stated is due to the fact that the Department of Agriculture has heretofore based its estimates upon a bale of one size while the Census Bureau's final report has used a bale of a different size, making a true comparison impossible so long as this difference existed. Since bales of cotton are of different sizes in different States and different seasons, an accurate comparison can never be made so long as

the running bale is made the unit. The only true unit is the pound, which never fluctuates in either State or season.

Reducing, therefore, the Department estimate and the final census report for each of the past six years to the only true unit—the pound—we find the following remarkable result:

Number of pounds of lint cotton, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture and as subsequently reported by the Census Bureau, for the years 1899 to 1904, inclusive.

Bureau.	1899.	1900.	1901.
Bureau of Statistics	4,329,193,000	4,856,738,000	4,529,954,000
Census Bureau	4,467,097,000	4,846,471,000	4,550,950,000
	[a] 137,904,000	[b] 10,267,000	[c] 20,996,000

Bureau.	1902.	1903.	1904.
Bureau of Statistics	5,111,870,000	4,889,796,000	6,157,064,000
Census Bureau	5,091,641,000	4,706,591,000	6,426,698,000
	[d] 20,229,000	[e] 183,205,000	[f] 269,634,000

[a] Underestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 3.1 per cent.
[b] Overestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 0.2 per cent.
[c] Underestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 0.5 per cent.
[d] Overestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 0.4 per cent.
[e] Overestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 3.9 per cent.
[f] Underestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 4.2 per cent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it will be noticed from this table which I have read that for the years 1900, 1902, and 1903 the Department slightly overestimated the crop, and for the years 1899, 1901, and 1904 they slightly underestimated the crop.

The largest underestimate of the crop was 4.2 per cent in 1904; the largest overestimate of the crop was in 1903, of 3.9 per cent.

I assert that for the purposes of business, for all practical commercial purposes, the estimate which comes within 3 or 4 per cent, on the 1st of December, is sufficient to enable the business of this country to be conducted safely, and to arrive at something like a fair valuation of the crop before it leaves the producer's hands.

Now, I know, Mr. Chairman, that there are some men in the South, and also in the North, who think we ought to abolish these estimates altogether. And I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LOVERING] has contended that they ought to be made in January instead of in December. As far as the latter suggestion is concerned, I would state that I would prefer to abolish them rather than to have them made in January, because they would then be too late for any practical purpose.

The question that is submitted to us is, Shall we abolish these estimates? I insist that we shall not, for this reason: If the Department of Agriculture does not do this work it will and must be done in some other way. It is a business necessity in this country that we should have information while the crop is being marketed as to its probable amount, in order that the business interests of this country can fix a fair price. You can not get along without information upon that subject at the time the crop is being marketed.

Mr. WANGER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BOWIE. I will.

Mr. WANGER. I understood my friend to refer to the business men of the country fixing the price of cotton. I would like to know whether or not the business men of the country, in his opinion, have as much to do with the fixing of the price of cotton as do the speculators in that article; whether it is not a fact that through speculation—in other words, through gambling—great fluctuations occur in the price of cotton which are injurious alike to the growers, the manufacturers, and that far greater portion of our fellow-citizens, the consumers of cotton products?

Mr. BOWIE. I have not the slightest doubt in the world, Mr. Chairman, that the speculation which goes on in the cotton exchanges of this country and in the bucket shops of this country have had and do have their effect upon the price of cotton. But ultimately the law of supply and demand will have its effect upon that question.

Now, if we could abolish by law speculation, or gambling, as the gentleman has called it, I have no doubt it would be a good thing, and I will be glad to see it done; but I am not expecting anything of that sort at this time. I realize that that is a condition and not a theory; but it is absolutely true, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding all the speculation that can be indulged in, that at last the thing that fixes the prices of cotton is the supply and demand.

And the point of view of the producer is that he wants the information as to what the supply is and what the demand is before the cotton has gone out of his hands and into the hands of the speculator. If he can get the information before he has parted with the crop he is in a position to demand the value thereof. And if he does not get the information until after he has parted with it, he can not get the value of it.

Now, so far as the census report is concerned, I heartily favor the continuance of it. But the Census Bureau deals with only one phase of the question. Their current semimonthly reports are of inestimable value, as is also the final report, but they do not undertake an estimate of what the crop will be. They tell us what has passed. When they make their final official report all the cotton will have been sold and will have been out of the hands of the producer. The Department of Agriculture, by its system, on the other hand, of reporting the condition of the crop at various times during the year, and, finally, on the 1st of December, by reporting its estimate of the entire crop, gives information to the producer and consumer alike, which is of great benefit in the fixing of the price before the crop has entirely left the producer's hands.

Now, then, I say that cotton reporting and estimating is going to be done. If we abolish the system of making these estimates by the Department of Agriculture by act of Congress they will be made nevertheless. But who will make them? Mr. Theodore Price will make them in the interest of Mr. Theodore Price, Mr. Henry M. Neill will make them in the interest of the British spinner, and others will make them in the interest of the cotton producer. These are all right so far as they go from their standpoint and for their purposes, but we must all admit that if we depend exclusively upon them we will have these reports from biased and interested parties on one side or the other. The only place at which you can expect an absolutely impartial opinion upon the subject, based on a canvass of unquestioned value, is from the Government itself, which holds the scales equally between the producer and the consumer. Now, I do not wish to be understood as objecting to all private reports. The legitimate consumer of cotton has the right to inform himself through every possible avenue as to the true condition of affairs before he makes his purchases, and the legitimate producer has the right to the same information before he makes his sales. And when this information is sought and obtained by either party for proper business purposes, it is not only valuable in itself, but it may often operate as a wholesome check upon the Department. No matter how honest the majority of public officials may be, it can do them no harm to feel that the public eye is upon them.

But the difficulty is that the very moment you abolish the Government system the old band of hired brigands who have been practically put out of business of late will resume their nefarious occupations at the old stand, and armed with unlimited capital and resources will so distort and manipulate the facts that producer and consumer alike will be at their mercy.

Now, I undertake to say——

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BOWIE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I would like to have you state in this connection about how this information is gathered by the Government upon which they base their report.

Mr. BOWIE. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. I undertake to say that the crop-reporting system of the Department of Agriculture is the best reporting system at least in America, if not in the world.

To begin with, they have traveling agents in the employ of the Government who visit every section of the South from the time the cotton is put into the ground until it is finally picked and ginned. Then they have State agents, who have their correspondents in every county of the State, from whom they get information as to the acreage first, as to the condition of the crop next, and their opinion on the 1st of December of the amount to be made. Then they have county correspondents, one man in every county. Then they have township correspondents, one man in every township. Then they have bankers and merchants, and, finally, they have correspondents in the case of individual planters who have been recommended to them.

They have 80,000 correspondents upon their list, from every one of whom they get, first, a report as to the acreage; second, a report as to the condition from time to time until November, and, finally, an estimate on the 1st of December of the entire crop. They get it from every one of these sources. Then

they put it in the hands of a statistical board composed of two gentlemen from the North and two gentlemen from the South, presided over by the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, who consolidate the reports from these different sources and make the final estimate.

The widest fluctuation that the experience of six years has ever shown was last year, and it amounted to only 4.2 per cent, and there was ample reason for that, because it was an entirely abnormal season and the crop continued to fruit and produce for weeks longer than had ever been known in its history.

And, Mr. Chairman, I assert that the facts above shown are in themselves the highest possible vindication of the integrity, the fairness, and the impartiality of those eighty thousand correspondents, practically all of whom are Southern, to the manor born, who as a labor of love, without money and without price, have given to the Department and thus to the world the truth that makes us free from the false reports of speculators and manipulators.

Now, it has been popularly supposed that there was an error last year of 9.5 per cent. That supposition is based upon this mistake: The Department last year in estimating the number of bales based it upon what they thought would be the average size of the bale, about 507 pounds net weight. The Census Bureau, by which it has been subsequently checked, made their estimate upon a basis of 500 pounds gross weight. Consequently when you spread this difference over 13,000,000 or 14,000,000 bales you have a great number of bales. That mistake was not discovered and corrected until recently, and I will put into my remarks at this time a statement which was made a few days ago by the Secretary of Agriculture, in which he corrects the discrepancy between the size of the bales. He reduces it to a question of pounds, and shows the true difference last year was only 4.2 per cent. The same error was made for the preceding five years.

Now, shall we leave the business of making these estimates, which affects over $2,000,000,000 worth of property annually, because the value of the cotton in the raw state is at least $600,000,000 and fourteen or fifteen hundred millions more in the manufactured state——

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. If the gentleman will permit me, I frequently have letters on the subject, as I suppose every Member from the South has, and I received a letter to-day protesting against the change in the estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture from the 500 pounds net to the 500 pounds gross. Is that the 507 pounds that the gentleman just spoke of?

Mr. BOWIE. There was never a 500-pound net bale. The estimate made by the Department last year was on the basis of 507 pounds net. I think it was exactly 506 pounds and a fraction, but close to 507 pounds. The Department changed this year for a very good reason. This is fully explained in the paper which I will insert as a part of my remarks or have read, if any gentleman desires it. The record will show, for instance, in the year 1904, that in North Carolina the average bale weighed 469 pounds; in Florida it weighed 451 pounds; in Arkansas, 516; in Mississippi, 521 pounds, and so on down the line, varying in all the States. And this variation also applies to all the seasons. In other words, there is no such thing as uniformity in the ordinary commercial bale of cotton.

I now send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, which fully explains the whole matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE NECESSITY FOR UNIFORMITY OF EXPRESSION IN ESTIMATES AND REPORTS RELATING TO COTTON MADE BY DIFFERENT BUREAUS OF THE GOVERNMENT.

It will be recalled that in December of last year the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture made a preliminary estimate of the production of cotton for the season 1904–5 of 12,163,000 bales, and that subsequently the Bureau of the Census issued reports showing the total production to have been 13,438,000 bales, both amounts being exclusive of linters. This showed an apparent discrepancy of 9.5 per cent, the estimate of the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture being apparently that much too small, as shown by the actual facts disclosed by the census reports later on.

This discrepancy, to the extent indicated, did not actually exist. It was largely due to the fact that the Census Bureau expressed the production of the year in question in bales of 500 pounds gross weight, or 478 pounds net weight, as far as square bales were concerned, such bales constituting 98.3 per cent of the crop. For the purposes of this comparison the entire crop will be considered as having been in square bales, as the comparatively small amount in round bales and in bales of sea-island cotton would not appreciably affect the results intended to be shown. The estimate of the Bureau of Statistics was expressed as in "net" weight bales, which an examination of the figures used by the former Statistician of the Bureau, Mr. Hyde, shows to have been estimated at 506.2 pounds. If Mr. Hyde had employed the same basis as that employed by the Census Bureau in reducing his estimate of the pounds of lint cotton produced to bales—i. e., had he given the figures representing production in bales of a gross weight of 500 pounds each, or a net weight of 478 pounds each—his estimate would have shown 12,881,000 bales as having been produced, instead of 12,163,000, thus making the discrepancy between his preliminary estimate and the final figures of the Census Bureau only a trifle over 4 per cent.

Had Mr. Hyde made known in December of last year the basis upon which he predicated his estimate of 12,163,000 bales—that is, had he published the actual pounds of lint estimated as produced, exclusive of linters—the same placed in comparison with the actual number of net pounds produced, as shown by the Bureau of the Census, would have shown a divergence in his estimate of only 4.2 per cent, as may readily be seen by an examination of the following figures.

The final report of the Census Bureau indicated a total production for the season of 1904–5 of 6,426,698,000 pounds. The estimate of the Bureau of Statistics was 6,157,064,000 pounds, both figures being given in round numbers, exclusive of linters. The difference between the estimate of the Bureau of Statistics and the report of the Bureau of the Census was 269,634,000 pounds, a discrepancy of a trifle over 4 per cent.

It must be plain to anyone from the foregoing that had the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Statistics used the same basis in reporting and estimating the number of bales produced the estimate of the Bureau of Statistics would not have been considered as seriously out of the way.

The figures given above emphasize the necessity of uniformity in methods of statistical expression as between different bureaus of the Government; and it was for this reason that the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture decided, in making the estimate on December 4 of the probable yield of cotton this season, to express the same in bales of the same size as the bales reported by the Census Bureau, thus establishing uniformity and enabling a ready comparison of the figures emanating from the two bureaus.

There has been some criticism of the Bureau of Statistics because of its departure this year from its previous custom of reporting the number of net-weight bales and in using the gross-weight bale instead; but it is thought the above statement will be sufficient to make it plain to anyone that the step was taken properly and that any other method would be likely to lead to the same confusion and misunderstanding that has existed regarding reports made in previous years.

Mr. BOWIE. In further explanation of this point I insert an item recently clipped from the columns of the New York Commercial, as follows:

The weighers' reports of the cotton received here this season show that it takes at least 110 bales to show 50,000 pounds.

This means an average gross weight of the season for cotton received in New York, counting bagging and ties, of 454½ pounds per bale. If we applied the Department basis of last year, this 50,000 pounds of cotton would only have produced 94½ bales, a difference of 16 per cent in the relative weight of the bales.

A bale of cotton as it comes pressed from the gin varies in every State, in every county, and in every season. Therefore, when we make our comparisons with the past, with bales of cotton which varied in every State and in every county and with every season, we have a comparison that is not only valueless, but positively misleading. Consequently, when the Department of Agriculture was called upon to defend its reports, as it was when checked by the Census Bureau, it had to meet the proposition that the Census Bureau had put the bale of cotton at a fixed amount of 500 pounds gross weight and the Department of Agriculture had put it at a fixed amount of 507 pounds net.

Mr. LOVERING. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BOWIE. Certainly.

Mr. LOVERING. How does the gentleman explain the discrepancy between the ginners' report, issued two hours and a half ago, and the estimate of the Bureau as of the 1st day of December? There was a difference in the report of the Census Bureau a fortnight ago of 22,000 bales more reported to have been already ginned than the Bureau estimated would be ginned during the entire season.

Mr. BOWIE. In certain States.

Mr. LOVERING. That 22,000 bales has grown by the report to-day to more than 183,000 bales in excess of what the Bureau estimates will be ginned during the entire season.

Mr. BOWIE. I thank the gentleman for his question. There are two answers to it. In the first place, he has selected only four States out of fourteen, and it is well known that, it being an estimate entirely, you can not expect that it shall be absolutely correct in every State. It is sufficient for the purposes of the business of the world that the aggregate of all the States shall approximate the truth and shall be honestly reported.

Mr. LOVERING. Why can not you expect it to be correct?

Mr. BOWIE. The gentleman has singled out certain States. The gentleman omits to state that in each of the States he has singled out a bale of cotton as it comes from the gin is less than 500 pounds, whereas the Department has made its estimate on a 500-pound bale basis.

Mr. LOVERING. I will say that the State of Georgia, where there is the largest discrepancy, has bales averaging fully 500 pounds.

Mr. BOWIE. Not at all. Upon the contrary, the average last year, which was the largest in the history of the cotton crop, was only 480 pounds in the State of Georgia. In the State of North Carolina, where the next largest discrepancy takes place, the average last year, when the bales were the

heaviest that they had ever been in the history of that State, was only 469 pounds.

Mr. LOVERING. Allowing every latitude possible, there is no explanation of the 183,000 bales discrepancy.

Mr. BOWIE. If the gentleman will reduce his census bales to the size that they actually are, there has not been as much ginned in those States as the Department of Agriculture estimated there would be. There was a statement made only on yesterday, in the hearing of the gentleman, that one man had 300 bales of cotton in one warehouse in North Carolina the average weight of which was only 428 pounds, and the average for the State is only 450 pounds or less.

Mr. BURLESON. I will state in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, if the gentleman will permit me, that if you will reduce the running bales of the Agricultural Department to the 500-pound gross weight bales of the Census Bureau there will be absolutely no discrepancy between the Agricultural Department estimates and the last report that has just been issued by the Census Bureau; on the contrary, that this last report issued by the Census Bureau is a verification of the estimate made by the Agricultural Department instead of a refutation or contradiction of it.

Mr. BOWIE. Yes; the gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct. I hold in my hand the report to which the gentleman refers, made two hours ago by the Census Bureau. That report shows that the percentage of the total crop ginned up to December 13, 1904, was 89 per cent. It is admitted by every person who has informed himself on the subject that the high price of cotton prevailing this year and the early season has brought the cotton to the market earlier than it has ever come in the history of the crop. But take the basis of 89 per cent, the same basis they had last year, and the crop as shown by the census report will come within 100,000 bales of the Department estimate.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will pardon me, is it not always the case that in the era of high prices the bales are light in weight?

Mr. BOWIE. The bales are lighter on account of high prices and on account of the fact that seed cotton varies in lint production from year to year; that is the universal experience. This year the seed cotton produces less lint than it did last year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I started to say a while ago, we are up against this proposition: Shall we depend for our information in regard to this great product upon the work of private agencies, one side of which is gotten up for the purpose of reducing the price and the other side of which is gotten up for the purpose of increasing the price, or shall we take an impartial source that will hold the scales equal and just between the producer and the consumer?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. BOWIE. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in that connection, and merely for the purpose of emphasizing what the gentleman from Alabama has so well said, I wish to say that at a number of farmers' meetings this year in North Carolina in my own district I have asked that question, whether the farmers would prefer to take the Government report rather than rely upon the report of the speculators, and uniformly in these farmers' meetings I was told that the farmers desired a continuance of these reports.

Mr. BOWIE. That is my information with this exception, that you will find many men buying cotton in the South who are just as much bears as if they were buying in New England, and when men in the South try to buy cotton they are just as eager to buy it cheap as they are in New England.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Of course our people in North Carolina and the South want accurate reports.

Mr. BOWIE. Oh, yes; absolutely.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. That goes without saying, but at the same time I understand from them that they prefer to continue the Government reports rather than to take the reports of the speculators.

Mr. BOWIE. I have not a doubt of it. I have no doubt if you put it to a vote to-morrow that these people who have to go up against the reports from private speculators, although they lost 2 or 2½ cents a pound by a break of prices produced by the December, 1904, estimate of cotton, that nine-tenths would vote in favor of a continuance of these reports, because they believe that events have fully justified and vindicated their accuracy and fairness in the past.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the fact that there have been complaints justly made of certain officials of the statistical department of the Government. I shall not undertake, in the course of these remarks, to speak on a subject that is pending in the criminal courts. I am heartily in favor of anything that will send the men who have acted fraudulently in that Bureau to the penitentiary. There has been evidence—at least in one case, and perhaps in others—that there has been fraud shown, especially with respect to the acreage reports made in the spring of the year. There may have been other cases just as criminal which have been undiscovered. I hope justice will be meted out to those who are guilty, and I hope the law will prove sufficient, and if it does not prove sufficient, I am in favor of making it so, so as to cover all future cases. And I wish here to state that the Southern Cotton Association, through its officials, performed a notable public service in the part they took in their discovery and exposure. But, notwithstanding the fact that fraud was proven in that case, I assert that the past estimates of the Bureau are fully and amply sustained by evidence that is not open to contradiction.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the head of the great Department of Agriculture is a man as pure, upright, and as honest as this country contains within its length and breadth. [Applause.] As far as I am concerned, I believe that no man in America would be quicker to frown upon fraud practiced within his Department than would he. If fraud has entered into it in the past, or should enter into it in the future, I haven't the slightest doubt that upon getting evidence of that fact he would act, and act promptly, upon it. I do not expect that we should have absolute honesty in that Department any more than in any other. All I say is that we have in the Department of Agriculture facilities for getting a crop report and condition reports that do not exist anywhere else in this country, that we have in that Department the disposition to report it impartially and fairly, and to hold the scales equally between all concerned, and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a great injury to the producer of cotton and a great injury to the consumer of cotton if we take out of the hands of an impartial and disinterested board the doing of work of this character and put it into the hands of private agencies, no matter what those private agencies are or who they may be.

Mr. Chairman, before closing my remarks it would no doubt be proper for me to say, for it has already been given to the press and published broadcast in the country, that this resolution was unanimously laid upon the table after a full hearing on both sides before the House Committee on Agriculture, which had before it the Lovering resolution, which I had read at the opening of my remarks, at which Mr. LOVERING spoke in its behalf, and at which the opposition to its adoption was ably represented by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS], speaking alike for the producer and the consumer.

I have spoken upon the subject merely because I thought it was due to the country, and particularly to my section of the country, that the facts which have been so much perverted and obscured in the past by misleading statements and comparisons should be known and given the fullest possible circulation.

I believe that the final report of the Census Bureau for this year will fully vindicate the substantial accuracy and the absolute integrity of the Department's estimate made on December 1.

I know that the experience of the past six years has fully warranted and vindicated the public confidence, unmistakably shown by the course of the market upon these reports. I do not believe there is or ever was any necessary for the adoption of such a resolution as this, and I am glad to know that in that belief I am supported by the unanimous opinion of the House Committee on Agriculture, which has given this question most careful study and consideration.

It has only been within the last few years that the price of cotton has reached a point which would give a fair profit to its producers.

For each of the years 1903, 1904, and 1905 its value has exceeded $600,000,000.

Though the crop of this year is shorter than the crop of last year by more than 3,000,000 bales, it is likely that by one of the contradictions of trade its value will be greater by many millions of dollars.

I should not be surprised to see—if not this year, certainly within the near future—the total value of the cotton crop in the producers' hands exceed $700,000,000. It was only seven or eight years ago that the value was less than $300,000,000. I here insert a tabular statement showing the annual increase in value since 1898.

	Bales.	Values.
1898–99	11,274,840	$283,000,000
1899–1900	9,436,416	363,784,820
1900–1901	10,383,422	494,567,54-
1901–2	10,680,680	438,014,687
1902–3	10,727,559	480,770,282
1903–4	10,011,374	617,501,548
1904–5	13,565,885	628,195,359

What this difference means to the people of the South can not be told in speech nor described in words.

What is it that has enabled the people of the South within the past five or six years to attain a degree of prosperity never enjoyed since 1860?

I assert, first, that the Department of Agriculture has done its full share in that splendid work. Aye, sir, I assert that the Bureau of Statistics of that Department has performed a great service in that regard.

This is not the time nor the place for me to review the great work that the Department of Agriculture has done and is doing, not only for the people of the United States in general, but for the people of my section in particular; but this I do assert, that no single agency of the Government has contributed so much to our prosperity and happiness.

But, Mr. Chairman, as much as the Department of Agriculture has undoubtedly been able to do, and frank as I am to give due credit for all that it has done, I assert that the present prosperity of the people of the South and the great victory which they have won from those who in the past have been able successfully to crush down the value of their greatest staple and to pauperize the men in its production is due in the largest measure to the work of their own hands, to the spirit of unity of purpose which has actuated them under trying conditions.

There were those who thought that the December, 1904, estimate of the Department of Agriculture was a great curse to our people. It unquestionably did have a depressing temporary effect upon the price of cotton, but I assert that it caused the greatest blessing ever conferred upon our people! It brought them face to face with a great danger, and when they saw the danger in its full extent they acted!

In the convention held in New Orleans in January, 1905, there were thousands of delegates from every State in the South, composed of bankers, lawyers, merchants, and farmers, banded together as one unit to hold, to preserve, protect, and to save from destruction the great staple upon which our people so much depend!

That convention recommended, first, that the unsold cotton should be kept off the market until the price went to 10 cents a pound, and, second, that the acreage for the ensuing year be reduced 25 per cent.

The recommendations were laughed at by Mr. Theodore Price and others, who still insisted that cotton would go to 5 cents per pound, but in thirty days Mr. Price was on the verge of bankruptcy, and he has admitted that he would have failed if he had not seen the handwriting on the wall and reversed his position. In less than two months' time cotton had increased in value at least $10 per bale. In five months' time it was selling at between 10 and 11 cents per pound, or an increase of from $20 to $25 a bale. It has sold recently in the South at 12 cents per pound on the wagon.

The men who had faith in the movement, who stood by it, saw it vindicated! I do not believe they have so soon forgotten the lesson which they learned last year.

All that they need to protect the price on the staple in the future is to act as they did a year ago—to stand together, each for all and all for each—determined that there shall be fair play dealt out to the men who actually grow the cotton, instead of giving all of its profits to the band of speculators "who toil not, neither do they spin," but whose actions and whose iniquities make them fit companions in infamy with the other kings of frenzied finance and the insurance magnates now sojourning in foreign lands, "who have left their country for their country's good."

It has been charged that the Southern Cotton Association, which, acting through Mr. Harvie Jordan, its president, has recommended that the balance of the crop now remaining in the producers' hands be taken from the market and held until the price equals 15 cents a pound, is unwise and likely to do permanent injury to the cotton planters of the South as well as to the consumers of cotton. I assert that this is a mistaken view. In the first place, it matters little whether Mr. Harvie Jordan or Mr. Anybody-else should advise the farmers not to sell until the price reaches 15 cents per pound. They may take the advice or they may not take it. It may have been wise or it may not have been wise for Mr. Jordan to give it, but the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that all the powers of speculation combined can not prevent cotton from greatly increasing in value before the summer is over, and Mr. Jordan is simply giving the planters of the South the advice to sell their cotton for the highest price which they can get for it ,and with this position we all do, and ought, to sympathize.

To all appearances the crop for the year 1905 will be three and one-half million bales less than the crop of 1904. Not a single disinterested estimate places the reduction at less than 3,000,000 bales. The takings by spinners this year exceed the takings last year, notwithstanding the enormous difference in price, by more than a quarter of a million bales. Assuming the reduction of the crop to be only 3,000,000 bales, the spinners of the world are face to face with the fact that for the remainder of the year they will have at least three and one-quarter, if not three and one-half, million bales less to go on than they had a year ago, with this difference, of course there was about a million bales more brought forward into the year 1905 than in the year 1904. Allowing for that difference, there is still an absolute shortage of over 2,000,000 bales as compared with the conditions of last year. Against this shortage, on the other hand, we have 5,000,000 new spindles erected during the year and an increasing market throughout the world, a more general diffusion of prosperity, and therefore of purchasing power, than ever known before, and peace in the Orient. Under conditions far less favorable the price of cotton went to 17 cents per pound two years ago, and to my mind 15 cents per pound this year is not an unreasonable expectation.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is asserted that this price is too high for cotton and that the spinners can not make a profit on it at that figure. The answer to this is very simple; a difference of 2 or 3 cents in a pound of cotton can not be found in a shirt or a handkerchief or other articles of personal apparel. All that the manufacturer has to do is to correspondingly raise the price of his goods, and this he undoubtedly will do, as he has invariably done in the past. It will never be felt by the consumer when it reaches him.

The price of wool is 30 cents a pound, and upon any fair comparison of actual values there is no such difference intrinsically as the market has shown between these two products.

I believe we have reached the point at which the world demands and is willing to pay and can afford to pay a higher price for cotton than it has in the past.

Of course by planting for an excessive crop during the coming year and forgetting the lesson so recently learned it is within the power of the producers of cotton "to kill the goose that lays the golden egg" and reduce the price of their own product by their own action to a starvation point again. But I don't believe, Mr. Chairman, that they will do it. The propaganda has already been started which, I believe, will be successful in holding the acreage down to the same point that it was last year.

The likelihood is, through better farming methods and through the probability of a better crop yield, for it could scarcely be worse, the cotton actually raised, without any increase of acreage, will be a million more bales next year than this one. I should not regard this as a calamity. Upon the contrary, I believe the world now needs and is willing to pay for twelve and one-half million bales of cotton annually. It will not be many years before it will need and will be willing to pay a fair price for 15,000,000 bales of cotton.

The people of the South will be able to produce all the cotton needed for the world's consumption, not through the mistaken medium of an increase of acreage, but through the far wiser and more economical plan of better agricultural methods, which will produce a greater yield of lint per acre.

In this direction lies the future hope of prosperity in the South, as well as the keeping of the supply of cotton approximately equal to the demand—but for my part I want the demand to always keep just a little in excess of the supply!

Just as the farmers of the West have doubled the yield of corn per acre by better and more scientific methods, so do I believe the farmers of the South will increase the yield of their cotton per acre, and thereby decrease its cost by the study and application of more improved methods of culture, by a wiser system of seed selection, and a more general diversification of crops, and at the same time demand and receive a fair reward for their labor. [Applause.]

Mr. LOVERING. Mr. Chairman, I am unwilling that the speech of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOWIE] should go unchallenged or that the statements he furnished in his attack upon my resolution should go out unaccompanied by statements from me in refutation thereof, as I said before the Committee on Agriculture that in introducing this resolution to revise the

estimates I disclaim absolutely any purpose to question the integrity of the Secretary of Agriculture or of anyone in his Department. No, nor to question their ability nor impugn their motives.

I do not believe there is a more honest or efficient officer in the service of the Government than the present Secretary, and were he to resign I do not know where the Government would find as good a man to fill the place. Having said this, I am entirely justified in questioning the methods employed in making the recent cotton-crop estimate of December 4 and the propriety, from every business standpoint, of making it at that date. Furthermore, I am justified in asking whether the agents employed in the cotton States are entirely free from the influences surrounding them, which are well known to be in the interest of underestimating the crop. As a cotton spinner and in the interest of cotton spinners, I am anxious that all of the figures and estimates given out to the public shall be as nearly exact as is possible and as free from guessing as may be.

And therefore, to begin with, I think the Bureau estimate should never be made earlier than January 1 of each year. It is nearer the end of the ginning season, and the data available at that time is more reliable and exact than on December 1.

Then, too, I think the Bureau report should be made with some reference to the ginning reports, which by January 1 will have been so frequent and so full as to be an indisputable indicator of the crop. Now I am told that such census reports are not taken into account in making the Bureau estimates.

As I understand it, the procedure of the Bureau is to ascertain, first, the number of acres under cultivation; second, the abandoned acreage; third, the net acreage; fourth, the number of pounds per acre of seed cotton in each State; fifth, the percentage of lint per hundred pounds of seed cotton; and, sixth, having arrived at the pounds of lint per acre, multiply this by the acres in each State and divide by 478, net lint to bales of 500 gross.

Now, this may all be very well, but of these six factors the last only is a known quantity. All the rest are guesses, or an average of guesses, possessing all the elements of uncertainty and subject to the whims and environments of the agents located in many thousand places—I am told 80,000.

But allowing them all to be conscientious and impartial men, I maintain that they could furnish more accurate reports on January 1 than on December 1. I do not believe they would deny this themselves, and if they are conscientious I believe they would modify in January the statements or returns they sent out in December.

It is for this reason that I have introduced and am pressing this resolution. A wrong has been done and it should be righted.

The Bureau should have the right, in the light of the census reports, to revise its final estimate of the season, and that, too, before the final ginners' report and the final commercial estimate shall be determined.

Now, perhaps some one will ask my reasons for doubting the last estimate of the Department of Agriculture. Although it is a matter of common knowledge, I desire to emphasize some of the reasons for taking this action.

I.

Inaccuracy of the report of the Department of Agriculture as demonstrated by the ginners' report of December 1.

State.	Government estimate, Dec. 4, 1905.	Ginners' report, Dec. 1, 1905.
Georgia	1,564,311	1,561,061
North Carolina	545,055	573,598
Oklahoma	231,838	230,648
South Carolina	995,027	992,708
Total	3,336,231	3,358,015

By the 1st of December these four States had ginned 22,000 bales in excess of the Bureau estimate. The ginners' report issued the 20th shows the excess to have grown to 183,341 bales.

II.

As explained by Secretary Wilson, the delay in issuing the Bureau estimate on December 4 this year was caused by wide divergence in the reports sent in as to the yield per acre.

In the opinion of all unbiased and conservative observers of the cotton situation, the condition figures published by the Government in September, October, and November were fairly accurate and represented the relative improvement experienced by the crop, thanks to the splendid fall. The October conditions figure for Texas was exactly the same as a year ago, and other States showed a slight reduction only. In the absence of detail-yield figures, the following calculation has been made on the actual yield for 1904 and the estimate yield for 1905. These figures are based on the entire acreage estimated by the Department of Agriculture, no allowance having been made for abandonment, as no detailed figures are available. In conjunction with these figures the October condition for the various States is given this year and last year.

State.	October condition, 1904.	October condition, 1905.	Actual yield, 1904.	Estimated yield, 1905.
Alabama	76	70	172	170
Arkansas	77	72	199	166
Florida	82	76	125	140
Georgia	78	76	201	196
Indian Territory	83	78	240	189
Louisiana	78	59	268	165
Mississippi	77	68	224	185
Missouri	82	81	296	280
North Carolina	82	77	252	233
Oklahoma	85	80	316	260
South Carolina	82	74	214	215
Tennessee	76	79	174	218
Texas	69	69	173	156
Virginia	82	77	184	232
General average	75.8	71.2	222	186

In the light of the October condition figures, the yield figures are mostly quite incongruous and appear to have been fixed in an absolutely arbitrary spirit. Arkansas had a poor yield last year, owing to floods in the spring, and it is hardly conceivable that with a condition figure only 6½ per cent lower there should have been a decrease in yield of 16 per cent. Similar objection may be made to the yield figures for the other Gulf States, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. In the case of Georgia, North Carolina, and Oklahoma the proportion between condition figures and yield is well maintained; but, strange to say, just in those States the Agricultural Bureau is already shown to have considerably underestimated. More glaring still is the case of South Carolina. The condition is about 10 per cent lower than last year, but the yield according to Government figures is higher. The probability is that the acreage figures underlying the calculation of the Government are absolutely wrong. Yield figures on a wrong acreage are worse than useless, and the Government ought to abandon the acreage figures and estimate the yield, with the assistance of the census figures, of cotton ginned to the latest available date.

III.

To December 13 this year a quantity of at least 9,200,000 bales will have been ginned. In the Gulf States and north Texas ginning is still proceeding on a heavy scale, and the daily quantity ginned between November 14 and December 13 will this year have been about 68,000 bales, as compared with 87,000 bales last year and 68,000 bales in 1903 for the same period. This would prove that there is no exhaustion, and, as in former years, the least quantity ginned after December 13 has been 1,300,000 in the small crop year 1903–4, hardly less can be expected this year. It is much more likely that a far greater quantity remains to be ginned than in 1903 or in 1902 by reason of the lateness of the crop in the most prolific States.

IV.

The tendency of the Department of Agriculture has generally been to underestimate the size of the crop, to the great detriment of the consumer. During the past five years the underestimate has averaged 632,400 bales, or 5.6 per cent; during the past ten years the underestimate reached 778,400, or 7.6 per cent. Below is a table giving the Government estimates and the commercial crops, as determined by the Financial Chronicle:

Season.	Government estimate.	Commercial crop.	Underestimate (per cent).
1895–6	6,375,000	7,147,000	10.8
1896–7	8,250,000	8,706,000	5.3
1897–8	9,600,000	11,216,000	14.4
1898–9	10,000,000	11,256,000	11.2
1899–1900	8,900,000	9,422,000	5.5
1900–1901	10,100,000	10,389,000	2.6
1901–2	9,674,000	10,701,000	9.6
1902–3	10,417,000	10,758,000	3.1
1903–4	9,932,000	10,123,000	1.6
1904–5	12,163,000	13,557,000	10.1

While the commercial crop, as counted by the New Orleans and New York Cotton Exchanges and the Financial Chronicle, includes such linters as may have been produced and shipped out of each year's crop, it does not, on the other hand, include

the cotton which is held in farmers' hands at the end of each season and which fully offsets the linter production.

In regard to the claim that the light weight of the bales in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Oklahoma offsets the excess of cotton shown to have been already ginned in these States, as compared with the Department of Agriculture's estimate of the total crop, I quote the following telegram from New Orleans, published in the New York Journal of Commeree of December 6:

Secretary Hester makes the actual average weight of 4,252,543 bales of cotton crop, embracing port receipts and overland for three months, from September to November, inclusive, 519.10 against 523.23 pounds per bale last year, a decease of 4.13. Detailed averages are Texas, 534.56; Louisiana, 522.16; Alabama, etc., 530; Georgia, 508; South Carolina, 500; North Carolina, 501.95; Virginia, 496; Tennessee, etc., including Memphis, St. Louis, and overland, 523.82.

From the above it will be noticed that this official statement of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange indicates that in no State except Virginia is the average weight of the bales less than 500 pounds gross.

Converting yesterday's report of the United States Census of the quantity of cotton ginned up to the 13th of December on the basis of the average weight of this year's bales, as reported by the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, it is found that there had been ginned up to the 13th of December in the equivalent of bales of 500 pounds gross 9,647,000. As the estimate of the Agricultural Department is, by its own statement, in bales of an average weight of 500 pounds gross, or 478 pounds net, it is made more evident than previously that the estimate of the Department of Agriculture is an underestimate and has already been substantially exceeded by the amount of cotton ginned up to the 13th of December in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Oklahoma, and has been closely aproximated by the amount of cotton ginned to the 13th of December in Texas and Alabama.

This makes it evident that the claim that the light weight of bales in the Carolinas, Georgia, and Oklahoma offsets the disparity between the ginning returns and the figures of the Agricultural Department is unwarranted.

The details of yesterday's ginners' report in bales of actual weight, 2 round bales being counted as 1 square bale, the equivalent of these returns in bales of 500 pounds gross, and the estimate of the Agricultural Department, by States, is as follows, thousands omitted:

State.	Total ginned to Dec. 13, running bales 2 round equal to 1 square.	Average weight as per New Orleans Cotton Exchange.	Total equivalent in 500-pound bales.	Total crop as estimated by Agricultural Department, bales of 500 pounds gross.
Alabama	1,132	530	1,200	1,267
Arkansas	474	519.1	492	618
Florida	70	519.1	73	77
Georgia	1,621	508	1,647	1,564
Indian Territory	279	519.1	287	325
Louisiana	415	522.16	442	555
Mississippi	949	519.1	985	1,213
North Carolina	599	501.95	601	545
Oklahoma	257	519.1	267	232
South Carolina	1,043	500	1,043	995
Tennessee	226	519.1	235	336
Texas	2,173	534.56	2,325	2,383
Missouri	33	519.1	35	41
Virginia and Kentucky	15	496	15	17
Total	9,282	a519.1	9,647	10,168

a Average.

In the opinion of all close observers the underestimate this year is near the average of the last ten years, the growth being likely to reach 10,900,000 to 11,000,000 bales. This underestimate by the Government practically sanctions the exorbitant demands made by southern farmers and holders and causes very serious loss to the spinning and manufacturing industry of this country. It is a well-known fact that the South always underestimates the size of the cotton crop, and the Government ought, in the interest of the cotton-textile trade, to try to arrive at an impartial estimate. The former Statistician of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. John Hyde, is reported by the Manchester Guardian, Tuesday, December 5, 1905, to have said that—

There is not the slightest doubt that the correspondents of the Department have combined to mislead it, and that the actual crop will prove to be not far from 11,000,000 bales. The Department's correspondents always underestimate the crop, and this year the enormous influence of the Southern Cotton Association has been brought to bear upon them with the object of inducing them deliberately to misrepresent the actual condition.

Although now in an unofficial capacity, Mr. Hyde is no doubt in the best position to appreciate and weigh the reports of the southern correspondents at their exact value.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to be perfectly fair in this matter. It is obvious that if an underestimate of the crop is made, which is very serious, it is to the disadvantage of consumers of cotton. It is obvious that if an overestimate is made it is a disadvantage to the planter. Now, what has happened? These estimates have been made, and it has been shown that the average is over 758,000 bales underestimated during the last ten years, and it is but fair to assume that the proportion has not been much disturbed during this last year.

Now, what is the effect? Of course the effect of a "bullish" report on the cotton crop would be to put down the price of cotton, or if a "bearish" report on the cotton crop it would put up the price of cotton.

I do not claim to be any less human than anybody else. I am a cotton manufacturer, and represent cotton spinners, and I know that the profit to the cotton manufacturer nowadays is exceedingly small; and I say that 12 cents a pound for cotton seems to the spinner an unreasonable and fanciful price, and is as bad for him as 5 cents a pound is for the planter. Fifteen cents per pound is a famine price, and would have the same effect it did when it was 15 cents under what was known as the "Sully boom," when 25 per cent of all the spindles in the country were stopped.

Mr. BOWIE. But they took all the cotton they could get at 5 cents.

Mr. LOVERING. They are not fools. They will take all they can get at the lowest price and the farmers will get all they can. Do not forget that.

Now, here is the farmer making from 100 to 150 per cent upon an article, while the manufacturer is fortunate if he makes 4 or 5 per cent, and many times he makes much less. The wage scale in Fall River is influenced by the difference in the price of a print cloth and the price of cotton. As the price of cotton goes up the difference narrows. The wage-earner is paid there a percentage in surplus wages of the difference between the two.

The other day when the Bureau estimate came out cotton jumped four or five dollars a bale.

What was the effect? It wiped out the entire difference there was, so that the week before 6 per cent could have been added to the wages of the employees, but as it turned out there was nothing for them. That is the way it affects the operative.

For that reason I want to see such estimate as shall keep the thing on a fair level. Twelve and one-half cents is a prohibitive price for cotton. Fifteen cents is a famine price for cotton, and it would stop spinning.

Mr. BURLESON. And 5 cents is a ruinous price.

Mr. LOVERING. Yes; 5 cents is a ruinous price for everybody. Cotton is to a man's back what food is to his stomach. It is a prime necessity of life. It ought not to be kept at an abnormally high figure. It only can be kept there by manipulation and combination and collusion, which are as repugnant to the Sherman antitrust act as is the keeping of beef at an abnormally high figure. It is just the same.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I will address myself directly to the issue. I feel quite sure that my friend from Massachusetts has dealt with this matter with the utmost candor and sincerity. It is gratifying to us all that he bears witness to the integrity of our Secretary of Agriculture, and that he continues to testify to his confidence in the honesty and ability of the gentlemen who make up the statistical estimates of the cotton crop in the Department of Agriculture. I deplore, however, the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts has so suddenly and completely lost confidence in the methods pursued by the Department in making its estimate of the cotton crop. If I remember aright, last year, when the Department's estimate indicated the largest cotton crop that was ever grown in the history of the product, when I was called upon to defend the integrity and virtue of its estimate, standing by my side at that time was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LOVERING], proclaiming that he not only believed in the integrity, the value, and the virtue of that report, but also in the methods by which the estimate was reached. This year, when we have unquestionably a small crop, I sincerely regret that the gentleman from Massachusetts, human though he be, as he confesses, is now asserting his loss of all confidence in the methods pursued by the Agricultural Department for obtaining this statistical result.

As I have said, last year (1904–5) there was raised in the South the largest cotton crop in its history—a crop in size beyond the comprehension even of cotton experts. No one looked for such an enormous crop; no one thought such a crop possible. Even professional estimators representing foreign cotton inter-

ests, who are ever present with enormous overestimates, did not have the "nerve" to estimate near 13,000,000 bales. However, the reports during the growing season made by the Department of Agriculture from month to month had forecasted such a crop, and on December 3, 1904, it gave out an estimate for the year of over 12,000,000 bales. This report we all know was received by the producers with storms of protest, the charge being freely made that it was an overestimate. It was later demonstrated that the report of the crop was nearer the true facts than any other estimate, and was in fact slightly below the amount of cotton actually produced.

The gentleman from Massachusetts now earnestly contends that the present crop has been underestimated. I think I can conclusively show that the gentleman is laboring under a grievous misapprehension of the facts. The gentleman suggests that the estimates of the Bureau of Statistics should be made with some reference to the ginning reports issued by the Census Bureau, and states that he is told that such ginning reports are not taken into account in making the Bureau of Statistics estimates. It so happens that I am prepared to inform the gentleman positively that his information on this point is absolutely without foundation in truth. On December 4 last I was present when the estimate was made, and I regret that the gentleman from Massachusetts was not there; I know that the Secretary of Agriculture invited and urged him to be present. I was there from the beginning until the doors were opened and the final figures given to the public. I followed every step of the procedure in preparing the final estimate of the production of cotton this year, and I say to the gentleman that the census ginners' reports issued prior to December 4 were given due weight—in fact, were taken very seriously into account.

When the board of four statisticians assembled, all reports from the several distinct corps of correspondents—viz, special field agents, state statistical agents, county correspondents, township correspondents, special cotton correspondents, individual planters, and ginners—were brought together in convenient form on parallel columns and each member of the board was provided with the figures. The members of the board at this time also had before them the latest reports of the Weather Bureau and the census ginners' reports, and from these exhaustive data the statisticians prepared their estimates, which were used in an arithmetical and statistical computation of the report. Henceforth the gentleman may be at ease on this matter; but as a matter of fact the census reports made from time to time during the season, based on ginners' returns, while of very great interest and value, are not certain indications of the season's total production. The reasons for this are plain. In the first place, these preliminary census reports show the number of running bales that have been ginned to a given date, regardless of weight, and it is well known that these bale weights vary astonishingly in the different States and also vary in one year as compared with another; secondly, it is also well known that the seasons also vary—one may be much earlier or later than another—that is, the crop matures more rapidly and is gathered and ginned more quickly some years than in others. The exact ratio as between one year and another has not been and never can be known; but the fact that one season is earlier or later than another and that no two seasons are alike in this respect prevents the census reports made during the progress of the season from being an absolutely accurate indication of the probable total crop. The fact that the gentleman does not seem to understand this is one reason I have for stating that he is laboring under a misapprehension of the facts.

Now, upon what further facts does he base his contention that the last report of the Agricultural Department is inaccurate or is an underestimate of the cotton crop? He selects from the report three States and one Territory—the States of North Carolina and South Carolina and Georgia, and the Territory of Oklahoma—and because, perchance, the aggregate yield of cotton reported by the Agricultural Department as the crop for this year is less by about 22,000 bales than is shown to have been already ginned up to December 1 by the Census Bureau, he rushes to the conclusion that of course it is an underestimate of the crop throughout the cotton region; but, mark you, in reaching this conclusion he at the same time ignores the reports from nine other States and one Territory which also grow cotton. Now, in the very nature of things an estimate can not be exact; if it was it would be no longer an estimate. The real issue is not whether the estimate is exact in the particular State, but whether, taking it as a whole, it is an honest and fairly accurate estimate of the crop in the entire cotton section. He also ignores completely the fact that the Agricultural Department when it announced its estimate of the crop on December 4 announced the result of its statistical calculations in bales of 500 pounds gross weight, whereas the Census Bureau announces its results in all its preliminary reports in "running" bales just as they come from the ginneries, without reference to weight, in some States the bales weighing as little as 450 pounds and in others more.

Last year in the State of North Carolina the running bales were quite light, weighing only 469 pounds on an average. As I have said, when the Agricultural Department announced its estimate this year it expressed the result in bales of 500 pounds gross weight. Now, I submit that in order to institute an intelligent comparison—I will go further and say that in order to institute a just and fair comparison between this estimate of the crop announced by the Bureau of Statistics of the Agricultural Department and the report of the Census Bureau covering the quantity ginned up to December 1 one must reduce the figures giving the number of running bales ginned in any given State to bales of 500 pounds gross weight, this being the basis used by the Agricultural Department in announcing its estimate. I will state in this connection that this is also the basis used by the Bureau of the Census in its final report at the close of each season.

When you pursue this fair method of comparison and take into consideration the difference in the weight of the bale for the State that he makes most complaint about—North Carolina—can it be claimed that the Agricultural Department is so very far wrong? Can he fairly contend that the Bureau's estimate is at all wrong? On the contrary, in my deliberate judgment it is a remarkably accurate estimate of the crop in that State. I am told by gentlemen from North Carolina that many of the gins have already been dismantled and that about 98 per cent of the crop has been gathered and that they have practically ceased to gin cotton. In addition, they tell me that the running bale this year is lighter than it was last year, the weight being about 450 pounds per bale. Now, let us apply this method of comparison and note the result:

The Census Bureau's report of cotton ginned up to December 13 shows for North Carolina 598,504 running bales. If the average weight of the running bale in North Carolina this year is 450 pounds, then the equivalent number of 500-pound gross-weight bales ginned up to December 13 is 538,654 bales. The Bureau of Statistics estimated the total production of North Carolina at 545,055 bales of 500 pounds gross weight, and thus you see that in this State the evidence of underestimation is wholly wanting.

I am told by other gentlemen—and I can furnish their names to the gentleman from Massachusetts if desired—that in South Carolina and Georgia the crop has been practically gathered; that there is but a small part of it remaining in the field. Instead of the gentleman from Massachusetts having a basis for the contention that this is an underestimate of the crop, I will say that if one were of a gambling temperament he would be perfectly safe in wagering the gentleman from Massachusetts an amount equal to the value of his largest cotton mill that in the State of Mississippi alone the crop has been overestimated by the Bureau of Statistics to a larger number of bales than it has been underestimated in the three States and one Territory about which he so continuously complains.

Now, there can be no question about this. The gentleman has embodied in his remarks a detailed statement showing the discrepancy between the commercial crop and the estimates of the Agricultural Department. As was so well said by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOWIE] in his remarks on this subject, the commercial crop includes linters, and it is not comparable with the agricultural crop, which is the actual production for each year, because it is the amount of cotton marketed—sold—and includes cotton brought forward from the previous year as well as the linters, while it does not include cotton remaining unsold. Furthermore, the commercial crop as finally announced and the estimate of the Agricultural Department as announced previous to this year were not made upon the same basis as to the weight of bales, and the gentleman from Massachusetts overlooks all these facts. Hence I say that his comparison is misleading, unjust, and unfair to the Bureau of Statistics. This is another reason I have for stating that the gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension as the facts.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, in order to sustain his assertion of annual underestimation by the Department of Agriculture, presents a table covering the years from 1895 to 1904, inclusive, in which he compares the Bureau's estimates, in bales, with the commercial crop, also in bales, and from this absurd comparison deduces the result that during the series of years covered by the table the underestimate amounted to 7.6 per cent, ranging for the separate years from 1.6 to 14.4 per cent. The fallacy of these figures is self-evident. As has

been stated, the Government estimate in years prior to the present one has been expressed in net-weight bales, the weights varying from year to year. The commercial crop was expressed in a different kind of bale entirely; and, furthermore, as I have conclusively shown, the commercial crop is never the agricultural crop; so there is absolutely no comparison to be made between the two sets of figures and the percentages drawn from such comparison are, with due respect to the gentleman from Massachusetts, nothing short of ridiculous.

Take the Department's estimate of December 3, 1904, for the crop of that year. The gentleman from Massachusetts says that the discrepancy between the commercial crop of that year and the estimate given by the Agricultural Department was 10.1 per cent. Now, as a matter of fact, if you adopt a proper basis of comparison, as I have before indicated and which I will embody in these remarks later on, and which even the gentleman from Massachusetts must admit is fair, you will find that the difference between the estimate and the actual crop was about 4 per cent. The gentleman from Massachusetts asserts that the difference is always on one side, or, rather, that the Department's estimates are always underestimates. That, too, is a mistake. I entirely dissent from that proposition. During the last six years the Department has overestimated the crop just as often as it has underestimated it. Notwithstanding this fact, I positively assert that since it has engaged in this work of estimating the cotton crop its annual estimate has proven more accurate—nearer to the actual crop as it is finally ascertained to be—than any estimate coming from any other source.

The best proof of the correctness of this proposition is the fact that the Department's estimate is accepted throughout the commercial world, not only in our own country, but across the seas, as the most impartial and the most accurate estimate of the crop that is made. It is the one estimate that now materially affects the market price of the product; and why? Because everybody believes that it is honest and accurate and impartial, and all accept and act on it as such.

The gentleman contends that the estimate of the crop is made too early in the season, and suggests deferring it until January 1. I protest against the suggestion, because if you defer the report until January 1 it will be of absolutely no value to the producer of cotton. The farmer before this date has parted with the bulk of his crop.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has elsewhere suggested that the report be abandoned. If the Government abandons this field, and it would be tantamount to an abandonment of the field to postpone making the estimate to a later day, what would immediately follow? Every man knows that at once this field would be covered by the professional estimators. And what would then be the consequence? You may take the record from newspapers of our country and you will find that before the Government engaged in this work for a series of years the professional estimator invariably overestimated the crop from three-quarters of a million to a million and a half bales, thereby unfairly depressing the price of cotton, to the great injury of the producer.

Several years ago, before the exhaustive system and methods of gathering cotton statistics had been perfected by the Department of Agriculture, private Pullman-car estimates were yearly precipitated upon the cotton planters of this country by Buston, Neill, and other professional estimators, all of which were manifestly in the interests of the Manchester and Liverpool cotton interests. Frequently these estimates were more than a million bales in excess of the true crop and were shamefully misleading. Now that the Department has perfected its system and has forecasted so closely the true conditions for several years, such estimates made by professional estimators are discredited and ridiculed. The publication by the Department of Agriculture of its cotton estimate has resulted in saving millions of dollars to the American planter and cotton interests.

I beg leave to embody at this point a portion of the last annual report of the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture, showing conclusive reasons and necessity for the issuing of crop reports by the Government:

* * * * * * *

The producer should have as good a central crop-reporting agency as the buyer. Since his business is divided into many small noncooperative units, he can not have this without Government aid. The manufacturer, the dealer in actual products, and the consumer also need protection from the speculative manipulation of agencies organized to modify prices temporarily for their own advantage, while the main purpose of crop reports is that the whole people may be benefited by a knowledge of the actual facts which may influence current prices.

A knowledge which covers only parts of the area of a given crop is misleading, because to judge for the entire unit area from local conditions alone gives a wrong basis, and the producer and others interested need a knowledge of the crop of entire area expressed as a total. Reports covering part of an area, or covering the area definitely only in parts, may be used by self-interested crop-reporting agencies to mislead. The reporting agency, in order to enable those interested as producers, consumers, or dealers to recognize the conditions in the entire crop area, must resolve all the facts into quantitative statements, preferably a single numerical statement, as of yield for the entire area, and the market must then resolve the balances between supply and demand into current prices. Only by "weighting" reports from each district—that is, by giving to each partial report only that arithmetic weight which the acreage in the area covered by the partial report demands—and assembling the whole into one statement can the crop estimator accurately report for the whole area. Such definite forms of statement have the advantage of placing the reporting agency under responsibility to attain accuracy, also of being easily interpreted by all parties, and they are capable of comparison from month to month or from year to year or with averages for the previous ten years.

The Bureau of Statistics, acting as a disinterested agency, has assumed the task of keeping the farmers, the dealers, and the users of farm products informed, and the general acceptance of its estimates in deciding prices is the only proof needed to establish the reasonable accuracy of these estimates. Its reports of conditions and its estimates, used by markets in establishing current prices, have become a necessary part of our domestic trade and our foreign business. These monthly reports serve as guides to all intermediate reports from whatever source, which, without this monthly basis, would be too local and partial to be of much value.

NECESSITY FOR CROP REPORTS.

The purposes of the Government's reports on acreage, condition, or quantity of agricultural products promised throughout the season, and on quantity and prices of farm products actually produced, may be enumerated as follows:

1. To give information to producers, consumers, and dealers of actual yields; also to report the actual conditions of promise of crops.
2. To enable market centers better to balance supply against demand in defining current prices warranted by natural conditions.
3. To insure whatever stability of prices a changing state of natural conditions allows.
4. To be so certainly authentic and so comprehensive and definite for entire crop areas that interested agencies can not well discredit nor warp the figures with their own estimates, and thus make wrong prices and unstable markets.
5. To enable producers to know the facts as to the promise of prices for their crops, that false reports may not mislead them into early sales at prices wrongly made too low.
6. To create confidence, that sales and consignments by producers may be made more freely, that dealers may more safely conduct their business with lower handling charges, and that manufacturers and other consumers may more freely purchase stocks to hold, thus adding certainty and stability to their business, that they may work on a less speculative basis, and thus bring more equitable returns from labor and expenditure to all interested.
7. To make reports so frequently and give facts so soon after changes in prospective conditions occur, or so soon after actual yields are harvested, that the least possible element of uncertainty or speculative condition may prevail to remove prices from their normal economic place.
8. To give production by localities or crop areas, and to give local market demands, so that producers may know to which market to sell and so that buyers may know where best to secure supplies, thus to equalize prices and to avoid loss from very low prices, as in case of heavy production of perishable products.

As I have said, if the Government now abandons this field it will again be immediately covered by professional estimators and the farmer who makes this cotton will again become the victim of constant overestimation of his crop.

But to return to the contention of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Government estimate is inaccurate: In all fairness, when you consider that he directs his complaint against the returns of three States and one Territory, and then finds a discrepancy of only 21,784 bales and reaches this conclusion by actually proceeding upon a false basis, you must begin to appreciate upon what flimsy ground he has to stand when he seeks to discredit the Bureau of Statistics by requiring it to make a new estimate to be issued at a date when it can be of no value.

Now, if he goes to the other nine States and the remaining Territory on the list, he can not show a single instance where there is even slight evidence of the probability of an underestimate of the crop. Why, gentlemen, in the State of Mississippi—I cite Mississippi because I have heretofore referred to it—the Government's estimate indicates a crop of 1,212,846 bales. That was the Government's estimate issued by the Bureau of Statistics on December 4. The census in the ginners' report giving the amount ginned up to December 1 showed that there had been ginned only 840,729 bales. A comparison of the two reports shows that about 400,000 bales must yet be ginned subsequent to December 1 before the Government's estimate of the crop is reached—practically one-third of the crop in that State yet to be ginned. Any man who has practical knowledge of cotton and cotton growing will tell you that there was not one-third of the cotton in the fields of Mississippi on December 1. It is true the ginning in Mississippi is much later than in other States, and this fact explains in part the divergence above pointed out; but when you consider the further fact that on December 13 the census ginners' reports showed that there had been ginned in Mississippi only 949,203 bales, and consider in connection therewith that to the same date in 1902, 1903, and 1904 there had been ginned, respectively, 78.2 per cent, 84.1 per cent, and 79.8 per cent of the total crop, you can't escape the conclusion, notwithstanding the comparison is being made between running bales and bales of 500 pounds gross weight, that the crop here is overestimated rather than underestimated.

Now, take Arkansas. According to the Government's estimate it will make this year 618,463 bales of cotton; but the ginners'

report shows that on December 1 422,813 bales have been ginned, or approximately 200,000 bales yet in the field, and on December 13 only 474,350 bales had been ginned. It is patent that this estimate is too high. The gentleman completely ignores such facts as these when he comes to present to you his contention that there has been an underestimate of the cotton crop by the Department.

The gentleman from Massachusetts attempts, in another table which he presents, to reduce the running bales as reported by the Census Bureau as having been ginned up to December 13 to equivalent 500-pound bales by using the average weight of this year's bales as reported by the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, and places the figures thus obtained in comparison with the Bureau's estimate. Now, with all due respect to the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, I direct attention to the fact that last season this same exchange, through its accomplished secretary, Mr. Henry G. Hester, computed the average gross weight of the commercial bale marketed between March 1, 1904 and March 1, 1905, at 519.87 pounds. The Census Bureau, in its final report for last year, showed the average gross weight per bale, counting round bales as half bales, to have been less than 500 pounds. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will consult Bulletin No. 19, issued by the Census Bureau under date of April 25, 1905, entitled "Quantity of Cotton Ginned in the United States," he will find, on page 10 thereof, the average gross weight per bale as estimated by the New Orleans Cotton Exchange and the average gross weight per bale, counting round bales as half bales, as actually established by the Census Bureau, the latter figures being based on reports obtained from local cotton weighers in each county. This year the New Orleans Cotton Exchange fixes the average gross weight per bale for the entire cotton belt at 519.1 pounds.

If last year's inaccuracy can be taken as a criterion, this year's estimate by the exchange is also worthless, and so this comparison by the gentleman from Massachusetts likewise utterly fails and is misleading. Again, I state that I accord the gentleman absolute honesty and sincerity of purpose in persisting in his effort to secure the adoption of his resolution, but I also believe, as I have heretofore said, that he is laboring under a misapprehension of facts. It may be that he has been blinded by self-interest, which he has so candidly confessed; it may be that the gentleman, who is one of the largest cotton spinners, has failed to provide himself with cotton to use in his mills during the coming season, believing that there was to be a twelve or thirteen million bale crop. I feel sure he was of this belief, for in the beginning of this season, while on a visit to New York, the newspapers reported that he estimated the crop at 13,000,000 bales, and this estimate of his was announced on the floor of the New York Cotton Exchange. It may be that these facts and these circumstances have blinded the gentleman so that he can not see conditions as they really are; but, gentlemen, when you consider all the facts in connection with the matter, you who have no such interests can not escape the conclusion that the estimate made by the Government on December 4 is fairly accurate, and I feel quite sure that everyone believes that it was an honest estimate. I believe that the size of the crop, as finally announced, is going to be approximately close to the estimate of the Department, and I believe that, as a whole, the ginners' reports bear it out. I will submit here the actual figures and you will find that there is a discrepancy of only a small per cent between the Government's estimate and the actual crop as it has been found to be at the end of the cotton season for the last six years.

Number of pounds of lint cotton produced in the United States (exclusive of linters), as estimated by the Department of Agriculture and as subsequently reported by the Census Bureau, for the years 1899 to 1904, inclusive.

Bureau.	1899.	1900.	1901.
Bureau of Statistics	4,329,193,000	4,856,738,000	4,529,954,000
Census Bureau	4,467,097,000	4,846,471,000	4,550,950,000
	[a] 137,904,000	[b] 10,267,000	[c] 20,996,000

Bureau.	1902.	1903.	1904.
Bureau of Statistics	5,111,870,000	4,889,796,000	6,157,064,000
Census Bureau	5,091,641,000	4,706,591,000	6,426,698,000
	[d] 20,229,000	[e] 183,205,000	[f] 269,634,000

[a] Underestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 3.1 per cent.
[b] Overestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 0.2 per cent.
[c] Underestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 0.5 per cent.
[d] Overestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 0.4 per cent.
[e] Overestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 3.9 per cent.
[f] Underestimate by Bureau of Statistics, 4.2 per cent.

You will notice how marvelously close, with the exception of last year, the estimates of the Bureau, when reduced to pounds, are to the actual number of pounds reported by the Census Bureau at the end of each season as having been produced, and even last year the report was only a trifle over 4 per cent out of the way. You will also notice that in three of the years the Bureau's figures were overestimates and that in three other years they were underestimates. The total divergence for the entire period of six years is less than 1 per cent, as has been shown by the statement heretofore made by my friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOWIE].

The gentleman from Massachusetts makes reference to an alleged statement by the former Statistician of the Department, Mr. John Hyde, as reported by the Manchester Guardian, in which he is reported to have said: "There is not the slightest doubt that the correspondents of the Department have combined to mislead, and that the actual crop will prove to be not far from 11,000,000 bales. The Department's correspondents always underestimate the crop, and this year the enormous influence of the Southern Cotton Growers' Association has been brought to bear upon them with the object of inducing them to deliberately misrepresent the actual condition." The gentleman from Massachusetts appears to think that this statement is conclusive, as he says: "Mr. Hyde is in the best position to appreciate and weigh the reports of the southern correspondents at their exact value." Now, an examination of the table which I have just presented shows that the southern correspondents do not always underestimate the crop. The estimates of the Bureau are based on the reports of the southern correspondents, and it appears that during the past six years there were three underestimates and three overestimates by the Bureau.

When Mr. Hyde severed his connection with the Department of Agriculture, on account of ill health, and went to Europe he was in a very depressed and pessimistic condition. I have reason to know that he was then imbued with the idea that a conspiracy existed throughout the entire South to mislead the Bureau and cause the public to believe that this year's crop is smaller than it actually is. He left this country with that idea in his mind, and as he has been completely out of touch since then with the current events the same ideas are probably still entertained by him; but he is utterly mistaken, and the fact that this statement purporting to come from him is issued at Manchester, England, and is published in a paper devoted to the interest of the English cotton spinners is quite significant. It clearly indicates to me that the former Statistician is identifying himself with the spinning interest and will in all probability soon enter upon the rôle of a professional cotton-crop estimator. This class always contends that the Government estimate is inaccurate, and frequently contends when the crop is short that it should be entirely abandoned.

Consider just for a moment what is the highest test one can apply to show the virtue of these estimates of the cotton crop made by the Government. The American people are the smartest, shrewdest people on earth. I do not say that with any vanity—I believe it; they are the shrewdest people in business affairs on this mundane sphere, and the fact that they accept and act on the Government's estimate of the cotton crop is high evidence to my mind that it is the estimate nearest the truth or the exact facts.

This year's estimate indicates a small crop, and the gentleman from Massachusetts complains that the report is inaccurate. If he has complained heretofore I have not heard of it, but I recall that last year when the report was being denounced from every section of the South, when it was believed by some that the crop had been overestimated more than 600,000 bales, I stood here and contended that all the producer of cotton wanted was to secure an impartial and honest estimate; if I remember correctly the gentleman and I were in accord at that time. I believe now that this is what the gentleman wishes.

I insist on believing that he is laboring under a misapprehension of facts in regard to this matter. I believe it, and accord to him absolute honesty when he says he wants this new estimate; but I believe there is no necessity for it, and not only is there no necessity for it, but it would occasion a waste of money, and, if issued, could only serve to depress the price of cotton, and hence would be a grievous wrong to millions of people who grow and are interested in the price of this great staple.

The table I have presented successfully controverts the accuracy of the gentleman's figures as to the estimates and the actual crops for the last six years; beyond that I can not go, as there are no figures prior to 1899 of the actual production similar to those issued since then by the Census Bureau. Prior to 1899 we can only compare commercial crops, which, as I

have before stated, are not at all comparable with the agricultural production.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has also spoken of the comparative profits made by the growers and manufacturers of cotton. He asserts that the producer of cotton realizes very large profits for his year's labor, but that the manufacturer of cotton, on the contrary, makes a very small per cent on his investment. This contention of his was thoroughly thrashed out the other day when his resolution was before the Committee on Agriculture for its consideration, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON], replying to this phase of the gentleman's argument, conclusively demonstrated that he was entirely mistaken. I insist now that the farmer who is engaged in growing cotton makes no such profits as the gentleman has stated, and, in fact, is one class which, until the last year or two, has had but little share in the great prosperity about which we hear so much. On the contrary, the cotton manufacturers—if trade journals are to be believed—have been enlarging their plants, increasing their output, extending their trade, and giving every evidence of a most profitable industry.

But, gentlemen, whether I am right or the gentleman from Massachusetts is right on this issue, what bearing has it on the real issue raised by the gentleman's resolution? Is the last estimate of the cotton crop by the Agricultural Department fairly accurate and should the Department be required to revise it?

The gentleman from Massachusetts presented, in substance, these same arguments in support of his resolution to the Committee on Agriculture, to which body same had been referred, and that great committee, made up of Representatives in Congress from every section of our country, after giving the gentleman a patient hearing, by a unanimous vote refused to report his resolution, which could only discredit the estimate against which the gentleman complains. I confidently believe that it has been shown that the gentleman proceeds upon an untenable basis in order to reach his conclusion that the crop has been underestimated by the Agricultural Department.

The gentleman has made specific criticism of the methods employed by the Department of Argiculture in making the crop estimate. The system and methods of gathering statistics by the Department of Agriculture are scientific, comprehensive, and consistent. They are not the product of a night, but have been perfected and evolved for forty-five years, until they have reached during the past several years the highest degree of perfection and accuracy obtainable by statistics. In this connection I beg leave to incorporate in my remarks parts of the last annual report of the Bureau of Statistics, which gives in detail these methods. This report likewise appears in the supplement to the December Crop Reporter of the Department of Agriculture and also in the body of the Secretary's report, and is thereby distributed throughout the entire United States in editions of several hundred thousands. There is every evidence on the part of the officials of this Department to show clearly and frankly the scientific methods by which they arrive at their reports:

METHODS OF CROP REPORTING.

The Bureau of Statistics issues each month detailed reports relating to agricultural conditions throughout the United States, the data upon which these statements are based being obtained through a special field service, a corps of State statistical agents, and through a very large body of voluntary correspondents composed of the following classes: County correspondents, township correspondents, individual farmers, and special cotton correspondents.

A special field service is composed of ten traveling agents, each assigned to report for a given group of States. They are especially qualified by statistical training and practical knowledge of crops. They systematically travel over the districts assigned to them, carefully note the development of each crop, and keep in close touch with best informed opinion, and render written and telegraphic reports monthly and at such other times as is required.

The State statistical agents are paid agents located in forty-three of the States. Each of these reports for his State as a unit and maintains a corps of correspondents entirely independent of those reporting directly to the Department at Washington. These State statistical aids report each month direct to the State agent on schedules furnished them. These are then tabulated and weighted according to the relative product or area of the given crop in each county represented and summarized for the use of the State agent. Then he coordinates and analyzes them in the light of his own knowledge of conditions, derived from personal observation and other sources, and prepares his monthly and other written and telegraphic reports to the Department.

There are in the United States approximately 2,700 counties of agricultural importance. In each of these counties the Department has a principal county correspondent, who maintains an organization of several assistants. These county correspondents are selected with special reference to their qualifications and constitute an efficient branch of the crop-reporting service. They make the county the geographical unit of their reports, and, after obtaining data each month from their assistants and supplementing this with information obtained from their own observation and knowledge, they report directly to the Department at Washington.

In the township and voting precincts in the United States in which farming operations are extensively carried on the Department has township correspondents, who make such township or precinct the basis of their reports, which they also send to the Bureau of Statistics each month.

Finally, at the end of the growing season, a large number of individual farmers and planters report on the results of their own individual farming operations during the year.

With regard to cotton, any information at hand is supplemented by that furnished by special cotton correspondents, embracing a large number of persons intimately concerned in the cotton industry.

SCOPE OF CROP REPORTS.

Eleven reports on the principal crops are received each year from special field agents, from county correspondents, from State statistical agents, and from township correspondents, and one report relating to the acreage and production of general crops is received during the year from individual farmers.

Six special cotton reports are received during the growing season from the special field agents, from the county correspondents, from the State statistical agents, and from township correspondents, and the first and last of these reports are supplemented by returns from individual farmers, special correspondents, and a list of cotton ginners kindly supplied this Bureau by the Census Bureau of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Special cotton schedules are sent out each month during the growing season. The May schedule deals with the acreage and condition of cotton. The June, July, and September schedules deal exclusively with the condition of cotton. The August schedule deals with the condition of cotton and the amount of old cotton on hand. The November schedule deals with the average yield per acre of cotton, the abandoned acreage, if any, and the cost of picking.

METHODS OF HANDLING REPORTS.

Just previous to the issuing of the monthly reports, the several different corps of correspondents send their reports separately and distinctly to the Department at Washington.

The reports of special field agents and State statistical agents residing at points more than 500 miles distant from Washington are sent by telegraph, in cipher, to the Secretary of Agriculture, by whom they are placed in a safe located in his private office, to which there is no access until the day on which the report is issued.

In order to prevent any possible access to reports which relate to speculative crops, and to render it absolutely impossible for premature information to be derived from them, all of the reports from the State statistical agents, as well as those of the special field agents relating thereto, are sent to the Secretary of Agriculture in specially prepared envelopes, addressed in red ink, with the letter "A" plainly marked on the ends. By an arrangement with the postal authorities, these envelopes are delivered to the Secretary of Agriculture in sealed mail pouches. These pouches are opened only by the Secretary or Assistant Secretary and the reports, with seals unbroken, immediately placed in the safe in the Secretary's office, where they remain sealed until the morning of the day on which the reports are issued, when they are delivered to the Statistician by the Secretary or the Assistant Secretary. The combination for opening the safe in which such documents are kept is known only to the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Reports from the State statistical agents and special field agents in relation to nonspeculative crops are sent in similar red, addressed envelopes, marked "B," which go to the Bureau of Statistics and are kept secured in a safe until the data contained in them are used by the Statistician in computing estimates regarding the crops to which they relate. The reports from the county correspondents, township correspondents, and other voluntary agents are sent to the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics by mail in sealed envelopes. The figures reported are transferred from the schedules to large tabulating sheets, where they are given proper arithmetical weight according to the acreage or production of the county or agricultural unit they represent. State averages are then determined and the computations verified. All these reports are tabulated in separate sections working in separate rooms, and, to guard against any individual drawing deductions from the results shown for any State or States tabulated by him, the chief of the division numbers the tabulation sheets at the top where the name of the State to which they relate appears and cuts off and omits groups of counties marked with the number, so that there is nothing to show the State to which any figures pertain. After having been worked up by different clerks in other rooms from those in which they are tabulated and partially added, they are delivered by the chief of the division to the Statistician, who assembles the sheets for final computation.

METHODS OF PREPARING REPORTS.

For the purpose of checking up the results of the several sources of information and reducing the possibility of error to a minimum, the final results are made up by a crop-reporting board composed of the Chief Statistician, or Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, as chairman, and four individual members, made up of statisticians and officials in the Bureau and members of the special field service called to Washington on report days for that purpose. Thus the plan is to select this board of four members each report day from an available corps of six or eight men well trained and thoroughly informed as to crop conditions and as to the relative value and correctness of the reports from the different corps of correspondents. This board, with several expert computers, meets on report days in the office of the Statistician, which is kept locked and no one allowed to enter or leave it. All telephones are disconnected.

After the assembling of the board, all reports by States from the several distinct corps of correspondents are brought together in convenient form in parallel columns on final tabulation slips, and the board is thus provided with several separate estimates covering the same territory and the same crops, made by the respective corps of correspondents, each reporting for a territory with which he is thoroughly familiar. There are also prepared for the board abstracts of the reports of each crop by States from the weekly Weather Crop Bulletins of the Weather Bureau issued during the month. With all these data before them, each individual member of the board computes separately his own estimate of each crop by States. These reports are then compared and discussed by the board under the supervision of the chairman, and the final figures by States are decided upon. It is interesting to remark how often the reports of the different corps of correspondents very nearly approach or equal each other, and how often the final figures arrived at by the individual members of the board agree with each other. These State estimates, which are in percentages, are then multiplied into the acreages for their respective States. The sum of these products is divided by the sum of the acreages, giving the percentage for the entire crop for the United States.

METHOD OF ISSUING REPORTS.

Reports in relation to cotton thus prepared by the crop-reporting board are issued on the 3d of each month during the growing season,

and reports relating to the principal farm crops and live stock are prepared and made public on the 10th day of each month. In order that the information contained in these reports may be made available simultaneously throughout the entire United States, and that one part of the country may not have the advantage over another, they are simultaneously handed, at a given hour, as at 12 o'clock noon or at 4 o'clock p. m. on report days, to all applicants and to the Western Union Telegraph Company and the Postal Telegraph-Cable Company for transmission to the exchanges and to the press. These companies have reserved their lines at the designated time, and by use of a "flash" forward immediately the figures of most interest. A mimeograph statement also containing such estimates of condition or actual production, together with the corresponding estimates of former years, for comparative purposes, is prepared and sent to a mailing list of exchanges, newspaper publications, and individuals. The same afternoon, printed cards containing the essential facts concerning the most important crops of the report are mailed to the 77,000 post-offices throughout the United States for public display, thus placing the most available information within the farmers' immediate reach.

Promptly after the issuing of the report, it, together with other statistical information of value to the farmer and the country at large, is published in the Crop Reporter, an eight-page publication of the Bureau of Statistics, under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture. An edition of over 100,000 of this Reporter is distributed to the correspondents and other interested parties throughout the United States each month.

WORK OF THE YEAR—CHANGE IN METHODS.

A crop-reporting board, composed of a chairman and four members, as noted above, has been appointed, with entire jurisdiction over all crop reports and estimates made by the Bureau.

Thus when the final results obtained from the several corps of correspondents are assembled on report days, the Department's figures are determined by employing the judgment of several experts instead of a single individual. This has been generally accepted as a marked improvement in the crop service. The Weather Crop Bulletins of the Weather Bureau are also used by the Bureau in the preparation of its estimates.

In order to render doubly secure and secret the confidential information contained in the monthly crop reports, stringent orders governing their preparation have been promulgated and are strictly observed governing the "Methods of preparing reports," referred to earlier in this report.

A very great improvement has been made in the special field service, by districting the United States and assigning each of the respective field agents to a definite group of States, which they thoroughly travel over and report on each month. The cotton-producing States have thus been redistricted and the service augmented and perfected there by the appointment of two new agents.

Mr. Chairman, the manufacturing centers of foreign countries and the United States are dependent upon us for their raw product—cotton. To meet these great demands at home and abroad is the mission of the American cotton planter. The manufacturer, the merchant, the factory operative at home and abroad, to as great an extent as the cotton planter, should be deeply interested in monthly reports of the condition and progress of a product upon which all these classes are dependent. Census methods gather statistical information slowly. At no time does it make an estimate of the crop, and its final report, giving size of the crop, is not issued until the ginning season is closed. In the meantime the important crop has been picked, ginned, and marketed; and if the Government should abandon the work being done by the Bureau of Statistics of the Agricultural Department the producer of cotton would have no information as to the size of the crop except what certain interests obtain and publish through agencies in which the farmer and public are not regarded as being concerned. All interests, therefore, demand that the true condition of the cotton crop should be made known promptly, to the end that the farmer may get a fair and honest price for his product and harmful speculation may be discouraged. To remedy these evils and to protect these interests, Congress, away back in 1862, provided for the issuing of monthly crop reports, and to-day this developed and perfected crop-reporting agency in the Department of Agriculture stands as a bulwark against the domination of speculators in this country and abroad and as a protection to the cotton planter of the South and allied industries.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, of course the gentleman from New York does not know what a severe blow he has struck the country [applause and laughter] in refusing me permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I did desire briefly, but I can not do it now, to state the reasons for the vote I shall give on this matter, for I am advised that if a new Member approaches a subject with becoming modesty he may, without subjecting himself to the charge of undue forwardness, explain briefly the reasons that impel him to vote on an important matter that is discussed in his district as in all other districts. I did desire to state the reasons that would impel me to vote upon the particular matter of where that portion of the President's message relating to the insurance question should be referred.

I understand that the amendment which is to be proposed to the amendment will take the form of referring that part of the President's message touching insurance to the Judiciary Committee, with the request that that committee make a report to the House whether, in their opinion, the Congress has constitutional rights or legal rights to extend national jurisdiction over this particular business, and, if so, along what lines it may move. I shall vote for that amendment to the resolution, because, first, Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to believe that the language of the message itself submits to this House a question purely legal in character, which (although I confess to a very limited understanding of the rules and the precedents here in the House) would, according to what I do understand of them, necessarily carry it to the committee of this House which has to pass upon legal questions as its primary function. I shall vote for it in the next place, Mr. Chairman, because I believe from a legal and constitutional standpoint this body has no right to extend its legislative power over this particular business, and that to do so would be an interference with the authority, the power, and function of the States, and I should like to have the mature opinion of the able lawyers on the Judiciary Committee as to that. Or, Mr. Chairman, even if I be mistaken as to that, there is at least a prima facie case against the extension of the authority of the United States—that is to say, if the decisions of the Supreme Court themselves constitute prima facie evidence that that is the law which they say is the law. I know, of course, that there are gentlemen who concur with the boy who, when he was being examined for his law license, and was asked the broad question, "What is law?" replied, "It is the last guess of the Supreme Court;" but as a general proposition, Mr. Chairman, I think the Congress of the United States has been rather inclined to adopt the doctrine of stare decisis, and, to say the least of it, the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States that insurance is not interstate commerce would be a prima facie case against legislation enacted here to control it as such, and it would result in uncertainty and in doubt as to what particular authority should exercise its control over the corporations, societies, or organizations engaged in the insurance business, and, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is peculiarly a business which should be under the exclusive operation of either one power or the other.

I believe that if there be a division of authority it will result in one power standing and waiting for the other power to act, or it will result in a contest between the two powers, and from that contest or from that fight the insurance companies themselves will be the only ones who will derive benefit. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it will be a case of refusing or evading the question, or else it will be as a case of quarreling between two teachers as to who shall whip a boy, and while they are quarreling the boy will leave and go about his business. I vote for it, therefore, Mr. Chairman, because, prima facie at least, the legal phase, if nothing more, is against us, and I believe that while the issues were being made up to try the lawsuits to determine whether this body had power the question, if left to the States themselves, would be settled. Of course what I am saying does not apply to any bills touching the right of Federal control here in the District of Columbia and in the Territories, for only Congress can control in these; but in so far as interstate control is concerned, it is believed that the most effective way that this body can deal with that proposition, that the method which will bring the best results, the method which will bring the quickest action, will be to give a clear-cut, ringing, decisive "no" to the question of whether we shall interfere with the control that may, without legal doubt, be exercised by the States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I again renew my request that I be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I think we will deal out equal and exact justice, so I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. GILLESPIE. I will yield to the gentleman as much time as the gentleman needs to conclude his remarks.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York to make the motion that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Texas that the gentleman from New York moved that the committee rise, which takes precedence over the offer of the gentleman to yield part of his time, the gentleman not having the floor at the time he made the offer.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUTLER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House resolution 42, and had come to no resolution thereon.

COUNCIL CITY AND SOLOMON RIVER RAILROAD.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who objected to the consideration of House bill No. 99, now withdraws his objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The bill has been already reported.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; and it was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LLOYD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Thursday, December 21, 1905, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for the support of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Southern Branch—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for protection of American seamen and for consul at Lisbon, Portugal—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the construction of an Army general hospital at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending a deficiency appropriation for construction of a vault in the courthouse and post-office building, New York, N. Y.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of awards made by the Spanish Treaty Claims Commission—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill to authorize trustees appointed under town-site laws to administer oaths—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill for the relief of certain receivers of public moneys—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill to authorize receivers of public moneys for land districts to deposit certain sums with the Treasurer of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill for the relief of persons who have executed conveyances of land to the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill relating to fulfillment of contracts relet by the Government—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill directing in certain contingencies a refund to receivers of public moneys—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, a draft of a bill for the disposal of abandoned naval reservations—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an appropriation in excess of the limit of cost for the post-office building at Atlantic City, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 9715) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the compulsory attendance of witnesses before registers and receivers of the Land Office"—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9716) to amend section 5491 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Commtitee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9717) to repeal section 2306 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9718) to empower officers, clerks, inspectors, agents, and employees of the United States to administer oaths, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9719) for the relief of certain entrymen and settlers within the limits of the Northern Pacific Railway land grant—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9720) to punish persons who fraudulently obtain, or attempt to obtain, title to public lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9721) to amend section 5481 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 9722) locating the outlet for the sewerage-disposal system—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 9723) authorizing the extension of W and Adams streets NW.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 9724) to organize a national reserve of marksmen and to encourage rifle practice and excellence in marksmanship among citizens of the United States, so as to render them quickly available for efficient service in time of war—to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9725) to establish a fish-culture station at Trout Springs, Gallinas Canyon, San Miguel County, N. Mex.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 9726) to prescribe the salaries of Cabinet officials—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 9727) to enlarge and make additions to the public building at Wausau, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 9728) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make experiments and investigations to determine the best methods of utilizing in irrigation limited water supplies in connection with "dry farming" in the semiarid regions of the United States, and to make appropriations therefor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 9729) to provide for the control, administration, and support of the public schools of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9730) to determine and regulate the salaries of the officers, teachers, and other employees of the board of education for the public schools of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GILLETT of California (by request): A bill (H. R. 9731) to authorize the transfer to an adjoining district of causes in which the judge for the district in which such causes are pending is disqualified, or in which a fair trial can not be had in such district—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 9732) to repeal an act entitled "An act to carry into effect a convention between the United States and the Republic of Cuba, signed on the 11th day of December, 1902"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 9733) to divide the judicial district of Maryland into two judicial districts, to be known as the eastern and western districts of Maryland, to provide for the time of the holding of the courts, and to provide for officers of the court, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 9734) to authorize the Baltimore and Washington Transit Company, of Maryland, to extend its street railway in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9735) to relieve from taxation coal imported from foreign countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 9736) to amend section 1

of chapter 538 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 9737) to reorganize the corps of dental surgeons attached to the Medical Department of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 9738) to amend the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9739) governing deposits by the Secretary of the Treasury with national and State banks, and requiring payment of interest on said deposits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9740) to prevent and punish overissue of stock by combinations, consolidated companies, or trusts engaged in interstate commerce—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9741) fixing a date for the assembling of the Congress of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 9742) providing for the retirement of noncommissioned officers, petty officers, and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9743) amending an act entitled "An act fixing the fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts in certain States and Territories"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: A bill (H. R. 9744) to amend sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act to determine the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of the United States and to regulate the removal of causes from State courts, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1887, as amended by an act approved August 13, 1888—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9745) to increase the pension of certain officers and enlisted men entitled to a pension under the provisions of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890, and acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9746) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to require use of some form of rail fasteners or other contrivance to prevent spreading of rails—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9747) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make experiments in irrigation in the semiarid regions of the State of Texas, and to make appropriations therefor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 9748) to provide for the further purification of the water supply of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 9749) to amend section 648 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9750) appropriating the sum of $50,000 for locking and damming and otherwise improving Richland River between Dayton, Tenn., and where it empties into the Tennessee River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9751) for the improvement of Cumberland River, in the State of Tennessee, above Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9752) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON: A bill (H. R. 9753) to regulate the hours of work of first and second-class clerks in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9754) to provide for the classification of the salaries of clerks employed in post-offices of the first and second classes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 9755) to promote the efficiency of the clerical service in the Navy of the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9756) to provide souvenir medallions for the Zebulon Pike Memorial Association—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 9757) to amend paragraph 34 of section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JENKINS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 55) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the commencement and termination of Congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 56) to amend the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved February 3, 1905—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A resolution (H. Res. 116) requesting information concerning limitations upon rights of free speech in the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 117) requesting information from the Attorney-General concerning criminal prosecutions of persons adjudged by courts guilty of violation of law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A resolution (H. Res. 118) asking the Secretary of the Interior to submit to the House of Representatives reports, records, and correspondence in case of the abolishment of the Kingfisher (Okla.) land office and his reasons for failure to remove the officers, register and receiver—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A resolution (H. Res. 119) condemning the Lovering joint resolution for an extra cotton report and requesting the Committee on Agriculture to report the same adversely—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Utah, favoring national aid in road construction—to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 9758) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Joseph R. Ricker—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9759) for the relief of W. A. Walker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9760) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Coan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9761) granting an increase of pension to George H. Hutchison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9762) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Reel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9763) granting an increase of pension to Sebastian Maxsam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9764) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Eckel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9765) granting an increase of pension to J. C. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9766) to authorize the payment of $5,000 to the widow of the late Tranquilino Luna in full for his contest expenses in the contested-election case of Manzanares against Luna—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 9767) granting a pension to William J. Crane—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 9768) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Stacy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9769) granting an increase of pension to William D. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9770) granting a pension to Mary Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9771) granting a pension to George A. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9772) granting an increase of pension to Michael Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9773) for the relief of the personal representatives of John McCabe and Patrick McCabe, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9774) granting a pension to Delia White—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9775) granting a pension to Charles Dougherty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9776) for the removal of the charge of desertion against James Dolin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9777) granting a pension to Annie Valerie Stockton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9778) for the relief of Philip Loney—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 9779) granting a pension to Dominico Ghio—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 9780) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Ellen C. Taft—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 9781) granting an increase of pension to J. F. Curtis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9782) granting an increase of pension to Francis T. Skinner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9783) granting an increase of pension to David P. Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9784) for the relief of Nelson Dalbec—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 9785) granting an increase of pension to William A. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9786) for the relief of W. W. Elam, of Overton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 9787) granting a pension to Alice Hill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9788) granting a pension to William W. Garvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9789) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Nichelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9790) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Jett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9791) granting an increase of pension to Amelia E. Grimsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9792) granting an increase of pension to William Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9793) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 9794) granting a pension to John A. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 9795) granting a pension to Emory E. Patch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 9796) granting an increase of pension to Lurancy E. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 9797) granting a pension to James H. Seward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9798) granting an increase of pension to Philo N. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9799) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9800) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Bashaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9801) granting an increase of pension to Edward Farris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9802) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9803) granting an increase of pension to Frances J. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9804) granting an increase of pension to Baron Blanchard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9805) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Vest—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9806) granting an increase of pension to Charles Finch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9807) to correct the military record of Andrew Martin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9808) granting an increase of pension to John A. McNerney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9809) granting an increase of pension to David Roney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 9810) for the relief of Benjamin F. Osborn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9811) for the relief of James M. Mock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9812) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Newbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9813) granting a pension to Hariet P. Sanders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9814) granting an increase of pension to Elihu Wheeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 9815) granting a pension to Alice B. Hartshorne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9816) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Spanogle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 9817) for the relief of James Piles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9818) for the relief of James M. Cook—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9819) for the relief of James Brock—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9820) for the relief of Francis Denham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9821) for the relief of Elijah Crabtree—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9822) for the relief of James T. Warden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9823) for the relief of Fletcher H. White—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9824) for the relief of James Marlow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9825) granting a pension to Henry Rutheford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9826) granting an increase of pension to Perry T. Pollard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9827) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Willis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9828) granting an increase of pension to John Broughton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9829) granting an increase of pension to William J. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9830) granting an increase of pension to Malissa Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9831) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hadley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9832) granting an increase of pension to Alexander D. Polston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9833) granting an increase of pension to James C. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9834) granting an increase of pension to John Hicks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9835) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Ashinhurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9836) granting an increase of pension to Dyer Collett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9837) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9838) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Fergerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9839) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Siler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9840) granting an increase of pension to George W. Dickerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9841) to correct the military record of James H. Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9842) granting an increase of pension to Herman F. W. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9843) granting an increase of pension to William G. F. Schneider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9844) granting an increase of pension to John J. Erick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9845) granting an increase of pension to Bryant L. Wakelee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 9846) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Hoagland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 9847) granting a pension to George W. Hartman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9848) granting an increase of pension to George Laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9849) granting an increase of pension to Isaac McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9850) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9851) granting an increase of pension to William G. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9852) granting an increase of pension to William Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9853) granting an increase of pension to Gibson C. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9854) granting an increase of pension to Erastus A. Doe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9855) granting a pension to Alexander Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9856) granting an increase of pension to Kate O'Donnell Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9857) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Douglas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9858) granting an increase of pension to Sanford Morse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9859) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus F. Van Niman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9860) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Hirst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9861) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Arthur—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9862) granting an increase of pension to William B. Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9863) granting an increase of pension to Nehemiah Lounsbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILL: A bill (H. R. 9864) for the relief of Julia Nolan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9865) for the relief of William H. Collins—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9866) for the relief of Frank A. R. George—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9867) granting a pension to William Bieber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9868) granting a pension to John Tweedall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9869) granting a pension to William Eddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9870) granting a pension to Mary E. Spence—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9871) granting a pension to Andrew J. Church—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9872) granting an increase of pension to Betsy Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9873) granting an increase of pension to George Evatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9874) granting an increase of pension to John T. A. Galloway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9875) granting an increase of pension to John R. Onion—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9876) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Mallalieu—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 9877) for the relief of James P. Barney—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9878) granting a pension to Mary E. Paugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 9879) for the relief of the heirs at law of Capt. John Lewis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9880) granting a pension to Emeline K. Wright—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 9881) granting an increase of pension to William Crisp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9882) granting an increase of pension to Joel H. Mastin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9883) for the relief of Fred M. Yale—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 9884) for the relief of John S. Burt, administrator of Mrs. Susan Burt—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 9885) for the relief of John R. Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 9886) granting an increase of pension to William H. Swadner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 9887) granting a pension to George Saxe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9888) granting a pension to Abigail Townsend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 9889) granting an increase of pension to Jacob J. Boyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9890) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus A. Hesse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLEPPER: A bill (H. R. 9891) to remove the charge of desertion from military record of Pernett T. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 9892) to correct the military record of Lyman W. Wentworth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9893) for the relief of Andrew Barr—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 9894) for the relief of the estate of Edward C. Lewis—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 9895) granting an increase of pension to Stephen L. Eggert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 9896) granting an increase of pension to William McKenzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: A bill (H. R. 9897) granting a pension to Charles F. Dunn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9898) granting a pension to Abraham H. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9899) granting a pension to Almira Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9900) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hinckley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9901) granting a pension to Edwin R. Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9902) granting a pension to Amelia Noell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9903) granting a pension to Mary E. Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9904) granting an increase of pension to Neeta H. Marquis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9905) granting an increase of pension to John W. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9906) granting an increase of pension to Hinman Rhodes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9907) granting an increase of pension to Ashley A. Youmans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9908) granting an increase of pension to Horace A. Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9909) granting an increase of pension to John A. Lennon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9910) granting an increase of pension to John McCoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9911) to correct the military record of Henry S. Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9912) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Julius Bosley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9913) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Andrew A. St. John—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9914) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles R. Stevens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9915) for the relief of Margaret Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 9916) granting a pension to Samuel C. Sargeant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 9917) granting an increase of pension to Orlando Dieffenbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHALEK: A bill (H. R. 9918) granting an increase of pension to James Rozporka—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 9919) for the relief of Charles R. Hooper—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 9920) for the relief of the heirs of Jabez Tanner, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 9921) granting a pension to Ann Lytle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9922) granting a pension to Mary A. Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9923) granting a pension to Joseph J. Mishler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9924) granting a pension to Carrie A. Conley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 9925) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9926) for the relief of the heirs of the estate of Melissa Gathright, deceased, of Colbert County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 9927) for the relief of Thomas J. Sweeney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9928) for the relief of Charles Sorrell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 9929) granting an increase of pension to Orlean De Witt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9930) for the relief of Recknagle & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 9931) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Espy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9932) granting an increase of pension to John E. Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 9933) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Whitaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9934) granting a pension to Lucy M. Edgerly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9935) granting a pension to Isabel Seaman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9936) granting an increase of pension to Emily H. Gardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9937) granting an increase of pension to Adam Nixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9938) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Seaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9939) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Macnamara—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9940) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Niles Dickerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 9941) to place David Robertson, sergeant, first class, Hospital Corps, on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9942) granting a pension to Lisetta M. Vogt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9943) granting a pension to Elizabeth Saunders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9944) granting a pension to Thomas J. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9945) granting an increase of pension to William W. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9946) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Elder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9947) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Story—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9948) granting an increase of pension to James E. Winegardner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9949) granting an increase of pension to Rolland Nease—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9950) granting an increase of pension to George W. Recob—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9951) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9952) to remove the charge of desertion against Albert Stratton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9953) to correct the military record of Philip Reiss—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9954) granting an honorable discharge to James A. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9955) granting a pension to James W. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9956) granting a pension to Reid Cloud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 9957) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9958) granting a pension to Catharine O'Neil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9959) granting an increase of pension to James Kaime—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9960) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Sorrell, alias Thomas A. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Missouri and Southern Illinois Branch of the German-American National Alliance, for a liberal reciprocity treaty with Germany—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of United Presbyterian Church of East Brook and Shenango, Pa., for a constitutional amendment abolishing polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey: Petition of 60,000 Alaskan residents, for representation in Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BATES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William J. Crane—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Erie, Pa., favoring preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Charles Ziegler, of Erie, Pa., against reducing the tariff on Philippine tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWIE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Dominico Gliso—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELL: Petition of 63 retail grocers and 10 merchants in Chicago, against any tax on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Frank E. Bader, of Phoenixville, Pa., favoring repeal of tax on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Henry Ottey, of Westchester, Pa., and Kenhawa Council, No. 248, Junior Order United American Mechanics, Westchester, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Papers accompanying bill (H. R. 6011) for a public building at Red Wing, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Stoneware Potters' Union, No. 8302, of Red Wing, Minn., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William McNair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Electa E. Brooks—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the Indian Territory Press Association, favoring joint statehood for Indian Territory and Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of 60,000 Americans of Alaska, for representation in Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of the Merrit & Chapman Derrick Company relative to the steamers *Marie* and *Success* (bill H. R. 7014)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, for an appropriation to improve the harbor of said city—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Fred M. Yale—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEIFER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Swadner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KITCHIN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George Saxe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: Petition of H. Seh & Co., of Allentown, Pa., against the tax on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew Barr—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Lyman W. Wentworth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., for an appropriation to remove hidden rocks in the bay of said city—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, Cal., favoring reforms in the Bureau of Immigration in enforcing the Chinese-exclusion laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert M. Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Stephen L. Eggert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah C. Bryan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William McKenzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDOX: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ezekiel Harris—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAHON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Orlando Dieffenbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: Petition of Samuel R. Shipley and many others, of Philadelphia, Pa., against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of Washington Camp, No. 359, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Tacony, Philadelphia, Pa.; Carpenters' Union No. 227, and Alex H. Frankenberger and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the National Encampment

of the Grand Army of the Republic at Boston, Mass., 1904, for establishment of a National Soldiers' Home at Yountville, Napa County, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, for appropriation to improve harbor of said city—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Associated Charities of San Joaquin County, Cal., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, Cal., favoring steps taken by the President to relieve the tension caused by the harsh treatment of privileged classes from China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the California Fruit Growers' Association, of Los Angeles; Ontario Cucamonga Fruit Exchange and San Antonio Fruit Exchange, favoring the President's policy as to control of railway freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Woodland (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce and the Stockton Grocers' Protective Association, against control of railway rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Winters (Cal.) Board of Trade, for control of railway rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Los Angeles Division, No. 111, Order of Railway Conductors, against control of rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Orange Grove Lodge, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, against control of railway rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Transportation Club, of San Francisco, against the Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Francisco Division, No. 53, Order of Railway Trainmen, against control of railway rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, against any change in the present Chinese-exclusion laws—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Red Bluff, Cal., against diversion of water of Sacramento River for irrigation purposes—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of directors of the Upland Citrus Association, favoring President's ideas relative to railway rate control—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of American members of the Educational Association of China, against harsh treatment of Chinese students desiring to study in America—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Merchants' Exchange, for agreement with the Chinese Government to relieve American goods of the present boycott—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, for a treaty with German Empire favorable to trade relations—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of 300 citizens of Sharon, Pa., against sale of liquor in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of 300 citizens of Sharon, Pa., for a law to protect no-license territory from the original-package cases—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of 300 citizens of Sharon, Pa., for a law to protect citizens of Oklahoma from the sale of liquors for twenty-one years—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 144, of New York, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Petition of the Choctaw-Gordon Game Preserve, of Paris, Tex., relative to Choctaw Indian lands—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the United Confederate Veterans of New Orleans, La., favoring bill to provide for the graves of Confederate soldiers who died in northern prisons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Local Union No. 446, Cigar Makers' International Union of America, of Norristown, Pa., against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ried Cloud—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 21, 1905.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. TELLER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

SENATOR FROM OREGON.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, I desire at this time to present the credentials of my colleague from Oregon, appointed by the governor of that State to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of the late Senator Mitchell.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be received and read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read the credentials, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
Executive Department:

SALEM, *December 13, 1905.*

The Governor of Oregon to John M. Gearin,
of the City of Portland, State of Oregon:

Whereas on the 8th day of December, 1905, the seat of the Hon. John H. Mitchell, one of the Senators of the United States from the State of Oregon, became vacant by reason of his death; and

Whereas there has been no session of the legisiture of this State at which such vacancy could be filled by the election of a Senator to succeed the said John H. Mitchell; and

Whereas it is of vital importance to the interests of the State and nation that such vacancy be filled:

Now, therefore, be it known that, reposing special trust and confidence in the capacity, integrity, and fidelity of John M. Gearin, a citizen of the State of Oregon, I, George E. Chamberlain, governor of the State of Oregon, do in the name and by the authority of said State, by these presents appoint and commission him, the said John M. Gearin, to be a United States Senator to fill the place made vacant by the death of the said John H. Mitchell and to occupy the same until a successor shall be duly elected.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State to be affixed, at the city of Salem, on this 13th day of December, 1905.

GEO. E. CHAMBERLAIN, *Governor.*

By the governor:
[SEAL.] F. I. DUNBAR, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator that the certificate, as I understood from its reading at the desk, is defective in that it provides that Mr. Gearin is appointed until his successor is elected. The governor has no power to make such an appointment. I will examine the certificate, however, and confer with the Senator. It can be very easily corrected, but I think as it stands it is fatally defective.

Mr. FULTON. Is there objection to my colleague being sworn in at this time?

Mr. BURROWS. I did not know that Mr. Gearin is present. I think under the circumstances I should object to the oath of office being administered because of the defect in the certificate. A certificate appointing a person a Senator until his successor is elected seems to me to be defective.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. I am very clearly of the opinion, in concurrence with the Senator from Michigan, that the last clause of this commission, "and to occupy the same until a successor shall be duly elected," is in excess of constitutional authority. It is, however, mere surplusage, for the Constitution provides how long a Senator appointed by the governor to fill a vacancy may hold the appointment. If the appointment in itself to fill a vacancy is complete and in accordance with the constitutional provision, whatever is added going to the duration of the term is utterly unnecessary, and if in violation of it is a mere matter of surplusage, not going to the validity, it seems to me, of the appointment.

We have had, I think, a similar case within my recollection. There was a vacancy—that is not disputed—occasioned by the death of Senator Mitchell, which is sought in this appointment to be filled. It is recited that the vacancy happened in a vacation, while the legislature was not in session, and the governor says:

> Now, therefore, be it known that, reposing special trust and confidence in the capacity, integrity, and fidelity of John M. Gearin, a citizen of the State of Oregon, I, George E. Chamberlain, governor of the State of Oregon, do, in the name and by the authority of said State, by these presents appoint and commission him, the said John M. Gearin, to be a United States Senator to fill the place made vacant by the death of the said John H. Mitchell.

If the last clause, following that I have just read, were omitted, that, I submit to the Senator from Michigan, is a complete and valid evidence of the appointment of Mr. Gearin by the governor of Oregon, and I think that the Senate ought to disregard entirely the unnecessary and altogether impotent

words which occur at the end of the commission. I make that suggestion to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I only desired to call the attention of the Senate to the defect in the certificate. Of course that portion of the certificate which declares that Mr. Gearin is appointed to fill the vacancy until his successor is elected may be regarded as surplusage, if the certificate in other particulars clearly shows that the executive of the State had the power to make the appointment.

The certificate is defective in another particular. The governor says that he appoints the person named to "fill the vacancy." He has no power to do that. The Constitution provides that the executive of the State, in such a case as the present, "may make a temporary appointment until the next meeting of the legislaure, which shall then fill the vacancy." But I do not care to be hypercritical about it at all. I simply call the attention of the Senate to the defects in the certificate.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator does not make an objection?

Mr. BURROWS. Oh, no; I shall make no objection. I only desired to call the attention of the Senate to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. TELLER. I can not give the exact date, but the Senate heretofore passed on just such a case as this, and the Senator appointed was sworn in. I suggest that the newly appointed Senator from Oregon be sworn.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator appointed from Oregon will present himself at the Vice-President's desk and take the oath prescribed by law.

Mr. Gearin was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. FULTON; and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

CONVEYANCES OF PUBLIC LANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, inclosing a draft of a bill for the relief of persons who have executed conveyances of lands to the United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

REFUND TO RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, inclosing a draft of a bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury, in certain contingencies, to refund to receivers of public moneys acting as special disbursing agents amounts paid by them out of their private funds; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

FULFILLMENT OF RELET CONTRACTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, inclosing a draft of a bill to provide for the fulfillment of contracts relet by the Government; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office inclosing a draft of a bill for the relief of receivers of public moneys acting as special disbursing agents in the matter of amounts expended by them, contingent expenses, expenses of depositing public moneys, and expenses of hearings in land entries; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a lettter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office inclosing a draft of a bill to authorize trustees appointed under the townsite laws to administer oaths, and for other purposes; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

DEPOSIT OF UNEARNED FEES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office inclosing a draft of a bill to authorize the receivers of public moneys for land districts to deposit with the Treasurer of the United States certain sums embraced in their accounts of unearned fees and official moneys; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

ABANDONED NAVAL RESERVATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of the General Land Office inclosing a draft of a bill to provide for the disposal of abandoned and useless naval reservations; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 99) to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 480) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of the mayor, counselor, and aldermen of Annapolis, Md., praying that the U. S. frigate *Constitution*, commonly known as "Old Ironsides," may be preserved, repaired, and sent to the Naval Academy at Annapolis; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash.; of the Receivers and Shippers' Association of Dayton, Ohio, and of the Fruit Exchange of San Bernardino, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Anti-Saloon League, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the California Water and Forest Association, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal that section of the law which exempts the State of California from the system of advertis the forest-reserve timber sales; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the California Water and Forest Association, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish game refuges and breeding grounds within national forest reserves; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. DICK presented a petition of 295 citizens of Fremont, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side by the diversion of the water for manufacturing purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a memorial of the Importers and Wholesale Grocers' Association of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation imposing a duty on tea and coffee; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Whetstone Lodge, No. 3, International Association of Machinists, of Galion, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the German-American Alliance, of St. Paul, Wis., praying for the ratification of a fair and just commercial treaty with the German Empire; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle

of Pines treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SCOTT presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 1320) for the relief of Jessie W. Graham, sole heir of Jesse Graham, deceased; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of the common council of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the closing of the fair weather opening or gap in the Government pier at that city; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BURKETT presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hardy, Nebr., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against the Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the Rhode Island State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, praying for the enactment of legislation for the extermination of the gypsy moth and brown-tail moth, and also that increased appropriation be made for the maintenance of agricultural experiment stations; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ANKENY presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the issuance of railway stock; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 951) to grant to the State of Minnesota certain vacant lands in said State for forestry purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 91) granting leaves of absence to homesteaders on lands to be irrigated under the provisions of the act of June 17, 1902, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands; which was agreed to.

NORA E. SNEDDON.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. SPOONER, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Nora E. Sneddon, widow of John Sneddon, late a messenger of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EMPLOYMENT OF MESSENGERS FOR COMMITTEES.

Mr. KEAN. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], to report it favorably, in order to do away with discrimination. I report the resolution without amendment, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. HEYBURN. I understand from the Senator that this covers all the committees that have not messengers.

Mr. KEAN. I believe it does, with one more that I am about to report. It covers every Senator, I believe, who had no messenger or other patronage.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho object to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not object to the resolution. I asked the question for information.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON], to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on National Banks be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, after the words "Select Committee on National Banks," I move to add the words, "and all other committees of the Senate not now provided with messengers."

Mr. LODGE. That is right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2382) directing the issue of a check in lieu of a lost check drawn by the superintendent of the United States mint at Denver, Colo., in favor of the United States Reduction and Refining Company; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2383) to amend paragraph 34 of section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2384) for the relief of the estate of F. Z. Tucker, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2385) for the payment of Robert D. Benedict for services rendered (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 2386) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in buildings, ships, navy-yards, and parks and other premises owned or controlled by the United States Government; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2387) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Smith; and

A bill (S. 2388) granting an increase of pension to John Leary.

Mr. ALGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2389) granting a pension to Catherine S. Lacy;

A bill (S. 2390) granting a pension to Eunice G. Wickware;

A bill (S. 2391) granting a pension to Mary E. Kilbourne; and

A bill (S. 2392) granting a pension to Jennie S. Ostler.

Mr. MILLARD introduced a bill (S. 2393) granting an increase of pension to John L. Clark; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 2394) granting an increase of pension to John A. J. Taylor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 2395) granting an increase of pension to Leonidas E. Mills; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2396) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 2397) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota,' approved January 14, 1889," so as to create a State forest reserve, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HEYBURN. I introduce a bill, which I ask to be read once and lie on the table.

The bill (S. 2398) to create the National Board of Corporations and to provide for the regulation thereby of corporations engaged in interstate, Territorial, District, or insular possession business was read the first time by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DICK (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2399) for the relief of George F. Ormsby; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2400) to correct the naval record of Peter H. Brodie, alias Patrick Torbett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2401) to amend sections 4924, 4925, 4926, and 4927 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to patents; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2402) granting a pension to Liddia Pierce;

A bill (S. 2403) granting a pension to Orpha A. Blake;

A bill (S. 2404) granting a pension to James Phelps;

A bill (S. 2405) granting an increase of pension to John P. Winget;

A bill (S. 2406) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Milliman;

A bill (S. 2407) granting an increase of pension to Ven Druth Washburn;

A bill (S. 2408) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Schroder;

A bill (S. 2409) granting an increase of pension to William R. Partridge;

A bill (S. 2410) granting an increase of pension to James H. Dickson;

A bill (S. 2411) granting an increase of pension to Carrie B. Findley;

A bill (S. 2412) granting an increase of pension to John W. Armitage;

A bill (S. 2413) granting an increase of pension to Curtis Griffin;

A bill (S. 2414) granting an increase of pension to Newberry W. Wheeler; and

A bill (S. 2415) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Ida Edgerton.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 2416) to refund certain excess duties paid upon importations of absinthe and kirschwasser from Switzerland between June 1, 1898, and December 5, 1898; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2417) for the relief of Recknagel & Co; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 2418) to enable the Indians allotted lands in severalty within the boundaries of drainage district No. 1, in Richardson County, Nebr., to protect their lands from overflow, and for the segregation of such of said Indians from their tribal relations as may be expedient, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 2419) to provide for the construction and operation of a deep waterway between the cities of Chicago, Ill., and St. Louis, Mo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 2420) for the relief of Eleonora G. Goldsborough; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2421) granting an increase of pension to Herrick Hodges; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 2422) for the relief of the estate of George F. Lee, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2423) granting an increase of pension to David A. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HEMENWAY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2424) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Wood;

A bill (S. 2425) granting an increase of pension to John A. Seiss;

A bill (S. 2426) granting an increase of pension to Alexander C. Sloan;

A bill (S. 2427) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Carpenter;

A bill (S. 2428) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brady;

A bill (S. 2429) granting an increase of pension to James Devor;

A bill (S. 2430) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Fraze;

A bill (S. 2431) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester C. Peters; and

A bill (S. 2432) granting an increase of pension to Amos Martin.

COUNCIL CITY AND SOLOMON RIVER RAILROAD COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives and calls the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] to it.

The bill (H. R. 99) to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company was read the first time by its title.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, that bill being in the nature of an emergency measure should be passed at once in order to do any good at all. I ask for its present consideration.

The facts in the case are substantially these. There is a railroad being constructed from a point on Solomon River up on the eastern portion of Seward Peninsula, in Alaska. Seward Peninsula is the peninsula where Nome is situated. There is a law requiring all railroads in Alaska to pay a tax of $100 a mile. Last year Congress, in order to promote the building of this railroad in that difficult and inclement country, relieved the company of the tax upon the condition that they would complete 20 miles within a year. The railroad company have already completed 18½ miles, and they were unable to go any farther because of the early advent of frost and cold weather and the difficulty of getting in the materials. Their time expires the 31st of this month, and in order that they may not suffer any hardship the bill is simply to give them an extension of one year within which to complete it.

Seward Peninsula is the bleakest part of Alaska. There is no timber, and everything in the way of material and supplies has to be imported there for the construction of the railroad. The company are building a standard-gauge railroad wholly with their own means. They are not peddling stock anywhere. I think they are entitled to this encouragement. If we are to give them this relief, the bill ought to pass now, because the time will be out on the 31st of this month. The bill simply extends the time one year.

Mr. GORMAN. Let the bill be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill was read the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time of the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company to comply with the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of chapter 299 of the laws of the United States, entitled "An act extending the homestead laws and providing for the right of way for railroads in the district of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved May 14, 1898, in acquiring and completing its railroad now under construction in Alaska, is hereby extended as follows:

First. That the time to file the map and profile of definite location of its first section of at least 20 miles with the register of the land office in the district of Alaska, as provided in said sections 4 and 5, is hereby extended to and including the 31st day of December, 1906.

Second. That the time to complete the first section of at least 20 miles of its railroad, as provided in said section 5, is hereby extended to and including the 31st day of December, 1906, and the time for completing its entire railroad, as provided in said section 5, is hereby extended to and including December 31, 1909.

Third. That it shall be lawful for the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company to hereafter operate its railroad in the district of Alaska for a period to and including December 31, 1909, without the payment of the license fee of $100 per mile per annum on each mile operated, as provided in section 29 of chapter 1 of the act entitled "An act for making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the concurrent resolution of the two Houses, until Thursday, January 4, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 21, 1905.

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

Thomas B. Latham, of Indian Territory, to be United States attorney for the central district of Indian Territory, vice John H. Wilkins, whose term will expire January 9, 1906.

James L. Martin, of Vermont, to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont. (A reappointment, his term expiring January 12, 1906.)

MARSHAL.

John E. Kendrick, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island, to which position he was appointed on June 5, 1900, in the place of James S. McCabe, whose term had expired.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

A. W. Maxwell, of Moberly, Mo., to be receiver of public moneys at Lawton, Okla., vice James D. Maguire, resigned.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Henry D. McKnight, of Oklahoma, to be register of the land office at Lawton, Okla., his term having expired December 19, 1905. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Henry Schneider to be postmaster at Waterloo, in the county of Monroe and State of Illinois, in place of Hardy C. Voris. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1905.

INDIANA.

Jesse Parmenter to be postmaster at Wabash, in the county of Wabash and State of Indiana, in place of John M. Crain. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William A. Murphy to be postmaster at Amesbury, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in place of Cyrus W. Rowell. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

NEW YORK.

Henry W. Wilcox to be postmaster at Deposit, in the county of Broome and State of New York, in place of Charles H. Putnam. Incumbent's commission expires January 21, 1906.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Wallace W. Rollins to be postmaster at Asheville, in the county of Buncombe and State of North Carolina, in place of Wallace W. Rollins. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

TENNESSEE.

Andrew W. Wills to be postmaster at Nashville, in the county of Davidson and State of Tennessee, in place of Andrew W. Wills. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1906.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 21, 1905.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Sterling A. Campbell, of California, to be collector of customs for the district of Humboldt, in the State of California.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John G. Church to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Gunner William J. Foley to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 10th day of April, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Howard W. Stone, a citizen of Iowa, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of March, 1905.

Julian P. Willcox, a citizen of Colorado, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 13th day of April, 1905.

To be second lieuenants in the Marine Corps from the 19th day of June, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Bennet Puryear, a citizen of Texas.
William W. Buckley, a citizen of Kansas.
William C. Wise, jr., a citizen of Virginia.
William D. Smith, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Harold B. Pratt, a citizen of New York.
Randolph Coyle, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

Philip H. Torrey, a citizen of Montana, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 18th day of July, 1905.

Benjamin B. Gossett, a citizen of South Carolina, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 18th day of August, 1905.

Robert L. Denig, a citizen of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of September, 1905.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 21, 1905.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, from whom all blessings are, we recognize in Thy son, Jesus Christ, who brought to light life and immortality and taught us the beauty of holiness, Thine own best gift to the world, whose advent will be celebrated with joy and gladness, thanksgiving and praise, in every home throughout the length and breadth of Christendom; and as we strive to imitate Thee in gifts to our friends and kindred we most fervently pray that we may not forget in our generosity the downtrodden, the outcast, homeless, and poor, especially the children in poverty, bereft of friends and kindred, remembering that "Twice blest is he who gives." And now, O God, our Heavenly Father, keep us close to Thee as we separate for this holiday season to go to our several homes, that we enter not into temptation, and bring us together again at the appointed time in health, strength, and vigor. In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the only debate that is demanded on this resolution, No. 42, is on the part of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LOVERING], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] would like to be heard in reply, and they are willing to print their remarks in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LOVERING] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] have the right to print for five days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LOVERING]——

Mr. BURLESON. It is understood that the gentleman from Massachusetts is to submit his remarks to me.

Mr. PAYNE. Then I will ask that the gentleman from Massachusetts have five days and the gentleman from Texas seven days in which to print.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LOVERING] have five days and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] have seven days in which to print remarks on the pending resolution, No. 42. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to file the views of the minority to accompany H. R. 3, being the Philippine tariff bill, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi presents the views of the minority upon the bill indicated, and asks unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I will have to object to that. I can not see any reason for departing from the usual rule in this case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will change the request, then, and make it that both reports be printed in the RECORD—the report of the majority and the views of the minority be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the report of the majority and the views of the minority be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I object to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well, then, Mr. Speaker, I will file the report.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, if there is no business on the Speaker's table, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to inquire if anybody else wants to make a speech? If they do, I believe they ought to have a chance.

Mr. PAYNE. The supply of eloquence seems to be exhausted for the present. I think perhaps it will come again later.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, January 4, 1906, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a

copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation to replace the Nantucket Shoal light vessel—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 9961) repealing an act entitled "An act to extend the time for presenting claims for additional bounties," and its amendments and extensions, and so forth—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9962) to establish a permanent military camp ground in Hardin, Meade, and Bullitt counties, in Kentucky—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 9963) to provide for the enlarging of the United States court building at Asheville, N. C., containing the United States court room, post-office, clerk's office, and internal-revenue offices—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 9964) to establish a Bureau of Naturalization, and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 9965) to provide for the construction and equipment of a revenue cutter for service in Narragansett Bay and adjacent waters—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 9966) making Monterey, Cal., a subport of entry in the customs collection district of San Francisco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9967) providing for the disposition of the segregated coal and asphalt lands in the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, Ind. T., so as to thereby provide a school fund for a future State—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY: A bill (H. R. 9968) to provide for the survey of Fort Point channel and South Bay, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9969) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to cause a survey to be made for a 40-foot channel in Boston Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9970) to provide for surveys for a ship canal across Cape Cod and from Narragansett Bay to Boston Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9971) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to complete the improvement of Fort Point channel, Boston Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9972) for the further protection of interstate trade and to amend "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9973) to amend clauses 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, and 450 of Schedule N of an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9974) to reduce taxation on American citizens who use hides, leather, boots, shoes, saddles, and harness—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9975) to carry into effect the provisions of a convention, signed at Washington July 24, 1899, between the United States and France, under authority of "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897, and transmitted to the Senate of the United States by the President at Washington, December 6, 1899—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9976) to create a new Federal judicial district in Ohio, to be called the central district—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 9977) to provide for the survey for a ship canal from Fall River Harbor to Weymouth Fore River. Boston Harbor, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 9978) to amend an act entitled "An act to revise and amend the tariff laws of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1905—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 9979) to authorize the acquisition of land or buildings for the United States embassies and legations in foreign capitals—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT of California: A bill (H. R. 9980) authorizing the accounting officers of the Treasury to readjust the accounts of the Pacific Railway and other companies for transportation of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps since July 1, 1896, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9981) to regulate the practice of dentistry or dental surgery in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9982) to provide for a port of delivery at Albuquerque, Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9983) to provide for the erection of a public building at Albuquerque, Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SCOTT: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) extending the provisions of the act of June 27, 1890, to include the officers and privates of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Regiments Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and the widows and minor children of all such persons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 58) directing a suitable shaft to be placed at the grave of John Tyler—to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 9984) granting an increase of pension to Samuel McKinney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 9985) granting a pension to Myron L. Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9986) granting a pension to Susan A. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 9987) for the relief of Ellen Sexton—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9988) granting a pension to Georgiana Schroeder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9989) granting a pension to Jennie Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9990) granting an increase of pension to William C. Banks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9991) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Chapin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9992) for the relief of John Beasley, of Rhea County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 9993) granting a pension to George W. Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 9994) granting a pension to Christopher Horn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 9995) granting an increase of pension to Elias Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 9996) granting a pension to Adelaide B. Hawes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9997) granting an increase of pension to Howard M. Hubbard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9998) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9999) granting an increase of pension to Orion B. Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10000) granting an increase of pension to Franklin W. De Lano—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10001) granting an increase of pension to Irvin F. Hoyt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10002) to remove the charge of desertion against John N. Barker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 10003) granting an increase of pension to George W. Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10004) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Hazen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10005) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of E. J. Rice—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10006) to remove the charge of desertion against Oris Bailey, alias John O. Bailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 10007) granting an increase of

pension to Appleton Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 10008) granting an increase of pension to James W. Dorman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULKERSON: A bill (H. R. 10009) granting a pension to Mary B. Root—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10010) granting a pension to Emeline B. Kerns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10011) granting a pension to George Hermon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10012) granting a pension to Daniel W. David—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10013) granting a pension to Olive J. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10014) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 10015) for the relief of the estate of Capt. Charles E. Russell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 10016) granting a pension to Timothy Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10017) granting a pension to Franklin B. Carland—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 10018) granting an increase of pension to Emmeline Pancost—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10019) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Shook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 10020) granting a pension to Sarah J. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10021) granting a pension to Margaret Earhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 10022) granting a pension to Annie S. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. to Martha Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 10023) granting a pension to Martha Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10024) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Stevig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10025) granting an increase of pension to Peter O. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10026) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Matherly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10027) to correct the military record of James Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10028) to correct the military record of John D. Gardner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 10029) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Higbee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10030) granting an increase of pension to Arby Frier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10031) granting an increase of pension to Martin Haley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10032) granting an increase of pension to Octavo Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10033) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Roe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10034) granting an increase of pension to William H. Zombro—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10035) granting an increase of pension to James P. Waldorf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10036) granting an increase of pension to John A. Naus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10037) granting an increase of pension to John Hathorn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10038) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Denny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10039) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Monroe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10040) granting a pension to Lizzie S. Fecker—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10041) granting a pension to Sarah A. Dewland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10042) granting a pension to Emma G. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10043) granting a pension to Fannie E. Grayson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10044) granting a pension to Kate Lackey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10045) granting a pension to James M. Polsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10046) for the relief of Capt. Wilson Strickler, Company C, Twenty-first Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 10047) granting an increase of pension to George W. Ellicott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10048) to correct the military record of Adolphus Yuncker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 10049) granting a pension to Hiram Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10050) granting an increase of pension to John S. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 10051) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus Henson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10052) granting an increase of pension to Ellis K. Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10053) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Gressinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 10054) granting an increase of pension to Robert Shoemaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 10055) granting a pension to Osborne Eddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10056) to authorize the President to appoint Charles L. Gibbs, late acting volunteer lieutenant in the United States Navy and now in the Light-House Service, a commander on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10057) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States relief vessel No. 58, of the Light-House Service, stationed at the South Shoals, Nantucket, Mass.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 10058) granting a pension to Charles E. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10059) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 10060) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10061) granting an increase of pension to James E. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 636) for the relief of William Slater—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 696) granting a pension to Matilda Merrick Goodrich—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1078) for the relief of Hamilton D. South, second lieutenant, United States Marine Corps—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 1126) granting a pension to Jesse C. Thomas—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1397) for the relief of Alexander Lucas—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1518) to correct the military record of George S. Groesbeck—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 1545) granting a pension to Florence D. Rafferty—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2072) granting arrears of pension to H. Morris Husband—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2138) for the relief of the estate of Lewis Patterson, deceased—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2379) to remove the charge of desertion against Archibald Gibson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6528) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Preston—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, advocating retention of present bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of J. G. Getties and others, and General John A. Dix Council, No. 25, Order United American Mechanics, of Ingram, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 60,000 Americans in Alaska, for representation in Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BURLESON: Petition of S. A. Berkley and others, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Beasley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CURRIER: Petition of Granite Council, No. 13, of New Boston, N. H., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DWIGHT: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 15, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Lestershire, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLACK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Appleton Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: Paper to accompany bill H. R. 7637—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of the Rhode Island Poultry Association, for increased appropriation for agricultural experiment station—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island Poultry Association, for placing basic slag meal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Painters and Decorators' Union No. 195, of Providence, R. I., for placing wood alcohol on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William B. West—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Levi C. Bishop—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Dudley Portwood—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 60,000 Americans in Alaska, for representation in Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Indian Territory Press Association, for favorable laws relative to Indian lands, etc.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Phoenix, Ariz., against joint statehood with New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Allegheny Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, for law to prohibit polygamy and for the recognition of Christ as the basis of all legislation relating to the family—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUDGER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Riley Hooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah J. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of the common council of Milwaukee, favoring closing of fair-weather opening on breakwater harbor of refuge—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James M. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of California: Petitions of the Merchants' Association and the Chamber of Commerce of Santa Ana; the Chamber of Commerce and the Pachappa Orange Growers' Association, of Riverside; the Riverside Heights Orange Growers' Association; the Riverside Fruit Exchange; the Chamber of Commerce of Redlands; the San Bernardino Board of Trade; the San Bernardino County Fruit Exchange; the Highland Orange Growers' Association; the Stewart Citrus Association, of Upland; the Upland Citrus Association, of Upland; the Mountain View Orange and Lemon Growers' Association; the Ontario Cucamonga Fruit Growers' Exchange; the San Antonio Fruit Exchange, of Pomona; the Covina Orange Growers' Association; the Covina Fruit Exchange; the Cohuenga Valley Lemon Growers' Association, of Colgrove; the Semitropic Fruit Exchange, of Los Angeles; the Southern California Hardware Association, and the California Fruit Growers' Exchange, favoring increasing the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission relative to railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 4, 1906.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 21, 1905, when, on request of Mr. SPOONER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. Robert M. La Follette, Senator-elect from the State of Wisconsin, which I ask may be read and placed on file.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The credentials of Robert Marion La Follette, chosen by the legislature of the State of Wisconsin a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905, were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. La Follette, the Senator-elect, is in attendance, and I ask that the oath of office be now administered to him.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect will present himself at the Vice-President's desk and take the oath of office prescribed by law.

Mr. La Follette was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. SPOONER, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

PRODUCTION OF SUGAR IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a cablegram received from the acting governor-general of the Philippine Islands, relative to the agricultural conditions in those islands as depicted by the planters of Iloilo; which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 22, 1905.

SIR: I have the honor to state that the following cablegram has just been received from the acting governor-general of the Philippine Islands:

"Have received the following telegram from Iloilo planters: Prices sugar ₱3.81 assorted. No hopes improvement. The situation of agriculturists insupportable. Sole salvation abolition Dingley tariff. Asociacion Agricola prays transmit Washington deplorable state. Agriculture planters prefer not to harvest crop present prices.

"DE LEON, *President Association.*"

₱ is the symbol for 1 peso, Philippine currency, which is equivalent to 50 cents, United States currency. ₱3.81 is the price for 1 picul, which is equivalent to 137⅓ pounds. The price per hundred pounds at the rate named is $1.39.

Very respectfully,

WM. H. TAFT, *Secretary of War.*

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the University of Missouri *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of J. P. Harvey, administrator of Matilda D. Harvey, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Anna McDonald, widow of James McDonald, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Isabella G. Francis, administratrix of the estate of Roger A. Francis, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the Wardens of St. Thomas Episcopal Church, of Middletown, Va., *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the

assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Augustin Lazare, administrator of the estate of Jean Baptiste Lazare, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the trustees of the Mount Zion Church of United Brethren, of Frederick County, Va., *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of Sarah Lou Smith, Mary Ellen Smith, and Susan Virginia Smith, sole heirs of Sarah G. Smith, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of G. S. Lannom, receiver of the Humboldt Female College, of Gibson County, Tenn., *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting, in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the act of January 31, 1881, that permission be granted by Congress to Brig. Gen. William Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, to accept a decoration of Commander of the Order of the Legion of Honor, and also to Capt. Daniel T. Moore, Artillery Corps, United States Army, to accept a decoration of Chevalier of the Order of the Legion of Honor, conferred upon them by the French Government, and inclosing letters from the Secretary of War authorizing these applications; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the proceedings of the seventeenth meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held at Morganton, N. C., July 8 to 13, 1905; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Clifton, Ariz., remonstrating against the admission of Arizona and New Mexico into the Union as one State; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to permit the admission into the United States of Chinese visitors and travelers not of the cooly class; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of New Orleans, La., praying for the passage of the so-called "ship-subsidy bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Furniture Exchange of Cincinnati, Ohio; of the Board of Trade of New Orleans, La.; of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis.; of the Live Stock Commission Merchants' Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, and of the Manufacturers' Association of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of Grand Division, Brotherhood of Railroad Freight and Baggage Men of America, of Lancaster, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Norwood, Pa., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the repeal of the present duty on imported hides; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DUBOIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Cambridge, Idaho, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of 375 citizens of Caldwell, Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation granting leave of absence to homestead entrymen under the Payette-Boise reclamation project until water for irrigation purposes is available; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CLARK of Montana presented a petition of the North Montana Round-up Association, of the State of Montana, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the exportation of live stock from the United States, and providing for the use of American beef as a ration in the supplies of the Government for the use of the Army in the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Teamsters and Drivers' Local Union, No. 177, American Federation of Labor, of Helena, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BURKETT presented a petition of the West Nebraska Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Meriden, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Nebraska State Sportmen's Association, of Hastings, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect migratory game birds; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a petition of the North Nebraska Conference, of Albion, Nebr., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 880) granting an increase of pension to Michael Brannan; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Burnside Council, No. 26, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Chester, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Lincoln Post, No. 3, Department of the Potomac, Grand Army of the Republic, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a temporary home in the District of Columbia for ex-volunteer Union soldiers and sailors; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Galva, Ill., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the United States, and a petition of the Ladies' Missionary Society of the Bethel Church, of Reno, Ill., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Council of Lincoln, Ill., and a petition of the Joint Labor Council of Evanston, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Fourth Quarterly Meeting of the Railway Employees' Twentieth Century Club of Illinois, and a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Peoria, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Illinois Coal Operators' Association, of Springfield, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FULTON presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Marshfield, Oreg., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of Coos Bay, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Greater Salem Commercial Club, of Salem,, Oreg., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of free locks on the Willamette River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FLINT presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the removal of certain hidden and visible rocks in the harbor and bay of San Francisco, and approaches thereto, to a

depth sufficient to permit the safe navigation of vessels of the largest class; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the consideration and protection of the interests of the dried-fruit industry in any commercial treaties made with the German Empire; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the appointment of six special agents with diplomatic rank and title of commercial attachés for the promotion of American industry and trade; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the creation of a Federal judicial circuit court in the Orient; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Bar Association of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of California; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of the mayor and common council of Tucson, Ariz., and of sundry citizens of Clifton, Ariz.; of the mayor and Chamber of Commerce of Tucson; the mayor, city council, and sundry citizens of Nogales; the board of supervisors of Navajo County; sundry citizens of Naco; the mayor and city council of Prescott; the board of supervisors of Mohave County and the anti-joint statehood committee of Kingman; the board of supervisors of Flagstaff; the Chamber of Commerce and sundry citizens of Bisbee; the Phoenix and Maricopa County Board of Trade, of Phoenix; sundry citizens of Pearce; the mayor and board of aldermen of Douglas; the board of supervisors of Yavapai County, and of the mayor and common council of Bisbee, all in the State of Arizona, remonstrating against the admission of Arizona and New Mexico into the Union as one State; which were referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying that recognition be made of the international exposition to be held at Milan, Italy, April 1 to November 30, 1906; which was referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions.

He also presented petitions of the Merchants' Association of San Francisco, the Municipal League of Los Angeles, and of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side by the diversion of the waters for manufacturing purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented petitions of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, the Board of Trade of Redlands, and the California Water and Forest Association, of San Francisco, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of wild animals and birds in the Wichita Forest Reserve, so as to apply to the different forest reserves of the United States, and especially to those of the State of California; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Harvey S. Harriman; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LONG presented a petition of the Society of the Dames of 1846, of Dallas, Tex., praying for the enactment of legislation granting an increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 986, Carpenters and Joiners of America, of South McAlester, Ind. T.; of Local Union No. 1587, Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Hutchinson, Kans.; of the Trades League, of Philadelphia, Pa.; of W. M. Selanes and 44 other citizens of Spring Hill; of Local Union No. 416, Iron Molders' Union, of Iola, and of Local Union No. 56, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Leavenworth, all in the State of Kansas, and of E. P. Dicken and 6 other citizens of Kansas, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the West Kansas Conference of the Free Methodist Church, of Macksville, Kans., and a petition of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Paola, Kans., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against the Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the committee on temperance of the house of representatives of the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 552) for the relief of James W. Morgan; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented an affidavit to accompany the bill (S. 1670) granting an increase of pension to William McNabb; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented an affidavit to accompany the bill (S. 2089) granting an increase of pension to John P. Campbell; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Muddy Creek Grange, No. 1437, Patrons of Husbandry, of Meriden, Kans., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented the petition of Thomas Crosbie and 23 other citizens of Evanston, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of Local Council No. 105, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Freed, W. Va., and a petition of Local Council No. 181, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Guyandotte, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of 51 masters pilots and others navigating Block Island Sound and Long Island Sound, and a petition of 39 masters pilots and others navigating Block Island Sound and Long Island Sound, praying for the establishment of a light-ship equipped with a fog signal off Point Judith, Rhode Island; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Current Topics Club, of Newport, R. I., and a petition of the board of reference of the Charity Organization Society, of Newport, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Agricultural Federation of Rhode Island, praying that an appropriation be made for the maintenance of agricultural experiment stations; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Agricultural Federation of Rhode Island and a petition of the board of managers of the Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, praying for the enactment of legislation admitting basic slag meal free of duty; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Rhode Island Poultry Association, praying that an appropriation be made to provide for the extermination of the gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Rhode Island Business Men's Association, remonstrating against the repeal of the present bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FORAKER presented petitions of Cleveland City Council, No. 55, of Cleveland; Arcanum Council, No. 149, of Arcanum; Price Hill Council, No. 210, of Cincinnati; Storms Creek Council, No. 108, of Terre Haute; Fairmount Council, No. 155, of Cincinnati; Piqua Council, No. 80, of Piqua, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Local Union No. 2, of Cincinnati; Local Union No. 13, of Newark; Local Union No. 328, of East Liverpool; Local Union No. 17, of Bellaire; Local Union No. 437, of Portsmouth, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; Standard Lodge, No. 702, of Cleveland; Whetstone Lodge, No. 344, of Galion; Lincoln Lodge, No. 307, of Cincinnati; Buckeye Lodge, No. 55, of Columbus, International Association of Machinists; Local Union No. 327, of Lorain, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' International Alliance; Scioto Lodge, No. 150, of Portsmouth, International Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; Bricklayers' Union No. 22, Bricklayers and Masons' International Union, of Dayton; Iron Molders' Union No. 198, of Mansfield; Iron Molders' Union No. 132, of Zanesville, and 36 citizens of Dayton, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the rigid enforcement of immigration regulations and the enactment of such additional laws as will afford protection against the depressing industrial effects of the unrestricted admission of foreigners to the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the American Institute of Architects, of Cincinnati; the Board of Trade of Marysville; of 5 citizens of Cleveland; 16 citizens of Cincinnati; 335 citi-

zens of Fremont; 449 school children of Fremont, and of sundry citizens of Mansfield and Chillicothe, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side by the diversion of the waters for manufacturing purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. KNOX presented petitions of the congregations of the First Baptist, St. Matthew's Episcopal, and St. John's Evangelical Lutheran churches, all of Homestead, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of Michael Scherrer, of Erie; Carney Brothers, of Erie; George F. C. Cantor, of Erie; Rudolph Phister, of Erie; Key West Cigar Works, of Erie, and of Local Union No. 301, Cigar Makers' International Union of America, of Akron, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "Curtis bill," relative to a reduction of the duty on tobacco imported from the Philippine Islands; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Saratoga Council, No. 262, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; Jordan Council, No. 746, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Allentown; Landisburg Council, No. 707, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Landisburg; Aspinwall Council, No. 238, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Aspinwall; Court Jackson, No. 121, Foresters of America, of Philadelphia; Washington Camp, No. 443, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Davidsburg; Falls City Council, No. 385, United American Mechanics, of Beaver Falls; Local Union No. 1186, Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Pittsburg, and of sundry citizens of Beaver Falls, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of Laurel Point Grange, No. 915, Patrons of Husbandry, of Vandergrift; Stony Fork Grange, No. 1033, Patrons of Husbandry, of Stony Fork; Moshannon Grange, No. 1272, Patrons of Husbandry, of Philipsburg; Mauger Grange, No. 111, Patrons of Husbandry, of Milan, and of the Patrons of Husbandry of Harrison, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the present oleomargarine law by striking out the word "knowingly;" which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of the Civic Club of Philadelphia; W. E. Hering, of Philadelphia; Elizabeth E. Lee, of Philadelphia; sundry citizens of Philadelphia; Charles P. Cody, of Erie; the City Parks Association of Philadelphia; Dr. A. J. Hesser, of Pittsburg; Robert M. Eldon, of Aspers; Fairmount Park Art Association, of Philadelphia, and of D. W. Stubbs, of Germantown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side by the diversion of the waters for manufacturing purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Wilkinsburg; United Presbyterian Church of Shenango; United Presbyterian Church of East Brook; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Southwest Philadelphia, of Philadelphia; First Presbyterian Church of Wilkinsburg; First United Presbyterian Church of Coraopolis; Millers Run Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Cannonsburg; United Presbyterian Church of Homestead, and of Third United Presbyterian Church of Allegheny, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the United Presbyterian congregations of East Brook and Shenango, United Presbyterian Church of Coraopolis, United Presbyterian Church of Homestead, Benjamin F. Paist, jr., of Langhorne, and of C. C. Riggs, of Langhorne, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. WARNER presented a petition of the Jewish congregations of Kansas City, Mo., praying that relief be granted the Jews in Russia; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MARTIN presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 492, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Roanoke, Va., and a petition of sundry citizens of Richmond, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Bar Association of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment of an additional United States district judge for the northern district of California; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a Federal judicial circuit court in the Orient; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to authorize the appointment of six special agents of the United States with diplomatic rank and title of commercial attachés; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the dried-fruit industry in any commercial agreement that may be made with the German Empire; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the General Baptist Conference of Northern California and Nevada, praying for the enactment of legislation to negotiate a new treaty with China, so as to establish a more equitable and friendly relationship with that country; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of the Fruit Exchange of San Bernardino; of the Southern Retail Hardware and Implement Association, of Venice; of the Chamber of Commerce of Santa Ana; of the Orange Growers' Association of Riverside; of the Board of Trade of Redlands; of the Board of Trade of Pomona, and of the Chamber of Commerce of Napa, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Pomona, Cal., and a petition of the Board of Trade of Redlands, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit the admission into the United States of Chinese merchants, visitors, and travelers not of the cooly class; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Fourth Semiannual Meeting of the Counties Committee of the California Promotion Committee, of Santa Barbara, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the preservation of forests, the conservation of waters for irrigation purposes, and the improvement of rivers and harbors in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of Kenesaw Post, No. 106, Department of California, Grand Army of the Republic, of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation granting a pension of $30 a month to veteran soldiers who are totally disabled; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying that proper recognition be given to the international exposition to be held at Milan, Italy, in 1906; which was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Pomona, Cal., and a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish game refuges and breeding grounds within national forest reserves; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. SPOONER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Afton, Neenah, Lakemills, Edgar, Rhinelander, Wautoma, Milwaukee, Westbend, Abbotsford, Menasha, Jefferson, West Salem, Watertown, Greenwood, Augusta, Fond du Lac, Hancock, Edgerton, Waupun, Kingston, and Fort Atkinson, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Waterville, Me., praying for the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of George Meacom, of Boston, Mass., relative to the reconstruction of obsolete ships of the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented a memorial of sundry citizens of North Dakota, remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TELLER presented the petition of E. G. Rathbone, praying for a full investigation of his official conduct while director-general of posts of Cuba; which was referred to the Committee on Cuban Relations.

REGULATION OF NATURALIZATION.

Mr. CULLOM. I have a memorial sent to me from the Civic Federation of Chicago on the subject of naturalization. It is a pretty important paper and it is signed by important men. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and that it be printed as a document in addition. It is a short paper.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed as a document and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Having observed for a number of years the methods followed by the courts in the city of Chicago in granting naturalization to aliens, and believing that changes in these methods are desirable more effectually to carry out the intent of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States in relation to naturalization, the Civic Federation of Chicago begs leave respectfully to submit to your honorable body this brief memorial, with the hope that our testimony may emphasize the necessity of prompt legislation on the subject as has been recommended in the reports of the Secretary of State and the Attorney-General.

While the evils resulting from lax and often illegal customs throughout the country of granting citizenship to foreigners has long been common knowledge, and is exposed in the report of the special examiner whose investigations, under the direction of the Attorney-General, covered many States of the Union, our conclusions are based on the conditions as we find them in our own city.

A careful examination of the court records, as well as personal observation of the manner of conducting naturalization both in preliminary and final hearings, shows that the procedure is subject to grave criticisms. This is especially true of periods immediately preceding national elections. The laws, inadequate as they are, have been violated both in spirit and in letter and the institution for the granting of citizenship to the worthy utilized by the various political organizations for the making of partisan voters.

The causes for these deplorable conditions are several, and in our observations we hesitate to accuse either courts or politicians. The situation makes the result inevitable, and we have no doubt that both judges and party organizations would gladly be free from the pressure that is upon them through lack of legal restrictions. We judge this from the fact that, so far as we can learn, the two principal political parties, after much work and expense through their organizations, achieve in a given contest about equal results in securing new adherents, and therefore are relatively of the same political strength they were at the beginning.

As an indication of the wholesale and ill-directed manner in which voters are created we submit the following data:

Naturalization by the courts in Cook County, Ill., during the last five years—1900 to 1904, inclusive.

1900.		
Superior court (12 judges)	5,998	
Circuit court (14 judges)	4,928	
County court (1 judge)	4,904	
Criminal court	643	
		16,473
(Judges of the superior and circuit courts sit in rotation in the criminal court.)		
1901.		
Superior court	324	
Circuit court	2,228	
County court	752	
Criminal court	26	
		3,330
1902.		
Superior court	1,490	
Circuit court	2,490	
County court	1,708	
Criminal court	60	
		5,748
1903.		
Superior court	1,117	
Circuit court	2,873	
County court	220	
Criminal court	52	
		4,262
1904.		
Superior court	4,635	
Circuit court	5,045	
County court	12	
Criminal court	None.	
		9,692
Grand total		39,505

Naturalization from October 1 to November 5, 1900, inclusive.

Superior court, all judges:		
Aliens	1,984	
Minors	1,411	
		3,395
Circuit court, all judges:		
Aliens	2,715	
Minors	2,878	
		5,593
County court, all judges, aliens and minors		501
Criminal court, all judges:		
Aliens	186	
Minors	774	
		960
Grand total		10,449

Naturalization from October 1 to November 7, 1904, inclusive.

Superior court, all judges:		
Aliens	665	
Minors	3,441	
		4,106
Circuit court, all judges, aliens and minors		3,395
County court, all judges, aliens and minors		681
Criminal court		None.
Grand total		8,182

Practically all of the judges of the various courts named participated in the work of naturalization during the terms indicated, but only turee or four held night sessions for the purpose.

Naturalization from March 1 to April 2, 1901, inclusive.

Superior court:		
Aliens	43	
Minors	62	
		105
Circuit court:		
Aliens	244	
Minors	308	
		552
County court, aliens and minors		217
Criminal court:		
Aliens	15	
Minors	24	
		39
Grand total		913

Naturalization from March 1 to April 6, 1903, inclusive.

Superior court:		
Aliens	174	
Minors	408	
		582
Circuit court:		
Aliens	868	
Minors	548	
		1,416
County court, aliens and minors		379
Criminal court:		
Aliens	43	
Minors	4	
		47
Grand total		2,424

The following memoranda indicate the speed with which final orders of naturalization have at times been granted:

October 8, 1904, in circuit court:		
Aliens	384	
Minors	778	
		1,162
October 15, 1904, in circuit court:		
Aliens	554	
Minors	856	
		1,410
October 20, 1904, in circuit court, aliens and minors		706
October 13 and 14, 1904, in circuit court, aliens and minors		700
October 3, 1904, in circuit court, aliens and minors		299

On October 8, 1904, one judge appears by the records to have naturalized 344 men. On the same day another judge appears by the records to have performed 201 naturalizations. The 1,162 naturalizations of the circuit court for the day were by eleven judges.

At the time the special examiner for the Government visited Chicago he declared that the criminal court was without authority to grant naturalization, as it was not a court of common-law jurisdiction. Since that time the criminal court has issued no certificates of citizenship to aliens, although this court had previously, from the year it was created under the State constitution of 1870, done a full share of the naturalization work of the county, its heaviest years having been 1896, when it granted about 12,000 final papers.

We would not assert that all of the evils of reckless and illegal naturalization that are possible under the present lax system are found here, yet all of the judges and clerks of the courts interviewed in our investigation agreed that conditions have been and are extremely bad, and in some instances scandalous. For example, it has been the custom for the political parties to deposit a sum of money—frequently $500 or $1,000—in the office of the clerk of a court to be drawn against for fees as the candidates for final papers were rounded up and brought in during the few weeks before elections. During these times usually two or three judges are selected to sit at night for this special work, when one or the other of the principal political committees pays the clerks in the office of the clerk of the court for the extra work. So great has been the stress sometimes that these night sessions have lasted until after midnight. There is an entire lack of solemnity or dignity attending the formalities, and in thousands of instances, as we are well convinced, the men who are thus made citizens have little or no comprehension of the responsibilities imposed upon them. Questions are put rapidly and perfunctorily and the answers are often unintelligible.

Some improvement has been noted since the passage of the act of 1903, under which two witnesses are required; but frequently they are professional witnesses and answer for a large number, when at times it is quite apparent that they know little about those for whom they vouch. All the documents used are now uniform in all the courts of this county, and are prepared to meet special classifications; yet these improvements are only the first step in the direction of reform. We believe that, while something may be done by State legislation, the evil is one that should not be left to the various States for correction. We are of the opinion, in fact, that the only solution of the problem is through an act of Congress. The general recommendations made by the Secretary of State in his recent report to the President are eminently sound, and we believe should be enacted into law. Besides these recommendations, too well known to your honorable body to need repetition here, we should respectfully offer for your consideration the following specific suggestions, which we believe should in substance be embodied in a national law:

(1) "No naturalization of any kind, nor applications of intentions to become naturalized, should be permitted after the hour of 5 o'clock

p. m. of any court day. This would prevent the evil of night sessions in large centers of population."

(Evidence of this practice will be found in the naturalization proceedings in the city of Chicago, where, prior to the last election, in November, several of the judges sat until nearly 11 o'clock at night.)

(2) "It should be forbidden by law for anyone or any association, political or otherwise, to pay the expenses of naturalization, and it should be made a misdemeanor, and every applicant for naturalization should be compelled to state, under oath, that he has personally paid the expense connected with the naturalization and has made no arrangement with anyone for a return of the fee.

(3) "In view of the experience that professional witnesses are used, who testify to scores of applications, the law should provide that no one witness shall testify to any naturalization in more than five cases within three months prior to any general or special election, national or State.

"(Great care should be taken in the evidence given by these witnesses and the evidence should be preserved and made a part of the record of the naturalization.)

(4) "No naturalization should be had in any court within thirty days prior to any election, special, general, national, or State, unless in such cases where a right to become naturalized accrues within thirty days, either by the expiration of the five years' residence or by the attainment of the age of majority.

(5) "A return should be made of all naturalization proceedings by the clerks of the several courts to the Secretary of State or to the authorities having naturalization in charge of the General Government, such return to be made within ninety days after each naturalization, the incidental expenses of such return to be paid by the State authorities.

(6) "Legislation should be passed forbidding any court officer from soliciting persons to seek the right of naturalization, and it should be made punishable to do so, the category of court officers to include all sheriffs and bailiffs.

(7) "There should also be a limitation to the method of naturalization, by compelling each applicant to docket his application (without fee, however), so that each naturalization should be heard by itself. It should also be made a prohibition by any judge to enter upon the function of naturalization while any case is being heard in court, with or without jury trial. (In practice it has been found that scores of applicants for naturalization come in and interrupt the proceedings of trials and motions.)

(8) "It is generally known that many illegal naturalizations have taken place in Cook County, where a court like the criminal court of Cook County had no jurisdiction in the premises. The general and special election laws of the State should provide that applicants for registration should state the particular court in which such naturalization has taken place, and it should be made the duty of the State's attorney in each county to file proceedings for the revocation of all illegal naturalization papers wherever notice thereof shall be brought to such State's attorney.

(9) "It should be made a penal offense for any clerk of any court or any officer having naturalization in charge to receive any money from any person or political party as naturalization fees. We do not favor that naturalization should be confined to the Federal courts.

(10) "In all cases of naturalization two witnesses should be required, but it should be left optional with the judge whether in any particular case this requirement be confined to one witness, and in such case the judge should make record of his action in the premises."

In addition, we would suggest that, inasmuch as serious embarrassments, including costly litigation and possible difficulties encountered in foreign lands by those whose certificates of naturalization have been granted by courts without jurisdiction, such as the criminal court of this county, it is a matter for careful consideration whether or not Congress should validate the certificates of citizenship issued through misapprehension of the law.

Respectfully submitted.

THE CIVIC FEDERATION OF CHICAGO,
By THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:
B. E. SUNNY, *Chairman.*
LABRUE W. NOYES.
WILLIAM D. KERFOOT.
JOSEPH EOTIS.
E. ALLEN FROST.
ADOLPH MOSES.
ROBERT MCMURDY.
ADOLPH NATHAN.
ALEXANDER H. REVELL.
W. H. BROWN, *Secretary.*

MINNESOTA RAILROAD COMMISSION.

Mr. NELSON. The Minnesota railroad commission has had the rate-making power since 1897. I have here a statement prepared by the secretary of the commission, Mr. A. C. Clausen, showing the number of cases that have been considered under the law by the commission, and what disposition has been made of the same. It is very brief. I move that it be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. ELKINS, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2106) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Vanburen, Ark., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee to whom was referred the bill (S. 2159) authorizing the Jasper and Eastern Railway Company, its successors and assigns, to construct and operate a railroad bridge across the Sabine River, in the States of Texas and Louisiana, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

[Several messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries.]

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HALE. I introduce sundry bills relating to legislation in the Navy Department. Every bill is accompanied by a statement from the head of the Department, and I ask that in each case the accompanying paper may be printed.

The bills were read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, which were ordered to be printed, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

A bill (S. 2433) for the relief of laborers, mechanics, and other employees of the Navy Department injured, and the families of those killed, without fault of their own, while in the discharge of their duties;

A bill (S. 2434) to reestablish the grade of commodore in the Navy;

A bill (S. 2435) to require graduates of the Naval Academy to render service in the Navy during a prescribed period;

A bill (S. 2436) to provide for two vice-admirals in the Navy;

A bill (S. 2437) to repeal provisions of law requiring affidavits of disinterestedness to accompany copies of contract filed in the returns office;

A bill (S. 2438) authorizing the construction of an armored cruiser, to bear the name of, and to represent upon the naval register, the *Constitution;*

A bill (S. 2439) to amend the act approved April 28, 1904, "to require the employment of vessels of the United States for public purposes;"

A bill (S. 2440) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to certify to the Secretary of the Interior for restoration to the public domain all reservations which are not needed for naval purposes;

A bill (S. 2441) to provide for the appointment of marine engineers;

A bill (S. 2442) to provide for the appointment of chaplains for temporary service in the Navy;

A bill (S. 2443) conferring the rank of major-general upon the officer in command and the rank of brigadier-general upon the officer second in command of the United States Marine Corps; and

A bill (S. 2444) to provide for the transfer to the Navy of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service and the Naval Militia.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 2445) granting medals to certain Indian policemen of the Standing Rock Agency, N. Dak.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2446) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Devils Lake, in the State of North Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2447) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Commodore John Barry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

A bill (S. 2448) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1896 (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2449) to create the western division of the judicial district of North Dakota for judicial purposes and to fix the time and place for holding court therein.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (S. 2450) for the relief of settlers upon the abandoned Fort Rice Military Reservation;

A bill (S. 2451) granting to the State of North Dakota 30,000 acres of land to aid in the maintenance of a school of forestry;

A bill (S. 2452) granting an additional land office in the State of North Dakota;

A bill (S. 2453) granting to the State of North Dakota 30,000 acres of land to aid in the maintenance of a school for feeble-minded;

A bill (S. 2454) to provide for the disposal of timber on public lands chiefly valuable for timber, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 2455) limiting the time within which forest-reserve lands restored to the public domain shall be subject to entry, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 2456) relating to proofs in homestead and other claims to public lands, and punishing false swearing therein, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 2457) to amend section 2461 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and

A bill (S. 2458) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of desert lands," as amended by the act entitled "An act to repeal the timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 2459) granting an increase of pension to Alexander M. Scott; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM. I introduce a bill for the relief of Abner C. Proctor. I desire to state that while I know this individual and think he is a meritorious gentleman, yet I do not know the contents of the bill. I introduce it for publication and for reference to the proper committee for consideration. I hope the beneficiary may be allowed whatever is due him.

The bill (S. 2460) for the relief of Abner C. Proctor, was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2461) for the relief of Mahala C. Carter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2462) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Watts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committe on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2463) granting a pension to Julia A. Morris (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2464) granting a pension to Margaret A. Hardin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2465) granting a pension to Johanna Callahan;

A bill (S. 2466) granting a pension to Sarah A. Fugett;

A bill (S. 2467) granting an increase of pension to Martin Clark;

A bill (S. 2468) granting an increase of pension to David A. Reich;

A bill (S. 2469) granting a pension to Daniel B. Stone;

A bill (S. 2470) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Hudkins (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2471) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Dawson (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2472) granting a pension to Jasper Summers;

A bill (S. 2473) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Noggle (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2474) granting an increase of pension to Horatio Ernest.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 2475) to provide for the control, administration, and support of the public schools of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 2476) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to regulate the business of employment agents and employment agencies (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2477) for the opening of a street in Mount Pleasant, D. C.;

A bill (S. 2478) authorizing the extension of Prospect street NW. (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2479) to repeal section 1 of "An act to name streets, avenues, alleys, highways, and reservations in that part of the District of Columbia outside of the city of Washington, and for other purposes," approved February 16, 1904; and

A bill (S. 2480) in relation to contracts with the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2481) granting an increase of pension to Elijah R. Wilkins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2482) granting an increase of pension to Cutler A. Chamberlin; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARNER introduced a bill (S. 2483) construing the provisions of sections 2304 to 2309 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 2484) for the relief of Charles W. Howard;

A bill (S. 2485) for the relief of William S. Johnson; and

A bill (S. 2486) for the relief of Richard C. Silence.

Mr. WARNER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2487) for the relief of Wilhelmina Sharp;

A bill (S. 2488) for the relief of Sidney J. Wetherell, assignee of A. V. Davis;

A bill (S. 2489) for the relief of the heirs of Robert A. Brown, deceased;

A bill (S. 2490) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Warrenton, Mo.;

A bill (S. 2491) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church of Sturgeon, Mo.;

A bill (S. 2492) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church of Marshall, Mo.;

A bill (S. 2493) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Warrenton, Mo.;

A bill (S. 2494) for the relief of James Brice;

A bill (S. 2495) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the St. Louis Hay and Grain Company;

A bill (S. 2496) for the relief of the estate of Edward N. Peyton, deceased;

A bill (S. 2497) for the relief of the estate of M. W. Garrison, deceased;

A bill (S. 2498) for the relief of the county of Marion, in the State of Missouri;

A bill (S. 2499) for the relief of the estate of John M. Armstrong, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2500) for the relief of the heirs of Tillard Ragan, deceased.

Mr. WARNER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2501) granting an increase of pension to Jessie E. Foster;

A bill (S. 2502) granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Fitzwater;

A bill (S. 2503) granting a pension to Martina Danenmueller;

A bill (S. 2504) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan B. W. Bennington;

A bill (S. 2505) granting a pension to Edwin F. Foster, alias Paul Gillon;

A bill (S. 2506) granting a pension to Samuel H. Gott;

A bill (S. 2507) granting an increase of pension to William Wheeler;

A bill (S. 2508) granting an increase of pension to Rosanna Zahn;

A bill (S. 2509) granting an increase of pension to Albert Sriver;

A bill (S. 2510) granting a pension to Mattie H. Krekel;

A bill (S. 2511) granting a pension to James P. Hopkins;

A bill (S. 2512) granting a pension to E. C. Curtis;

A bill (S. 2513) granting a pension to William D. Foster;

A bill (S. 2514) granting a pension to Jordan J. Denny;

A bill (S. 2515) granting a pension to Nathan Goodman;

A bill (S. 2516) granting a pension to Mary C. McCaw;

A bill (S. 2517) granting a pension to Charles Herbst;

A bill (S. 2518) granting a pension to Frederick Hartman;

A bill (S. 2519) granting a pension to John Hobart;

A bill (S. 2520) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Hannaford;

A bill (S. 2521) granting an increase of pension to R. R. Dill;

A bill (S. 2522) granting a pension to Thomas J. Hughes;

A bill (S. 2523) granting a pension to Celestine Grojean;

A bill (S. 2524) granting a pension to Freda Burow; and

A bill (S. 2525) granting an increase of pension to Perry B. Sibley.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 2526) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Welch; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2527) to confirm and legalize prior admissions to citizenship of the United States where the judge or clerk of the court administering the oath to the applicant or his witnesses has failed to sign or seal the record, oath, or the judgment of admission, and to establish a proper record of such citizenship; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McENERY introduced a bill (S. 2528) for the relief of Mary E. Barrow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTUS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2529) for the relief of the estate of A. P. Gafford, deceased (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2530) for the relief of the estate of S. F. Poole, deceased.

Mr. OVERMAN introduced a bill (S. 2531) to authorize the President of the United States to suspend the collection of certain custom duties or taxes and check the unjust operations of certain unlawful combinations or monopolies called trusts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FULTON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2532) granting an increase of pension to Franklin B. Giltner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2533) granting a pension to Jackson Yates (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2534) granting an increase of pension to James H. Street (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 2535) for payment of bounty to Melvin Culp for services rendered in the civil war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 2536) providing for the construction of a dredge and dump scows for use at Oregon coast harbors;

A bill (S. 2537) to provide for continuing the work of improving Tillamook Bay and bar; and

A bill (S. 2538) to provide for the acquisition of the canal and locks at Willamette Falls, Willamette River, Oregon.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 2539) for the relief of Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Anderson, United States Army, retired; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SPOONER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2540) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Miller (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2541) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Murray; and

A bill (S. 2542) granting an increase of pension to Matthew O'Regan (with accompanying papers).

Mr. FLINT introduced a bill (S. 2543) for the relief of William Pinkerton, jr., Mary McKellar, Eleanor Culley Stevenson, Sarah S. Patterson, and Rachael Salina Reynolds, heirs at law of William Pinkerton, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2544) to amend the act of Congress approved April 21, 1904, entitled "An act to amend section 17 of the act of Congress approved June 6, 1902, entitled 'An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes;'" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2545) granting a pension to Carl Niemann;

A bill (S. 2546) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Parker;

A bill (S. 2547) granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Vaughan;

A bill (S. 2548) granting an increase of pension to Jesse M. Furman;

A bill (S. 2549) granting an increase of pension to George W. Boyles;

A bill (S. 2550) granting a pension to Chester E. Wadsworth;

A bill (S. 2551) granting an increase of pension to Hinman Rhodes; and

A bill (S. 2552) granting an increase of pension to Louise J. D. Leland.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 2553) for the relief of Bernard W. Murray; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2554) providing for the regulation of the practice of medicine, surgery, and dentistry in the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2555) granting a pension to Sarah A. Bargar;

A bill (S. 2556) granting an increase of pension to George B. Hunter (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2557) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Longfellow (with accompanying papers).

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 2558) authorizing W. T. Clark to construct a bridge across the Columbia River near the city of Wenatchee, Wash.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2559) for the relief of persons who have executed conveyances of lands to the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2560) authorizing the disposition of surplus and allotted lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, which can be irrigated under the act of Congress approved June 17, 1902, known as the "reclamation act," and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2561) to amend section 1261 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and acts amendatory thereto; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2562) for the relief of R. S. Gillilan, executrix of the estate of M. B. Gillilan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2563) granting a pension to Isaac Carter (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2564) granting an increase of pension to Michael Matheney (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2565) granting a pension to William P. Parrill (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2566) granting an increase of pension to George H. Rodeheaver;

A bill (S. 2567) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Latham; and

A bill (S. 2568) granting an increase of pension to Noah C. Fowler.

Mr. ELKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2569) granting an increase of pension to Isabella H. Thompson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2570) granting an increase of pension to Harrison D. Lowery;

A bill (S. 2571) granting a pension to Barbara Eckardt;

A bill (S. 2572) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Sherwood (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2573) granting a pension to Laura A. Swiger;

A bill (S. 2574) granting an increase of pension to Parker Pritchard (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2575) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Waugh (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2576) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Toppins; and

A bill (S. 2577) granting an increase of pension to F. M. Lynch.

Mr. ELKINS introduced the following bills, which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2578) for the relief of Alice M. Stafford, administratrix of the estate of Capt. Stephen R. Stafford;

A bill (S. 2579) for the relief of Nathan Reed and others; and

A bill (S. 2580) for the relief of Andrew J. Holley.

Mr. ELKINS introduced a bill (S. 2581) authorizing the President to appoint Charles H. Pendleton a lieutenant-commander on the retired list, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2582) to authorize the American National Bank, of Graham, Va., to change its location and name; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Select Committee on National Banks.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 2583) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Robey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2584) for the relief of the estate of Edward R. Phillips, deceased (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2585) for the relief of Frank Hoskins (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2586) for the relief of Adam Carpenter (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2587) for the relief of the trustees of Trinity Episcopal Church, of Marshall, Va.;

A bill (S. 2588) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Centerville, Va.;

A bill (S. 2589) for the relief of the trustees of Forest Hill Methodist Episcopal Church, of Dumfries, Va.;

A bill (S. 2590) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Deepcreek, Va.;

A bill (S. 2591) for the relief of the trustees of Andrew Chapel, Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Fairfax County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2592) for the relief of the trustees of Lee Chapel, Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Fairfax County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2593) for the relief of the trustees of the Sons of Temperance, of Portsmouth, Va.;

A bill (S. 2594) for the relief of the trustees of Macedonia Methodist Episcopal Church, of Stafford County, Va.;

A bill (S. 2595) for the relief of Wesley Rankins;

A bill (S. 2596) for the relief of Luther H. Potterfield;

A bill (S. 2597) for the relief of John W. Ritenour;

A bill (S. 2598) for the relief of the estate of George P. Loehr, deceased;

A bill (S. 2599) for the relief of the estate of Joseph P. Mahaney, deceased;

A bill (S. 2600) for the relief of George M. Fry;

A bill (S. 2601) for the relief of the estate of Richard M. Harrison, deceased;

A bill (S. 2602) for the relief of G. W. Browder;

A bill (S. 2603) for the relief of John W. Fairfax;

A bill (S. 2604) for the relief of Hulda V. Coffer;

A bill (S. 2605) for the relief of the heirs of William Walton, deceased;

A bill (S. 2606) for the relief of the estate of James G. Hodges, deceased;

A bill (S. 2607) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of John Heater;

A bill (S. 2608) for the relief of Samuel S. Dennis;

A bill (S. 2609) for the relief of the heirs of William D. Etheridge;

A bill (S. 2610) for the relief of the heirs of John D. Mathews;

A bill (S. 2611) for the relief of A. O. Tucker;

A bill (S. 2612) for the relief of the owners of the American schooner *Wilson and Hunting* and cargo;

A bill (S. 2613) for the relief of E. A. R. Wyatt, heir of Edward A. Wyatt, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2614) for the relief of H. L. Briscoe, heir of Sarah Briscoe.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Washington Railway and Electric Company to operate automobile lines within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2616) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint William F. de Niedman captain and quartermaster in the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2617) granting an increase of pension to William H. Thompson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2618) granting an increase of pension to Harlan P. Wolcott; and

A bill (S. 2619) granting an increase of pension to William H. Willie.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 2620) to provide that the inhabitants of Porto Rico shall be citizens of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2621) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii;" which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2622) to refund certain excess duties paid upon importations of diamonds from Holland between July 21, 1903, and July 24, 1903; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2623) for the extension of Euclid street, in Meridian Hill, District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 2624) granting an honorable discharge to Henry G. Thomas, deceased, Company C, Second Kentucky Cavalry (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2625) for the relief of Robert W. Caldwell, First Regiment Ohio Heavy Artillery Volunteers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2626) to correct the military record of Isaac Thompson; and

A bill (S. 2627) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Urton.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 2628) granting an increase of pension to John Snider; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2629) granting a pension to W. B. Lunbeck; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURROWS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2630) granting an increase of pension to Rolla Glover;

A bill (S. 2631) granting a pension to Sarah J. King; and

A bill (S. 2632) granting an increase of pension to Walter S. Smith (with accompanying papers).

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2633) to regulate the compensation of skilled mechanics employed in the Naval Gun Factory of the Washington Navy-Yard, in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 2634) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Friend; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2635) to extend to the natives of Alaska the rights, privileges, and benefits conferred by the public-land laws upon citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, which were ordered to be printed, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. KNOX introduced a bill (S. 2636) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Greensburg, in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2637) for the relief of the Society of the United Brethern in Christ, of Tyrone, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2638) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Whaley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2639) for the relief of Mattie E. Price;

A bill (S. 2640) for the relief of E. E. Ferrell; and

A bill (S. 2641) for the relief of the heirs of S. H. Ayers, deceased.

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2642) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Ward, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

Mr. BURKETT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2643) granting an increase of pension to James H. Thrasher (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2644) granting a pension to Charles B. Hart;

A bill (S. 2645) granting an increase of pension to C. C. Pace;

A bill (S. 2646) granting an increase of pension to James P. Robey; and

A bill (S. 2647) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Dunkleberger (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. DUBOIS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2648) granting an increase of pension to Egbert R. Wills (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2649) granting an increase of pension to William C. Maxey;

A bill (S. 2650) granting an increase of pension to Aaron M. Howes; and

A bill (S. 2651) granting an increase of pension to Solon Orr.

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 2652) for the extension of Vermont avenue from Florida avenue to Howard University; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced a bill (S. 2653) for the relief of John H. Lohman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 2654) making Monterey and Port Harford, Cal., each a subport of entry in the customs collection district of San Francisco;

A bill (S. 2655) to establish a light and fog signal on Karquinez Strait, California;

A bill (S. 2656) to purchase an additional strip of land to the eastward of the light-house at Pigeon Point, California;

A bill (S. 2657) to construct a tender for the use of the light-house inspector of the twelfth light-house district; and

A bill (S. 2658) to construct a tender for the Light-House Service in Hawaiian and Pacific islands waters.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2659) to provide for the temporary warranting and for the retirement of pay clerks in the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2660) relating to the pay of mates in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2661) authorizing the appointment of Henry G. Burton, a captain on the retired list of the Army, as a major on the retired list of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CARTER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2662) for the relief of John T. Eaton;

A bill (S. 2663) for the relief of James A. Fitzgerald; and

A bill (S. 2664) for the relief of Thomas Cushing.

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 2665) to construct and place a light-ship off Point Judith, Rhode Island; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2666) to aid the State of Colorado to support a school of mines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2667) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Valentine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2668) to regulate the retirement of certain veterans of the civil war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. HANSBROUGH submitted an amendment providing for the payment to the Devils Lake Sioux Indians of North Dakota, in addition to any one of installments of $30,000 provided by the act approved April 27, 1904, the sum of $57,874.87, being the amount of the deficit of the $145,000 authorized by said act as the first payment, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. LONG submitted an amendment authorizing the accounting officers of the Treasury Department to reopen and restate accounts of the clerks of the United States district courts for the Indian Territory covering the period from May 31, 1900, to March 3, 1901, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FULTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2261) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

FAJARDO DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed:

The Senate and House of Representatives:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith an ordinance enacted by the Executive Council of Porto Rico on October 27, 1905, granting to the Fajardo Development Company the right to construct, maintain, and operate a railway between the towns of Mameyes, Luquillo, Fajardo, Ceiba, and Naguabo, in the island of Porto Rico.

This franchise was approved by the President of the United States on December 11, 1905.

Attention is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1906.*

CLAIMS OF COPE WHITEHOUSE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

The Senate:

In response to the Senate's resolution of December 7, 1905, I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State forwarding copies of the papers called for in regard to the claims of Cope Whitehouse to certain desert lands in Egypt.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1906.*

EXISTING STATUS IN SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. TILLMAN. I send to the desk a resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public welfare, as to the existing status in Santo Domingo; whether or not President Morales carried his Government with him when he disappeared from the capital or whether he left it behind, and whether the American officers who have been in charge of the custom-houses are still performing that work, and, if so, under what arrangement and by what authority.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SPOONER. I suggest that that resolution involves a very grave question of international law. The Senator will undoubtedly want to speak upon it, and we all want to hear him.

Mr. TILLMAN. No; I do not want to talk upon the resolution. I merely want it passed just as it is.

Mr. SPOONER. Then, I hope the resolution will go over until to-morrow.

Mr. TILLMAN. All right. Under objection, of course, the resolution will go over under the rule. That carries it over until Monday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under objection, the resolution will go over.

CONSTRUCTION OF RAILROADS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate the following:

1. A copy of the invitation to submit bids for the construction of railroads in the Philippine Islands pursuant to the act of Congress now in force.

2. Copies of all bids which were submitted under said invitation.

The Secretary of War is also directed to inform the Senate fully what action has been taken with reference to said bids, giving the reasons for such action, and if all of said bids have been rejected what further action has been taken with reference to the construction of railroads in the Philippine Islands under the law aforesaid.

SURVEY OF COOS BAY, OREGON.

Mr. FULTON submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of Coos Bay and bar, Oregon, with a view to widening and deepening the entrance to said bay to a depth of 40 feet at mean low tide, and to submit a plan and estimate for such improvement.

The Secretary of War is also authorized and directed to cause an investigation to be made as to the present commerce of said Coos Bay and the commercial resources of the country tributary thereto, and report the same to Congress.

That the expense of such survey and investigation be paid out of the unexpended balance of the appropriation heretofore made for the improvement of the entrance to said Coos Bay and Harbor.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] be, and he is hereby, appointed to the following committees: To Investigate the Condition of the Potomac River Front at Washington (chairman); Census; Civil Service and Retrenchment; Claims; Immigration; Indian Affairs, and Pensions.

Mr. GORMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Senator from Oregon [Mr. GEARIN] be, and he is hereby, appointed to the following committees: Claims; Pensions; Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game; Industrial Expositions, and National Banks.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent of the Senate that I be excused from further service upon the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. GEARIN] be substituted in my place on that committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] asks unanimous consent of the Senate that he be excused from further service upon the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. GEARIN] be appointed to take his place upon that committee. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

PRINTING OF A DOCUMENT.

Mr. TELLER. I desire to have printed as a document an article published in the North American Review of December, 1905, on the Philippine question, the author being the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be published as a document. It is brief.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado asks that an article entitled "A Democrat in the Philippines," heretofore published in the North American Review, may be printed as a document.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senator does not ask for the reading of the paper, does he?

Mr. TELLER. No.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The request was simply that the article be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I think most Senators have seen the article; there has been quite a demand for it; and, therefore, I should like to have it published as a document.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I shall not interpose an objection in this case, but I think it is not a good practice to introduce here articles, essays, treatises, political or otherwise, that are written undoubtedly with great skill, backed up with great knowledge and information, and present them to the country as public documents. I wish that Senators would think of this consideration before asking that any particular treatise or paper, which has not been before Congress, and which is not before a committee, but which is simply taken from some good magazine or some good book or some good newspaper, shall be made a Congressional document.

With this suggestion I shall not now in this case, as the question has just come up for the first time this session, interpose any objection, but I shall certainly reserve the right, if this practice becomes too common, to interpose objection. The Senator from Colorado is an old and conservative Senator, and I think he must feel as I do about this matter.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say that I agree with the Senator from Maine, but I think the Senate will bear me out in the statement that I have rarely asked for such publications. The article in question is one carefully written. It is not a political article in any sense, but is an economic article on an economic question. The question is a live one; a question that is coming here to the Senate for discussion. I know a number of people who have asked for the printing of this article; otherwise I should not have asked for its publication.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, if it be not asking too much of the Senator from Colorado, I should be glad to have him state, so far as he can, the substance of the article. I understand from the reading of the caption of the article that it was written by "A Democrat in the Philippines." I do not know whether he was the first Democrat who has ever been to the Philippines, and I do not know just what the purpose of the publication is.

Mr. TELLER. No, Mr. President; I understand quite a number of Democrats went over to the Philippines after the last session under the auspices of the Secretary of War.

Mr. HALE. Did they come back good Democrats. [Laughter.]

Mr. TELLER. They came back; but what their views are, as a rule, I do not know.

Mr. HALE. The Senator does not know whether they have been converted?

Mr. TELLER. No; I do not.

Mr. HALE. That is a matter that should be carefully looked into. [Laughter.]

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] that I was one of those Democrats who went to the Philippines, and I can enlighten him. I will state that those Democrats were not converted at all; but I will remind the Senator that he should pay a little attention to the Republicans that accompanied the Democrats and see whether or not they were converted. [Laughter.]

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], that an article from the North American Review, entitled "A Democrat in the Philippines," written by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], be printed as a public document? The Chair hears none, and the order to print is made.

EMPLOYMENT OF MESSENGERS OR ASSISTANT CLERKS FOR COMMITTEES.

Mr. KEAN. I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate on the 21st day of December passed a resolution giving to the Select Committee on National Banks a messenger.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey moves that the vote by which the resolution referred to by him was passed be reconsidered. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on National Banks be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Jersey to reconsider the vote by which the resolution just read was passed.

Mr. KEAN. One moment, Mr. President. That resolution was amended on the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. Let the amendment be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment referred to will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, after the words "Select Committee on National Banks," I move to add the words, "and all other committees of the Senate not now provided with messengers."

Mr. LODGE. That is right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, if it is not unreasonable, I would venture to ask the Senator from New Jersey to explain briefly the object of his motion.

Mr. KEAN. The object of my motion, Mr. President, is to reconsider the vote by which the resolution which has just been read was adopted, in order that, as I conceive, the true intent of the Senate may be put into the resolution—that is, to amend the resolution by adding after the word "messengers" the words "or assistant clerks," so that each committee of the Senate will be provided with a clerk and an assistant clerk or messenger.

Mr. SPOONER. How would it leave the matter if that vote should be reconsidered and the resolution amended as proposed by the Senator from New Jersey? Would that leave every committee with a clerk and an assistant clerk?

Mr. KEAN. Yes; or a messenger.

Mr. SPOONER. Or a messenger. How many committees would be affected by that? We were told the other day, I remember——

Mr. KEAN. Three or four will be affected by it if we put in the words "or clerk," but if the resolution should be left as it is it would affect twenty-nine committees.

Mr. SPOONER. These are to be, as I understand, active committees.

Mr. KEAN. Yes; active committees.

Mr. SPOONER. If the resolution shall be reconsidered and the Senator's amendment adopted, every committee, large or small, active or inactive, will have a clerk and either an assistant clerk or a messenger?

Mr. KEAN. That is right.

Mr. FORAKER. And nothing more.

Mr. KEAN. Not under this resolution.

Mr. FORAKER. I ask, Mr. President, that the resolution may go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over at the request of the Senator from Ohio, if there be no objection.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask unanimous consent to put to the Senator from New Jersey another question, only for information. Under the resolution as it now stands, will every committee of the Senate have a clerk, an assistant clerk, and a messenger?

Mr. KEAN. No. Some committees have an assistant clerk now. Some of the committees that have assistant clerks claim the right, in addition, to appoint messengers. This is to limit the number to two assistants for each committee that has not already an assistant clerk or messenger. Of course, it will

not interfere with the Committee on Appropriations, with the Committee on Pensions, with the Committee on Foreign Relations, or with any of the large committees that have assistant clerks at the present time. A great many of them are provided for by law and not from the contingent fund of the Senate. This applies to those who are paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I objected only because I wanted an opportunity to look at the resolution and see what the effect of it would be. I understand now from the explanation that has been made that the resolution, if adopted, will not interfere with committees that have already clerks and assistant clerks and messengers.

Mr. KEAN. It will not.

Mr. FORAKER. Then I have no objection.

Mr. HEYBURN. Then, Mr. President, I interpose an objection and ask that the matter go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the motion does not necessarily go over upon a single objection.

Mr. SPOONER. No.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion to reconsider is before the Senate, and the question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. HEYBURN. I understood that on the objection of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] the matter was going over, and that he has just withdrawn his request that it go over.

Mr. FORAKER. Yes; I have withdrawn my objection.

Mr. LODGE. A motion to reconsider does not go over on a single objection, I think.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair has so stated.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not know upon what objection—I have not examined the rule—the motion would go over; but I do not desire that it shall be disposed of summarily at this time. There is some information that I should like to have as to what committees have more than a clerk and an assistant clerk.

The Senate acted upon this matter, I thought, with a full knowledge of what it was doing. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] proposed an amendment that committees not having a messenger should each of them be provided with one.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. That was immediately after the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], in answer to a question which I put to him, stated that the resolution affected only two or three committees; but it now turns out to be the fact that twenty-eight or twenty-nine committees are affected. Am I not right?

Mr. KEAN. That is right.

Mr. HEYBURN. But, Mr. President, if twenty-eight or twenty-nine committees are entitled to messengers, they should have them. The proceedings in regard to this matter will be found on page 633 of the RECORD of the last day of the session before the vacation. The Senator from New Jersey said:

> Mr. KEAN. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], to report it favorably, in order to do away with discrimination. I report the resolution without amendment, and ask for its present consideration.
>
> The resolution was read, as follows:
>
> "*Resolved*, That the Select Committee to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law."
>
> Mr. HEYBURN. I understand from the Senator that this covers all the committees that have not messengers.
>
> Mr. KEAN. I believe it does, with one more that I am about to report. It covers every Senator, I believe, who had no messenger or other patronage.

That is quite general.

> The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho object to the consideration of the resolution?
>
> Mr. HEYBURN. I do not object to the resolution. I asked the question for information.
>
> The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.
>
> Mr. KEAN. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted yesterday by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON], to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.
>
> The resolution was read, and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:
>
> "*Resolved*, That the Select Committee on National Banks be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law."
>
> Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, after the words "Select Committee on National Banks," I move to add the words, "and all other committees of the Senate not now provided with messengers."
>
> Mr. LODGE. That is right.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator kindly give me the date of the RECORD from which he reads?

Mr. HEYBURN. Page 633 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 21, 1905.

Mr. DANIEL. Thank you.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, the question of extending assistance to committees of this body has been somewhat talked about. A very large number of committees of this body are located in the Annex; they are separated from the body of the Senate and from the business of the Senate in a most inconvenient way; and they have not even the accommodation of a desk within this building. Their members have occasion to go backward and forward frequently in the performance of their duties connected with the work of their committees and connected with their work as members of this body; they have no messenger to send, and so they must either take the clerk of their committee or the assistant clerk, or they must appeal to the ordinary messenger service that is connected with the Senate; they have no one who belongs to the committee that they may call upon to perform the duties that arise every hour during the sessions of this body. It is but fair that those committees that are deprived of the ordinary conveniences which are enjoyed by other committees of this body should be provided with messengers to perform those duties; and it would not be such a burden as would seem to be unreasonable upon the expenses of this body.

I was very much gratified when the Senate so unanimously concurred in the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] in regard to this question. I immediately proceeded to take advantage of it, to nominate a competent man to perform the duties of messenger, and to install him in his duties; but I was advised by the department in which those appointments are filed that a caveat had been entered there that stayed the force and effect of the action of this body as it appears upon the record, and that no such appointment could be recognized, notwithstanding the fact that this body had in its usual manner acted upon the question.

I hope there will be no hasty disposition of this matter. If it is not the intention of this body to provide assistance for at least those committees that are separated in the performance of their duties from the main body, let us know that after fair and full consideration. The proposition has been made, I believe—I will not, however, take up the question now—that these committees might be provided with some conveniences in this Capitol that would avoid the necessity of going backward and forward several blocks in every kind of weather and making a trip of it whenever the little details connected with their business require them to come in contact with their committee rooms or with the clerical force at their disposal. I hope the Senate will seriously consider this matter before it reconsiders and undoes the very good work which it did on the last day of the session before the holidays.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator quoted my name in reading the debate. I merely desire to state the understanding on which I voted for that resolution. What I supposed it covered was that some committees had two clerks and a messenger, or three clerks. There are some that have two, and there are others that have only one. I understood the purpose of the resolution as it was amended on the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] was to give to every chairman of a committee a clerk and an assistant clerk or a messenger—that is, two persons connected with the committee where theretofore there was only one. I did not understand, and I do not think the Senator understood, that the proposition was to give three assistants to every committee. Some committees have three now, as I say, some have two, and some only one. It is not necessary to discuss whether it is desirable to give every committee three clerks. The point is that that is a separate proposition from the one which I think all Senators understood on the last day of the session before the vacation. To add a third clerk or messenger—for most of these messengers do clerical work—would involve an expenditure of $50,000 a year, a very large addition to the roll of the Senate. I am not prepared to say whether that is necessary or not. Some committees have more to do than other committees; they have hearings, they have a great many bills, and that work of the committee takes practically the time of one man. Therefore, on those committees the chairman who has two clerks is no better off really than the chairman of an entirely inactive committee who has two clerks. All I wished to point out was that the proposition which is now made was not the one on which I think Senators thought they were voting the other day. Whether it is a meritorious proposition or not is another thing.

What we meant to do the other day, as I understood, was to provide that every chairman of a committee, whether a majority

chairmanship or a minority chairmanship, had at least two clerks, or a messenger and a clerk, the messenger performing clerical work. I think that is very proper. I think they ought all at least to have those two, but whether we want to go further and make the force of every committee, without reference to the work of the committee, three persons, is a much larger proposition.

I hope, therefore, the Senate will reconsider the vote by which the previous resolution was passed, so as to bring the matter fairly before the Senate. I do not think we want to undertake to act under a resolution about which there was certainly complete misunderstanding on the part of many Senators. I do not think we want to establish an expenditure of nearly $50,000, when a great many Senators supposed from the colloquy which occurred here, as I certainly did, that the proposition involved only two or three or three or four additional clerks.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of the chairman of the committee having this matter in charge how it happens that the salaries paid to the messengers and the salaries paid to the clerks vary from nine hundred dollars to fourteen hundred and forty dollars as to messengers and from fifteen hundred up to two thousand two hundred and twenty for clerks?

Mr. KEAN. Replying to the Senator from Texas, I will say that those figures, I believe, are established by law.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, then it must be a bad law which estimates the value of one Senator's messenger at fourteen hundred and forty dollars and another Senator's messenger at nine hundred dollars.

Speaking for myself, I believe that every Senator ought to be sufficiently provided with clerical help, and I take it no Senator here would hesitate a moment to vote for such a proposition; but to provide a Senator with two clerks and one messenger looks to me like putting them somewhat in the Senator's way. It may be there are here some Senators with so many things requiring their attention that they need three assistants, but as for myself—and I am not inclined to neglect my part of this work—I think a third one would be in my way. I take it that it is largely the same with most of the Senators.

But what I protest against is the disparity. If a clerk is worth $1,500, I want him to be paid $1,500, because I believe that the laborer is worthy of his hire; but if a clerk is worth only $1,500 I do not want him to be paid $2,220, because I believe the hire is also worthy of the laborer; and it seems to me that while this matter is before us now it would be a very good time to equalize the salaries of men who perform practically the same service.

I perfectly understand that the clerks to the important committees of this body are entitled to receive and do receive higher salaries than those who are purely and only clerks to Senators. I presume there are clerks to certain important committees who are well-nigh invaluable to those committees, and I do not grudge a proper and even a liberal salary to such a clerk, a salary commensurate with his capacity and his usefulness; but I do not believe there can be any defense for wasting the public money by paying one clerk $2,220 for what another clerk performs for $1,500, unless the $1,500 clerk is underpaid.

Of course, I understand that the salary of $2,220 is attached to the clerkships of certain committees, but those committees, as we understand, generally have no duties to perform, or at least perform no extra labor. They are rather ornamental than useful positions, though under the rules of the Senate it is well to have them, because occasions come when those committees are required to do important work. But for——

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is quite right that there is a great disparity, in the pay of clerks of committees, between the actual duties and what they perform. But that is not a thing that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate can deal with. It has all grown up and is a part of the body of the law of the Senate. In the old days only two or three committees, very hard-working committees, had clerks who were paid above $1,500 or $1,800. From time to time, on appropriation bills and otherwise, amendments were adopted putting on other committees, at $1,800 and then at $2,250. So now the great number of committees of the Senate have clerks at $2,250—committees which almost never meet—and other committees that have a great deal of work to do have clerks at the same salary.

Mr. GALLINGER. Twenty-two hundred and twenty dollars.

Mr. HALE. I do not know why that sum was fixed. But the Senator from Texas knows it is pretty difficult to take any back steps. Everything is entirely different from what it used to be, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. And somewhat different from what it ought to be.

Mr. HALE. I think so. I served in the Senate fifteen years and had but one clerk. I had no assistant clerk and no messenger. I did not think I was entitled to an assistant clerk. As the Senator from Texas says, he would have been in the way. I should like to have had a messenger. I had only one clerk. But never until within the last few years did the Committee on Naval Affairs, which does a great deal of work, have an assistant clerk, and it has not a messenger attached to the committee. It has one assigned to it.

That is the way all this has come up. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who has served with me on the Committee on Appropriations for years, will bear me out that it is a thing fixed in the law, and it is unequal undoubtedly.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, of course the labor to be performed by the Senator himself and therefore the labor to be performed by the clerk or his assistant grows greater every year. The Government is touching the people at so many new places, I regret to say, that the correspondence of a Senator to-day is perhaps five times what it was in the days to which the Senator from Maine refers.

The truth of it is the correspondence of a Senator has become the burden of a Senator's life, and the task of writing thirty or forty and sometimes fifty letters is an almost daily one with us. Writing those letters for a thousand years would not add a cubit to a man's intellectual stature. It is purely a burden, but it is one which must be performed. When a Senator's constituent writes him on any subject, that constituent is entitled to a prompt and a respectful answer, and if the Senator does not allow the constituent to hear from him the Senator is very apt to hear from the constituent at the proper time; and I share the resentment which a constituent feels toward a Senator who ignores his communication.

This correspondence, growing from year to year, has become such a great burden that it would be utterly impossible for a Senator to perform his duties without clerical assistance. As for my part I am willing to give all that is necessary, but I am not willing to spend one dollar of public money to provide patronage for anybody. If the work of a Senator's committee or the work of a Senator requires three, let him have them. But I will not vote one dollar of public money merely to provide somebody a place. Patronage is not a very wholesome thing for a Senator to cultivate, and certainly it is not a very wholesome thing for the Senate to provide places merely that Senators may fill them.

But, Mr. President, that was not the purpose for which I rose. I rose to protest against the inequality which offends against the rule of justice. Either some clerks are paid too much or other clerks are paid too little. My own opinion is that some clerks are paid too much. But if Senators do not agree with me in that, they must agree with me that men who perform the same services should receive the same pay.

I beg to say that I do not mean this in the nature of a complaint against the Senator from New Jersey or the committee over which he presides; I do not mean it as a complaint against any committee or as against the Senate, because I recognize that it has grown up from time to time, as suggested by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], but I do insist that it is an inequality which ought to be corrected.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I am not one of those Senators who are suffering from any incumbrance of patronage, but every Senator has to deal with a great many people who have very mistaken notions as to his power to exercise patronage. I do not think that any Senator here, on either side of the House, wishes to increase the clerical force of the Senate with any view to patronage. It is purely a matter of public business and the prompt dispatch thereof.

I observe in a detailed statement of the clerical and other committee force now employed and paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate that a great many committees have three or four employees, some of them perhaps more. Amongst the committees that have three or more I will enumerate the following: First, the Committee on Printing Records. I do not see the name of a Committee on Printing Records in the list of committees, and I did not know there was one. I presume it refers to the Joint Committee on Printing. Probably it may be otherwise named in this statement. The Committee on Appropriations has four; the Committee on Finance four; the Committee on Claims four; the Committee on Commerce three; the Committee on Pensions five; the Committee on the Judiciary three; the Committee on Military Affairs four; the Com-

mittee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads four; the Committee on the District of Columbia three; the Committee on Foreign Relations three; the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry three; the Committee on Territories three; the Committee on Interstate Commerce three; the Committee on Privileges and Elections three; the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico three; the Committee on the Philippines three; the Committee on Immigration three.

Mr. President, I am chairman of a very modest committee and which has a very modest establishment in what is sometimes called the "catacombs." I have no right to complain in any respect. It is the best the situation admits of. In addition to that, those committees which have as many as three employees having already been stated, there was a motion to give the Committee on National Banks a messenger. The Committee on National Banks is not one of the great committees of the Senate, like Appropriations or Finance, and it seemed that if we were going to give a messenger to a committee which had a single topic of treatment, and that a minor one as compared to the great and constant affairs of Government, other committees of like order ought to have them.

Now, in respect to committee chairmanships held by minority members, this observation seems appropriate: Few of those committees have much business. For the most part they have little or no business. The committee of which I am chairman has at present no business of general public concern. The committee rooms are used by the Senators as offices, especially the small committees. They are indispensable to the conduct of their public business. The committees vary as to their business. A particular incident happens in our Government by which a committee is overwhelmed for the time being with business and then, after a freshet, again there is a drought. You can not in the nature of things tell when a particular committee is going to have much business. Our Committee on Privileges and Elections, for instance, has had very heavy business and many hearings for a year or two. The time will soon come perhaps when they will not have a case or any matter of importance referred to them. We can not measure the necessities of a committee by the particular business which may be upon them at a particular moment.

I had presumed, and I believe such is the case, that the minority Senators were allowed this service because of their multifarious connections with the Government, rather than in the view that they would need these appurtenances and this aid for mere committee work.

Mr. President, I am told by the chairman of the committee which reported this resolution, and doubtless it is true, that in addition to these employees who are paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate the Senators who at this time represent the majority of the Senate have numerous other employees who assist in their work. There is no impropriety whatsoever in that if it is indispensable or appropriate to their efficient work.

The view I have of this question is simply this: It is to the interest of the Senate as a body that every Senator should be sustained by such appropriate help as is desirable for his efficient discharge of his Senatorial duties. A day may come at any time when his committee will have a good deal of work, although at that particular day it has none. Whether that day comes or not, his office in the Capitol, or as near thereto as accommodations will permit, has to be attended by his clerical force and by those who are ready to wait upon him and to help him in the execution of his office.

The Senate, Mr. President, like every other department of our Government, is congested. Our Calendars are congested with bills. There is not a bureau of the Government that is not congested. We must remember that we have added an empire to this Republic, call it by whatever name you will; and I am not adverting to it for the purpose of the slightest censorious observation. We have to take things as we find them. But the truth is that the American Republic at home is a republic, and the truth is also that from the far Orient to out in the Atlantic it is an empire. The men who are elected here as Senators of the United States are the legislators of a great empire, as well as of a republic, whether they will or no. That has come about in the destiny of this nation, and I am not discussing it at all save to call attention to the fact. We had brought up before the Senate this morning railroads in the Philippine Islands, 7,000 miles from where we are. What Senator knows anything about the subject, and how is he to inform himself? In order to the efficient discharge of the Senatorial duty here, the Senator ought to be sustained and have every employee in his service who is necessary or desirable to write his correspondence, to visit the Departments, and to meet those who wish to see him on public business.

I have no hesitation in spending a dollar of the people's money for the purpose of enabling me to discharge my office in a conscientious manner. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senate in according facilities to the minority members, but I believe, sir, that it rests upon a much higher view of the situation than courtesy. We call it courtesy because it is a fitting and appropriate exercise of Senatorial power. The Senators who are in the minority are just as responsible in their own conscience, are just as responsible to their constituents for the administration of this Government as are those who chance for the time being to be in the majority, and in some respects they have a heavier laboring oar than have those of the majority.

Now, then, this is a fitting time, at the beginning of a long session of a new Congress, to fix this matter and to fix it right, and let us fix it understandingly. Let us know what are the conveniences and what are the attendants of the various committees, and let us accord them according to the proprieties of each particular case and according to the reasonable necessities of Senatorial duty. I do not consider for myself that the three employees are a bit too many to enable me properly to discharge my duties. I do not want them for patronage. Patronage never has been and never will be a source of power to a man who is here to do his duty and for no other purpose. Patronage has oftener been the downfall of men than it has been their upbuilding. I do not seek patronage. I wish I did not have the little I possess. It is an incumbrance to Senators rather than an aid to them in their political career, if their political career is designed to be for the public good and not for some ulterior and sinister purpose. But the little patronage that does come to us and which is accorded in order to enable us to discharge our duties ought to be freely and fully accorded, and the honor of a Senator ought to be sufficient to give him any help which he would state in the open Senate he felt was desirable for the efficient discharge of his Senatorial duties.

My honorable friend the Senator who desires to have a messenger to attend him at the Maltby House ought to have that messenger, and any other Senator here who wants a messenger and signifies his desire to have him in service ought to have him.

Men who are Senators of the United States and who are responsible to this country and to the States to do their duty, to answer the letters of their constituents and to attend the multifarious questions that come before them, should be sustained by the Government of the United States in no stinted way, and in no other way than that which reason and common sense and the measure of means to end may dictate.

I offered the amendment in a somewhat different understanding of this case from that which I discover was in the mind of the chairman. Here are many committees of the Senate, some of them not now having much business before them, that have only two employees. There is no reason why those committees should not have three as well as the Committee on National Banks. There is no annual business about the Committee on National Banks.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Virginia excuse me?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. DANIEL. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I simply want to clear up my understanding of the proposition. I did not understand that the proposition was to give the Committee on National Banks three employees, but only two.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

Mr. KEAN. That is the proposition.

Mr. DANIEL. Perhaps that is true.

Mr. LODGE. That is, the Committee on National Banks, on which this started, has one clerk.

Mr. DANIEL. Ah!

Mr. LODGE. The proposition was to give it a messenger, who was to act as clerk, making two employees.

Mr. DANIEL. The intention was to give the committee two?

Mr. LODGE. The intention was to give them two; and then I understood the Senator's amendment was to make it uniform, and to give two to each committee.

Mr. DANIEL. I thought that that committee had two already.

Mr. SPOONER. Oh, no.

Mr. LODGE. No; and there are two or three other committees that do not have two employees, the Senator from New Jersey says.

Mr. DANIEL. I observe by the list that they all appear to have two. Possibly I may be mistaken.

Mr. KEAN. I think the Senator will find that the Committee on Rules has only one.

Mr. DANIEL. Only one?

Mr. KEAN. The Committee on Rules, over which the dis-

tinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] presides, has only one.

Mr. DANIEL. I was also informed, however, by the chairman of the Committee on Contingent Expenses that those Senators who had only two employees that were paid out of the contingent fund had more who were paid by law, so that this would be a misleading list if we were to take it as an indication of the number of employees of committees; and unless the mind reverted to the fact——

Mr. KEAN. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DANIEL. Certainly.

Mr. KEAN. I think the Senator must have misunderstood me. I did not mean to say they are employees of the committee. They are employees of the Senate, and often employees of the Senate, who have been recommended by Senators and so on, do work for Senators.

Mr DANIEL. They are assigned to the work of Senators?

Mr. KEAN. I do not even think that.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to get the correct statement of it.

Mr. KEAN. At least they are employed by the Senate, and during hours when the Senate is not in session I think they often work for Senators; but I do not think they are assigned to the committees.

Mr. DANIEL. I misapprehended the Senator.

Mr. KEAN. All the assignments to committees are, I think, in the book the Senator has. The others are simply employees of the Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand the Senator now. As I understand the Senator, the majority have a certain control of the patronage of the Senate and when gentlemen who hold positions under that patronage are not employed in the public business of the Senate they are enabled to assist them, very properly, in their own Senatorial work.

Now, Mr. President, here is the point I make as to that. In the discharge of Senatorial work every minority member ought to stand as the peer of his associate in the majority; and as he has not got such patronage, he should have that help from the Government which will enable him just as fully to discharge his duties as a Senator as those who are on the majority side of the Chamber.

A mere glance at this list of those who are paid out of the contingent fund would not reveal the actual state of affairs which we have to deal with. I do not consider it unreasonable that any committee should have three employees, provided the Senator who is chairman of that committee has no patronage which he can draw upon for the help which is necessary for the discharge in a proper way of the Senatorial office.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. Now I move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Virginia by inserting after the word "messengers" the words "or assistant clerks."

Mr. GALLINGER. So as to read?

Mr. LODGE. So that it will read?

Mr. KEAN. Let the resolution be read as I propose to amend it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey moves to amend the resolution. The Secretary will read the resolution as it would stand if amended.

The Secretary proceeded to read the resolution as proposed to be amended.

Mr. KEAN. That does not read right.

Mr. LODGE. That is wrong. It is not right.

Mr. SPOONER. Is there any objection to this matter going over until the Senate meets again?

Mr. KEAN. If it were not for those who are on the rolls already, the two or three who have been appointed, I should not object.

Mr. LODGE. Five have been appointed.

Mr. KEAN. Five have been appointed, and I do not care to strike them from the rolls of the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. I suggest that the Senator from New Jersey propose the amendment that he wishes to have come in and have it read.

Mr. LODGE. He has done so.

Mr. FORAKER. Now it can be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution with the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on National Banks, and all other committees of the Senate not now provided with messengers or assistant clerks, be, and are hereby, authorized to employ messengers, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest that the Senator from New Jersey read the resolution as amended.

Mr. KEAN (reading)—

Resolved, That the Select Committee on National Banks be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, and all other committees of the Senate not now provided with messengers or assistant clerks be, and are hereby, authorized to employ messengers, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I did not have in view the question of patronage when I addressed the Senate at the beginning of this discussion. I have not considered the question of patronage at all. I do not regard this as a question involving that principle. It was merely that a Senator might be provided with sufficient clerical help to perform his duties as a Senator. There is no use in evading the situation. While these are assistants to the committees, they are in effect assistants to the Senators who are chairmen of the committees, and it amounts to a question as to how much assistance each Senator shall have. Shall he have enough to enable him to perform the duties that devolve upon him as a Senator?

I may say personally that I have been compelled to employ extra help at my own expense, and I am doing it now in the performance of my duty as a Senator. For any duties that may arise other than those connected with my official position of course I expect to provide the necessary clerical force.

But the question is, Shall we, by this resolution, as it was adopted the other day, provide all Senators with sufficient clerical force? It has been stated here that it would be desirable could each Senator be rid of what has been termed the incumbrance of correspondence incident to his position. I do not think that that is just the right spirit in which to regard this question. We are here to represent the people, and they are entitled to correspond with us, and they are entitled to be answered. For one I like to see the people come close enough to the Government and be interested enough in the performance of their duties as citizens and our duties as their representatives to communicate with us. They are entitled to it, and I do not begrudge it at all. I am perfectly willing to answer every letter that comes and to perform all of the little duties in the way of accommodation that are incident to the holding of the position.

I hope this question will not be disposed of at this time. There is only a very meager attendance of the Senate here, and when we meet again there will undoubtedly be a fuller attendance. It is a question which affects a great many Senators who are not here at this time. I hope the resolution will go over by general consent until they are here, and not foreclose the Senators who are not here in disposing of this resolution.

Leaving out any question of patronage, or sentiment connected with the question of patronage, and looking at it merely as a question of necessity to enable us to perform our duties, no man holding the position of a Senator should be forced ever to neglect his public duty or else to pay for the assistance necessary to perform it out of his own pocket.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President, assuming all that has been stated by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN], I still submit, from the remarks which have been made here on the floor, that the proper course is to go back to the old method of considering each one of the committees separately. It has been suggested by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] that the committee probably would not know what to do with a third man. Hence I do not see any necessity for forcing upon any committees something that is absolutely unnecessary. If we go back to the system which we have had heretofore, the Senator can present to the proper committee his statement that he needs other help. I believe on the mere statement of any Senator that the work of his committee is such that he is either compelled to employ the extra service himself or else secure other assistance the proper committee—the Committee on Contingent Expenses—would immediately authorize him to secure that extra assistance. It seems to me that that is the proper and the only just way to deal with the question.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the fact that the measure of the needs of a Senator is not the committee which he may be at the head of. The measure of the needs of a Senator is other than the needs of a committee, and the measure of the needs of a Senator is not the same in the case of each Senator. Some Senators represent constituencies ten times as large as other Senators and have ten times as much work devolved upon them of the nature indicated by the Senator from Idaho. So it seems to me in dealing with this question we ought to take a much

broader view of it than that which is limited by the needs of a particular committee of which a Senator may happen to be the head.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator understood me correctly, he would find that we are not at all in disagreement upon that proposition. Each Senator does his work mostly through certain committees. I did not have reference merely to the chairman of that committee, but to the work of the Senator upon the several committees. If the work is such that he needs that extra assistance, I am certain that the Committee on Contingent Expenses would report favorably a resolution authorizing the extra assistance, whether he was chairman or otherwise.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Idaho. The resolution as now proposed to be amended by the chairman of the Committee on Contingent Expenses is, I think, eminently just and proper, and it would furnish relief to a great many Senators who are loaded with a great deal of work. It would give them either an assistant clerk or a messenger. Whatever name he would be called by, he would undoubtedly perform the functions of an assistant clerk.

Now, if it turns out that the Senator from Idaho needs, in addition to that, a messenger for his committee, let that be included as a separate proposition and refer it to the committee. If he is entitled to it, he can get it; but the Senator, I suggest, in all fairness, ought not to stand in the way of others getting a little additional help in some nineteen or twenty committees. I trust the Senator will withdraw his objection on that account.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I am not urging an objection so much as placing myself in the light in which I desire to stand on this question. It was suggested that this was an attempt to get patronage, and I desire to disclaim that principle. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that it does not affect me personally at all. I am very glad to have this resolution adopted, and I want it adopted in such a way and after such consideration as will leave me standing in a proper light, or the light in which I desire to present myself in this discussion.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. I beg leave to say to the Senator——

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will take occasion to say that it was my purpose to address the Senate as briefly as might be on this bill to-day, but there are reasons why I prefer to postpone that service until Monday next. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of concluding the discussion which is now in progress.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMPLOYMENT OF MESSENGERS OR ASSISTANT CLERKS FOR COMMITTEES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] yielded to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. DANIEL. I beg to say to the Senator I do not think anyone suggested that this was a mere patronage. I think he misapprehended an observation which the Senator from Texas made.

Mr. HEYBURN. I was not referring to the remarks of the Senator from Virginia at all.

Mr. DANIEL. I simply arose because I thought the Senator from Idaho misapprehended an observation made by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Virginia evidently misunderstood an observation of the Senator from Texas. The question of patronage did not originate with me. I took it from some one on the other side of the Chamber, who claimed an appointment as a matter of patronage, as I understood.

Mr. DANIEL. I only wished to put the Senator from Idaho right about it. I was simply affirming that the Senator from Texas had made no such suggestion.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the stenographer's notes will show that some Senator on the other side first referred to this as a matter of patronage.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I do not desire, so far as I am concerned, to prolong this discussion nor to oppose or to urge any further opposition to the adoption of the resolution, because it does leave the field open for further consideration along the line suggested by both the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from North Dakota. Any committee desiring further assistance of course may have it by conforming to the usual manner of proceeding.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a single word.

The first two years I had service in this body I had the honor of being chairman of the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, a committee that did not hold a meeting during those two years and has not held a meeting since. The committee had a clerk, I think at $1,500, and we got along very comfortably. I was promoted from that position to that of chairman of the Committee on Pensions, and I need not more than suggest to the Senate that more service was required there of a clerical nature than was required for the committee I had formerly served as chairman. From that committee I was either promoted or demoted, I do not know which, to the chairmanship of the Committee on the District of Columbia. That committee is trying to legislate for about 300,000 people who are denied the right of suffrage, and I think it is safe to say that at least 200,000 of them are constitutional kickers. We have a procession in that committee room constantly. We have to deal with sewers, with lamp-posts, with electric lights, street railways, steam railways, telephones, telegraphs, gas, and almost every other conceivable subject. That committee has one clerk, an assistant clerk, and a messenger. It ought really to have more clerical assistance, but we manage by hard work to get along.

The proposition embodied in the resolution which was adopted a few days ago, and which I did not understand fully, was to give the Committee on Woman Suffrage, as an illustration, the Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics, the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures, the Committee on National Banks, and the Committee to Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands——

Mr. KEAN. The Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics no longer exists.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from New Jersey says the Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics no longer exists. If necessary, it will be revived. The proposition was to give those committees two clerks and a messenger, precisely the number that the Committee on the District of Columbia has.

Now, Mr. President, it would not be fair to have an adjustment of that kind made, and I submit to the Senate, without desiring to make any further suggestion about my own committee, that if each of these minor committees gets a clerk and an assistant clerk or a clerk and a messenger it will be a very liberal disposition, and we ought all to be satisfied with it. I am very glad to know that the Senator from Idaho, after thinking the matter over, has concluded that it is a proper thing for us to adopt the resolution as amended.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I desire to say simply one word in order that what has just been said by the Senator from New Hampshire may not be misunderstood, either here or by the public, in regard to the clerks of committees that do no work.

We all know the fact that there are committees, some of which have been mentioned by him, which are merely nominal committees. But it is a mistake, Mr. President, to have the impression that the clerk of that committee has no duty to perform by reason of the fact that the committee itself does no work. The fact is that every Senator, whether he is chairman of a committee or not, has a secretary, and when a Senator is chairman of a committee he has not a secretary in addition to the clerk of the committee. His own secretary becomes ex officio clerk of that committee, or, vice versa, the clerk of that committee is ex officio his clerk or secretary.

So, when it is said that the clerk of the committee is the officer of a committee which is never called together, it will certainly produce a very wrong impression if it is understood from that that the clerk of that committee has absolutely no duties to perform. He has just the same duties that the clerk or secretary of every other Senator has in the performance of the clerical duty required by that Senator, and the only effect of being the clerk of one of these nominal committees is that he gets a little more salary than he would get if he were not named as the clerk of a committee. He is in fact in such a case but the private secretary of the Senator and in no manner differs from any other private secretary of a Senator except in the fact that he gets an additional amount of salary.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] asks me about the assistant clerk. It is true also in that case that the clerk of a committee, who is ex officio the clerk or secretary of a Senator, and the assistant clerk are both of them in such cases simply employed in the work of the Senator.

I may speak for myself as the chairman of one of the so-called nominal committees (Woman Suffrage), having only occasionally some very interesting audiences from a very interesting and charming portion of the public. Outside of that particular duty which devolves upon the clerk of the committee and the assistant, who is detailed from the Sergeant-at-Arms' office, the official work which those two officers have to do, in addition to the committee work, is more than can be reasonably required of them without other clerical assistance. As stated by the Senator from Idaho, ever since I have been a member of this body, with rare exceptions, it has been necessary for me to have additional clerical force to that which is supplied to me by the Senate. To all, except those of us who have had experience in this matter, it is difficult to realize the vast amount of office clerical work and departmental work devolving upon even those of us who belong to the minority, and how utterly impossible it is for any one man as the clerk of a Senator to do the clerical work of that Senator. Two are required for every Senator, and I believe for an average of the Senators more than two are necessary to properly discharge the duties.

A Senator represents the constituency of a whole State. My State, Mr. President, is not the largest by any means. It occupies about the same relation to the other States now that it did when the Government was formed. It is about the thirteenth State. It was one of the original thirteen and the smallest of the original thirteen in population, unless Delaware or Rhode Island. I do not know what their population was at that time. It was the youngest of the colonies. My State at the time of the adoption of the Constitution was the youngest colony which became a State. It was the thirteenth in its relation to the other States. It is still about the thirteenth.

Yet, Mr. President, there are in Georgia two million and a half of people and it is the usual thing when a man in my State has any business of particular importance in Washington about which he writes to his Representative that he also writes to one of the Senators and most frequently to both of them. This involves not only the correspondence, but the work to which that correspondence relates. I presume the same is true of all other Senators.

Now, Mr. President, considering for a moment Georgia as an average, if you please, what must be the immense mass of business which devolves upon a Senator, even if you confine it to the routine business, with a vast constituency behind it, with even a fraction of 1 per cent of them having something to attend to in Washington?

Mr. President, I do not think it becomes this Government (and I know I speak not only my sentiment but the sentiment of the public at large) that one of its officials shall be required to go down into his own pocket to pay for the clerical help which should be paid for by the Government.

I do not know what the status of this resolution is. I unfortunately reached the city on a delayed train and was not here when the discussion opened. I do not propose in anything I say to impede the course of such procedure as those who have been here all the time and have participated from the beginning in this debate see proper or best to be done. But I thought it was proper that I should say this in connection with what had been said by the Senator from New Hampshire, and also, in addition, to say what I have said in justification of what may seem from this debate, or from certain things which others have said in this debate, to be extravagance on the part of the Senate in the provision it makes for the clerical force assisting a Senator in the discharge of his labors.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I quite concur with what the Senator from Georgia has said, and I had no intention to make it appear in the brief observations I made that a clerk to a committee had not service to perform as private secretary to the chairman of the committee. But there is another side to that question, Mr. President. The clerk of the Committee on the District of Columbia has probably not written ten letters for the chairman during the last five years, and he is constantly employed in the work of the committee.

Mr. BACON. The Senator will pardon me. I might have stated at the time, and if the Senator will permit me I will say now, that for such a committee as that there ought to be distinctively a clerk of the committee who shall have no duties except to do the clerical work for the committee, because there are a number of committees in the Senate whose clerical work fully occupies not only one, but two clerks.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is precisely the situation that clerk is in. He is working early and late in the service of the committee, and he performs no service whatever for the chairman.

Now, Mr. President, I do not want to prolong this debate. I think that the Senate is ready to vote on the question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 8, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 4, 1906.

SECRETARY OF OKLAHOMA.

Charles H. Filson, of Oklahoma, to be secretary of Oklahoma, vice William Grimes, whose term will expire January 13, 1906.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

Asa P. French, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, vice Melvin O. Adams, resigned.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION AND CONSUL-GENERAL.

Hoffman Philip, of New York, now consul-general at Tangier, to be secretary of the legation and consul-general of the United States at Tangier, Morocco, to fill an original vacancy.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

John Edward Jones, of the District of Columbia, now consul at Dalney, Manchuria, to be consul-general of the United States at Dalny, Manchuria. This is a change of grade.

CONSULS.

Henry A. Barber, of Maryland, to be consul of the United States at Puerto Plata, Dominican Republic, vice William W. Handley, appointed consul at Trinidad.

Chester C. Mercury, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Managua, Nicaragua, vice Chester Donaldson, appointed consul at Port Limon.

Richard W. Austin, of Tennessee, to be consul of the United States at Glasgow, Scotland, vice Samuel M. Taylor, retired.

INDIAN AGENT.

Ret Millard, of Oklahoma, to be agent for the Indians of the Osage Agency in Oklahoma, vice Frank Frantz, appointed governor of Oklahoma.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Hiram P. Mackintosh, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Newburyport, in the State of Massachusetts. (Reappointment.)

Frank L. Shaw, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Machias, in the State of Maine. (Reappointment.)

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles F. Gallenkamp, of Missouri, to be surveyor of customs for the port of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri. (Reappointment.)

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Frank C. Sickles, of Oklahoma, to be register of the land office at Elreno, Okla., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

Alpha E. Hoyt, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Sundance, Wyo., his term having expired December 18, 1905. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Thomas R. Reid, of Oklahoma, to be receiver of public moneys at Elreno, Okla., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

Robert R. Herron, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Lander, Wyo., vice John A. Swenson, resigned.

Levi R. Davis, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Sundance, Wyo., his term having expired December 19, 1905. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

To be passed assistant surgeons.

Asst. Surg. Louis P. H. Bahrenburg to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 26, 1905.

Asst. Surg. John T. Burkhalter to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 25, 1905.

Asst. Surg. Bolivar J. Lloyd to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 16, 1905.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

To be second lieutenants.

Third Lieut. George Clayton Alexander to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from July 1, 1905, to succeed William Edwin At Lee, promoted.

Third Lieut. Muller Stuntz Hay to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 7, 1905, in place of William Gaines Blasdel, deceased.

Third Lieut. William Thomas Stromberg to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from October 30, 1905, in place of John Vitrunius Wild, deceased.

Third Lieut. Hiram Rex Searles to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 29, 1905, to succeed Leonard Taylor Cutter, promoted.

To be chief engineer.

First Assistant Engineer Robert Edward Wright to be a chief engineer with the rank of first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from August 23, 1905, to succeed Henry Orlando Slayton, retired.

To be first assistant engineer.

Second Assistant Engineer Quincy Bogardus Newman to be a first assistant engineer with the rank of second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from August 23, 1905, to succeed Robert Edward Wright, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

First Lieut. James C. Rhea, Seventh Cavalry, to be captain from December 28, 1905, vice Ladd, Sixth Cavalry, resigned.

To be second lieutenants to rank from January 2, 1906.

Sergt. Edgar J. Treacy, Troop H, Fourteenth Cavalry.
Sergt. Reynold F. Migdalski, Troop H, Thirteenth Cavalry.
Lance Corporal Henry R. Smalley, Troop K, Third Cavalry.
Sergt. James P. Wayland, Troop A, First Cavalry.
First Sergt. Robert Blaine, Troop H, Eleventh Cavalry.
Sergt. Luther Felker, Troop E, Eleventh Cavalry.
Squadron Sergt. Maj. Murray Blight Rush, First Cavalry.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Cornelius Gardener, Twenty-first Infantry, to be colonel from December 26, 1905, vice Price, Sixteenth Infantry, retired from active service.

Maj. John J. Crittenden, Twenty-second Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel from December 26, 1905, vice Gardener, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

To be second lieutenants to rank from January 2, 1906.

Sergt. Edward J. Cullen, One hundred and eighteenth Company, Coast Artillery.
Sergt. (First Class) John P. Adams, Hospital Corps.
Corpl. Ira Longanecker, Company H, Eighteenth Infantry.
Sergt. Philip J. Golden, Company B, Signal Corps.
Sergt. William C. Whitener, Thirty-seventh Company, Coast Artillery.
Corpl. William R. McCleary, Fifty-fifth Company, Coast Artillery.
Sergt. Frederick J. Ostermann, Third Company, Coast Artillery.
Q. M. Sergt. William J. Connolly, Thirtieth Company, Coast Artillery.

To be second lieutenants to rank from January 3, 1906.

Sergt. Everett D. Barlow, jr., Company B, Twenty-sixth Infantry.
Corpl. Lawrence E. Hohl, Company K, Sixth Infantry.
Sergt. James G. Boswell, One hundred and eighteenth Company, Coast Artillery.
Sergt. Robert E. Clarke, Company I, Eighth Infantry.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

Capt. George J. Newgarden, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major from November 23, 1905, vice Owen, retired from active service.

ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. Frederick W. Stopford, Artillery Corps, to be captain from December 20, 1905, vice Jewell, detailed as quartermaster.

Maj. Henry A. Reed, Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant-colonel from September 16, 1905, vice Schenck, deceased.

NOTE.—The above-named officer was nominated to the Senate December 6, 1905, and confirmed on December 19, 1905, under the name of Hugh A. Reed. This message is to correct the error in the name of the nominee.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 4, 1906.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

James P. Wayland to be second lieutenant of cavalry, United States Army.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

Frank Dillingham, of California, now consul at Aix la Chapelle, to be consul-general of the United States at Coburg, Germany.

PENSION AGENT.

William R. Warnock, of Urbana, Ohio, to be pension agent at Columbus, Ohio.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Frieda F. Mashbir to be postmaster at Safford, in the county of Graham and Territory of Arizona.

Hugh M. Watson to be postmaster at Clifton, in the county of Graham and Territory of Arizona.

ILLINOIS.

Henry Schneider to be postmaster at Waterloo, in the county of Monroe and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

Rankin C. Walkup to be postmaster at Crawfordsville, in the county of Montgomery and State of Indiana.

OHIO.

Charles E. Hixson to be postmaster at Leesburg, in the county of Highland and State of Ohio.

OKLAHOMA.

Bess L. Bailey to be postmaster at Snyder, in the county of Kiowa and Territory of Oklahoma.

TEXAS.

George W. Hoeffert to be postmaster at Schulenburg, in the county of Fayette and State of Texas.

VERMONT.

Collins M. Graves to be postmaster at Bennington, in the county of Bennington and State of Vermont.

VIRGINIA.

William C. Pendleton to be postmaster at Tazewell, in the county of Tazewell and State of Virginia.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn January 4, 1906.

B. F. Dudley to be postmaster at Mansfield, in the State of Louisiana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 4, 1906.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

The following prayer was offered by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.:

We come to Thee, Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, with glad and thankful hearts that Thou hast watched over us during the holiday recess and brought us together again in health, strength, and vigor without the loss of any.

Grant, O most merciful Father, that with every faculty alert and with every high and noble aspiration intensified, these, Thy servants, may go forward to the task before them with faith, hope, and confidence in right, truth, and justice, that the work of the Fifty-ninth Congress may be worthy of American statesmen and redound to Thy glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 21, 1905, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

On December 18, 1905:

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of December, 1905, on the 20th day of said month.

On December 21:

H. R. 299. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Portland and Seattle Railway Company;

H. R. 480. An act supplemental to an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," approved June 28, 1902, and making appropriation for isthmian canal construction, and for other purposes.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, and ask that the article which I send forward be read at the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee rises to a question of privilege and sends an article to the Clerk's desk to be read. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ABOLISH THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE?

We quite agree that something ought to be done for the relief of the Post-Office Department. Its work is simply tremendous, and, by an interesting coincidence, its usefulness is quite as great. There is no section of the governmental machinery more important or more accurately and satisfactorily conducted. But the burden put upon Mr. Cortelyou and his coadjutors can be materially lightened without impairing its efficiency. It is our opinion, indeed, that the people and the Government both would be better off if the franking privilege were abolished utterly.

That this privilege has been outrageously abused is a fact of universal knowledge. Congressmen load the postal cars with all sorts of freight—furniture, libraries, kitchen utensils, the family wash, pianos, poultry, barnyard animals, etc., without limit. They frank a cow, a washtub, or a churn as glibly as they do a letter or the speech that no one ever heard. They go further—they lend their franks in large, uncounted bunches to societies and propagandas that would flourish on the public Treasury as they already thrive upon the people's discontent. The whole system has been converted to the most abominable ends. It presents the perfected spectacle of graft. But its worst expression is to be found in the lumbering up of the mail cars, the preposterous demands upon the Department's resources of transportation, and the corresponding and concurrent crippling of the postal service in all its proper and legitimate activities.

We note the presentation of an alternative arrangement—an arrangement under the operation of which Members of Congress will receive a direct allowance for the purpose of conducting their official correspondence without cost to themselves. The expedient is most commendable. We quite agree that Members of Congress, who are but ill-paid public servants, should be spared the constant drain upon their resources involved in postage and the like. They should at least be left entirely free of artificial taxes and protected in the complete enjoyment of what small emolument has been assigned them. But this franking concession, which has grown to the proportions of insolent and predaceous graft, this should be contracted within the limits of common decency and transformed into an explicit allowance, no matter how generous and liberal it may be.

We think there are very few Congressmen who would care to oppose this adjustment in full view of the public gaze. Why not try it, gentlemen?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair hardly thinks that the article presents a question of personal privilege.

Mr. SIMS. I did not rise, Mr. Speaker, to a question of personal privilege, but to a question of privilege affecting the membership of the House.

The SPEAKER. Well, it occurs to the Chair that if it is a question affecting the House, a resolution ought to accompany the presentation of the article. However, the gentleman may proceed. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to make a statement?

Mr. SIMS. That will do me just as well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to make a statement. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the article just read is an editorial clipped by myself from the Washington Post, a newspaper published in this city. The Washington Post does not have the reputation of being a "yellow journal" or a sensational paper. I have never read anywhere any charge in any kind of yellow journal that was more sensational than this. If the statements there alleged to be facts are true, it is a disgrace to this House, at least a disgrace to the Members who have been guilty of the charge. Franking cows, barnyard animals, pianos, libraries, cooking utensils, and so forth. The statement is either true or false. If it is true, it is, as this paper states, the rankest kind of graft. If it is false, it ought to be shown to be false by an investigation, and I for one will introduce a resolution——

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman really think that a suggestion of that kind is worthy of the dignity of a denial?

Mr. SIMS. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that the statement on its face ought to carry its own refutation, but if that statement, alleged to be a fact, in the editorial columns of a paper that is quoted all over the country more than any other paper goes without notice, it is taken by the country press and the people as in the nature of a confession.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman believe that Congress ought to investigate every statement in the editorials of the Post which are not true, and yet which reflect upon Congress? [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. The mere conclusion or opinion of a Member affecting legislation is one thing, but this is a statement that Members are guilty, and if they are they ought to be expelled.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman seems to assume that this is a statement of fact. I think the Washington Post intended this only as a matter of vivid imagination and fancy, and never intended it to be taken seriously either by the people of the country or by gentlemen of the House.

Mr. SIMS. It does not state that it is charged. It says it is a fact that Members frank farm animals, kitchen utensils, etc., as freely as they do a letter or the speech no one ever delivered on the floor of the House. There might have been a little humor in the latter part; the other is a specific charge, and the paper ought to make that statement good or withdraw it.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. Does not the gentleman think the charge extravagant and ridiculous that the Post-Office Department, which has charge of the mails of this country, would permit anything of that kind, and does he think it worth taking up a great deal of the time of the House to discussing or denying it?

Mr. SIMS. I will ask if the gentleman from New York will state to me whether or not the statement is in substance true or untrue?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, the gentleman from New York has no idea that any Member of the House ever sent furniture through the mails, or could do so if he tried. I do not believe that one in a million of the readers of that article would believe any such extravagant story as this is about the membership of this House.

Mr. SIMS. Well, it won't do any harm, and it will cost very little to have this matter investigated; at least, we should ask a report from the Postmaster-General as to what abuses, if any, have existed.

Mr. PAYNE. Has the gentleman any resolution to offer now?

Mr. SIMS. Not at this moment, Mr. Speaker. I did not know but what the floor leader of the House on the other side could give me all the information I needed on this subject. I do not think a serious statement set forth in an editorial in a paper of high standing, which if true will blacken and disgrace the Members of this House, ought to remain as a blanket charge on every Member of the House. The charge ought to be investigated and its truth or falsity established.

Mr. PAYNE. Suppose the gentleman introduces such a resolution, if he thinks it should take that course.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I have no resolution ready at this moment to introduce, but if the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and other Members of the House think that I am unnecessarily taking up the time of the House, I shall desist; but I certainly will introduce a resolution to that effect if I can have the time allowed me to write it. I do think that this is of such importance and comes from such a source that it ought not to be passed unnoticed. If any Member of this House is guilty, or if the postal authorities who are charged with the transmission of the mails are taking cattle and libraries and kitchen utensils for Members of Congress and franking them through the mails, they should be discharged from the public service. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] seems to think that I am taking up valuable time of the House unnecessarily and unprofitably.

Mr. MANN. But, Mr. Speaker, nobody says that.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that he introduce his resolution in the usual way.

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Tennessee does not desire to introduce a resolution at this time?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the suggestion is that it be referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and then it may be introduced in the usual way.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Tennessee has not yet introduced any resolution. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he will yield for a second?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman understand from an examination of the law what the law provides in reference to the franking privilege?

Mr. SIMS. Well, I certainly understand that it does not go to the extent of including farm animals, kitchen utensils, and

libraries. Mr. Speaker, in order to put this thing in proper form, I send the following resolution to the desk and ask that it be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution which the gentleman from Tennessee sends to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads be, and hereby is, instructed to investigate whether or not there are or have been abuses of the franking privilege by Members of Congress or in the name of Members of Congress.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I would have to object to unanimous consent for the present consideration of such a resolution as that just read. I do not want to dignify this thing by an investigation. We can get at the facts from the Postmaster-General if an appropriate resolution is introduced.

Mr. SIMS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I shall call up the resolution as a privileged matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the House that the resolution is privileged. The Chair will read from the Digest:

In presenting a question of personal privilege a Member is not required in the first instance to make a motion or offer a resolution; but such is not the rule in presenting a case involving the privileges of the House.

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] has had read an editorial, as he states, and having had read the editorial it seems to the Chair to involve the privileges of the House. He now sends up the resolution which has just been reported. In the opinion of the Chair, the privileges of the House are involved.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, if no one wishes to discuss the resolution I am ready for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SIMS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve the itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House resolution No. 42.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House resolution 42.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House resolution No. 42, with Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania in the chair.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of the resolution for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That so much of the annual message of the President of the United States to the two Houses of Congress at the present session as relates to the revenue and the bonded debt of the United States be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I was instructed by the committee at this point—and I make the pro forma amendment—to offer an amendment, adding the words "and insurance," to the matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. That matter was discussed at some length before the recess. I think the House came to a pretty clear understanding of what our constitutional rights and limits were with reference to the question of insurance. I desire to say that the amendment was not mine, but was offered at the instance of the committee. It was not in the original text. I desire to state that I do not desire to offer that amendment at this time. I understand also that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] will not offer any amendment giving jurisdiction of this part of the message to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but it seems to be the consensus of opinion in the House that this matter should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary to report its opinion as to the constitutional rights of the House in the premises. Therefore, I will withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, when the proper time arrives, I wish to offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer the amendment to this paragraph?

Mr. HEPBURN. No, sir.

The Clerk read as follows:

That so much of the President's message as relates to corporations be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report fully at an early day their views as to the power of the Federal Government by legislation to regulate or control said corporations in the management or control of their business and business matters, and if said power exists then the extent of such power and under what provisions of the Constitution it is conferred upon the Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will allow me, I will say I have no objection to that amendment, but favor it when the proper time has arrived, which will be at the end of line 15, page 1.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are you offering that amendment for present consideration, or did you say you are going to offer it after a while?

Mr. HEPBURN. I will offer it when we reach line 15.

The Clerk read as follows:

That so much as relates to the appropriations of the public revenue for support of the Government as herein provided, namely, for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses, for sundry civil expenses, for fortifications and coast defenses, for pensions, for the District of Columbia, and for all deficiencies, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

That so much as relates to the judiciary of the United States, to the administration of justice, to the punishment and prevention of crime and the organization of courts be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HEPBURN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting that amendment after the word "courts;" I think it would come in there.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to amend by inserting the amendment, which the Clerk will again report.

Mr. HEPBURN. The Clerk will adjust the amendment to the language.

The Clerk read as follows:

That so much of the President's message as relates to corporations be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report fully at an early day their views as to the power of the Federal Government by legislation to regulate or control said corporations in the management or control of their business and business matters, and if said power exists then the extent of such power and under what provisions of the Constitution it is conferred upon the Congress.

Mr. HEPBURN. Probably it had better come in at the end of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Right after line 15, the Chair understands.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There has been so much disturbance in the House that nobody except somebody who is sitting close to the gentleman from Iowa knows what this is, and if it is not asking too much I wish he would explain the amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, it is simply a proposition to refer not simply matters of insurance, but all of that portion of the President's message in which he discusses corporations and the power of the Government over them—the whole subject—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That includes insurance?

Mr. HEPBURN. That includes insurance, but it does not include railroads.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does that also include express corporations—interstate express business of the United States?

Mr. HEPBURN. I would rather think not, but I am not sure; but it was that subject that the President discussed relating to the great corporations of the country and the need of some other control than that now exercised by the States. The purpose that I had in view was to get the views of the Judiciary Committee upon those subjects, whether or not the Government of the United States has the power to control those corporations engaging in business between the States or in business with some other State than the State of their creation, and if it have that power the extent of it and the clauses of the Constitution under which the Congress has derived the power to legislate.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think it is of almost as much importance to control the express companies of this country as the railroads of this country?

Mr. HEPBURN. I would suppose when the subject is discussed that is referred to by this legislation, clearly that particular matter that the gentleman has in his mind he will find is also amply discussed. I do not know how I would separate

an express company from some other of the great corporations that in my judgment are doing an interstate or a foreign commerce business.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I am glad to know that the gentleman has that view of it, because I think the express companies should be regulated in the same manner as the railroad companies are regulated.

Mr. HEPBURN. I am not at all sure, and I do not wish to commit myself to any proposition of that kind. It was not the purpose of this resolution to especially designate any particular corporation; but the whole subject, as broad as it is, discussed in the message of the President is referred to this committee.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will frankly admit I desired to draw the gentleman out on this very question as to whether or not express companies are to be regulated.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman has that information, he is gratified.

Mr. NORRIS. I could not hear, even in the reply that the gentleman from Iowa made to the gentleman from Texas, just what he said in regard to this amendment, and I did not hear it clearly when the Clerk read it. The other day when we were discussing the matter I gave notice that at this time I would offer an amendment that would refer the subject of insurance to the Judiciary Committee, and add a provision that the Judiciary Committee be instructed to report what jurisdiction Congress had, if any, over insurance, under our Constitution. Now, if that is included in the gentleman's amendment—if that will be accomplished—I have no desire to offer my amendment, and will heartily favor his. But I could not get the idea from the reading whether it would include that or not.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think that is included.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no doubt, I wish the Chair would ask the Clerk to read the amendment again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment again.

The amendment was read.

Mr. DALZELL. Does that include other than railroads?

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa whether it should not be modified by adding "other than railroads" after "corporations."

Mr. HEPBURN. I had so written it, but in copying it I think that has been omitted, namely, the words "corporations other than railroads."

Mr. DALZELL. Other than railroads?

Mr. HEPBURN. Other than railroads.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified to the extent suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. CANDLER. At what point in the resolution is this amendment offered?

The CHAIRMAN. After line 15 on the first page.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] as modified by the unanimous consent of the committee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That so much as relates to the islands which came to the United States through the treaty of 1899 with Spain, and to Cuba (except so much as relates to the revenue and the appropriations), be referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I am directed by the committee to strike out the words "and to Cuba," in line 13, leaving it preferably where it belongs now, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

That so much as relates to the election of the President, Vice-President, or Representatives in Congress be referred to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 11, page 4, insert "That so much as relates to the irrigation of arid lands be referred to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the resolution as amended to the House, with recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration House resolution 42, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the resolution as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote asked upon any of the amendments? If not, they will be voted upon in gross.

No separate vote was demanded.

The amendments were agreed to in gross; and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration at this time of a resolution to print for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for consideration of the following resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be authorized to have printed and bound whatever papers and documents in connection with subjects under consideration by the committee may be necessary to the transaction of its business; also that the committee be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Without objection, the resolution will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3) providing revenue for the Philippine Islands.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3) known as "the Philippine tariff bill," which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 8, 1902.

Be it enacted, etc., that the second section of the act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 8, 1902, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That on and after the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands the rates of duty which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like articles imported from foreign countries: *Provided*, That all articles wholly the growth and product of the Philippine Islands coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands shall hereafter be admitted free of duty, except sugar and tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured, upon which there shall be levied, collected, and paid only 25 per cent of the rates of duty aforesaid: *And provided further*, That the rates of duty which are required hereby to be levied, collected, and paid upon products of the Philippine Islands coming into the United States shall be less any duty or taxes levied, collected, and paid thereon upon the shipment thereof from the Philippine Islands, as provided by the act of the United States Philippine Commission referred to in section 1 of this act, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; but all articles the growth and product of the Philippine Islands admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty under the provisions of this act, and coming directly from said islands to the United States for use and consumption therein, shall be hereafter exempt from any export duties imposed in the Philippine Islands: *Provided*, That in consideration of the rates of duty aforesaid, all articles wholly the growth and product of the United States, going into the Philippine Islands, shall hereafter be admitted free of duty, except sugar and tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured, upon which no higher rate of duty shall be levied, collected, and paid than is laid upon articles of like character coming from the Philippine Islands into the United States: *And provided further*, That on and after the 11th day of April, 1909, all articles and merchandise going from the United States into the Philippine Islands, and all articles wholly the growth and product of the Philippine Islands coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands shall be admitted free of duty: *And provided further*, That in addition to said duty when levied and in case said articles are admitted into the United States free of duty, there shall be paid upon articles of merchandise of Philippine Islands manufacture coming into the United States and withdrawn for consumption or sale a tax equal to the internal-revenue tax imposed in the United States upon the like articles of merchandise of domestic manufacture; such tax to be paid by internal-revenue stamp or stamps to be purchased and provided by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and to be procured from the collector of internal revenue at or most convenient to the port of entry of said merchandise in the United States, and to be affixed under such regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe, and such articles of Philippine Islands manufacture mentioned in this proviso shall be exempt from payment of any tax imposed by the internal-revenue laws of the Philippine Islands: *And*

provided further, That in addition to the duty hereinbefore provided when levied and in case said articles are admitted into the Philippine Islands free of duty, there shall be paid upon articles of merchandise manufactured in the United States and going into the Philippine Islands and withdrawn for consumption or sale, a tax equal to the internal-revenue tax imposed in the Philippine Islands upon the like articles of merchandise when manufactured in the Philippine Islands; such tax to be paid by internal-revenue stamps or otherwise as provided by the laws in force in the Philippine Islands upon the like articles; and such articles manufactured in the United States mentioned in this proviso and going into the Philippine Islands shall be exempt from payment of any tax imposed by the internal-revenue laws of the United States. All the moneys collected under this section as amended shall be paid over and disposed of as provided in section 4 of the act hereby amended, and shall not be covered into the Treasury of the United States."

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after the word "articles," insert the word "wholly."

Page 2, line 18, strike out the word "*Provided*" and the remaining lines of said page and line 1 of page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following words, viz: "*Provided, however*, That in consideration of the rates of duty aforesaid sugar and tobacco, both manufactured and unmanufactured, wholly the growth and product of the United States, shall be admitted to the Philippine Islands from the United States free of duty."

Page 3, lines 15 and 16, strike out the words "purchased and;" and in line 17, after the word "procured," insert the words "by purchase."

At the end of the bill insert:

"SEC. 2. That on and after the day when this act shall go into effect all goods, wares, and merchandise previously imported from the Philippine Islands, for which no entry has been made, and all goods, wares, and merchandise previously entered without payment of duty and under bond for warehousing, transportation, or any other purpose, for which no permit of delivery to the importer or his agent has been issued, shall be subjected to the duties imposed by law prior to the passage of this act, and to no other duty upon the entry or the withdrawal thereof: *Provided*, That when duties are based upon the weight of merchandise deposited in any public or private bonded warehouse said duties shall be levied and collected upon the weight of such merchandise at the time of its entry."

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Wyoming says he desires to ask me a question before I begin.

Mr. MONDELL. I wish to ask the gentleman——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like order, so that we can hear this interlocutory performance over there.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order, so that the interlocutory proceedings may be heard. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. I wish to inquire, Mr. Chairman, if it is the intention of the gentleman in charge of the bill to give a reasonable time for discussion of this measure?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, it certainly is the intention of "the gentleman in charge of the bill" to do so. The bill comes up under the rules of the House; debate can only be stopped by order of the House. But aside from that, it is my intention, personally, to give ample time for a fair discussion of the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. About how much time?

Mr. PAYNE. "The gentleman" has not determined that in his mind. Debate will run into next week, undoubtedly.

Mr. MONDELL. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there are a number of gentlemen on this side who would like to be heard in opposition to the bill, and I trust time will be so divided that the gentlemen on this side, and of course gentlemen on the other side, who are opposed to the measure will be given a fair proportion of time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Wyoming that I think he is entirely safe in the discretion of the gentleman who occupies the chair, and who has a reputation for fairness in this House that he certainly will not sacrifice in this debate.

Mr. MONDELL. I simply wished to be assured that a reasonable time will be given and that the time will be divided fairly. I am sure that the distinguished Chairman will have no disposition to do otherwise.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman ought to be able to take my word for it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at the outset I think, perhaps, I had better state what the bill seeks to do. As members of the committee know, the present law in regard to goods coming from the Philippine Islands enforces the duty of 75 per cent of the Dingley rates on all goods coming from the islands which are the products of those islands. This bill, from the date of its passage, would put upon the free list all the goods coming from those islands except sugar and tobacco and the manufactures of sugar and tobacco, and on sugar and tobacco and the manufactures of sugar and tobacco the rates would be 25 per cent of the Dingley tariff until the 11th day of April, 1909. That day is selected because at that date expires the ten-year period under the treaty of Paris, under which Spain was to have the same privileges as the United States regarding her trade with the Philippine Islands. Of course, the committee contends—at least members of the committee do—that Spain could not claim any privilege under that clause of the treaty, the privilege of the free entrance of goods from Spain into the islands, unless Spain concedes to the products of the Philippine Islands the same rate of duty that the United States concedes. But we have made that date for the reason that it is about the right time to forecast in the future the date when we shall get revenues enough in the Philippine Islands from internal taxation and from import duties from other countries to take care of the finances of the islands, including the system of education that we are extending over those islands, with ample provision, as we believe, for all the expenses of the islands from that day.

So we have provided that after the 11th day of April, 1909, all goods coming from the Philippine Islands to the United States and all goods going from the United States to the Philippine Islands the product of either section of the country shall enter free of any duty whatever. [Applause.] At that date we are to place the Philippine Islands upon the same plane as all the territory of the United States, so far as revenue laws are concerned.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are some of us who believe that we ought to have free trade with the Philippine Islands from this moment. We believe it is and has been a principle of the Government of the United States, ever since the adoption of the Constitution, that whenever any goods are sent from one section of the country to another they shall go without the imposition of any import tax. That was, perhaps, one of the difficult questions in the Constitutional Convention; but it was settled then and settled right, that from whatever section of the country any imports should be made into any other portion of the country, they should go unrestricted by any tax. The only reason we do not give absolute free trade at once is because of the need of the revenue. We are following the same principle that we followed in the case of Porto Rico. When that bill originated in the House of Representatives, known now as the Foraker bill, we provided a duty of 15 per cent of the Dingley rates on all goods coming from the island to the United States, and then we provided that all the revenues raised from this duty should not be covered into the Treasury of the United States, but should go directly, without any tax for expense of collection, into the treasury of Porto Rico, to be used in the government of that island. Porto Rico was then at peace with the United States, as it always had been. The people of that island submitted to the change of jurisdiction—nay, they hailed the change of jurisdiction with gratitude.

There are gentlemen sitting around me now who remember the storm of indignation that came upon our devoted heads because we did not let those goods in free at that time without any restrictions, without even 15 per cent or any per cent of the Dingley rates upon the goods coming here. I think the committee, of which I had the honor to be the chairman then, received more abuse from the newspapers of the country than any committee has ever received in this House within my recollection; and so general was this that they forgot to publish the fact that the 15 per cent of duty was levied to help the poor people in Porto Rico, to relieve them of the burden of taxation, provide for the expenses of their government, and build up a system of education; and it was months after the bill passed before the people of the United States, or some of them, found out that there was any such beneficent provision in that bill.

We are following in the same track to-day. They have not enough revenue in the Philippine Islands to dispense with the $800,000 of duty paid upon goods going from the United States into the islands, or to dispense with the smaller amount of duty—about half a million dollars this year—upon goods coming from the islands into the United States, or to dispense with the $600,000 of duty on goods coming from Spain to the Philippine Islands. They need that money in their revenues. They need it for the expenditures of the government; they need it to build up that grand system of education which the United States is extending all over those islands. We have now over half a million children in the public schools; you will find them in every village and in every hamlet in those islands. We need more of them. We are extending the system. It costs money, and the money must come from somewhere. So we levy it upon these goods for the next three years to provide this sum of money. They have lately instituted a tax (it has been running about a year) upon spirits and tobacco in the Philippine Islands. That is a new tax. It has not run altogether smoothly up to the present time. Those people are a little slow in learning new methods and new habits of taxation. They are a good deal like the people in the United States in that respect. There is some scolding, some kicking, and some seeking to avoid the tax, as well as some disarrangement of business; because it often happens that when a man is taxed he seeks to collect his share of the tax, or the whole of it, out of the man who sells him the commodity, and he also seeks to collect the whole tax out of the man to whom he sells, so that he can make a profit

out of the transaction; and it has developed here in the distillation of spirits that some of these wealthy distillers have levied an amount equal to or in excess of the tax out of the people who sell them the raw material, and have also levied an amount in excess of the tax upon the people who purchase from them. Now, of course, it does not take a great deal of time for such things to adjust themselves, and in the long run the tax will prove successful. It is going to be a little higher next year than it was last; but still it is not over half as much as the tax upon the same articles in Porto Rico; it is not a third as much as it is upon some of the same articles in the United States. This tax is growing in favor, and by the time this limit comes about when we shall have free trade, and no revenue from the trade between the United States and the Philippine Islands, doubtless there will be sufficient revenue from the internal taxation and from that levied at the ports in the Philippine Islands upon goods coming from outside—from foreign countries.

Now, these are the general features of the bill. It is provided further that tobacco, sugar, and the manufactures thereof shall go from the United States into the Philippine Islands free of duty at once. Of course, we do not apprehend that much sugar will go there except a little refined sugar. Cigars and tobacco are different. We do expect that tobacco will go there and that some cigars will go there. Tobacco will go there, because for the prosperity of the cigar-making business in the islands, in order to enable them to hold their trade with the east, and especially with China, which absorbs 65 per cent of the whole output of cigars from those islands, it is necessary for them to have a better wrapper and a lighter wrapper than they are able to get now. Why, the heathen Chinee has got so civilized that, like the American dude, he must have a wrapper and a cigar of a different texture and of a lighter color or else it does not taste good to him. He even likes the bitter leaf that comes from Sumatra which he smokes. They are importing a little Sumatra leaf and wrapping that upon the cigars now. With free trade they believe they can take the Connecticut wrapper and put it upon those cigars and meet the competition, which is hard upon them now, from Germany with the Sumatra wrapper. Hence we have put that clause in the bill.

We have amended the bill in another particular. It came out on the hearings that when sugar had gone up a cent and a half a pound last winter some merchants bought up 39,000 tons of Philippine Islands sugar and brought it over to the port of New York to sell there. It took about three months to come on sailing vessels, and when it got to New York the bottom had dropped out of the market and sugar had got down to the old point, a cent and a half below the price at which it was when those people bought the sugar to import it there. The representative of those people appeared before the committee and told us these facts and wanted us to amend the bill so that that sugar should pay duty at the time it was withdrawn from bond for consumption, which, of course, after we pass this bill, would enable them to get it in here at 25 per cent of the Dingley rate and would take out of the Philippine treasury about $500,000 and transfer it to the pockets of the people who had bought up this sugar.

Now, we did not think that we were in the benevolent business to that extent, and so we have put in the second section of this bill, which provides that sugar shall pay a duty from the time it was put in the bonded warehouse or arrived in the ports of the United States, which will be 75 per cent of the Dingley rates, and the half million dollars will go into the treasury of the Philippine Islands to help educate these people over there. Now, these are the main points of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am unable to see why we should not treat the Philippine Islands exactly as we have treated Porto Rico. We have postponed it because the islands were in a state of war and insurrection; we have postponed it until they got upon their good behavior, until they sustained the government and obeyed the laws and maintained good order in the Philippine Islands, as do the little brown men in Porto Rico. The reason we have treated them differently has grown out of their insurrection, and because of the numbers of insurgents there. That is changed. The islands are pacified, and the people there have accepted the beneficent Government of the United States. The most of them are entirely satisfied with that Government, and will stay under the flag. The intelligent people in the islands, the well-educated people in the islands, believe that the time to sever their connection with the United States will not come in the next twenty-five years, if it comes at all. They believe the flag of the Republic carries beneficence with it. They have been led to believe that those who lived under the flag lived in a condition of prosperity and happiness, and they want a share in it, and it is because they want a share in that prosperity and happiness that they are demanding, they are asking, nay, they are praying to be put under the conditions which this bill will put them under, and give them only a fair show, if it gives them even that, to carry on their industries.

Now, the people of the islands are not all of them without prosperity. The hemp industry is an industry of wonderful prosperity. The only place on earth where manila hemp can be grown, where anything approaching it can be grown, is in the Philippine Islands. They have extended it, they are extending it to-day, and notwithstanding the multiplication of the product, the price has increased, and so where this hemp is raised the people are prosperous. It is made from a plant called "abaca," a sort of species of banana. They plant it and it seems to be a perennial crop for a series of years, and all they have to do is to harvest it. And yet, so great has been the demand for it in the past few years, and so greatly have wages increased in these islands in the past few years, that even the common ordinary laborers in the hemp district receive wages equal to two and three and four dollars of American money a day. And so the people engaged in that particular branch of industry are prosperous and the industry is growing. It amounts to considerably over two-thirds of the exports of the islands. I think the exports last year of this hemp amounted to twenty-two millions out of thirty-two millions of the total exports.

The next industry of importance in these islands is that of the raising of cocoanut trees and harvesting the fruit, and then drying the meat, grinding it, and putting it on the market as the copra of commerce. This has been a profitable industry, and is a profitable industry to-day, and is growing very largely. A cocoanut tree is planted, and after four or five years you begin to get the fruit. The tree lives for one hundred years, needs no cultivation, and the only labor is gathering the fruit and preparing the meat for commerce. A cocoanut tree will produce from 4 to 8 pesos' worth of fruit a year—two to four dollars a year—and so that has become a profitable industry, and attracts a great many laborers in the islands.

The difficulty about rapidly extending these two industries is the difficulty of getting laborers to perform the work in the field. A Filipino is different from the American in some respects. He is a greater lover of his home than is the average American, a greater lover of his locality. He is not a traveled man. You find many of them that have never been beyond the circle of 3 or 4 miles from where they live. It is the hardest work in the world, it is like tearing them up by the roots, to get them away from their homes to go even for a few months to do duty in the hemp fields and among the cocoanut trees or in the sugar plantations. In Negros, where eight-tenths of the sugar is raised, every year there are six months when they have to get laborers from all over the islands to go there and help them grind the sugar. They do not like to go even for six months. The shortage of labor in the vicinity is one of the things that must be overcome before these industries will reach even greater proportions than they have reached in these islands.

Copra exports amount to $4,000,000 a year; sugar, I think, to about two millions; perhaps a little more than that this last year under the large prices that were obtained; tobacco, unmanufactured, about $1,000,000; cigars and cigarettes a million dollars more, and the rest is made up of sundries—the exportations from the islands. Now, Mr. Chairman, of course it is natural for a man who has a dollar invested, when he thinks or even dreams that that dollar is menaced, to get into a sort of hysteria, and in that condition he is quite apt to exaggerate the circumstances surrounding that investment. So it is that it is easy to send out telegrams from the city of Washington and get replies addressed to Members of the House stating that certain industries are threatened, and alleging some of the most fantastic stories, made out of whole cloth, in regard to their particular industry. So it is that there has been circulated throughout the United States the story that there are 60,000,000 acres out of 72,000,000 acres in the islands that are arable lands. My colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], says 50,000,000. I think one man put it as modestly as 50,000,000, but some of them at 60,000,000. Now, what are the facts? Why, our people have been looking into that thing over there; they have not been idle during the seven years of occupation, and they estimate that not to exceed 9 per cent of that 72,000,000 acres of land can ever be cultivated for any purpose whatever so far as agriculture is concerned. Now, there is quite a difference between 9 per cent and 60 or 70 or 80 per cent.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Where does the gentleman obtain his authority for that statement?

Mr. PAYNE. From the census of the Philippine Islands, taken in 1903.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not been able to discover any statement that there were only 9 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. There are four volumes of that census, and if the gentleman looks assiduously he will find it there, because I have seen it.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman recall the page?

Mr. PAYNE. I can not give it to the gentleman now, but I shall give it to him one of these days before this debate closes. I can turn to it very readily, but I do not seem to have a note of the page here. Further than that, Mr. Chairman, it appears also from the census that 4.6 per cent of these 72,000,000 acres, or a trifle over half of all the available lands, are now under cultivation. Over one-half of these available lands are already taken up in the Philippine Islands. Now, I am not surprised at this statement in the census, Mr. Chairman, when I compare the topography of the Philippine Islands with the topography of the islands of Japan. Japan has been cultivating those islands for two thousand five hundred years, and they have built terraces all up the mountain sides in many localities where they could get a terrace to hang on and get a place as large as the size of an ordinary man's hand—if he has a large hand—in which to grow rice. Yet the statement is made that in all the territory of Japan less than 12 per cent of it is under cultivation after two thousand five hundred years of improvement. And the improvements that they have made are wonderful where these people have been able to make them in order that they might raise rice and the other crops that are raised there. Still there is less than 12 per cent of those islands under cultivation. Now, in view of that, it would seem that these fantastic statements which are sent around to have their effect, from interested parties, that there are so many millions of acres of land there that they can cultivate and raise sugar enough to supply the whole earth ought not to have any lodgment even in the brain of a man exclusively engaged as an attorney to appear before the Committee on Ways and Means on behalf of the beet-sugar interests of the country.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose so, but I would rather not be interrupted every moment.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, if the gentleman does not care to be interrupted——

Mr. PAYNE. Not every moment; but I will answer this question.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to ask if the gentleman classes as fantastic the statement of Secretary Taft that the Philippine Islands contain infinitely more arable land than Japan?

Mr. PAYNE. I think it was, if he stated so.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Made prior to the census, also.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. And the other statements I suppose that the gentleman made before the committee are to be classed with that and have the same weight?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take up the gentleman's side of this case, to which he is a recent convert, at this stage of the proceedings. It is true that Secretary Taft when he first went down there did think there was more arable land than in Japan. He had sailed through Japan and he had sailed into the islands. It is true he stated before the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House that he thought the islands could produce as much sugar as Cuba—not sugar for the world, but as much sugar as Cuba—at the same time saying he did not know much about the production of Cuba when he was before that committee; but he did not have the light that the census taken in 1903 has thrown upon it, where an examination was made and some attempt made to estimate the amount of the agricultural lands in those islands. Why, Mr. Chairman, those islands have been producing sugar for fifty years and more. They produced it under the Spanish régime. They extended the industry under the Spanish régime. Spain gave them a big bonus on their sugar by way of a differential duty. Spain charged 6.22 a pound against the sugar of the balance of the world, while they admitted the sugar from the islands at 2.96. There was a differential of 3.26 a pound in favor of the Philippine Islands under the Spanish possessions. They had that difference in the Spanish markets. They had it for years during the most of the Spanish régime. Well, now, it is said the Philippines sent great quantities of sugar to Spain, and that illustrates the contention that those Filipinos are making to-day, and what is that? Why, that their principal market was China and Hongkong and Japan up to the time of the Russian war. I think 60 per cent, perhaps not as much as that, on the average, goes to China and Kongkong, distributed generally in China, and they say those cunning heathen Chinese, when they are marketing the sugar, take advantage of the necessities of the man who is going to sell to them. I have heard some hint of that kind of thing being done in civilized Christian American, but if they find no other market they take advantage of that and buy as cheaply as they can, and so they did; but when this Spanish concession of 3.26 came in they had a market open to Spain and they could say to Mr. John Chinaman, "If you do not want sugar at that price, we will send it to Spain if it does take three or four months and we have to wait a long time for the return," and all that sort of thing.

So they increased the output. They got up to 300,000 tons a year, 80,000 tons of which was consumed in the islands and a little over 200,000 tons exported from the islands under the Spanish régime, and they were seeking out the available sugar lands for culture; and they cultivated altogether 400,000 acres, that produced 300,000 tons of sugar, the same sugar lands that in the heated imagination of these gentlemen are to produce an average of from 6 to 8 tons per acre the minute this bill is passed. They claim that it will all pass under cultivation almost from the drop of the hat. They had an incentive then in the differential duty of 3.26. We are proposing to take off a duty of nine-tenths cent a pound on the sugar, and still this wonderful change is to be made when we take off a cent a pound, when Spain had 3 cents off for years and they could only reach a production of 300,000 tons a year.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I know that the gentleman wants to be entirely fair and absolutely accurate, and I have a high regard for his great knowledge on this subject, but the gentleman does not intend, I think, to tell the House that the Philippines at any time had a differential of 3 cents or anything like it, because the gentleman recollects at all times there was a consumption tax, so that this differential was cut down by the amount of consumption, because it was genrally about two-thirds of the differential.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I was making my statement based upon the official report and also upon the statements of the beet-sugar men who appeared before the committee. I know they made some statements which were mistaken, and possibly they were mistaken in this, but I have always taken it as a rule that an admission made by a man against his own interest was the highest sort of evidence in the case.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what will be the effect of the passage of this bill reducing this rate of duty to 33 cents a hundred pounds, or a third of a cent a pound, upon the sugar industry in the Philippine Islands? I do not believe it is going to give them a market in the United States. I do not believe it is relief enough to help them here—at least I am very much in doubt about it—for the three years that this duty is to be placed upon the sugar. It will stimulate the price in China. We have examined a good deal into the cost of sugar in the Philippine Islands under their present methods, which, of course, can be improved if we could get the capital to go over there; and yet with the improved methods in the Hawaiian Islands they do not seem to have revolutionized the cost of sugar. They have better sugar lands there than they have in the Philippine Islands. They have had free sugar into the United States for about thirty years—absolutely free. They have built up an industry there in the Hawaiian Islands of 370,000 tons a year. They have some very rich lands. They have some lands there that have produced the record crop of the world. I saw some land near Pearl Harbor—land bought by the Government of the United States, but now under the control of the former owners on a certain leasehold arrangement—where they told me that in one year they had produced between 11 and 12 tons of sugar per acre. That was a single plantation. The managers of that plantation say that they do not think the extra amount of sugar pays for the extra expense in cultivation and in fertilizing.

Mr. McGAVIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. McGAVIN. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York what the reason is for excluding sugar from the absolutely free list?

Mr. PAYNE. I am sorry that my friend was not here when I commenced. I said that the only reason was for the sake of revenue. They need the revenue. There is no other reason that I know of.

A MEMBER. How much will it produce?

Mr. PAYNE. This year it will produce, on the present rate of duty, I think, $700,000. I have not the figures in my head now, but it will produce considerable revenue this year.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PAYNE. I think I will have to decline to yield until I get through. I can not spend all of the time answering questions.

Mr. FORDNEY. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question before he finished; that is all. I do not wish to interrupt him. I simply desire information.

Mr. PAYNE. That is all right. I would like to go on for a little while without so many questions. A question draws me away from the point I have in my mind.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not want to do that.

Mr. PAYNE. I remember now that I was talking about Hawaii, and free sugar there, and the result. Mr. Hatch, who is retained by the business people of Hawaii to look after their interests in Washington, appeared before the committee. He does not want this bill to pass, and they do not want this bill to pass. They are afraid that it will jeopardize something in Hawaii if this bill passes. Still, he tells about the result there. While these lands that I have referred to produce 11 to 12 tons per acre on this one plantation, they are able to produce but from 2 to 3 tons per acre on the average land in the island. The highest average was 4 tons in 1901. And they say that on their investment of $65,000,000 in plantations the last two years the return was 2.7 per cent profit in the whole island. Now, if with American capital and Hawaiian capital, if with the best machinery in the world, if with steam plows and the highest and best methods of cultivation for producing sugar in the world, this is the result after thirty years of free trade with the United States, what in the name of common sense has any interest in the United States to fear from the Philippine Islands?

Why, Mr. Chairman, I visited one of those plantations in the Philippines and saw a sugar mill. They had a carabao power with which to grind the cane. They had a carabao at each end of it, and a boy to drive each carabao. They had a three-roller mill, and they fed the rollers with one stalk at a time.

Some one suggested that they undertake to put in two. Our friend the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr HILL], who is always fertile in ideas, got them to put in two, and the thing stopped. The carabaos could not move it, and they had to pull one of the canes out and call men to push the levers before they could get the thing started. They ran the juice into a vat, and then dipped it up on to a platform and put it into the caldron there for boiling, and made the sugar in that way. I do not know how many men they had at work out there. I should say thirty to forty workmen stood about there grinding the cane. I have seen a good many cane fields, but I never saw a cane field where the cane was any poorer than in that field. Now, you expect these people, with these crude methods, without any understanding of the modern means of producing sugar, to walk at once into the position of the Hawaiian Islands, and be able to come into your markets and sell sugar here at the extravagant profit of 2.7 per cent profit on the capital invested. That is what all this potter is about in resisting the passage of this bill at 25 per cent of the Dingley duties.

Mr. MONDELL. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman; but if he will yield to a question——

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I will this once, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman persists in recurring to the case of Hawaii. I suppose from the gentleman's numerous visits to that island he discovered that the plantation owners have long since capitalized our duty, and that the Hawaiian plantations are capitalized at four to six times what they cost, and they are making less than 3 per cent upon the cost of the plantation, but it is because of the enormous overcapitalization there.

Mr. PAYNE. "The gentleman" does not know any such thing; and that thing is denied by gentlemen whom I met there, with all the apparent candor of my friend from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. I happened to be in Hawaii at the time that this process was going on.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman say sugar plantations in Hawaii were capitalized four to six times their cost?

Mr. MONDELL. I was saying I happened to be in the islands at the time when the bill passed making Hawaii a part of the United States, when the business of increasing the capital of Hawaiian sugar plantations was going on at a very rapid rate, and one plantation had its capital multiplied four times in less than two months.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, it may have been true about one plantation. The gentleman may have been there, Mr. Chairman, when some of the sugar plantations may have done as one of these plantations did in the Philippine Islands—put in new machinery with modern methods, or was about to do it, and increased its capital stock. He may have been there and seen one thing of that kind done; but of course, Mr. Chairman, one swallow does not make a summer. I believe the gentlemen who have lived there all these years have had an opportunity to know better than my friend from Wyoming on a single visit. I know they know more than I did on one visit. I admit it for myself and am willing to acknowledge it for him. I take it from the statements of these gentlemen, whose word I would receive anywhere and always, who told me that the capital stock of the companies was not greater and generally did not equal the investment in the plants to-day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would seem that having cited Hawaii and the experience there, that I should have carried conviction even to the souls of the gentlemen who are engaged in the manufacture of beet sugar and raising cane sugar in Louisiana. But I will go a little further into this question. Mr. Chairman, it is always difficult to find out exactly the cost of a thing. You go into my section of the country and try to find out how much it costs to raise a bushel of potatoes and how many different answers would you get? My people are like the rest of the people. Many of them do not know how much it costs. It costs one man four times as much to raise a bushel of potatoes as it does another, and then it depends upon the crop and upon the year; and that is so with everything raised in agriculture.

It costs different prices to raise an acre each of sugar cane on adjoining plantations in the State of Louisiana, and so it does in the Philippine Islands. You have got to get these different statements and put them all together to see what the average cost is. In some places it is high and in some places it is low. Some witnesses testified that it cost them $1.76 a hundred to raise sugar and deliver it at the port of Iloilo; and all the sugar there is shipped from two ports—Iloilo and Manila—and most of it from Iloilo, coming from the island of Negros, where eight-tenths of the sugar is raised. Some say the cost there is $1.76, some say it has cost them more, some say it has cost them less. Some put it at $1.41, others at $1.50; but a low average of all those prices would be $1.50 for the cost of sugar delivered at Iloilo.

Now, I am aware that Mr. Hathaway, representing a combination of seven or nine factories in the State of Michigan, and a beet-sugar man—he says he is not a beet-sugar expert—was sent over there to find out about this thing last summer. He went around the islands. He did not get what he wanted. He said: "I represent a capital of $10,000,000, ready to be invested in sugar plantations in the Philippine Islands. I want to buy some land of you."

Well, now, what would a Yankee do who was the owner of that land if he was raising potatoes on it or sugar beets? Would he not indulge in what these people over there call "poetry;" would he not indulge in imagination? Did you ever see two men swapping old broken-down horses but what each one of them could go a mile in three minutes or in two and a half? So it is with these people trying to sell their sugar lands. If Hathaway tells the truth, they figured down the price of producing sugar to a cent a pound or even less in some instances. He did not tell of the other instances where they put it above, but we found plenty of people who were willing to testify that it cost more. Mr. Hathaway went there with that proclamation, and even proposed in some instances options on land, and he got the appropriate story. This is the expert sent there by the beet-sugar interests. Well, they do not raise beet sugar in the Philippine Islands. Why did they not send a sugar-cane expert to those islands? In the Taft party there was a sugar-cane expert. He has appeared before the committee at every hearing they have had since I have been a member of the committee, since 1889, when the sugar industry has been a subject of consideration. He is an intelligent man—Colonel Hill, of New Orleans. He went there with the Taft party. He made it his special business to go around to the sugar plantations and see the operation of them. We had these hearings here for four days, New Orleans being about twenty-four hours, I believe, from Washington, and for the first time that the committee ever had hearings during my connection with it Colonel Hill did not appear. We did not hear anything of his offering to buy sugar lands down there for the purpose of getting the story.

We asked Mr. Hathaway why he did not invest. Well, he gave two reasons. One of them was that he was not sure enough of the United States Government down there and of the integrity of the future personnel of that Government to risk his money in buying lands and investing. And yet he sees a whole cloud of capitalists in the United States ready to go down to the Philippine Islands and develop the sugar lands there—sufficient to

swamp every farmer in Michigan and in Colorado and in my Congressional district—because we have a beet-sugar factory there—sufficient to swamp them all with cheap sugar from the Philippine Islands. That is one reason why they did not invest. The other reason I will proceed to talk about later. That is the Brussels convention matter, upon which I may have some reflections to make as I proceed.

A dollar and a half at Iloilo. Then there comes the freight to New York, 30 cents a hundred.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word to the gentleman from New York. Much of his speech is inaudible, and I am sitting within 15 feet of the gentleman. I wish he would endeavor to talk a little louder. I know that he can. His speech is most interesting.

Mr. PAYNE. A dollar and a half a hundred, Mr. Chairman, at Iloilo; 30 cents for freight to New York, possibly including insurance. That is $1.80. That allows nothing for loading the vessel at Iloilo and nothing for unloading it in the city of New York; nothing for commissions paid to commission merchants and nothing for interest during the three months the ship is on the voyage.

Now, Mr. Hathaway came in with some figures on shipping. He said that sometimes the rate was a little lower than this. That is possibly true, but the regular prevailing rate is what I have stated. He disputed the cost of insurance, and said that some got it at half the rate. Of course they do, for some ship it on steam vessels and it does not take a third of the time to get it over. Then it is not so hazardous as shipment by sailing vessels, and so they get it cheaper. But the regular rate, the ordinary rate, the rate that the ordinary man must pay, is as high as I have stated. That does not figure anything for interest, and, oh, how those people have to pay interest sometimes in the Philippine Islands—30 or 40 per cent a year for interest. Not all of them, but some of them. Why? Because the business has been so poor that they have not the money to go ahead and make a crop, and they have not the credit to get the money afterwards.

Mr. Hathaway said that you could loan money down there and have it paid in sugar at 1 cent a pound delivered at Iloilo. I would not wonder if he could find some one who would do that, but in order to do it he must cheat the laboring man out of his hire. In order to do that he must go through without paying his debts, and we can not calculate upon any such price for sugar as that.

Mr. Chairman, has my time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has just expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from New York answer a question?

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will kindly wait until I get through, I shall be happy to answer any question he may ask me. Now, Mr. Chairman, it was stated in Manila by Mr. Wellborn, the commissioner of agriculture, that the quality of sugar they ship to New York was of such a low degree of purity that they had to accept a cent a pound less for that raw sugar than was paid for other cane sugar at the port of New York. That is the condition on which they ship it there, and, of course, in estimating that cost you must add that cent a pound, and you get 2.80 for the sugar. I can readily see how this can be, because figure up the degrees of the sugar, and it makes considerably over one-half cent difference between that and 95-degree sugar coming from Cuba and the West Indies, and then with the impurities in the sugar besides that you can readily see that they are compelled to take a cent less, and that the buyer can not afford to give any more than that for their sugar. Well, there you have 2.80 a pound. Then you get it into New York, and that is without taking into account the unloading charges in New York and the commissions in New York and the warehousing in New York, because this sugar starts from Manila three months before it is marketed, and the market may be changed and the man may be compelled to hold it in order to get out even on it. The refiner charges 1 cent a pound. Gentlemen may figure that it does not cost more than sixty-five one-hundredths to refine sugar. I do not believe it does; but I never supposed the sugar trust was in it for their health. I never knew of their taking less than they can get, and these people have to pay them a cent a pound. That makes 3.80 as the cost of sugar without any duty—that is, the cost of refined sugar in the port of New York. Well, at 25 per cent we levy a duty of 33 cents a hundred, and that makes 4.13 for the next three years upon this sugar.

Mr. FORDNEY. What grade of sugar is that?

Mr. PAYNE. It is what they call "assorted" sugar; it runs from 70 up to 88.

Mr. FORDNEY. It is not 96° pure?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no; they do not have a pound of 96 sugar; far below it. That is the cost of that sugar ready for the market—4.13 in the city of New York. That is the sugar that is going to grow so rapidly in quantity when they reduce the duty to 25 per cent of the Dingley rate; that is the sugar that is going to occupy the lands that are not arable in order to depress the beet-sugar industry in the United States; that is the sugar that is to overcome the labor question, which is the most serious question in the Philippine Islands regarding agriculture, and it is in a different condition to-day than it was when we went there. Somehow the American flag seems to raise the condition of a man as to his capacity and ability and worth, and wherever it goes wages go up.

Why, the Spaniards used to pay about 20 cents a day for people employed in the navy-yard in the mechanical department. We have 3,000 of them there now, and we are paying 65 cents a day in gold. White & Co., contractors doing the government work there, are employing some men who are occupying their houses at the mouth of the harbor, in getting out granite, at 50 cents a day, but they are not so skillful men. The men on public works in the city are paid 40 and 50 cents a day in gold.

Now, these gentlemen come in with a reference to an agricultural report printed in August, 1904, and say that it contradicts Mr. Welborn in his statement. Why? He said he had been out on the sugar plantations before light and seen men sitting there ready to go to work. That would seem to look like a hard statement, but they do not work there the same hours of the day that Americans do. When it gets to be 11 o'clock and the sun comes straight down the Filipino has sense enough to go into his house and take his siesta in the middle of the day, and he gets out again about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and it is a common saying among them that nobody is fool enough to go out between the hours of 11 and 3 o'clock except Americans and dogs. [Laughter.] The Filipino does not do it. He has to commence early in the morning in order to get in his eight hours' work, and he hardly ever goes beyond that. And so he might well be sitting there before light in order to go to work. Then he tells the price that he saw these men paid. Yes; that is true; but that was before the prices got up in the sugar district, before the advanced spirit had seized these people up there in the sugar district; they had not advanced the wages. Now, the universal testimony is that two and three and four times as much is paid; that they pay 30 cents and upward a day in the sugar districts for the laborers that used to be paid 5 and 10 cents a day in that same district.

The people are getting some idea of what they are capable of. Wages have advanced, so if we get machinery and skillful men wages will advance still more. Now, where are we going to get the laborers? That has been a question that has been asked. Oh, they say, we will get the cooly laborer in there. Is there a man within the sound of my voice who ever believes that the House of Representatives, by a majority vote, will allow the cooly laborer to go in there or on one foot of American soil or of soil belonging to the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman in that connection to state also what the almost universal expression of opinion among business men in the Philippine Islands was as to that importation of labor.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I did not see but one man in the whole islands who was in favor of it, and that was a Doctor Gomez, who appeared before the Commission to advocate immediate independence, and I wish every man in this House would read Doctor Gomez on the subject of immediate independence. He said he represented the labor interests and he wanted the free importation of the cooly laborer into the islands. He wanted them there, and he is the only man who did want them there. Every other man deprecated the idea. He is a precious bit of humanity, this Doctor Gomez, and I hope you will all read him. His history is told by himself in that testimony. No; they do not want cooly laborers there. Now, it is said that three or four years ago the insular government was having some ships built over there or boats for the interisland trade, and they had to go to Hongkong to get them built. It occurred to them that they might teach the Filipinos to build ships; so they asked

Congress to allow Chinese shipbuilders to come in—skilled mechanics—to teach these Filipinos how to build ships. They were to come in for a period of five years and then be deported. These were skilled men. No one in the insular government ever dreamed that we were to have an importation of cooly laborers there to go into the sugar fields of the Philippine Islands. Why, there are about 44,000 Chinamen in the islands, and, so far as I can learn, not a single one of them is engaged in the sugar industry. They are merchants, stevedores, and work in the cities; they are clerks in the banks, as they are throughout the whole Orient, even in Japan, and all that sort of thing. They do not get out into the field to labor—not much. So that bugaboo disappears, Mr. Chairman.

Now, there is another difficulty about expanding this industry. Three years ago they had the rinderpest there among the carabao. The carabao is the draft animal in the Philippine Islands. There is no other than the carabao. He is an amphibious animal—webfooted. He has to get into a mudhole or in water about once an hour before he is fit to go to work again. It is said that they get sort of crazy unless they are allowed to do so. Of course they are a fit animal to plow with in a mudhole, and that is where their plowing is generally done, because there is a rainfall of 150 inches a year in those islands. The rainfall is 50 inches in the Hawaiian Islands. That is the way they do their plowing. It is discouraging work to stand and look at a carabao before a plow. He walks almost half as fast as an ox, and they have to have two of them—one in the mudhole while the other is at work—to one man. Now, that is the motive power on the farms. A few years ago they had the rinderpest and that took away in some localities 50 per cent, and in some 80 per cent, of these carabaos. Some say that an average of 80 per cent of the carabaos in all the islands was destroyed. They are recuperating by the method nature has provided, and the carabao is increasing, but they have not yet effectually stamped out the rinderpest. They have a serum there which they inject, and some of the natives contend that the serum is more dangerous than the disease. I am told that that is because of the unskillful way in which the operation is sometimes performed. They think they are getting the advantage of it, and they are going to have the carabao there, but it will take years to fill up the waste places left by the carabaos that have been destroyed.

Then they come with their siren song about the mule power in the islands, and they had the report of the Commissioner of Agriculture in August, 1904, that he had imported so many mules, so many horses, and so many cows, and they said that those were all alive, but it turned out that they were pretty much all dead. They could not stand the climate. Why, on the government farm they have a few mules. They were the mules that were condemned and retired by the War Department—that is, they were sent out there and retired without pay, so to speak, and sold. They have become acclimated there in the islands. They were the survival of the fittest. They do very fair work on the government farm, and there was not so much ravage of disease among them as there was of the newly imported. They got past that; they were immune. There were but a few of them.

They have got to stand the climate. They have got to stand the surra, which is so devastating to the force of mules down there. I think they would be much better draft animals than the carabao, but the planters have got to take the carabao. They have some oxen there. They brought some from China and some from Australia; still I think that these were subject to the rinderpest, and they could not stand it. Now, there is that problem that has to be surmounted before there is an increase in the production of sugar in the Philippine Islands—the labor problem, the draft-animal problem, and then there is the problem of capital. Why, Mr. Hathaway would have us believe he went down there armed and equipped to buy all the sugar plantations and erect factories, with millions behind him to do this thing, and still he turns back with the flimsy excuse that he has not confidence enough in the government we have put in there to invest his dollars. Where is the capital coming from, if such men as he will back out with such a flimsy excuse as that from the investment of capital, to develop the sugar industry in those islands? Four and thirteen one-hundredths cents a pound in New York for refined sugar or 3.80 without any duty whatever after three years. Who is that going to hurt? Let us look into it a little, because we have gone into this thing and investigated it somewhat.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I listened with delight to the gentleman's description of the Philippine Islands and the method of procedure in the way of agriculture, etc., which has been very entertaining, and some of his descriptions have destroyed my ideas as to the worth of those islands. I believe it is a matter of history that we paid at least $20,000,000 for them. From the gentleman's description I would like to ask him now if he does not think we paid too much for the islands?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I can answer that question and will do so cheerfully. I never wanted to pay a dollar for those islands. I never wanted to see the United States exercise jurisdiction over those islands. It was against my judgment and my inclination, and I only yielded to it because we seemed to have got there and destroyed the only form of law and order existing, and if we gave them up we sent them at each other's throats and we left them without organized government, we left them to the prey of the midnight assassin and the cruelty of the Moro or of the Filipino, whichever might happen to be in the majority at the time. [Applause on the Republican side.] So I yielded gracefully and accepted what little portion I had to bear of the white man's burden in the Philippine Islands, and when we got them I thought it was our duty to deal fairly by them. Nay, I thought it was our "plain duty" to deal fairly with them.

Mr. Chairman, I thought it was our duty to educate them and lift them up and try to make them equal to some sort of citizenship; equal to the task of governing themselves. I never went into it as a matter of dollars and cents, as far as I was concerned. I did not go into the Spanish war that way, and gentlemen remember here how earnestly I protested against the declaration of war with Spain. I am not ashamed of it. I am proud of it. I stood by President McKinley, Thomas B. Reed, JOSEPH G. CANNON, Nelson Dingley, JOHN DALZELL, General GROSVENOR, and other men in this House protesting against the hysteria that carried away 106 Members of this side of the House who joined in that side for the purpose of declaring war against Spain. I believed then that William McKinley would work out the problem and free Cuba without the spilling of a drop of American blood. I believe that if he could have held on for sixty days longer he would have worked out the problem and we never would have been here to-day discussing the sugar question in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PAYNE. I do.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. It would be interesting to all of us who took part in the affairs of the House at that time if the gentleman will state now what problem he had in his mind that could have been worked out which would have brought us to the desired end.

Mr. PAYNE. I did not catch the last part of the gentleman's question.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. What was the method that could have been employed to work out our salvation?

Mr. PAYNE. President McKinley was working it out by the usual diplomatic methods between two peaceful powers, the United States and Spain, and from what I have since heard I believe he would have accomplished that. Information came to me afterwards from the Spanish Government, through a gentleman who had information from them at the time, but that day is past.

We went into the war. I stood by it as a patriotic American citizen. I wanted the war waged, as it was waged, honorably, decisively, and with celerity. We brought honor to our arms. We accomplished a protectorate, or whatever you may call it—the Platt amendment relation with Cuba—and we got Porto Rico, and in addition we got the Philippine Islands for $20,000,000. And here we are. We have them. We have got to stay by them. Honor demands it. Give them independent government to-day and what have we got? If there is a warlike individual in the world, he is the Moro of the Orient, the Moor, the Mohammedan, who believes he should protect every sort of animal life except human life, and that he is entitled to credit in the next world if he kills an enemy. And he hates the Filipino. But if there was a conflict between the two, I think the Moro would win out in the end. There would be war in a minute. We went down to Zamboanga, and there we received a petition for a separate Territorial government for the islands inhabited by the Moros. Why? Congress in its wisdom had provided, under the leadership of my friend from Wisconsin, for a general assembly, which meets now in about a year or a year and a half, I think, in the islands—a branch of the legislature, to be elected by a small percentage of voters, by those who are qualified among the natives down there. They say that in that assembly the Filipino will be in the majority,

and they do not propose to submit to the rule of any Filipino, so they wanted a separate Territorial government for the Moro.

That shows the feeling between these people. Independent native government would not last as long as it would take to proclaim the fact, but you would have anarchy from the word "Go!" We must stay there, if we have any respect for our national honor, and work out this problem which seems to have fallen to us, which we are working out, and which, under the providence of God, we will accomplish in the end; and we will give these people education in the line of schools, in the line of labor and industrial application, that will lift them up; and will give them all one language, and that is the language in which we speak. All of this is being accomplished. We will annihilate the thirty to fifty different dialects, so that each tribe can converse with the member of any other tribe; in other words, try to make them a homogeneous people when the time comes, not in a day, but after a generation or two generations have passed; and when the American people have accomplished this herculean task the question will be up to our children, not to us, whether we will still hold them or whether we will let them go and let them try to work out their own salvation with the equipment we have given them.

But for all practical purposes we are there to stay. There is as much to stay there for as in Porto Rico. We owe them the same duty that we owe to Porto Rico. It is as much our plain duty to pass this bill as it was in 1900 to put upon the statute book the beneficent act that was written there for the Porto Rican people.

But I was talking about the production of sugar in the United States and the cost of it, having arrived at the lowest cost of 3.80 per cent for refined sugar under free trade in 1909, laid down in New York. A gentleman representing the sugar-cane interests in Louisiana, an intelligent man, appeared before our committee. Mr. Hill told us last winter that in 1902 they raised sugar at three and a half cents a pound. That is not refined sugar, but 96° centrifugal sugar. He told us they had reduced the cost in the campaign of 1904 and 1905 to 3½ cents a pound. Now, this was the statement of Colonel Hill; but I notice he omitted to tell us what he got for molasses which was made in the process of manufacturing all of this sugar. He forgot to state what they did with the molasses. I know that in some countries they get equal to half a cent a pound on the sugar for molasses. I do not suppose in Louisiana they throw it away. I do not believe they do. They have the modern methods and modern machinery there. There is nothing stated about that, but he said their estimate of cost of 3½ cents a pound was based on 125 pounds of sugar to the ton of cane. Well, if that is so, sugar did not cost them 3½ cents a pound for the cane they did produce. According to the official statement they produced cane down there that yielded 146½ pounds of sugar, on an average, for eight years.

It does not cost much more to get a hundred and forty-six and one-half pounds than it does to get 125 pounds, if it is there. And when you take this into consideration and it is reduced from 3 cents a pound to two and six-tenths for sugar, adding a cent for refining, it means 3.6 cents against three and eight-tenths for Philippine sugar laid down in New York. That is not all.

Doctor Wiley, who is Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture, stated before the United States Industrial Commission in 1900 that Louisiana planters were then selling sugar at 2¾ cents and making more money than ever before. That sugar could not have cost them 3 cents if they were selling it at 2¾ cents and making money on it.

Now, gentlemen, do you see any particular menace to the sugar industry of Louisiana, contending against free sugar from the Philippine Islands? Why, they say, there is so much land in the Philippine Islands. Did you ever stop to think how many million of acres of land there are in Louisiana—level land that can be used for the cultivation of sugar? They have got about 300,000 tons now, and they have not developed it beyond that, although they have had all this protection and all this land. If they had occupied all of the land they could have produced sugar in Louisiana for the entire consumption of this country—3,000,000 tons.

It takes time to do these things. It takes time for people to make up their minds to put capital into investment in these things. Then you have to have labor to do it with.

Mr. NORRIS. Can the gentleman give us any idea of the amount of land in the Philippine Islands that could be used for this purpose?

Mr. PAYNE. I gave that fully in the first part of my remarks.

Mr. NORRIS. I was not in the Hall at that time.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think I should repeat it. You will find it in the RECORD.

Before the passage of this law taxing alcohol they used to get an average of $1\frac{6}{10}$ pesos for 4 gallons of cane molasses for the purpose of distilling it into rum. One and six-tenths would be equal to 80 cents in gold. Could not they get as much as that in New Orleans for the molasses that goes into the distillery? And yet Colonel HILL says that there is no money with the price at 3 cents a pound. They talk about cheap labor. Why, labor is worth what it will do—what it is sufficient for.

I think when you take the ordinary efficiency of the Filipino at 30 or 40 cents' quality, and a dollar's worth of such labor will not accomplish more in the sugar field than the dollar a day labor in Louisiana or a dollar's worth of the dollar and a half or two dollars a day labor in the sugar-beet fields of Michigan.

Then the beet-sugar people have given us some statement of the cost of their sugar. I do not suppose they went to work to find out the cost of the factory that did the least business and let that enter into the general average of the cost. Why, there were three factories in Michigan that had to move out of the State. It was stated last January that they had to move out because they could not get the farmers to raise beets. That was the excuse given. But it was latterly found out that they moved out because the farmers could not raise beets on the land of that locality. It was what they called "stump land," where there had been pine forests; and they found they could not raise beets on that land, and these factories moved out. One of them has gone to Minnesota. Now, in making up the price of the sugar I suppose that what these factories had been doing was taken into consideration at the time they moved away, and that increased the general average of the cost of the production of sugar in Michigan. According to the statement of those gentlemen who came before us last January, they stated that in 1903—because the campaign is from 1903 to 1904—it cost them $4.68½ a hundred pounds.

In 1904 they had reduced it to $4 a hundred pounds, and they say that last season they reduced it to $3.90 a hundred pounds. That is granulated sugar ready for the market. That is their statement. As I stated, the Philippine sugar costs $4.13 as against $3.90, and yet these gentlemen are trembling, or pretend to be, for fear of the interference of the Filipino sugar, when they have got the price down to $3.90 a hundred pounds, or 3.9 cents a pound, for their sugar. That is their statement. In Colorado they say that this last year it cost them $3.71 a hundred pounds, or 3.7 cents a pound. Then they make the general statement that it cost as much freight on the sugar from Colorado to Michigan as the difference of 19 cents a hundred. Well, it does not cost any more to take it to the Chicago market then. They say it costs them 24 cents a hundred to take their sugar from Michigan to the Chicago market, if I remember correctly, and it costs 24 cents a hundred to take the Filipino refined sugar from the city of New York to any market outside of it, and especially to the Chicago market, and so one freight rate washes the other. You ought not to be afraid of that sort of competition.

But that is not all of it. Are there any by-products to beet sugar? Well, in Michigan they have a distillery that takes the molasses, which is good for nothing else, and distill it. Mr. Humphreys told us last winter that they got from $2 to $2.50 a ton for this molasses at the factory, just about enough, he says, to put it in a tank and run it out of the tank onto a car. That means that it costs $2 a ton to load it. Is that a fair and honest statement, Mr. Chairman? Mr. Hathaway said that they got from $2.80 a ton to $3.50 a ton, and he made no pretense that it cost all that to load the molasses into a tank on a car. They get that price at the factory, free on board. How much this amounts to I do not know. Whether the people who own the beet-sugar factory own the stock in the distillery or not I do not know, but I believe they do.

That is not all of it. I have looked into this price of alcohol to see how much that brought. Mr. Humphreys appeared as a sort of attorney for these companies, and he is a very good attorney, too—a capable man. Mr. Humphreys complained that they had to pay the Government of the United States $1,200,000 tax on the alcohol they made in a single year, which, at the rate of $1.10 a proof gallon, amounts to 1,100,000 gallons. He says it was worth from 30 to 40 cents a gallon. Well, they sold some to the Navy Department at wholesale, and the Navy Department gave 5 cents a pound for it in large quantities; and at 6.76 pounds to the gallon, that makes about 34 cents a gallon that the Navy Department paid for a large quantity, I suppose under a competitive bid.

They have not sold any to the Navy Department since, I suppose, because they are getting more elsewhere. That means 30 to 40 cents a gallon, or $330,000 to $440,000 a year, made out of the alcohol. I do not believe these shrewd business men in Michigan are giving that all away.

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, will the gentleman permit a question, please?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. Is it true that the cost of $3.90 for the production of sugar in Michigan does not include the receipts for the by-products?

Mr. PAYNE. They did not claim that there was a dollar received for the by-product on the pulp, and they complained about the alcohol and said it cost as much to load the molasses as they got for it—$2 or $2.50 a ton—a statement which I do not believe and to which I except.

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, will the gentleman permit one other question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. Is it not true that they said that $3.90 cost did not include the wear and tear or depreciation of the plant?

Mr. PAYNE. They did.

Mr. FORDNEY. Or the interest on the investment?

Mr. PAYNE. They did say that, and they say that in the Philippine Islands; they say that in New Orleans; they say that in Michigan; they say it in Colorado; they have said it in Utah; they say it universally. Whether it includes dividends or not, I do not know.

Mr. FORDNEY. Now, pardon one more remark. Will you please state whether or not if this bill becomes a law the twelve nations that are parties to the Brussels agreement would countervail against that?

Mr. PAYNE. I will come to that.

Mr. FORDNEY. Some time ago you were at that point and I wanted to ask you the question and you declined to yield at that time.

Mr. PAYNE. I will discuss that cartel business later, and if I do not I hope the gentleman will remind me of it, because I want to do it.

Mr. FORDNEY. All right.

Mr. PAYNE. Some of the Colorado people stated last spring that they were making refined sugar in Colorado at 3½ cents a pound.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. One man told me that he was making it for 3.21 a pound.

Mr. PAYNE. I think they are getting down pretty near the truth. By and by they will take into consideration all these things. What did they say about dry pulp? Why, they used to throw it all away. Then the factories put in machinery costing $67,000, and now they sell their dry pulp at $14 a ton. It used to cost them $9,800 to remove that pulp. They earn 6 per cent on the $67,000, and also an amount equal to what it cost them to remove the pulp. You see they are advancing all along the line; and now let all these fifteen factories in the State of Michigan put in dry-pulp machines and save their $9,800 or $10,000 a year, and they will reduce the price of the cost of sugar in Michigan.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the percentage of pulp to a ton of sugar?

Mr. PAYNE. I think it was stated that it was 5 pounds to the hundred pounds of beets.

Mr. LOUD. Is the gentleman from New York aware that fully 90 per cent of the pulp of beets in Michigan is waste?

Mr. PAYNE. If I did not state that, Mr. Chairman, then I want to state it now. There are only two factories in Michigan that have put in the machines.

Mr. LOUD. It is an experiment.

Mr. PAYNE. An experiment! It cost them $10,000 to remove the pulp, and to-day they put it through the machines and get enough to pay all the expenses of removal and make 6 per cent on the investment, and they call that an experiment! I would be willing to take chances in such an experiment myself.

Now, two factories have the machines, and when the other thirteen factories get them—when they get the same sum total of the sugar produced in Michigan and get credit for the $10,000 in each factory saved upon the introduction of these pulp machines—it will reduce the cost of the general price of sugar as produced at these factories.

But we are not entirely without evidence on this subject of the future of the sugar beet. Why, it is more glowing than anything that has ever been discussed about the Philippine Islands. You know we had a hearing last January before the committee. Mr. Truman G. Palmer is secretary of the American Beet Sugar Commission, and he has appeared before the committee every time. He asked for the privilege to file a brief after the hearings last month, and I gave him three or four days, but I have not been able yet to see his brief. But he came out with a circular, which was distributed last January, in which he had some interesting things to say, all of which I can not stop to read, but you will find it on page 277 of the committee hearings. There are some parts, however, that I do want to read, and while I am reading it I want you to remember this fact, that either in 1900, when we were discussing the 15 per cent duty with Porto Rico, or later, when we were discussing the change in the tariff on sugar coming from Cuba, I stated to perhaps the most expert man, certainly the first expert in the beet-sugar business of the United States, Mr. Oxnard, after a conversation with him, that I expected soon to see the day that they would produce sugar, granulated and refined beet sugar, in this country at 2 cents a pound. "Well," he said, "Mr. PAYNE, I do not know as we will hardly do that, but I expect to see it below 2½ cents." That was his estimate then. Mr. Palmer is a little more definite. In this circular sent out to the people interested in beet sugar he says:

I take it that further Philippine tariff reduction is likely to come in due course of time, but it should not come until the Philippines greatly raise their wage rate on sugar haciendas and become at least semi-civilized—

These people claim to be civilized. There are 6,000,000 members of a Christian Church—

and until the brains and capital already engaged in the home industry, and which shall come to it under favorable circumstances if let alone, enable us to perfect the various improvements now under way.

Two years ago I wrote you at length concerning my suggestions of producing single-germ beet seed.

You know there are in beet seeds four or five germs in a cluster—four or five come up in a cluster—and the only way to thin them out to one is to get down on your knees and pull them out by hand. The American people do not like to get down on their knees; they do not like that kind of labor. It is expensive, and, besides, it injures the plant that is left.

The work was begun imemdiately by the Government and the first crop of seed from beets grown from 2,500 selected single-germ beet balls has just been harvested. I understand that 30 per cent of this seed came single germ and the expectation is that in four to six years more it will be an established thing, saving the farmers $6 per acre of actual labor, eliminating the hand work of thinning on hands and knees, and at least doubling the tonnage per acre—

Doubling the tonnage per acre—

Now, I hope that no one will ask me whether I really mean to say that. Mr. Palmer it is who says that. He continues:

Doubling the tonnage per acre on account of no injury being done to the remaining beets by hoeing out the superfluous ones, each plant standing 1 to 3 inches apart, depending upon how closely the seed is drilled in. If the sugar beets which the farmer now sells to the factory at an average price of $5 per ton cost him $3.50 per ton to produce, his crop grown from single-germ beet balls should not cost him to exceed $1.50 a ton.

This is Mr. Palmer who is to-day the secretary of the American Beet Sugar Association—probably the best informed man on this subject next to Mr. Oxnard.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. No; I can not be interrupted now. I desire to have Mr. Palmer heard without interruption.

The Government has taken charge of the scientific work on one of our sugar-beet seed farms in the State of Washington, and expects to be able to produce a strain of seed as high in sugar content as the best beets selected at the outset, which is 25 to 28 per cent. These mother beets should give factory beets of 23 per cent sugar, and, with a loss in extraction of 3 per cent, would enable the factory to turn out 400 pounds of granulated sugar per ton of beets. According to the Government report on the home-sugar industry for 1902, the average amount of sugar extracted per ton of beets was 221 pounds; hence this anticipated extra production of 170 pounds would nearly cut in two the present factory cost of producing sugar from American-grown beets.

Doctor Wiley, chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, Department of Agriculture, is to experiment this coming month with sugar "concrete," and, if successful, each factory, by increasing its investment 25 per cent, can operate three near-by "concrete" plants, shipping in the "concrete" to the main factory after the local campaign has been concluded and thus operating the year through and quadrupling its product, which would greatly lessen the cost of production.

Now, I don't know whether the doctor has got through with his experiment or not. I presume my friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] can tell.

Experiments are being made this year with an invention designed to remove the impurities of the juice at the outset instead of from the waste molasses after coming down through all the various processes, the inventor claiming that it will reduce the cost of a beet-sugar plant by 50 per cent, the labor to operate it by 33⅓ per cent, yield an average excess of 20 pounds of sugar per ton of beets, besides saving several valuable by-products.

All these matters lead to an eventual cost of production of granulated sugar from American-grown beets of something like 2 cents per pound, but it takes not only money and brains to perfect these improvements, but it takes time.

I desire to say right here in passing that these gentlemen claim that they were obliged to sell their crop 10 cents a hundred below the price of refined cane sugar simply because the sugar trust compelled them to do so. They could supply the market for only six months at a time, and the sugar trust would not supply the other six months unless they consented to take off 10 cents a hundred on their price, so that their price in Michigan this year averaged, he said, $4.15 a hundred.

We can offer the Philippine Islands a perpetual market for nearly $200,000,000 worth of purely tropical products annually. But whatever magnitude their sugar industry may reach, those who put their money into it will some day be compelled to fight a battle royal with the educated, scientific American farmer which will be costly for both and ruinous for one. Never in the history of the world has the nervous energy of the Temperate Zone succumbed to the listless workers of the Tropics, and it remains to be seen whether or not the sugar industry is to furnish the exception. Wise legislation would render such a battle unnecessary and with profit to all concerned. Unwise legislation will surely precipitate it and bring want and sacrifices to both.

And so on and so forth. It is a very interesting pamphlet, and I hope that everyone will read it.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. I wish to inquire to whom that rosy circular of Mr. Palmer's was addressed? Was it not addressed to gentlemen whom he wanted to interest in the beet-sugar business?

Mr. PAYNE. It was not. It was addressed to the sugar-beet people. He asked them to communicate with their Members of Congress. He asked the forty or fifty thousand beet-sugar farmers to see to it that no man came to Congress that dared to vote his opinions on this matter and do justice to the Filipino people. Oh, no; it was a general rally addressed to the sugar-beet interests all over this country. If the gentleman had read the pamphlet I do not think he would have asked the question, and if he reads it he will see that my reply is perfectly conclusive.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have read it, and I understand it is addressed, as that kind of a rosy and extravagant thing naturally would be addressed, to gentlemen whom Mr. Palmer desires to become interested in the beet-sugar business.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not see how my friend can say that, even with the new zeal that is given to him. I challenge any man in the House to read it and confirm what the gentleman has said. The whole scope of it shows that it is addressed to these beet-sugar people, and they are asked to threaten this House by petitions, telegrams, letters, and what not, and then to carry the matter to the polls if we do not obey the dictates of these gentlemen. Now, that is the circular, and how in the world could a man expect to interest capital in that way? I am telling what deadly peril there is about to come because of the obtuseness and obstinacy of the Congress of the United States in doing our plain duty for the people of the Philippine Islands. Do people interest capitalists in that way? I hardly think you will believe that. Now, they are afraid that this Philippine sugar industry is going to grow. Well, the beet-sugar production in 1901 was 163,000 tons. In 1902 it was 195,000 tons, in 1903 it was 208,000 tons, in 1904 it was 209,000 tons, and this year 220,000 tons.

Now, that is where the brains and the capital of the American people come in in developing this industry in the United States. They have been to work at it for fifteen years and more, and from the beginning of it fifteen years ago up until now they have got up to a production of 220,000 tons. We have abundant land in the United States, there is abundant capital and abundant brains to go into the business and still these people are afraid of the Filipino—weak brother that he is, a man like a child, with the intellect of a child of the age of 12 years. These people are afraid that they will get at it without capital and without draft animals and increase this sugar production down there until it equals all that we import from foreign countries and all that we import from Cuba and supply our entire demand of 3,000,000 tons and drive them out of business!

Mr. Palmer does not fear that, because with training and capital and work they are going to get down to 2 cents a pound for the product of sugar, somewhere near the figure I fixed in conversation with Mr. Oxnard when he admitted 2½; and I believe they are a mighty sight nearer 2½ cents a pound to-day than any of them are willing to admit, if they make a fair estimate of the sale of the by-products, and they might be nearer still if they put in this improvement, which, as my friend from Michigan says, has proven a success in saving $10,000 a year in these Michigan factories. They are liable to go on in the same direction. Oh, let them advance; let them spend less time coming down here to Congress and more time in perfecting their industries. Some of them admit this thing is sure to come. Mr. Palmer says it is sure to come, but he did not want it to come just yet.

Mr. LOUD. If the farmers received 2.31 for the beets, how can they get down to the price you suggest?

Mr. PAYNE. You mean for the sugar in the beets?

Mr. LOUD. How could they afford to sell it at 2 cents for the finished product?

Mr. PAYNE. I wish my friend had heard all I said. I read what Mr. Palmer said on the subject. Produce a single germ seed; save $5 an acre for labor; double the amount of acreage, etc. It is all pointed out; it is his argument.

Mr. LOUD. But the farmer gets 2.31 now.

Mr. PAYNE. I know, but he says the farmer can produce a double amount of beet sugar on the same acreage for a less amount of work, and then, of course, he can sell for less.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman wait until I answer this question?

Mr. HULL. Well, it is just on the same line and——

Mr. PAYNE. If he can make more money, of course he will sell.

Mr. HULL. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if there is not a large profit in beet pulp?

Mr. PAYNE. I went over that very thoroughly.

Mr. HULL. The point I want to make is this, that it is not simply the sugar they get, but it is the profit on the pulp as well.

Mr. PAYNE. And the molasses. Now, I come to a discussion of this Brussels convention business. Mr. Hathaway came to us with this convention business and he almost lost his breath. He thought it was going to take us off our feet. Well, we had some knowledge of this business before we knew Mr. Hathaway. He spoke of the beet-sugar convention at Brussels and what they had done, the treaty that they had signed, or the agreement they had signed, etc. The gravamen, the weight of it, was this, that if we dared take off this duty on sugar coming from the Philippine Islands the parties to this convention would put a countervailing duty on Philippine Island sugar equal to half the differential, or 50 cents a hundred. Let us see. The duty is 1.29 on their best sugar a pound. Now, a half dollar deducted would leave 79 cents, and they would put a surtax of 39½ cents, one-half the excess, upon Filipino sugar, and under those circumstances the Filipino sugar would all come to the United States.

I think they all united in the dire prediction that it would destroy the Filipino industry and also destroy the beet-sugar produstion. This was one reason why Mr. Hathaway did not invest his millions of dollars, because he went over to Hongkong and talked to a sugar expert there, and the Hongkong refiner told him that he was afraid of this countervailing duty, and if he bought Philippine sugar he could not send it to England; just as he told the Filipino in order to work down the price on the Filipino. Most all of it went to China. He distributed to China all the refined sugar China used, and it is stated that the Chinaman had got a little too high-toned to eat the old unrefined sugar he had been feasting on for so many years; that it is not as good even as decayed fish, but he demands now the pure article and is buying refined sugar at the refineries at Hongkong; but it was stated that this was going to close the door at Hongkong for Filipino sugar, and the ports of all the nations of the earth would be closed to it. Of course Hongkong was not bound by this agreement, or China or Japan or any other of those countries where they sell the largest part of the exported Filipino sugar, but it was stated it was going to have that effect.

Then they sent to New York and got Mr. Willett, of Willett & Gray. I do not know but that if Mr. Willett sits down and figures out a thing, and has the time in which to do it, he can figure it out pretty nearly right. He stated this subject of the convention better than any man they produced, but I think he made some woeful blunders with his statistics in other matters, as I will show hereafter. He interprets the convention, but I am not going to weary you by reading it. He says:

The high contracting parties agree to impose a special duty on the importation into their respective territories of sugars from countries that grant bounties, either on production or export—

Figure it out how by removing a duty on sugar coming from any part of the United States to another we grant a bounty! And further:

which duties shall not be less than the amount of the bounty, direct or indirect, granted in the country of origin, reserving the option to prohibit the importation of bounty sugars.

Now, he says:

I will give you an illustration of their application.

Mexico, up to March, 1904, assessed a duty of 15 cents per kilogram Mexican money, equal to $3.39 per 100 pounds United States money. Mexico for many years produced less sugar than it consumed, but in 1903 it reached the point where it produced more sugar than it consumed. Looking for an outlet for this extra production, they were confronted with the Brussels convention, which interpreted their import duty of $3.39 per 100 pounds as an excess of $2.89 above the about 50-cent maximum limit of the convention. One half of this—$1.45—was called surplus surtax and the other half—$1.45—was called bounty.

Mexico simply put an import tax on sugar coming into the country, something that we have always done. He says the convention put this surtax on it. Why do not they put it on us now? We have been offending all the time. But it is not

offending to take the tariff off of sugar coming from the Philippines into the States, but is it not offending if you put a duty of 1.65 cents or 1.68½ cents on sugar coming into the United States if it is an offense in Mexico to put a duty of 3.39 cents on it?

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not true that if the United States was an exporting country, if we exported sugar to nations signatory to the Brussels convention, and still retained our high duty they would charge a surtax against our exports?

Mr. PAYNE. The Philippines do.

Mr. MONDELL. If our exports amounted to any considerable amount?

Mr. PAYNE. We do export from the Philippine Islands. We export refined sugar from this country. Have we got to give up our sugar bounty because of this Brussels convention?

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not the invariable rule under the regulations of the Brussels convention to charge the surtax against any country that exports and has an import duty of above one-half cent per pound?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think it is.

Mr. MONDELL. That is what I understand to be the effect of the action of the convention. If it is not true, I have failed to understand the action they have taken. They have not countervailed up to this time, because we have not as yet given the Philippines over half a cent reduction in duty.

Mr. PAYNE. He further says:

This example shows clearly the application to any other country. The import duty on sugars into the Philippines is 73 cents per 100 pounds, which is 20 cents per 100 pounds surtax, less the 2 cents per 100 pounds charged on the exportation of sugar from the islands, say 18 cents per 100 pounds. Under the ruling of the convention one-half of this amount, say 9 cents per 100 pounds, is excess surtax, and the other half, 9 cents per 100 pounds, is bounty, but the permanent commission, in their discretion, have recently decided that the Philippines have a permissible surtax and no bounty. Their decision reads as follows:

"Regarding the Philippines there exists a surtax, but the commission has decided that this surtax can not be construed to mean a bounty for raw or refined sugar."

Well, they have considered the question in the United States and in Mexico. I do not understand that they are charging any surtax against Mexico now. True, they reduced the duty in Mexico, but it is still 52 cents a hundred pounds. It is just over the line. We have a way of regulating our own affairs. We have a way of putting on such duty as we please. We are an independent nation here. They do not put on a surtax against a pound of sugar that comes from any part of the territory belonging to the United States. But the question about the Philippines was in regard to the duty on sugar coming into the islands according to this man, and he is right about it, and not the question about the sugar coming from the islands to the United States. Why do they not insist upon putting a surtax on Porto Rican sugar? It does not all come to the United States, although most of it does. We have remitted the whole of the duty, 1.68½ for 96 degree sugar. Why do they not do it? And it was of this bogie and the other question about continuing the integrity of the personnel of our Government in the Philippine Islands which staggered Mr. Hathaway and kept back his millions of dollars. What he himself saw in the Philippine Islands concerning the production of sugar and what he heard about it was undoubtedly the real reason, and it is the reason that will keep American capital out of the Philippine Islands.

If, according to the statement of Mr. Palmer, there are millions upon millions in it in the United States, when those brainy people from the Northwest, the Temperate Zone—American brain in which I glory—and American capital shall come to a hand-to-hand conflict with our little brown brother in the Philippine Islands for the possession of the sugar market of the United States they will have a sure advantage over him.

So much for Mr. Willett on this particular branch of the question.

Now, I did not want Mr. Willett to go away and lay awake nights over this convention business, and so I thought I would put a little evidence in right in the midst of what he was saying, and I read a dispatch received from our minister to Belgium, Mr. Wilson, dated the 31st day of October, 1905, to the Secretary of State, as follows:

Permanent sugar commission sitting at Brussels suppressed compensating duty on sugars imported from Philippine Islands until new examination of Philippine regulations is made in conjunction with the legislation of the United States of America, Cuba, and Porto Rico. Question believed to be definitely settled as regards Philippine sugar.

That is the whole dispatch. From what I have read I have no more doubt that this question is entirely settled than that under the convention there does not exist the slightest reason for action against the United States because we dare to have sugar come from one part of the United States to another part without the payment of duty. The thing is absurd.

Now, we heard it stated often that when we made a concession to Cuba the Cuban planter would not get the difference, but the sugar trust would, and some sugar men came before the committee last January and quoted from Willett & Gray, showing that the price in New York of Cuban sugar was that day 19 cents a hundred less than the corresponding price of Hamburg sugar, and went away triumphantly, "We told you so." "Why," I said, "gentlemen, we have access to Willett & Gray's circular. See what it was for the whole period—the year before the Cuban treaty went into effect, on December 27, and the year after." I got the figures. They are printed in the hearings of last spring, and gentlemen will find them there. They showed what? That when the bulk of the West Indian sugar came in the market price in the United States was lower than the Hamburg price.

That was so before the Cuban treaty went into effect for a year, and that was so after the Cuban treaty went into effect for a year. The variation was about the same, and the sensible conclusion was that when there was a large amount of sugar coming into the market of the United States the buyer held off and the seller could not afford to pay the interest and warehouse charges, and therefore the buyer squeezed him to lower prices. Then, when Mr. Willett brought in his figures last month for eleven months of 1905, he shows about the same variation that there was the year before the treaty. Right along there was about the same variation, showing conclusively that the reduction of 20 per cent did not make any difference.

Then I thought I would look into the official records of the sugar going into consumption in the United States. The principal item of sugar introduced into the United States from Cuba for the fiscal year ending June 30 last was 1,744,013,316 pounds of 95° sugar. That entered at a price of 3.1 cents a pound, $3.10 a hundred. There was introduced of the same degree in 1905 other sugars, mainly from West India, 3,000,000 pounds and a fraction, at 2.4 cents a pound instead of 3.1 a pound. Cuban sugar was worth seven-tenths of a cent more in the New York markets.

It looks as though Cuban sugar was a little better sugar than the other West Indian sugars. Then recollect that the duty is to be counted, two-thirds of which they say goes to the trusts. You see it simply is not true. The figures show it. I had a little curiosity to see how these figures came out, so I took Willett & Gray's circular and got the average price of 96° sugar, which is the sugar for which they give the price for the year ending June 30 at $4.55 a hundred, duty paid. The same way with the other sugars—Cuba $4.42 a hundred and other cane sugars $4.05. So when we compare the figures of the official report with those of the renowned Willett & Gray, who appear in opposition to all this legislation, I have no doubt but what Cuba gets the benefit of that 20 per cent reduction. But Mr. Willett contends that that 20 per cent reduction has had a wonderful effect in stimulating the amount of sugar produced in the island of Cuba. He came before the committee with an estimate of the sugar imported from the other countries and the sugar produced in the United States, and stated that this year we must buy only 300,000 tons of sugar, paying the full duty, to meet our consumption of sugar. Well, when I heard him say that the consumption of sugar estimated for this year was 2,667,000 tons I was a little curious. I knew the sugar consumed in this country was 2,765,000 tons last year, and how it could be 100,000 tons less this year I could not figure out.

He admitted that sugar consumption was increasing, and had been for several years, at the rate of 9 or 10 per cent per annum, but he had taken last year, he said, because that was definite, and made it the estimate of this year. Now, if he had been fair, he would have said that the estimate this year should be rated at 3,000,000 tons, but he did not do it. Then he estimated the importation from Cuba this year at 1,300,000 tons. Well, I thought I would look that thing up. Last year the importation from Cuba was 1,139,000 tons. I did look it up, and I found that we had accurate statistics for ten months of this last calendar year, and the two calendar years preceding, for ten months. I found that the importation from Cuba for the ten months in 1904 exceeded the importation for ten months of 1905 by 164,000 tons. Then I looked to see how much the importation of sugar was for November and December 1903 and 1904, and I found that it was somewhere about 50,000 tons for each year. Well, I added about 60,000 tons to the figures for the ten months for the year 1905 and found on that basis the importation of sugar into the United States from Cuba for the last year was less than a million tons, as against his figures of 1,300,000 tons. Oh, I tell you, these figure experts, or expert figurers, on sugar can show you some remarkable footings.

Well, I looked that over to see how much more we are importing at full duty, because it is more than we were importing

the year before. We imported from Cuba, 1,000,000 tons; from Hawaii, 370,000 tons—I took Mr. Willett's estimate of 370,000 tons, which I think is too high—from Porto Rico, 210,000 tons; cane sugar produced in the United States, 300,000 tons; beet sugar produced in the United States, 265,000 tons; 39,000 tons of Philippine Island sugar, which is now in bonded warehouses in New York. Whether it will go into consumption or not, I do not know. These figures added make 2,184,000 tons. This subtracted from the 3,000,000 tons that we consume leaves 816,000 tons imported into the United States at the full rate of duty. Why, when we were trying to pass and did pass through the House the bill to get reciprocity with Cuba, I was told that it would immediately send down the price of sugar to the consumers in the United States, and some of these very sugar men have been howling, trying to make capital out of the fact that it did not reduce the price of sugar in the United States. I believed that it would not, and it has not. I believed that the exporters of the sugar would get the difference, and they have. I believed that it would not hurt a single sugar industry in the United States, and it has not.

But they say we had in contemplation a hundred or more factories, and we have only built six. We would have built more, but the thing was so uncertain, and we did not know what you would do with the Philippine Island sugar, and all that sort of thing.

Well, I propose to give these gentlemen certainty. Let us write it into the statute book. We will have 25 per cent of duty until April 11, 1909, and then we will have the free importation of sugar from the Philippine Islands, so that you will not have to complain hereafter about knowing where you are at or what you are to do in the future.

I believe, as I have always believed and have told these gentlemen, that if the thing was definitely settled and they knew what the law was there would not be any trouble about developing the industry, but as long as it hung in the balance and the thing was agitated people would be frightened. They themselves have frightened people in trying to prevent this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Why not consider it as definitely settled now?

Mr. PAYNE. It never will be definitely settled until it is settled right. We have no right morally, we have no right in carrying out our constitutional prerogatives, to charge these people duty except for the mere purpose of revenue for themselves. We have no right to protect one part of the United States against another part, and gentlemen representing the tobacco interests and representing the sugar interests have so expressed themselves before the Committee on Ways and Means in this debate. The only thing they have claimed to say was that we have not definitely concluded that we were going to stay forever in the Philippine Islands. We are there now and there is no prospect of getting away for the next twenty-five years, in the anticipation of the most sanguine man. Are we going to treat them in this manner for twenty-five years because we have not definitely decided what our children will do twenty-five years from now?

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from New York permit a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. I understood the gentleman to say a minute ago that in the Cuban reciprocity he contended that it would not hurt the beet-sugar industry. Let me say to the gentleman that in the State of Michigan there are four factories that went into the hands of the sugar trust, and that they have been shut down and torn down. One of them cost $800,000, and within ninety days from the time the trust obtained title to it they had 150 men on the factory razooing it to the ground.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; I understand that. I am glad the gentleman has made the admission, because the sugar people who came before the committee stated that they did not know whether the trust owned any stock or not, but there was a gentleman who was acting as trustee and who had bought stock and appeared in the board of directors, and possibly he might be a representative of the sugar trust, and he had bought some of these factories. He says that four factories have been closed down. I know of three, and I know why they closed down.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not think the gentleman does.

Mr. PAYNE. I know what they say. They say it is because they built the sugar factories out where they had to raise the sugar beets, among the pine stumps or on the pine-stump land, and they could not raise them.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, the gentleman has reference to the Oscoda factory. Let me say that I do not know whether the trust owns the factories or not——

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman, then, is in the same state of ignorance that Mr. Humphrey and Mr. Hathaway were.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. It has been stated that it was able to control the price of the product.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; but I do not think it is worth while quibbling about it. Probably it was the man in the moon who invested and not the sugar trust. I do not care who it is. I heard one gentleman say that he thought he had been buncoed. He was led a year or two ago to vote against Cuban reciprocity, and the first thing he knew the beet-sugar people were selling out to the trust and he was helping the trust all the time. They owned a part of the stock then and he did not feel right about it. I did vote for it, and I have no sympathy with him. The best way is to vote right, and the right side of this question is to do the just thing by all the people of the United States, the Filipinos, and the beet-sugar people and the cane-sugar people, and if we vote this bill we will do exactly the right thing. [Applause.]

Now, they say they are afraid they are going to overslaugh us with sugar. The consumption of sugar has increased in this country from 1,949,000 tons in 1894 to 2,767,000 tons in 1904. The imports from Cuba increased from 43,000 tons in 1895 to 1,151,000 tons in 1904. That is an increase of 42 per cent in consumption, and an increase in the Cuban product of 36 per cent. If you take it this year the increase in consumption is from 1,900,000 tons to 3,000,000 tons, an increase of 37 per cent, and the product from Cuba from 843,000 tons in 1895 to 1,000,000 tons in 1905, an increase of 16 per cent.

In Hawaii there has been a big increase from 1895 to 1904. In 1895 it was 129,000 tons, and in 1904 it was 330,000 tons. They have got clear beyond their limit, and lots of these estates do not pay to operate them. They are having a hard time to get laborers; they want the Chinese-exclusion act repealed; they want to let in cooly labor, peons, or anybody else. I do not know what other gentlemen told them, but I told them that so far as I could resist it, I would do so, and that they might calculate to go on with their sugar estates without the benefit of cooly labor.

Now, as to Porto Rico, I did not have the statistics back of 1901. Then it was 66,000 tons, and in 1904 it was 116,000 tons, an increase of 75 per cent. They were pretty well established in the sugar business when we took them in. I know one Englishman who came here weeping for the poor Porto Rican with the 15 per cent Dingley rate, and I was told that he was a millionaire sugar producer there. I told him about it, and he never bothered me about it after that. Now, in the Philippine Islands the largest production they have ever made was 300,000 tons. They consume 80,000 tons in the islands.

They exported that year 220,000 tons. That is the biggest thing they ever did. That is when they had most of their 400,000 acres under cultivation. Census year (1903) they had 180,000 acres under cultivation, and they produced 180,000 tons of sugar, and still these people will claim that they have been producing 2 and 3 tons of sugar per acre, and find some plantation where they had done it, and they say that represents the average of the islands, when the census shows 180,000 acres actually under cultivation and 180,000 tons of sugar for that year. Then they go back and say that was a half crop and say that some other years they had 300,000 tons. So they had, but they had more acres under cultivation. They may sometimes produce an average of a ton and a quarter to an acre down there, according to the calculation made by Secretary Taft. On one estate he figured up a ton an acre. Some one looked over his figures and said that it showed a ton and a quarter an acre. I think it was a ton and a quarter myself, I think there was a mistake in the figuring, and certainly I do not think Secretary Taft meant to deceive anybody. There it is, a ton and a quarter an acre, sometimes, but are they going to have such a growth of this industry that they will produce from 4 to 6 tons an acre down there? Now, what moonshine! What is the use of talking like that. They can not do it.

The history of these other countries show that they can not do it. Here is Hawaii, with free sugar against the duty of 1.68½ on 96 degree sugar, having that advantage, claiming that they can make but 2.7 per cent on their investment, and that many do not make a dollar on their investment. There is some difference between Hawaii and the Philippine Islands. It seems to be in favor of Hawaii. They have less rainfall—50 inches a year instead of 150 inches a year—and they can work the ground better, they can work machinery better, they can work steam plows better. Yet with all these advantages the average is a little over two tons an acre in the Hawaiian Islands. They say we do not get all the juice in the Philippine Islands. Of course they do not. With their three roller mills

they get about 50 per cent. The best factories in Louisiana get 85 and 88 per cent. They may get the mills down there some day to do that. We will not get them down there before Mr. Palmer's five years are up, in which he is to produce 2-cent granulated refined sugar in this country. He is not afraid. Give him three years' time in energy in the Temperate Zone against the people of a tropical zone. He is not afraid. He need not be afraid. He told his honest convictions when he said that there is no danger to him, and there is no danger to his industry.

But I am taking too long. I did not intend to talk so long, Mr. Chairman, and I shall say very little about tobacco. Now, of all the scares and ghosts and goblins in the world, the worst is the scare that has been worked up among the tobacco people—telegrams going out from Washington to telegraph your Member that if he votes for this bill—H. R. No. 3—he will put us in competition with the Chinese cheap labor in Manila. There are twenty-eight Chinamen under the census, and they are all that could be found in the Philippine Islands who are making cigars. Think of it! Twenty-eight Chinamen out of nearly 12,000 cigar makers. Competition with the cooly laborer in the Philippine Islands! Well, now, of course that is a fraud upon these people. The only protests I have received from my district—and we have cigar factories there, for we raise tobacco there, and we have a beet-sugar factory there—was from one of my constituents, who said in a letter the other day—he is a cigar maker—that if I did not defeat this bill it would bring him and his fellow-workers in competition with Chinese cheap labor in Manila. Well, I think there are some Chinese factories there, but they are little bits of fellows, such as we have in little towns, who have two or three men working for them. The big factories are owned generally by the Filipinos. There are some eleven Americans in the cigar business there, some Chinamen, one negro, and the rest are Filipinos. The big factories with two or three thousand hands are owned by Filipinos and run by Filipinos.

I am not going to go at length into the tobacco business. Why, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has run it down and back and forth, and he has received from the cigar makers themselves and the cigar manufacturers figures that are startling in confutation of every representation made before our committee. These come from manufacturers and workmen. The cigar makers need not be afraid of the cigar makers in the Philippine Islands. The competition will be from the cigars made by the Williams process by machinery—made at a less cost per thousand than they can make them by hand. Now, tobacco costs as much in the Philippine Islands as it does in the United States. New York tobacco sells for 10 cents a pound; Virginia tobacco for 6 or 7 cents a pound. How much is it, I will ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I do not know.

Mr. PAYNE. I think 6 or 7 cents. That is exported. I do not want to disparage the products of the gentleman's State, but it is stuff that is fit only for chewing tobacco and plug and smoking tobacco, and then large portions of it only fit to send to Germany or some other foreign country. Connecticut leaves sell for 30 or 40 cents a pound. We raise some Connecticut leaf up in my district. Well, the wrapper tobacco of the Philippine Islands is worth 35 cents a pound according to the statement of this gentleman. Let us see.

This was submitted by Mr. Bijur before our committee when he appeared. Price of domestic cigar leaf, he puts it—he does not say whether wrapper or filler—New England, 21.6; New York, 10; Pennsylvania, 9; Ohio, Miami Valley, 7½; Wisconsin, 7.8; Georgia and Florida, 28.8. There is a little item of interest in the statement made before the committee. In Georgia and Florida they have gone into the experiment of raising tobacco under shade or cover. They have imported the Sumatra seed. They have succeeded in making a leaf equal to the Sumatra tobacco, some of them claim; some say nearly equal. Of course Sumatra tobacco costs from a dollar to a dollar and a half a pound, with a dollar and eighty-five cents duty. They are producing this Sumatra leaf down there ready for the trade at a cost of 80 cents a pound for leaf wrapper tobacco—thin, nice, perfect leaf, like the Sumatra—to wrap American cigars with. We have got it naturalized—American tobacco in Florida and Georgia. Well, they put it down here in this statement at 28 cents a pound. Now, they give here market price for Filipino leaf tobacco per quintal—that is, 101.44 pounds—from the Daily Bulletin, Manila, December 12, 1904. Isabela, 1901, first to fifth class—these statistics go back quite a ways. They are furnished by Mr. Bijur before wages went up.

It would have been a better average if it was brought down to now, but we want to convict him out of his own mouth. They put in first class at $42; that is, 42 cents a pound, as against 21 cents in New England and 28 in Georgia and Florida, and they have not any tobacco that compares with the wrapper leaf in Georgia and Florida or with the wrapper leaf in Connecticut, and yet these people are howling for protection. Why, they say that even with the 9 cents duty on tobacco for the next three years this is going to ruin their business. Men come down here and some of them go over to see brother HILL, and he brings in his exhibits and the statement that he has, and they go back and say, "It is not so much of a scare after all" and "I think you are right about it," but still this agitation is kept up. Isabela is the best tobacco. Then there is the Cagayan, which is not as good. This is 1901 quotation. First to fifth class, $11 to $38, which is 38 cents a pound, or 37 cents with a hundred and one pounds and a fraction to the quintal.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Is that price in gold or silver?

Mr. PAYNE. That is in gold; good old American dollars. Isabela, 1902—this is for another year—first to fifth class, sixteen to thirty-six dollars a quintal; Cagayan, 1902, first to fifth class, ten to thirty-two dollars. Brill, that is a poor quality, first class, few stocks offered—they do not have much first class—thirteen fifty a quintal; second class, $11; third class, nine fifty. None of it gets down to the farmers' price in Virginia, or Ohio, or Wisconsin, or in Pennsylvania. That is what is costs there in Manila while they are trying to persuade the tobacco farmers of this country this bill is going to ruin them, and they are just as earnest in trying to persuade the sugar men.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Has the gentleman received any protests from the tobacco growers of Tennessee or Kentucky?

Mr. PAYNE. According to my recollection, not a word. There are none up to this time, to my recollection.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman that although there is an immense territory in both of those States where they do not raise anything except tobacco I have not received a single protest, and I have inquired of a number of leading tobacco farmers and they all say that this tobacco will not conflict with the Tennessee and Kentucky tobacco, which is practically the same as Virginia.

Mr. PAYNE. They are level-headed men.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Of course they are.

Mr. PAYNE. I thought I would have to testify to it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am glad the gentleman has so quickly and promptly stated the whole truth.

Mr. PAYNE. Export leaf Filipino tobacco, wrapper, per pound, 30 cents; filler, 10 cents; smoking tobacco, 7.5 cents. Mr. Shuster, collector of internal revenue, discovered afterwards he had made a mistake about the tobacco and changed it, but we will let it go at that. Mr. Bijur says what the value of the United States cigar tobacco ready for the market "should be." Why did not he tell us what it is? "Should be!" Why, there is a wonderful chance of explanation of the words "should be" and a play of the imagination. What a wonderful chance for the poet! New England, 35; New York, 18; Pennsylvania, 21; Ohio, 21; Wisconsin, 21; Georgia, ——; Florida, 80. Well, in my country they raise tobacco. A small percentage of it is suitable for wrappers. Another small percentage is suitable for binders and a part is suitable for fillers; and of course they can not sell fillers for 6, 7, or 8 cents a pound in the market unless they get as much as 20 cents or 21 cents a pound for the wrappers, which is a small proportion of it, and sell the whole crop on the farm at the uniform price of 10 cents a pound. Now, here is the showing by the man who was put forward to represent this interest, trying to show that he is going to injure the tobacco farmer in the United States.

And then they got up another scarecrow. The duty on Sumatra leaf coming into the islands is 23 cents; coming into the United States is $1.85. They said: "Why, your bill will allow that Sumatra leaf to come in and be made up into cigars and sold in the United States and only pay a duty of 23 cents a pound." Why, gentlemen, look at the bill. It relates wholly to the products of the Philippine Islands coming in free of duty, and whatever is imported into the United States from another country pays the Dingley duty. It is so enacted in the bill; so written in the law. Where is the danger? They say that you can not tell the difference. I said: "Do you mean to tell me, as an expert, that you can not tell the difference between Sumatra and the Isabella leaf?" "Well, we might tell it, but the custom-house officer might be deceived." "But the custom-house officer has the inspection of the leaf that goes into the factory. We can follow it from the beginning to the end, until it goes into the market or goes out of the Philippine Islands. There is no chance for a fraud. If your prediction is right, Congress is here and we will see to it in the future that that tobacco pays $1.85 before it goes into the islands rather than to have it come in in fraud."

The rice men of Louisiana have been, within two or three days, protesting. We have forced onto the people in that coun-

try a duty on rice which is a protective duty. Representatives from that section all voted against it; but the Republican party vote and legislate for the whole people of the United States, and the rain and the sunshine and Republican rule fall alike upon the good and upon the evil. Now, they are raising all of the rice that is consumed in the United States, and they are thanking God that He induced the Republican party to give them that duty on rice. Well, they have been told that if rice came in free from the Philippine Islands, although they imported $7,000,000 worth last year and will probably import three and one-half and four million dollars this year to supply their own wants and to feed their people, it will destroy this industry here. Those people in Louisiana—the people who raise rice there that is so magnificent—who own those large plateaus of land surrounded by dikes, inundated just at the right time—rice planted not in the water, as in the eastern country, but planted when the land is comparatively dry, and where they use the plow and other tools and plant the crop and then turn on the water until the rice is matured, doing so much of it by machinery—will soon be in a position to sell the rice against any rice anywhere in all the world; but they are afraid of the carabao and the Philippine plow—a sharp stick and a little piece of iron on the end, driven through the water, because the rice paddies have to be inundated when the rains fall from heaven—and they fall mightly copiously in the rice-planting season—they plow the land under water, set the rice under water, wade through it so laboriously in the hot sun—yet the people of the South are afraid of those people sending rice to the United States and flooding this country and driving the owners of the rich soil down in Louisiana and Texas out of the business.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Are they going to continue to use those primitive methods?

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman asked me if they are going to continue to use those primitive appliances.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Under Republican administration.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, the Filipinos are a progressive people. The gentleman is getting a glimmering that will raise him up immeasurably in his political ideas if he will only follow it.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. I will suggest to the gentleman from New York that he is rapidly climbing down off of that high-tariff horse he used to ride around here.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, the gentleman may see something in that. Did I ever advocate a duty on sugar and protect the sugar producer in New York against Kansas, Pennsylvania, or Michigan, or against tobacco?

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Did you not advocate a measure creating a tariff duty of 75 per cent of the Dingley rates against the protest of the majority of the membership of the other side of the aisle?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, the other side of the aisle, as usual, was wrong. [Laughter on the Republican side.] They wanted to deprive the Philippine people of any revenue. I protested against it. I know more now than I did then. I thought 75 per cent would produce more revenue than a lower duty. It did not. Twenty-five per cent may, but we have got to get a duty of some kind to give a little revenue, because the march of progress is going on and we do not propose to halt in the work of educating those people, especially in the industrial arts, if the whole Democratic party, great and small, all wings flopping together, are against it. We are going to take care of that. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] The Japanese, progressive people as they are, are raising rice the same way that they raised it a thousand years ago. It seems to be a certain sort of necessity of that climate and the nature of the rainfall there. They have got to get a flood from heaven as the rains fall, so they construct their rice paddies to hold the rain, and when the rain comes it comes too soon, and they have got to get the carabaos to wade the water to run their plows. They are not able to get mules to do it. They die. They are not able to use steam plows. The paddies are small. They are generally small. They do not take in a hundred or a thousand or more acres, as they do in Texas. Providence has not dealt so generously with these people in regard to rice as it has with the people of Texas and Louisiana. I hope that with improved methods they can do better. I hope that you people in Texas and Louisiana, when you are able to furnish rice at half the cost that you are furnishing it to-day, will not drive the Philippine people out of their rice paddies. I hope the time will come when they will be able to feed their own people down there.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has it fallen under your observation that these Filipinos raise a superior kind of rice and export it and then import an inferior quality from somewhere else and live on that themselves?

Mr. PAYNE. It has not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The reason I ask that question is because I received a letter or circular from somewhere down in Texas stating that that is exactly the condition of affairs.

Mr. PAYNE. I shall look for the official report and find out. I hope the gentleman will do it before he commences his speech.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman from New York will permit me, I would venture to say for the benefit of the gentleman from Missouri that if the Filipinos have been guilty of that performance—that they exported good rice—they first imported it, for they certainly have not raised any of it up to this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have detained the committee much longer than I expected. I want to say a word more about a Filipino who appeared before the committee at Manila and here, Mr. E. de la Rama. He is a man of about 36 years of age, a splendid specimen of manhood, educated in Paris, who speaks French, Spanish, and United States—perhaps I should say English—with great facility. He is a little short of English when he gets into the excitement of a speech. He is a natural orator, a sugar raiser, a plain farmer, and still a bright and interesting man. When he appeared before the committee the other day, he closed his address with these words:

> Before closing I wish to inform the committee of the last recommendation which I received before leaving the islands from our people. I was asked to say to the lawmakers in the national capital that it may be possible that we may be mistaken in some statements which we make, and that it might be possible for us to invade the market in the United States; but it may also be that we may have some reason for not doing so, and it may also be possible that the opponents of this bill may make statements which may be correct or not. This, nevertheless, is a very important matter. It is a question on one side of the prosperity and the felicity of a country under the American flag, while on the other side of the ruin and continual misery of the same country. We believe that the matter is of sufficient importance, so that an effort should be made by practice to show who is in the right. If, after some length of time of practice or practical application, it should be found that we have been mistaken, and that we really can only prejudice instead of benefiting this country, we ask ourselves in such case, Is there any power which could prevent Congress from reestablishing the tariff? Then, in such case, we would not oppose the measure, because, although we are a barbarous people, we have sufficient intelligence to understand that charity begins at home.

I commend that to the gentlemen representing the beet-sugar interest and the cigar interest and the tobacco interest of the United States, and ask them to get up on the plane of this "half civilized," this "barbarian" Filipino, Señor de la Rama, and remember with him that charity begins at home. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BONYNGE. Will the gentleman yield for a few questions? I did not interrupt him during his remarks.

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. BONYNGE. What is the acreage in the Hawaiian Islands cultivated in sugar?

Mr. PAYNE. I have not those figures here.

Mr. BONYNGE. How much sugar did the gentleman say was raised per acre in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. PAYNE. The census showed a ton per acre. The estimates of the sugar planters showed that some years it was one and a quarter tons per acre. There are 400,000 acres that have been in cultivation, although they sometimes do not cultivate them in sugar. There was 200,000 acres last year. Generally they do not have a rattoon crop. They do not have a crop two years in succession. There is usually some other crop raised in between; so that while there have been 400,000 acres in cultivation it has not been all at the same time.

Mr. BONYNGE. Was there testimony before your committee of cases where as much as two or three tons were raised per acre?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; just as there has been shown another instance where as much as eleven tons were raised in one place in Hawaii.

Mr. BONYNGE. I will ask the gentleman if this land adapted to sugar culture amounted to 9 per cent of the 73,000,000 acres of lands?

Mr. PAYNE. The census reports say 9 per cent is arable.

Mr. BONYNGE. And one-half of those lands are uncultivated at the present time.

Mr. PAYNE. Not quite one-half; 4.4 per cent, to be accurate.

Mr. BONYNGE. If put into sugar cultivation they could raise on those islands something over 4,000,000 tons, then, could they not, even at a ton per acre?

Mr. PAYNE. If it was all put under cultivation and they could raise sugar on all of it, a ton per acre might mean that; but a large portion of those lands is not suitable for sugar.

They are more suitable for abaca, for the hemp business; they are more suitable for cocoa; they are more suitable for tobacco and for grazing. So that I take it, from what I can learn, that about the same proportion of sugar lands could be found in the remaining 4.4 per cent as have been found in the 4.6 already under cultivation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. As I remember it, there are 1,500,000 under rice cultivation.

Mr. PAYNE. I forgot about the rice.

Mr. BONYNGE. I am talking about the 4,000,000 acres which are not under cultivation at all, but that are available to be put under cultivation.

Mr. PAYNE. I think about the same percentage as the present percentage would be available for sugar cultivation if it was extended to this land.

Mr. BONYNGE. Now, on another subject I should like to ask the gentleman. Do I understand him to argue that the United States Government has no moral right to levy this tax, except for the purpose of revenue?

Mr. PAYNE. I think I did state that.

Mr. BONYNGE. Has that always been the view of the gentleman?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I do not know whether it has or not.

Mr. BONYNGE. When you discussed the Porto Rican question in the House, did you not argue that we should levy the tax against the Porto Rican sugar for the purpose of setting the precedent to the Philippine Islands, that their products should not come into the United States free of duty?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know. That was a pretty good speech, and if the gentleman has read it, it is probably all right. If he has not read it, he will find it good reading now.

Mr. BONYNGE. That is your view now.

Mr. PAYNE. It may be that I took that position at that time. The whole theory of the Porto Rican bill was to fix such a percentage of taxation as would replenish their treasury; and further, the most important thing I had in my mind—although I was remonstrated with in high quarters for presenting it—was that we should establish the relation of those islands to the United States, to know "where we were at," and what we should do in the future, what the law was, whether the Constitution went there or not to prevent Congress from legislating as it pleased.

Mr. BONYNGE. Also, incidentally, was it not your view then that we should levy that tax for the purpose of establishing this precedent that the Philippine products should not come into the United States free of duty?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not remember any such thing. If I said it, it will appear in the RECORD, because I never change what I say.

Mr. BONYNGE. I will call the gentleman's attention to that later. Now, do I understand the gentleman to argue that there will be no benefit to the Filipinos by this reduction of duty?

Mr. PAYNE. I am doubtful about the benefit to the Filipinos.

Mr. BONYNGE. What is the purpose of the bill, then?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, to reduce taxation in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BONYNGE. Regardless of whether it benefits the Filipinos or not?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, it will benefit them in this way: It will give them courage. There is some sentiment in it. They believe it will help them. They say the present law is unjust, and I think it is. I want to do justice by them. Then if it does not benefit them it is not my fault, but the decree of Providence in creating those islands and in locating them and in not so fixing them that they can raise sugar to advantage. It may be the position of the American sugar producer in the United States, who has got so far along that nobody can touch him.

Mr. BONYNGE. So that it is more from the sentimental standpoint than from the economic standpoint?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no; it is because it is right. Does not the gentleman appreciate that? Because it is right between them and us. That is the reason.

Mr. BONYNGE. When the gentleman argued the Porto Rico question I did not understand him to take that position. On the contrary, I understood from the speech of the gentleman at the time that it would be wrong to admit the products of oriental countries into this country free of duty and to put the labor of the United States into competition with the cheap labor of the Orient. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. I commend that speech to the gentleman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman spoke several times in regard to the peculiar labor conditions that existed in the islands, and I wish he would explain at length what those conditions are.

Mr. PAYNE. The Filipino laborer has not been educated up to the plane of labor in the United States. His wants are not so many. He can get along without a hat, and, in rare instances, without a shirt and without pants. His wants are few; he has not the incentive to work that men have in this temperate climate, and yet I was glad to see generally that they were wearing hats and shirts and pants and even a frock. They are advancing in that respect. They do not require as much to eat. There are a number of tropical fruits they can eat that do not require to be cooked; they live very well on rice, and they have not been ambitious about the beauty of their homes. These are built there of the nipa grass and of the cogan grass, with bamboo poles. A man builds his own house himself. It does not require a great deal of labor to build it. When you go there and advance wages by the month they get tired out at the end of two days or at the end of the first week and want a holiday; they have a great many holidays. They are gradually being lifted out of that rut. They have not the incentive to lay up money. They have no savings banks in the islands; they do not know what it is to have money in the bank, and yet I was told that one of the banks at Manila had started a savings deposit, and in an incredibly short space of time they had a great many depositors, and a deposit of a considerable amount from laborers. They are learning these things, and as they learn them they demand greater wages. They insist on larger wages. A cigar manufacturer in Manila told me he was afraid of free trade because it will advance the wages of the cigar makers.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Now, if the gentleman from New York will pardon me, a question right there. The gentleman stated that the Spaniards paid 20 cents for labor in the navy-yard and that we were paying 65 cents a day. Has labor improved in the same ratio?

Mr. PAYNE. I understand it has improved, but I can not say whether it has improved in the same ratio or not, but the cost of living has increased nearly double they say.

Mr. PERKINS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. PERKINS. When the gentleman considers the difference in the intelligence of the laborer and the difference in the efficiency and industry of the laborer, does he think that the sugar raiser in the Philippines gets any more work for a dollar than the sugar raiser in Michigan?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not, and I so state in the report.

Mr. PERKINS. I so understand.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from New York permit a question on another line?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. MANN. As I understand the bill, if a manufacturer of alcohol or tobacco in the Philippines sends his product here into this country free of duty he pays here the internal-revenue tax, and that is transmitted to the Philippine Government?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that is a dangerous precedent?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think so. If they send their products into the market here, they ought to pay the same tax and have the same rights——

Mr. MANN. Yes, but they do not have the same right; they have a better right.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, the gentleman is quarreling with the fact that we collect the internal-revenue tax and transmit it to the other government?

Mr. MANN. We collect the internal-revenue tax and turn it over to them. I understand that has been the policy in the collection of the custom duties, but that came through special circumstances at the time. This is a permanent policy. If the Government once adopts it, and should it be necessary, we may have to do the same thing with the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says no, but we can not treat the Philippine Islands on any better terms than we treat the Hawaiian Islands. They are complaining now that we collect money and do not turn it over to them. Now, we adopt the policy of government under which they can manufacture alcohol and tobacco in the Philippine Islands, pay nothing there and then come here and collect the internal-revenue tax and transmit it to them. Why should it not be the same principle with the States? Why should the Philippines have better advantages in the long run, permanently, than any other Territory, or the States of the Union? I am asking for information.

Mr. PAYNE. These islands came to us after three hundred years or more of Spanish rule and Spanish misrule.

The people were robbed by the officials. The industries, many

of them, some of the time were prostrated under the heavy taxation that was laid. The question of governing those islands and of getting the expenses was a question that was thought over very carefully in the Porto Rican case. In that case I had introduced a bill for free trade, as the gentleman will remember, and then I came across General Davis, who was the governor-general, and questioned him upon the subject in the presence of the Secretary of War. I asked him how he was going to pay the revenue. Well, he said that they could get some out of the internal-revenue tax, that they made 1,100,000 gallons of rum. I asked him then what it sold for, and he said from 20 to 40 cents a gallon at retail. Then I said, "If we add $1.10 to that, will the people stand it?" He said, "No," and in reply to my question as to what they would do he said there would be riot and bloodshed down there among those peaceable people; that we could not collect it now; that after a time we could, but that we can not do it now. In other words, we had that burden upon us and we would have to take care of them. I have thought it better to collect these taxes and turn them over to the treasury and give those people an idea that they were doing something toward raising the revenues of their government; that they were paying these taxes and that we were supporting their government upon taxes paid by them and our commerce with them and give them in that way a more independent feeling. I do not want them to get the feeling that we are giving merely as a matter of charity, making appropriations from year to year, but I want to bring out the manhood of these people. I want them to feel that they are men, responsible to this Government for the upbuilding of these islands and for the aid of the Republic of the United States.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman has that feeling—and I know he has, and he knows that I have always supported him in these matters—would it not be wise to insert in that provision of the bill a time limit, so that Congress reserves to itself the determination of the policy in the future, and not forever make these people feel that they are dependent upon the National Treasury for their support without help from themselves? Of course I understand that Congress has that power of reserve anyway.

Mr. PAYNE. I will say to the gentleman that I hope when this period arrives—this 11th day of April, 1909—they will be in such a position that we can extend our revenue laws to them, so far as the custom duties are concerned, the same as to the Porto Rican islands, upon the commerce with the rest of the world, and increase their internal-revenue tax—I do not think we can make it as much as ours—and that the revenues would be sufficient to turn the other back into our Treasury without stopping the progress of education, which I deem so essential. Now, the gentleman does not want to put anything in the way of education——

Mr. MANN. But why not add a limitation so that then Congress can stop if it wishes to, and not be in the position where we could be called by them "robbers" if we take away from them that which belongs to us, which does not belong to them?

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman is unduly apprehensive.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], reference to the bill which we have under consideration will show that this act is purely amendatory of the act of March 8, 1902, which is described in the title as an act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, and we reserve the right in the act to make that legislation simply three years.

Mr. PAYNE. We have that right anyway.

Mr. MANN. I understand that to be the case, of course, and that this is the law now. But now if they bring in these articles they must pay the customs duty upon them, and here is a position which may mislead them——

Mr. PAYNE. No; the gentleman is wrong about that. It has been held that they do not have to pay our internal-revenue taxes when they bring them in here.

Mr. MANN. But the customs duty?

Mr. PAYNE. The internal revenue.

Mr. MANN. But they pay the customs duty. They pay the customs duty.

Mr. PAYNE. But they do not have to pay the internal revenue.

Mr. MANN. They pay the customs duty and then the internal-revenue tax on it.

Mr. PAYNE. I was of that opinion until I was brought up on it in the committee by a gentleman who stated differently.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman now say——

Mr. PAYNE. Under the present law they do not.

Mr. MANN. Under the present law, if they bring a gallon of alcohol from the Philippine Islands, all they have to pay is the customs duty on that?

Mr. PAYNE. That is right.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken. In addition to that they are required to pay the internal-revenue tax. The customs duty is practically nothing.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, we had the opinion of the Attorney-General, and they do not exact that.

Mr. MANN. I still think the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has the same recollection.

Mr. MANN. I have seen a whole committee under an impression and still seen them wrong. [Applause.] Because if that be the case we would all be in the Philippines manufacturing alcohol, because the cost of manufacture and the customs duty together would not amount to one-half the internal-revenue tax in this country, but now you propose to change——

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken; the cost of the customs is larger than that of the internal revenue.

Mr. MANN. I think the chairman of the committee is wrong about that. When alcohol is brought into this country——

Mr. PAYNE. I want to suggest to my friend it is so easily settled by looking at the law that we can not get closer than by——

Mr. MANN. That is true, but, whatever may be the law, here is a proposition to change the customs duty. Now, if it is proposed to pay over internal-revenue taxes to these people, it seems to me that the only proper way to do is to make a time limitation, so that Congress at the end of the time, if it wishes to give this charity to these people again, can do so; but they will not have the right to feel they are entitled to it.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I do not think we are going to have much trouble in their insisting upon their rights, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I have not been here as long as the gentleman from New York, but he has been here long enough to know that a law that is made as a charity is hard to change. Here is a case now. Because we gave the sugar raisers of Colorado and a few other States what they called a right, but what is partly a charity, they can not find language enough to denounce you now when you propose to insist upon some rights for the rest of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield, but I would remind my friend that I would like to bring this discussion to a close, as I have been on my feet for three hours and three-quarters already.

Mr. LLOYD. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that Hawaii is seeking legislation at the present time to have all the customs duties turned over to the Hawaiian government?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, yes; and the gentleman knows there is no more prospect of their getting it than there is to get the balance in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. LLOYD. I beg your pardon; I have no such knowledge.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I think I know it.

Mr. LLOYD. You may know more about it than I do, but I know such legislation is sought and is pressed with earnestness and with some degree of merit it would seem. These people down there claim at the present time we are taking all their revenues from them, and we are leaving them in an impoverished condition, and they are unable under the present system to meet their present financial needs, and it is a very serious proposition to them, and so they are coming and demanding legislation.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think it is very serious when you tell them we are spending a great portion of it in appropriations, that we will soon be spending more for the benefit of the harbors of those islands, and that the Territories of the United States get no such appropriations from the Treasury because they have no harbors and they have to support their own government, and they have to have imported articles which are duty paid when they come into their territory. Hawaii has nothing to complain of.

Mr. LLOYD. That does not relieve the situation, because we have information from what seems to be a reliable source that there will be no river and harbor bill probably during this session and probably not during this Congress, so that any needs they may have in that particular direction will not be granted by the Government.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 99. An act to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] does not like to go on to-night, and I do not feel like urging him. I have imposed myself so long upon the House that I think they are tired of me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to make a very long speech, but I could not finish this side of 5 o'clock, and I really would rather speak in the morning. I would take it as a great kindness if I could be allowed to do so.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, the committee has been so indulgent to me I do not insist upon going on now, and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration House bill No. 3, the Philippine tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

The Senate and House of Representatives:

Referring to section 32 of the act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith an ordinance enacted by the executive council of Porto Rico on October 27, 1905, granting to the "Fajardo Development Company" the right to construct, maintain, and operate a railway between the towns of Mameyes, Luquillo, Fajardo, Ceiba, and Naguabo, in the island of Porto Rico.

This franchise was approved by the President of the United States on December 11, 1905.

Attention is invited to the accompanying report of the Secretary of State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 4, 1906.*

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leaves of absence were granted as follows:

To Mr. GREENE, for five days, on account of important business.

To Mr. MARSHALL, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. SAMUEL, for six days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. HOGG, for thirty days, on account of serious illness in family.

To Mr. HEFLIN, for ten days, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. BIRDSALL, for three days, on account of illness in family.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting request for return of a copy of the findings filed by the court January 13, 1896, in case of William W. Myers, executor of estate of James W. Myers, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William W. Myers, executor of estate of James W. Myers, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Jesse W. Coleman, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of J. D. Robinson, administrator of estate of Melchisedec Robinson, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Mitchell H. Butt, heir of estate of Thomas P. Butt, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Joseph Erving, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William Stone, heir of estate of Mark Stone, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting three petitions of residents of the Philippine Islands—to the Committees on Ways and Means and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, submitting a statement of expenditures for contingent expenses for the period from July 1, 1904, to November 30, 1905—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, recommending a release of its title to the property known as "The Cuartel" to the city of Monterey, Cal.—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a communication from the Quartermaster-General of the Army, a recommendation relating to the pay of Army officers stationed at Nagasaki, Japan—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a communication from the acting governor-general relating to the condition of the sugar industry in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting a request relative to an appropriation for the exposition at Milan, Italy—to the Committee on Appropriations, and letter only ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting copies of communications from the Secretary of War recommending that Brig. Gen. William Crozier and Capt. Daniel T. Moore be permitted to accept decorations of the Legion of Honor—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, recommending legislation for allowances of mileage of retired officers of the Army when assigned to active duty—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Rouge River, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting a statement of the expenditures of the Bureau of Fisheries during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the governor of Hawaii submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for expenses of the legislative assembly of the Territory—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for investigating the values of black sands in the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for an additional messenger—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Chief of Division of Printing and stationery submitting a change of estimate for paper for checks and drafts—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for purchase of land at Cushings Island, Maine—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for fortifications in the insular possessions—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the upper portion of Coan River, Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the journals of the house of delegates of the first session of the third legislative assembly of Porto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, a draft of a bill to authorize the sale of certain timber on the Menominee Indian Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, a draft of a bill for allowance of interest on proceeds of sale of Indian lands so far as they are the portion of minors—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriations for relief of persons injured by the explosion at Frankford Arsenal—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed, except printed document.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations required by the several departments of the Government to complete the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for prior years—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a request that Rear-Admiral Charles D. Sigsbee, Capt. John M. Hawley, Commander Reginald F. Nicholson, Commander Alexander Sharp, and Lieut. Commander Harry George be permitted to accept the decoration of the Legion of Honor—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4463) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 21); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4459) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations respecting the rights and privileges of the fish wharf, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 22); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Maine, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 58) to prevent the unlawful wearing of the badge or insignia of the Grand Army of the Republic or other soldier organizations, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 23); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4461) to provide for the abatement of nuisances in the District of Columbia by the Commissioners of said District, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 24); which said bill and reprot were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BABCOCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 127) authorizing the extension of Rhode Island avenue NE., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 25); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 130) authorizing the extension of Kalorama road NW., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 26); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 10062) appropriating the receipts from the sale of public lands in the State of Minnesota to the construction of drainage works for the reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 10063) to amend section 4045 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 10064) to amend section 11 of an act of Congress approved February 12, 1901, entitled "An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company," and so forth—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10065) for the establishment of a commission to be known as the Confederate Memorial Commission, with three members, for the purpose of protecting, preserving, and beautifying the graves of Confederate soldiers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 10066) to provide a drop-package system on rural free-delivery routes at a special reduced rate of postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10067) authorizing the disposition of surplus and allotted lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, which can be irrigated under the act of Congress approved June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10068) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Wenatchee, Wash.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10069) to regulate the compensation of skilled mechanics employed in the Naval Gun Factory of the Washington Navy-Yard, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 10070) to further increase the efficiency of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10071) to provide for untaxed denaturized alcohol for industrial purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUSHMAN (by request): A bill (H. R. 10072) for the regulation of the practice of medicine, surgery, and dentistry in the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10073) to establish a rifle range near American Lake, in Pierce County, State of Washington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 10074) in relation to contracts with the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10075) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to regulate the business of employment agents and employment agencies—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10076) to provide for and levy an import duty on Egyptian and other long-staple cotton imported into the United States from foreign countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10077) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make monthly reports as to the long-staple cotton, pineapple, and orange crops—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10078) to provide for the construction of public highways within the different States, and making appropriations therefor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10079) to establish a national military park and Branch Soldiers' Home at the battlefield of Olustee, in the State of Florida—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10080) to provide for sittings of the United States circuit and district courts of the southern district of Florida at the city of Miami, in said district—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10081) to provide for sittings of the United States circuit and district courts of the southern district of Florida at the city of Liveoak, in said district—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 10082) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Fremont, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10083) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Marion, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10084) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Tiffin, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 10085) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States courts and other Gov-

ernment offices at Lake Charles, La.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10086) for the erection of a public building at Crowley, La.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 10087) for a survey of the present channel leading from the wharf at Biloxi, Miss., to Ship Island Harbor, Mississippi—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10088) making an appropriation for dredging a channel from Ship Island Harbor to Gulfport, Miss.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 10089) to increase pensions in certain cases—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 10090) providing for the importation in bond of materials for constructing, repairing, and equipping ships, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 10091) to amend the laws of the United States relative to the registration of trade-marks—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10092) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make experiments to eradicate splenetic or southern fever ticks and to make appropriation therefor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWES: A bill (H. R. 10093) for the repair and construction of chapels at permanent Army posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULKERSON: A bill (H. R. 10094) to provide for the erection of a public building at Maryville, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10095) making certain changes in the postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10096) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 10097) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 10098) to supplement and amend the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 10099) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10100) to provide for instruction in forestry in the colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and for experiments in forestry in the agricultural experiment stations established under an act of Congress approved March 2, 1887—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10101) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey to the State of Minnesota a certain tract of land situated in the county of Dakota, State of Minnesota—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 10102) to amend section 100 of "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii"—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10103) to refund to the Territory of Hawaii the amount expended in maintaining light-house service on its coasts from the time of the organization of the Territory until said light-house service was taken over by the Federal Government—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10104) to ratify and confirm the sale by the Territory of Hawaii of personal and movable property ceded and transferred to the United States by the republic of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10105) to amend section 91 of "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii"—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10106) providing for the setting aside for governmental purposes of certain ground in Hilo, Hawaii—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10107) for the relief of the occupants of certain Government lands on the slopes of Punch Bowl, in the city of Honolulu, in the Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 10108) making Monterey and the city of Port Harford, Cal., each a subport of entry in the customs collection district of San Francisco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10109) creating the office of commissioner of mines, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 10110) providing for an additional appropriation for the erection of a public building at Nevada, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 10111) to extend the time in which purchasers of land under the act of February 20, 1904, entitled "An act to authorize the sale of a part of what is known as the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota," may pay for the land purchased under said act—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 10112) providing for the erection of an addition or extension to the post-office and court-house at Quincy, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 10113) amending section 17, chapter 296, United States Statutes at Large, volume 14, so as to reduce mileage from 20 to 6 cents per mile—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 10114) to provide for the transportation of the President—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 10115) to establish a fish hatchery and fish-culture station in the State of Kansas—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 10116) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota,' approved January 14, 1889," so as to create a State forest reserve, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 10117) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10118) making an appropriation for the erection of a permanent rostrum in the national cemetery at the Presidio, San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10119) making an appropriation and providing for the construction of a United States revenue cutter for service in the harbor of San Francisco, State of California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10120) making an appropriation for the improvement of the grounds within the Presidio Military Reservation, at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 10121) to authorize the redemption of documentary and proprietary stamps—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10122) to establish a fish-hatching and fish station in the State of Minnesota—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10123) regulating the settlement of the accounts between the United States and the several States relative to the disposal of the public lands, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10124) granting to the State of Minnesota certain lands for forestry purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 10125) for the erection of a public building at the city of Warrensburg, in the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10126) for the erection of a public building at the city of Clinton, in the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10127) to increase the efficiency of the Army by providing for promotion according to merit—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10128) to authorize the granting of pensions and the increase of pensions in extraordinary cases not now provided for—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 10129) to amend section 5501 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 10130) to extend Seventh and Franklin streets NE.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10131) for the extension of Seventh street, Sixth street, and Franklin street NE., and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 10132) providing for the granting of additional lands to the State of Idaho for the purpose of aiding in the construction of the State capitol and the procuring of the grounds and accommodations necessary and incident thereto—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 10133) to provide for the annual pro rata distribution of the annuities of the Sac and Fox Indians of the Mississippi between the two branches of the tribe and to adjust the existing claims between the two branches as to said annuities—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 10134) to establish four permanent military camp grounds in the States of Texas, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, and California, and for the enlargement of the Chattanooga and Chickamauga National Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT of California: A bill (H. R. 10135) to provide for an additional district judge for the northern district of California—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10136) prohibiting members of Congress from being employed in certain Federal business—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 10137) to increase the salaries paid to the district court judges of the southern district of New York—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10138) to provide for the payment of certain expenditures incident to the office of the President of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10139) to regulate hours of service in the postal service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10140) to amend section 842 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, in conjunction with the State of Texas, to determine and establish the boundary line between the Choctaw Nation, Ind. T., and the State of Texas—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 60) proposing an amendment to the Constitution, relating to selection of inferior officers—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) appropriating money for the decoration of the new Federal building at Chicago, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RIXEY: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) asking for estimates for the improvement of Aquia Creek, in Stafford County, Va., from Coal Landing to Whartons Landing—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCALL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 63) for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 13) providing for a survey of St. Lucie Inlet—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A resolution (H. Res. 122) for survey of Port Sheldon, Michigan—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A resolution (H. Res. 123) asking the Postmaster-General for certain information relative to transportation of mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BANNON: A bill (H. R. 10141) granting a pension to Eliza J. Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10142) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 10143) granting an increase of pension to David D. Reese—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10144) granting an increase of pension to Edward Wayman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10145) granting an increase of pension to George W. Eveleth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10146) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus S. Clason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10147) for the correction of the naval record of Samuel Charles Hampton—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 10148) granting an increase of pension to John Spahr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10149) granting an increase of pension to David Stonrock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10150) granting a pension to John A. Richards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10151) granting an honorable discharge to J. C. Ponceler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 10152) granting certain lands to the city of Biloxi, in Harrison County, Miss., for park, cemetery, and hospital purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 10153) for the relief of J. O. Johnson—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 10154) granting an increase of pension to David Harvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10155) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Ludlun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10156) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose L. Babcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 10157) for the relief of Alexander Gross—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10158) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint William F. de Niedman captain and quartermaster in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 10159) granting an increase of pension to Edward O'Donnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10160) granting a pension to Matthias Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10161) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin R. South—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10162) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Back—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10163) granting an increase of pension to John Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON (by request): A bill (H. R. 10164) granting a pension to Emma L. Beatty—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10165) granting an increase of pension to Ervin F. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 10166) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Morgan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 10167) granting a pension to Wilson S. Karr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10168) granting a pension to John Bonhomme—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10169) granting a pension to Sarah M. Gilkerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10170) granting a pension to David M. Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10171) granting a pension to Jordan Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10172) granting a pension to Adolph Legout—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10173) granting a pension to John H. Lockhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10174) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10175) granting an increase of pension to Matthew A. Knight—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10176) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Gates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10177) granting a pension to Elizabeth Kohler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10178) granting a pension to Richard M. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10179) granting a pension to Adolphus N. Pacetty—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10180) for the relief of C. W. Moffatt—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10181) granting an increase of pension to John Crew—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10182) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Bickel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10183) granting a pension to Susan A. De Groodt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10184) granting a pension to E. L. Fulkerson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10185) granting a pension to Theodore Hengstenberg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 10186) granting a pension to Louisa Priewe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 10187) granting an increase of pension to David Hawkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 10188) granting an increase of pension to James L. Conn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10189) granting a pension to Frances E. Truesdell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 10190) granting an increase of pension to George F. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10191) granting an increase of pension to Mary Klinefelter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 10192) granting an increase of pension to Alanson B. Thomas—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10193) granting a pension to James Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10194) granting an increase of pension to Leander Stocker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10195) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10196) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Organ—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10197) granting an increase of pension to John Frazer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10198) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Wilkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10199) granting an increase of pension to William Neely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10200) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Boring—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 10201) granting a pension to Cyrenious M. Wykoff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10202) granting an increase of pension to Fredricka Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10203) granting an increase of pension to Rufus Lucore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10204) granting an increase of pension to Samuel T. Askey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10205) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Showers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 10206) granting an increase of pension to Frank Gibbons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10207) granting an increase of pension to Florence Mahoney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10208) granting an increase of pension to David P. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 10209) granting an increase of pension to John U. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10210) granting an increase of pension to Christina Drick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 10211) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10212) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10213) granting a pension to William F. Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 10214) granting an increase of pension to Alice B. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10215) granting an increase of pension to Sophia M. Hutchins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10216) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Longstaff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10217) granting an increase of pension to William A. Barnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10218) granting a pension to Melissa Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10219) granting a pension to George S. Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10220) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Henry Smith, alias Henry Schmidt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10221) granting a pension to Jane Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10222) granting an increase of pension to George Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10223) granting an increase of pension to Amos Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10224) granting an increase of pension to David Bussey, alias George Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10225) granting an increase of pension to Nathan B. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 10226) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Theodore Berdell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10227) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10228) granting an increase of pension to John Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10229) granting a pension to Helen G. S. Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 10230) granting an increase of pension to Clark A. Winans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULKERSON: A bill (H. R. 10231) for the relief of John F. Tyler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10232) for the relief of Frank Harper—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10233) for the relief of John S. Logan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10234) for the relief of Ellis W. Joy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10235) granting a pension to William Acord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10236) granting a pension to Albert W. Vermillion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10237) granting a pension to Sarah E. Stockton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10238) granting a pension to John T. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10239) granting a pension to Sanford Rhoads—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10240) granting an increase of pension to John H. Curnutt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10241) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Parish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10242) granting an increase of pension to Elias Chute—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10243) granting an increase of pension to Peter Runyan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10244) granting an increase of pension to Selman Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10245) granting an increase of pension to Michael Callery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10246) granting an increase of pension to John Harrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10247) granting an increase of pension to William F. Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10248) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Stillwaggon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10249) granting a pension to Michael Kuenstle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10250) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Marble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10251) granting a pension to Sarah M. E. Hinman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10252) granting a pension to Joseph J. Vincent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10253) granting an increase of pension to Edmund A. Locker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10254) granting an increase of pension to William G. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10255) granting an increase of pension to David C. Clouse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10256) granting an increase of pension to Daniel D. Diehl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10257) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Deems—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 10258) granting an increase of pension to Elias Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 10259) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Medlin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10260) granting an increase of pension to Pryor L. Draper—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10261) granting an increase of pension to James Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10262) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Shields—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10263) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Blevins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10264) granting an increase of pension to Alexander R. Long—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10265) for the relief of Susan J. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 10266) granting an increase of pension to William H. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 10267) granting an increase of pension to David W. Farington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10268) granting an increase of pension to Luther M. Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 10269) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Ricketts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10270) to refund certain excess duties paid upon importations of absinthe and kirschwasser from Switzerland between June 1, 1898, and December 5, 1898—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 10271) granting an increase of pension to Stephen G. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10272) granting an increase of pension to Marion Gunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10273) granting an increase of pension to John H. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10274) granting an increase of pension to William Tarlton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 10275) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Julia A. Doane—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 10276) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Weeks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10277) granting an increase of pension to John Hann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10278) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Dutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10279) granting an increase of pension to W. W. Konkright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOAR: A bill (H. R. 10280) granting an increase of pension to James Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10281) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus A. Dweeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10282) granting a pension to Emma E. Goodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 10283) granting a pension to Agnes Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10284) granting a pension to Robert J. Yeoman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10285) granting a pension to W. J. Grow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10286) granting a pension to Alonzo L. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10287) granting a pension to John M. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10288) granting a pension to Fountain M. Fain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10289) granting a pension to Albert Brendel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10290) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Crymble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10291) to correct the military record of H. Heckman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10292) granting to the town of Mancos, Colo., the right to enter certain lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 10293) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Galbraith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10294) to correct the military record of E. D. Judkins—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 10295) granting an increase of pension to John H. Sutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10296) granting an increase of pension to James Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10297) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Hercherberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10298) granting an increase of pension to Oliver C. Redic—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10299) granting a pension to S. C. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 10300) granting an increase of pension to George C. Sackett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10301) granting an increase of pension to George N. Beymer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10302) for the relief of John H. Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 10303) granting a pension to John Brodie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10304) granting an increase of pension to Michael Daniel Kernan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 10305) to provide for the repayment of certain customs dues—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 10306) authorizing the appointment of Capt. Theodore Frederick Kane, a captain on the retired list of the Navy, to be a rear-admiral on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 10307) granting an increase of pension to Milton A. Saeger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 10308) granting an increase of pension to Dillon F. Acker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10309) granting an increase of pension to Maryett Adamy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 10310) for the relief of the beneficiaries under the will of John G. Winter, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 10311) for the relief of Charles Simmons—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10312) for the relief of Percival Perdue—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 10313) granting an increase of pension to Robert Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 10314) granting an increase of pension to Maurice F. Nason—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10315) granting an increase of pension to Julia M. Langdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10316) granting an increase of pension to M. Nelson Dickinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10317) granting an increase of pension to Clarissa A. Frederick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10318) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Hollett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10319) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Deal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10320) for the relief of Daniel Mosher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 10321) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10322) granting an increase of pension to Edgar W. Calhoun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10323) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Donahue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10324) granting an increase of pension to Elbridge G. Van Dyke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10325) granting an increase of pension to C. Samson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10326) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10327) granting an increase of pension to Fisher Rosencrance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10328) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Robacker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10329) granting an increase of pension to George L. Waltz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10330) granting an increase of pension to Miles Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10331) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Sampson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10332) granting an increase of pension to George N. Chaffee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10333) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10334) granting an increase of pension to Jason P. Carey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10335) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 10336) granting a pension to Angelina Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10337) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10338) granting an increase of pension to Ellen McCudden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10339) granting an increase of pension to John Caverly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10340) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bigelow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10341) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10342) granting a pension to John C. Newell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10343) granting a pension to Harriet G. Rhokes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10344) granting a pension to Elbridge Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10345) granting a pension to Martha Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 10346) for the relief of Edwin Lee Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10347) for the relief of Walter Wadsworth—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10348) for the relief of George T. Reeves—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10349) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas and John Hollis—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10350) for the relief of Christian Church of Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10351) in relation to Mexican war pensions—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 10352) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Boush—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10353) granting a pension to Thomas B. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 10354) granting an increase of pension to William M. Gift—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10355) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Erb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 10356) granting an increase of pension to Martin B. Doty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10357) granting an increase of pension to Florian Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 10358) granting an increase of pension to Charles Dorin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 10359) granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus C. Small—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10360) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10361) to correct the military record of Lewis Rankin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10362) granting an increase of pension to William J. Cheneworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10363) for repayment of duty on refined sugar, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10364) granting an increase of pension to John P. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10365) granting a pension to Emeline T. Hayner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10366) for the relief of John Coppinger—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 10367) granting an increase of pension to Richard H. Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10368) granting an increase of pension to Albert Overmire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10369) granting an increase of pension to William C. Quigley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10370) granting an increase of pension to Romanus Binkley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10371) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Wittenback—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10372) granting an increase of pension to Charles Reiter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 10373) granting an increase of pension to William Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10374) granting an increase of pension to Lincoln A. Hamlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10375) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Duke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10376) granting an increase of pension to David A. Clowes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10377) granting an increase of pension to Vinton Myrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10378) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Peiper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10379) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Kimes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10380) granting an increase of pension to William Raup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10381) granting an increase of pension to Frederich Schroyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10382) granting an increase of pension to John Jeffers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10383) granting an increase of pension to Tillie M. Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10384) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Suiter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10385) granting an increase of pension to Barnett Burdick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10386) granting an increase of pension to John P. Blount—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10387) for the relief of J. W. Patterson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 10388) for the relief of Arthur Walsh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 10389) granting an increase of pension to John W. Ellsworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 10390) for the relief of Mrs. Octave Simoneaux, Henry Robertson (administrator), Plattenville, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 10391) for the relief of Addison C. Fletcher—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 10392) granting a pension to Emma J. Coble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10393) granting an increase of pension to E. J. O'Donnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 10394) granting an increase of pension to John Behymer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10395) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Cundiff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 10396) granting an increase of pension to John A. Malone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10397) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Weber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 10398) granting an increase of pension to Catherine E. Heishley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10399) granting an increase of pension to John H. H. Sands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10400) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Harrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 10401) granting an increase of pension to William T. Yount—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10402) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10403) granting an increase of pension to James H. Odell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10404) granting an increase of pension to John Moules—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: A bill (H. R. 10405) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Resh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10406) granting a pension to Anna J. Cottingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCROGGY: A bill (H. R. 10407) granting a pension to James M. Nicely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10408) granting a pension to Anna E. Middleton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10409) granting a pension to Mary Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10410) granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10411) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10412) granting an increase of pension to Ophelia Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10413) granting an increase of pension to John W. Barrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10414) granting an increase of pension to Azubath Srofe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10415) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Engle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10416) granting an increase of pension to Dimmitt C. Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10417) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Eckhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10418) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas Reveal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 10419) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel trust patents of Louisa Phelix and Mary Louise Rolfa—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10420) granting an increase of pension to Robert Bathrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARTEL: A bill (H. R. 10421) granting a pension to William Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10422) granting a pension to Thomas C. Clary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10423) granting a pension to William P. L. Kirby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10424) granting a pension to Smith Thompson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10425) granting an increase of pension to Constantine P. Berry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10426) granting an increase of pension to Nathan T. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10427) granting an increase of pension to Calvin C. Leaming—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10428) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam Pringle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10429) granting an increase of pension to Frank Lamport—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10430) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Ledgerwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10431) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Kenisston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10432) granting an increase of pension to John E. Oyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10433) granting an increase of pension to Addison Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10434) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. King—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 10435) for the relief of Mrs. E. A. Magill—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10436) granting an increase of pension to John A. Ensminger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10437) granting an increase of pension to Casper Yost—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10438) granting an increase of pension to John M. Shirley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10439) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Gaunt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10440) granting an increase of pension to A. G. Sheppard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 10441) for the relief of Cornelius De Haas—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10442) granting an increase of pension to James H. Shears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10443) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Gridley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10444) granting a pension to Hiram R. Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10445) granting a pension to Margaret Emmons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10446) granting a pension to Henry S. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10447) granting a pension to Charles M. Bowen—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10448) granting an increase of pension to George M. Frazer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10449) granting an increase of pension to George B. D. Alexander—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10450) granting an increase of pension to Silas H. Ballard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10451) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. White—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10452) granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Daly—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 10453) for the relief of John H. Lohman—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10454) granting a pension to Edward Ring—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10455) granting a pension to Francis M. Burke—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10456) granting an increase of pension to William T. Edgemon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10457) granting a pension to Lizzie Bremner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 10458) granting a pension to Adrian Norman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10459) granting an increase of pension to Alta M. Westenhaver—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10460) granting an increase of pension to Adeline O'Brien—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10461) granting an increase of pension to Rachel C. Conner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10462) granting an increase of pension to E. B. McMillan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10463) granting an increase of pension to John S. Skeels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10464) granting an increase of pension to John L. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10465) granting an increase of pension to William A. Grady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10466) to remove the charge of desertion against James W. Byrd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10467) granting a pension to Mary Van York—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10468) granting a pension to Mary Duran—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10469) granting a pension to Martha Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10470) granting a pension to Grace L. Finsterwald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10471) granting an increase of pension to John S. Windsor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10472) granting an increase of pension to Addison M. Mansfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 10473) granting an increase of pension to John B. Gerard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10474) granting an increase of pension to Lewis F. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10475) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Isaac Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 10476) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Hesler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10477) granting an increase of pension to James B. Babcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10478) granting an increase of pension to William McGowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10479) granting a pension to Margarett Prescott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10480) for the relief of certain settlers upon land within the indemnity limits of the present St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway Company—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10481) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Handran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WANGER: A bill (H. R. 10482) for the relief of the owner or owners of the barge *Charlie*—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10483) granting a pension to James A. Gallt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEBBER: A bill (H. R. 10484) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Dunham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10485) granting an increase of pension to David A. Banks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10486) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10487) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Hueston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10488) granting an increase of pension to William B. Sturges—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10489) granting an increase of pension to John Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10490) granting an increase of pension to Lucius A. West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 10491) for the relief of the Stevens Institute of Technology, of Hoboken, N. J.—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10492) granting permission to Frank W. Clarke to accept the decoration of Chevalier of the Legion of Honor, conferred upon him by the French Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 10493) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of the legal heirs of John Harper, deceased, to certain lands in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 10494) granting an increase of pension to Hannah C. Reese—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 10495) granting an increase of pension to Martin Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10496) granting an increase of pension to Alexander M. Hurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10497) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Karney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2500) for the relief of Jesse H. Dickerson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3266) granting an increase of pension to J. J. Hunter—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3681) granting an increase of pension to Sanders M. Ingram—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4086) granting a pension to John R. Costen—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4150) granting an increase of pension to John C. McGinis—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4368) granting a pension to James W. Perkins—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4375) for the relief of Mrs. Mollie Bissell—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4604) for the relief of Jeptha B. Harrington—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4634) for the relief of the widow and children of Daniel McDonnough, deceased—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4804) for the relief of William Spears—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 4959) granting a pension to Mary A. Barrand—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5025) granting an increase of pension to Herbert C. Miller—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5154) granting a pension to Elmer E. Frederick—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. H. 5252) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Howard—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5417) granting an increase of pension to John J. Martin—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5456) for the relief of Walter Langley—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 5463) granting a pension to Sarah A. Harl—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5485) granting a pension to Horace D. Mann—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5502) for the relief of Thomas J. Benton—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5839) to correct the military record of and grant a pension to Gideon M. Burriss—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6232) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Holmes—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6527) granting an honorable discharge to Henry G. Breed—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6634) granting a pension to Henry Ramey—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6668) granting a pension to Alfred L. Hudson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6715) granting a pension to John M. Calloway and correct his military record—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6859) granting a pension to Eva B. Koch—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6895) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Bishop—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7190) granting a pension to Frank Gillespie—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7234) granting a pension to Ulysses G. Powell—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7335) granting a pension to Marion Skinner—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7390) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan W. Barber—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7432) granting a pension to Emily A. Cavender—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7665) granting an increase of pension to Wesley J. Banks—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7802) granting an increase of pension to John F. Davis—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7983) granting an increase of pension to Antoinette A. Darnall—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8050) granting a pension to Felix Linsay—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8082) for the relief of Susanne P. Thorne—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8154) granting a pension to Charles C. Howington—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8382) for the relief of Frederick Gray—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 8477) granting an increase of pension to Fannie L. Edgerton—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9351) granting an increase of pension to Marie Graves Bonham—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9593) granting a pension to C. M. Priddy—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9874) granting an increase of pension to John T. A. Galloway—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 494) granting a pension to Elcy R. Kelly—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 820) granting a pension to Henry Spurgeon—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 821) granting a pension to John Ward—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 831) for the relief of John E. Barrett—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1402) to restore to the pension roll the name of Andrew C. Smith—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1403) granting a pension to Sarah F. Armstrong—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1410) granting a pension to Eliza Peel—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1687) granting an increase of pension to James C. Daley—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1689) granting an increase of pension to William A. Bailor—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2004) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wilson—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2108) granting a pension to Mattie Settlemier—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2149) granting a pension to William D. Humbard—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2341) granting a pension to Helen H. Hulbert—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2367) granting a pension to William L. Beverly—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2430) granting an increase of pension to Orrin J. Wells—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2648) granting an increase of pension to Louis H. Leland—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2684) granting a pension to Birdie M. Wedge—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2713) granting a pension to Frances H. Brooke—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2719) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Johnson—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2723) granting a pension to Laura W. Brown—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3453) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Reeves—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3454) granting an increase of pension to Francis Heath—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3457) granting an increase of pension to Laurence Connelly—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3579) granting a pension to John R. C. Tucker—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3580) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Hubbard—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3581) granting a pension to William F. Monday—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3807) granting an increase of pension to William Stewart—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4966) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Dewey—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4967) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Holcomb—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5062) granting a pension to Eli Tippett—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5141) granting an increase of pension to Orrin J. Wells—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5172) granting an increase of pension to Milton Strattan—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5262) granting a pension to George Heishman—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5580) granting a pension to Perry Abbett—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5833) granting an increase of pension to Francis Heasty, alias Francis Heastings—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6347) granting an increase of pension to Silas W. Harris—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7167) granting a pension to Christian Hederer—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7192) granting a pension to Mary A. Johns—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7657) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Malone—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7970) granting an increase of pension to Walter Lynn—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8069) granting a pension to Sarah E. Tripp—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8225) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester G. Hunter—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Andrew J. McWhirter—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9074) granting an increase of pension to Abraham E. Pierson—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9146) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Jones—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9370) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Duffey—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9431) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hubbs—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9468) granting a pension to Henry Lawless—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9469) granting a pension to James Caudill—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9470) granting a pension to Daniel J. Shoemaker—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9671) granting an increase of pension to Carrie M. Hickman—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2809) for the relief of Edward J. Krueger—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3277) for the relief of John A. Harbour—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3515) for the relief of William R. Peach—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3522) for the relief of James H. Shannon—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 9955) granting a pension to James W. Baker—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9027) to correct the military record of Corwin M. Holt—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 9148) granting an increase of pension to William H. K. Southard—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9276) granting a pension to Mary O'Hare—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Brazier Automobile Works, of Philadelphia; the Sheldon Novelty Works, of Kankakee, Ill.; Levenson & Zenitz, of Baltimore, Md., and the Kellogg Switchboard and Supply Company, of Chicago, urging the passage of House bill 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill for pensioning John Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, proposed bill for increasing the efficiency of the militia, to be introduced in Congress, approved by the Interstate National Guard Association in convention at St. Paul, June, 1905—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Benjamin R. South—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mathias Reed—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward O'Donnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Kellogg Switchboard and Supply Company, of Chicago, for favorable consideration of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, favoring President's stand relative to railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Roman Catholic churches; the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Blanchard, Iowa; St. Matthew's Episcopal Church, St. John's Lutheran Church, and the First Baptist Church, of Homestead, Pa., for a constitutional amendment abolishing polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Cincinnati Live Stock Commission and the Merchants' Association, sustaining the President of the United States relative to control of freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Seattle, favoring the President's stand relative to freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, favoring the President's stand relative to freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Farmers' Club of Northampton, Bucks County, Pa., and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Richard, Bucks County, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution abolishing polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Clifton (Ariz.) mass meeting, December 20, 1905, against joint statehood of Arizona and New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Railway Freight and Baggage Men of America, against the Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Fairmount Park Art Association, favoring placing works of art on free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: Petition of the F. D. Warner Council, Order of United American Mechanics, of Westbrook, Me., for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Ayer, Houston & Co., of Portland, Me., for action on the bill (H. R. 7079) for removal of internal-revenue tax on domestic alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Old Orchard, Me., that sale of liquors in all buildings, ships, and premises used by the United States Government be prohibited—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Old Orchard, Me., for a Sunday law in the District of Columbia such as exists in our various States—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Old Orchard, Me., for the Hepburn bill with the brewers' amendment canceled—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey: Petition of the local union of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America of Lynn, Mass., relative to wood alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 8773) granting an increase of pension to William H. Joslin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Theodore H. Northrup—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Annie Rohr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of William Penn Council, No. 64, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restoration of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the City Park Association, against spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Pittsburg Supply Company, for 1-cent letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Civic Club of Philadelphia, for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of R. M. Blackwood, pastor of the United Presbyterian Church of Caraopolis, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, of Raritan, N. J., relative to the status of the Mormon Church members in Congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Pennsylvania and Caraopolis Lodge, No. 260, Knights of Pythias, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of Wagstaff Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Miami County, Kans., to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Pittsburg Supply Company, for 1-cent letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Joseph Fisher and A. H. Jones, for passage of the Penrose and Dalzell bills relative to ex-prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Saratoga Council, No. 262, of Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the General Synod of the Reformed Church of America, relative to status of members of the Mormon Church in Congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Anchor Sanitary Company, of Pittsburg, Pa., for 1-cent postage on letters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 1186, United Brotherhood of Carpenters of America, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Harris Pump and Supply Company, for 1-cent postage on letters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Maine, for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Petition of the Winton Motor Carriage Company, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring removal of the internal-revenue tax from alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Moreau Gas Fixture Manufacturing Company, A. L. Mayer, the Electrical Repair and Construction Company, and W. C. Stafford, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring removal of the internal-revenue tax from alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Gas Fixtures and Brass Company, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring removal of the internal-revenue tax from alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Cleveland (Ohio) Council, No. 55, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of A. G. Holmes and 35 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring establishment of a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 15 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring free hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Delaware County Woman's Suffrage Association, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 281, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CANDLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Morgan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of J. W. White, administrator of estate of Jonathan White—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert D. Higdon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Parkberry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAPRON: Resolution of Roger Williams Council, No. 8, Order United American Mechanics, of Woonsocket, R. I., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island Poultry Association, urging the passage of bills H. R. 285 and 286, relating to the gypsy and brown-tail moths—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island State Grange, in favor of the passage of bills H. R. 285, 286, and 345—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island Poultry Association and the Agricultural Federation of Rhode Island, indorsing the Adams bill for increasing the appropriations for experiment stations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, remonstrance of Cigar Makers' Union, No. 94, of Pawtucket, R. I., against the passage of bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island Poultry Association, in favor of placing basic slag on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers in support of bill granting an increase of pension to Ervin F. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the board of managers of the Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, in favor of placing basic-slag meal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rhode Island Business Men's Association, protesting against the repeal of the bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letter of Mrs. Cornelia J. Chadwick, relative to changing date for the inauguration of the President of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANEY: Petition of citizens of Indiana, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Wilson S. Karr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the J. J. Jermyn Foot and Thread Company, urging passage of the postal law providing for two classes of mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of W. B. Alvord, locomotive engineer, against the Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Civic Club of Philadelphia and the City Park Association of Philadelphia against spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of M. D. Collins, general manager of the Maloney Oil and Manufacturing Company, of Scranton, Pa., against granting fixing of railway rates to the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of J. H. Reichert, of Scranton, Pa., against repeal of the Grout bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 436, of Olyphant, Pa., against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Electric Commandery, No. 177, Knights of Malta, of Scranton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Scranton Bedding Company, favoring bill H. R. 7079, for removal of tax on alcohol rendered unfit for a beverage—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William F. Zehnder, of Scranton, Pa., against the Interstate Commerce Commission having control of railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Patriotic Council, No. 322, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Scranton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Retail Merchants' Association of Scranton, Pa., for passage of bill H. R. 13778, for increase of the Interstate Commerce Commission's power over railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Colonel T. D. Lewis Council, No. 1015, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Scranton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Dunmore Lodge, No. 382, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Scranton, Pa., for passage of bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Council, No. 196, Knights of Columbus, for a statue to Commodore Barry—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Clark & Snover Company, of Scranton, Pa., against granting power to the Interstate Commerce Commission over railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Master Printers' Association of Scranton, Pa., against the Post-Office Department furnishing envelopes at nearly cost to the people—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 439, of Carbondale, Pa., against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. V. Decker and 22 other citizens of Scranton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Camp No. 178, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Scranton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Phoenix and Maricopa County Board of Trade, against joint statehood for Arizona and New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Fayette E. Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Albert Sriver (H. R. 3369)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry G. McDougall—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Holland—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLACK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles M. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Smith Vaughn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel C. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William S. Henderson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John A. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petition of Council No. 97, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Hope, N. J., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of Hudelson, Johnson & Co., against a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FULKERSON: Petition of Charles Schreiber—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 99, of Ottawa, Ill., against reduction of the tariff on cigars manufactured in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Clark A. Winans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress, for improvement of Columbia River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jacob Baker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. H. Stovall, of Obion County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Landrum, of Gibson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of G. F. Brooks, administrator of the estate of Thomas Brooks, of Gibson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Araminta Goolsby, of Weakley County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of A. Enochs, heir of A. Enochs, of Dyer County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILBERT of Indiana: Petition of town health officers of Indiana, 160 in number, urging passage of the Heyburn pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Auburn Automobile Company and the

Elkhart Carriage Company, for the passage of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Resolution of the Parents' Auxiliary Association, Public School No. 33, Borough of the Bronx, New York City, favoring the metric system—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, resolution of the Commercial Law League of America, New York City, favoring extension of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, against admittance to Congress of members of the Mormon Church—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the United Presbyterian Church of Homestead, Pa., for a constitutional amendment against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Sewickley, Pa.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Third United Presbyterian Church of Allegheny, Pa., for an amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Pittsburg Supply Company, favoring 1-cent letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of James B. Church, jr., of Tiverton, R. I., for a safe harbor at Delaware Breakwater—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the park commissioners of the city of Providence and the Rhode Island Poultry Association, of Providence, for an appropriation to suppress the gypsy and brown-tail moth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Current Topic Club of Newport, R. I., for a model child-labor law in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Business Men's Association of Providence, R. I., against repeal of the bankruptcy law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Charity Organization Society of Newport, R. I., for a model child-labor law in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Agricultural Federation of Rhode Island, for increase of appropriation for agricultural experiment station—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. Midwood's Sons, of Providence, R. I., for two classes of mail matter only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the board of managers of the Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, favoring placing basic-slag meal on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Providence Stereotypers Union, No. 53, favoring Chinese-exclusion laws—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of citizens of Perry County, and Nelsonville, Ohio, and Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, No. 396, of Chillicothe, Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of James A. Garfield Lodge, No. 131, Knights of Pythias, of Corning, Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Petition to accompany bill for relief of William H. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew Ricketts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of H. W. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of the United Presbyterian Church of College Springs, Iowa, for an amendment to the Constitution abolishing polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of William J. Hambridge and others, concerning immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of H. G. Buehler and others, for the preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Resolution of Rawlins Post, No. 35, Grand Army of the Republic, of Nebraska, commending introduction of bill H. R. 1724—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOAR: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Gustavus R. Dwellay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Emma E. Goodwin, widow of Francis E. Goodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 105) for the improvement of Caney Fork River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of the Manufacturers and Merchants' Association of Utah, favoring the President's railway-rate ideas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUFF: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Lieut. John H. Sutton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of James Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Nicholas Herschberger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Oliver C. Redic—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Rev. S. C. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: Petition of citizens of Alaska, requesting legislation—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolution of the Missouri and Southern Branch of the German-American National Alliance, requesting that a liberal commercial reciprocity treaty be concluded with Germany as soon as possible—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 150 citizens of the Eleventh Congressional district of Wisconsin, against any reduction of the tariff on sugar from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Ojibwa Tribe, No. 5, Improved Order of Red Men, of Superior, Wis., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 62 citizens of the Eleventh district of Wisconsin, against the Philippine tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of a committee of the board of directors of the Veterans' Home of California, situated at Yountville, in favor of establishing said Home as a national soldiers' home—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the California Water and Forest Association, relative to the destruction of the forest trees and brush in San Bernardino Mountain Range; also, relative to expenditure of income from forest reserves and for the repeal of that which excepts California from advertising of forest reserve timber sales; also, for the enactment of a law giving the President authority for the protection of wild animals and birds in the forest reserves of the United States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Bar Association of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of California—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Merchants' Association of San Francisco, Cal., and the Association for the Improvement and Adornment of San Francisco, in favor of an appropriation for the improvement of the military reservation at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants' Association of San Francisco, Cal., against the destruction of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants' Exchange of San Francisco, Cal., relative to Chinese boycott—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, regarding the appointment of commercial attachés to promote American industries abroad—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the San Francisco (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the creation of a Federal judicial circuit court in the Orient—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., asking that full consideration and protection be given the dried-fruit industry of California in any commercial agreement which may be made with the German Empire—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, requesting that steps be taken to have the regulation now in force in Germany respecting the admission of dried fruit into that country altered—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., in favor of the proper recognition of the Milan exposition by the Congress of the United States—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Fran-

cisco, Cal., relative to the removal of visible and hidden rocks in the harbor and bay of San Francisco and the approaches thereto, which are menaces to navigation—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KNAPP: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Jacques—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Dillon F. Acker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of J. B. Van Petten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Maryett Adamy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert Purcell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, for proper recognition by Congress of the Milan exposition—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of the Pomona Board of Trade, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Pomona Board of Trade, favoring increased power of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Redlands, Cal., favoring game refuges and breeding grounds in national forest reserves—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, urging the increased allowance of sulphurous acid in dried fruits imported into Germany—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, favoring creation of a Federal judicial court—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, favoring appointment of special agents for the promotion of American commerce abroad—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Pomona Board of Trade, for game refuges and breeding grounds in the forest reserves of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, relative to a commercial treaty with Germany relative to the dried-fruit industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of the Oskaloosa Commercial Club, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition asking legislation to prevent excessive hours of labor of locomotive engineers—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Ottumwa Subdivision, No. 643, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, against anyone acting as engineer not experienced as a fireman—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of Red Lion Council, No. 125, Order United American Mechanics, urging the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of residents of Red Lion, Pa., urging the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigraton and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the cigar manufacturers and leaf tobacco merchants of York, Pa., protesting against a reduction of the tariff on tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured, imported from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMB: Petition of citizens of Richmond and Henrico County, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: Papers to accompany bill for relief of E. W. Calhoun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany case of P. J. Donoghue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Patrick Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Harvey Deal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of M. Nelson Dickinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Julia M. Langdon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew Carroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: Resolution of the 25,000 Club, of Van Buren, Ark., for bill to build bridge over Arkansas River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petition of sundry citizens of Georgia, favoring reimbursement for a temple destroyed during the war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Emeline Evins—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of Massachusetts Commandery of the Naval Order of the United States, against destruction of the frigate *Constitution*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William M. Gift—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Jacob Erb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of Black Hills Mining Men's Association—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary A. Barrand—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Cappinger, of Monroe County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of E. P. Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Gideon M. Burris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Samantha Schrimpsher—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Gabriel P. Keith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John E. Parleton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Resolution of the Indiana Bituminous Coal Operators' Association, relative to railroad-rate legislation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the State board of health of Indiana, in favor of the Heyburn pure-food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. C. Atkins & Co., in favor of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Enterprise Foundry and Fence Company, in favor of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the W. D. Allison Company, in favor of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Clark & Roberts Company, of Indianapolis, Ind., in favor of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Atlas Engine Works, in favor of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Arrius Court, No. 5, Tribe of Ben Hur, of Indianapolis, Ind., for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PADGETT: Petition of William Few, Margaret Brown, James Flack, William J. Armstrong, and George B. Nevills—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Andrew L. Grimes, late of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of T. J. O'Bar, heir of William O'Bar—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of A. A. Ezell, heir of Caroline Ezell, afterwards Bailey, deceased, late of Giles County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PALMER: Petition of the Master Printers' Association of Scranton, Pa., relative to printing Government envelopes—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of the United Charities of Hazelton, Pa., and Pleasant Hill Council, No. 390, of Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, for a law to admit to the United States Chinese travelers and visitors not of the cooly class—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of J. W. Owens and others, of Plymouth, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Scranton (Pa.) Division, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, against the Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of William Walters and others; Odd Fellows' Lodge, No. 180, of Shickshinny; Lackawana Tribe, No. 110, Improved Order of Red Men, of Plymouth; Councils Nos. 161, 282, and 43, of Wilkesbarre; Council No. 967, of Courtdale; Council No. 549, of Wanamie, and Council No. 307, of Glen Lyon, Junior Order United American Mechanics, all in Penn-

sylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Subdivision No. 673, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Pittston, Pa.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Petition of the Cigar Makers' Union of America against reduction of the duty on cigars from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINEY: Papers to accompany resolution for relief of William R. Payne—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Stephen Cundiff—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RIVES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jacob P. Mountz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jared Chamblin, Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Catherine E. Heishley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Virginia, for an appropriation to improve navigation of Aquia Creek—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Petitions of the American Humane Education Society and the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, against any alteration of transportation law relative to live stock—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUCKER: Petition of John L. Beveridge and others, for a volunteer retired list for volunteer generals of the Army of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 2270) to grant an increase of pension to John Lehn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill (H. R. 2262) to grant increase of pension to John Seymour—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: Resolution of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, No. 259, of Easton, Pa., protesting against the Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the Central Labor Union, of Easton, Pa., protesting against the employment of Chinese and Koreans on the isthmian canal—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of George B. Datsman and 25 others; the Japanese and Korean Exclusion League of San Francisco, Cal.; the National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Jamestown, Ohio; Cherry Council, No. 243, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cherryville, Pa., and Stroh Council, No. 731, of Weissport, Pa., favoring extension of immigration law—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Drake & Co., of Easton, Pa.; J. A. Eberto & Co., of Bethlehem, Pa.; the Knickerbocker Brace Company, of Easton, Pa.; Bush & Bull, of Easton, Pa.; C. K. Williams & Co.; F. S. Bixbee & Co.; Moger Brothers, and R. & H. Simon, of Easton, Pa.; the Bethlehem Foundry and Machine Company, Weston Dodson & Co., and Fechter & Martin, of Bethlehem, Pa., favoring the parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, letter inclosing resolutions relating to visiting Chinese students to the United States—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of citizens of Kansas, for survey of the Neosho River—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Kansas, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHARTEL: Petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union of Joplin, Mo., urging defeat of bill H. R. 3, for a reduction of tariff on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resoluton of citizens of Missouri, urging passage of a bill to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert Bothrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition and affidavit of Elizabeth A. Magill, for Indian depredations—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Petition of the Century Furniture Company, of Grand Rapids, Mich., in favor of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Widdicomb Furniture Company, of Grand Rapids, Mich., in favor of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Zeeland Furniture Manufacturing Company, the Star Furniture Company, and the Wolverine Specialty Company, of Zeeland, Mich., in favor of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hart Mirror Plate Company, of Grand Rapids, Mich., in favor of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Wolverine Motor Works, of Grand Rapids, Mich., in favor of bill (H. R. 7079) for removal of tax on alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: Protest of the Arizona Miners' Association and the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, against the joint statehood bill—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of Local Union No. 944 and Local Union No. 986, of Herrin, Ill., United Mine Workers of America, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolution of the Cigar Makers' Union of Ansonia, Conn., against the Philippine tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of several divisions of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, employed on New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad, against the Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of manufacturers of the Second district of Connecticut, favoring passage of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Lizzie Bremmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the North St. Paul Casket Company, for removal of revenue tax on domestic alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Alliance of Minnesota, for ratification of a favorable commercial treaty with the German Empire—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Rev. C. H. Knight, of Goshen, N. Y., against the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Simon Kraussman & Co., the Central Federated Union, and the Manhattan Island Cigar Factory, against bill H. R. 3, relative to the Philippine tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Lewis F. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John B. Gerard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Good—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 5, 1906.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Commitee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill No. 3, to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 8, 1902.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York permit me to move to discharge the Committee on Immigration from the consideration of a privileged resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask that the same be now adopted?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not yield.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, it will only take a minute or so to do this.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that it is a resolution reported adversely by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is mistaken. It is not that resolution. This resolution I now ask to have considered is a privileged inquiry calling on the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to send to this House copies of three reports heretofore made by Special Immigrant Inspector Marcus Braun,

of New York City, in 1904 and 1905, regarding immigration between Austria-Hungary and the United States.

Mr. PAYNE. Has it been reported by any committee?

Mr. SULZER. This resolution is now privileged under the rules, because it was introduced more than a week ago, and the committee has not reported it or acted upon it. It was introduced by me on the 13th day of December.

Mr. DALZELL. What committee?

Mr. SULZER. The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. PAYNE. I think I will insist on my motion.

Mr. SULZER. Very well, I will call it up again.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] declines to yield. The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill No. 3.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3—the Philippine tariff bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we all listened yesterday with a great deal of interest, pleasure, and instruction to the very elaborate speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. If I were certain that every Member of the House had either heard that speech or had read it, I would feel that any remarks at all explaining this Philippine tariff bill would be superfluous. Since this House developed from a deliberative assembly into a business body, what the Members want is facts more than rhetoric. That speech of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee was replete from end to end with instructive facts. Shakespeare says:

> To gild refined gold, to paint the lily,
> To throw a perfume on the violet,
> To smooth the ice, or add another hue
> Unto the rainbow, or with taper-light
> To seek the beauteous eye of heaven to garnish,
> Is wasteful and ridiculous excess.

I say in perfect soberness that so far as information is concerned in favor of the bill it is almost impossible to improve it. In thinking of his speech I am reminded of the incident wherein a man offered a prize to two negroes, each one to name the three best things on earth to eat. They went into the contest, and the first one named "Watermelons, possum, and sweet potatoes." The other one said: "Gosh, boss, I won't play, 'cause he has named all there is." [Laughter.]

But for fear some Member did not hear or read it, I shall state a few pertinent facts here to-day.

There has been a vast amount of talk about the productive capacity of the Philippine Islands; also about their area. I will confess I never was more astonished in my life, except when a Republican beat me for Congress in 1894 [laughter], than I was when I found out how small the area of the Philippine Islands really is. Probably every Member of the House that has not investigated the matter will be surprised. According to the figures of the Philippine agricultural bureau, the total area of the archipelago is 73,000,000 acres, of which 50,000,000 are forests and mountain lands practically worthless for agricultural purposes, and of the remaining 23,000,000 only 3,200,000 acres are cultivated in crops, as follows: Sugar, 180,000; rice, 1,600,000; tobacco, 80,000; sweet potatoes, 60,000; plantains, 85,000; hemp, 550,000; cocoanuts, 375,000; corn, 267,000.

In this country we are in the habit of talking about square miles instead of acres. The area of the Philippine Islands is 78,128⅛ square miles only. The State of Missouri contains 69,415 square miles. The ground that can be cultivated, according to the most liberal estimate, in the Philippine Islands is 35,937½ square miles, just about the size of that portion of the State of Missouri south of the Missouri River.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who is an expert in figures, says that there never have been cultivated more than 12 per cent of the Japanese islands. Twelve per cent of this Philippine cultivation, if it can be done, will be 12 per cent of 35,000 square miles, which makes a piece of land just about the size of six good counties in Indiana or Missouri. You could easily place the entire 78,128⅛ square miles in the Congressional district of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS]. In the light of cold facts, to these pigmy proportions shrinks our oriental empire, which has cost so much and about which certain misguided enthusiasts have boasted so extravagantly.

In the beginning of these remarks I wish to state what the Democratic position is. The majority of the Republicans of the Ways and Means Committee, under the lead of the chairman, who introduced the bill, propose to reduce the Dingley tariff rates on tobacco and sugar imported into the United States from the Philippine Islands—wholly the product thereof, from 75 per cent, where they now stand, to 25 per cent of the same, and we are to have the same provision for our products into the Philippine Islands until the 11th day of April, 1909. That is the day of the expiration of the treaty with Spain. But after the 11th of April, 1909, the Ways and Means Committee bill, the majority bill, provides there shall be free trade with those islands. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Democratic leader and ranking Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee, introduced a substitute providing for immediate free trade with the Philippine Islands. I do not think I am violating any of the secrets of the committee when I say that that substitute was voted down. Then we voted against reporting this bill simply because they would not vote for our substitute. We filed a minority report, a very short one, of which I will read every word, and which seems to cover the entire subject:

> The undersigned members of the minority of the committee believe that the anomalous and preposterous status of the Philippine Islands, by which they are treated as American territory for certain purposes and as foreign or semiforeign territory for certain other purposes, can not be long maintained and should be immediately terminated.
>
> At present, according to the whim of Congress or the Executive, they are considered as American or foreign, or as both American and foreign, or as neither American nor foreign.
>
> In justice to both the Filipinos and ourselves they should be considered as altogether American or altogether foreign.
>
> So long as we retain them we favor the establishment and maintenance of free trade betwixt them and the United States.
>
> The party, which we in part represent, desires to get rid of them at the earliest practicable moment, and we welcome the dissatisfaction of the hitherto legislatively favored classes, growing out of the competition of the products of Philippine labor with our own products in our own market as a possible moving cause to governmental divorce between the Philippine Archipelago and the balance of the United States.
>
> For these reasons we offer as a substitute for H. R. 3 H. R. 406, which is in words and figures as follows:
>
> "A bill to secure to the Philippine Islands free trade with the balance of the domain of the United States.
>
> *"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That from and after the date of the passage of this act all goods, wares, merchandise, or other articles, being the growth or product of any of the islands forming a part of the archipelago called the Philippines, or of the island of Guam, when shipped to any port of Hawaii, Porto Rico, or to any other port of the United States, shall enter any said port free of import duty.
>
> "SEC. 2. That from and after the passage of this act all goods, wares, merchandise, and other articles, being the growth or product of Porto Rico, Hawaii, or any other appurtenance, Territory, or State of the domain of the United States, when shipped to any port of the Philippines or Guam shall enter any said port free of import duty.
>
> "SEC. 3. That all existing provisions of law enacted by the Congress, by the Philippine Commission, or by any other authority whatsoever, civil or military, which are in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to repeal the provisions of a treaty of peace entered into at Paris, France, on the 10th day of December, 1898, by and between the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Spain, and confirmed by the Senate of the United States on the 6th day of February, 1899."
>
> If the substitute herein proposed is voted down we will support H. R. 3, being the bill reported by the majority, on the principle that it is a long step in the logical and right direction.
>
> JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS.
> CHAMP CLARK.
> WM. BOURKE COCKRAN.
> OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD.
> D. L. D. GRANGER.

There is no subject that I ever have had anything to do with on which there has been so much exaggeration, both up and down, to magnify and minify the value of the Philippine Islands. According to those ambitious to exploit them, they constitute a regular paradise; to listen to other people, a man should be very much disposed to go to his grave rather than to live in them. As usual, the truth is *in medias res.* Here is an extraordinary description of the Philippine Islands from a Republican paper—a Republican paper, mark you—printed in the State of Michigan—the Mount Pleasant Enterprise:

> I have been in the Philippine Islands about three months (too many), and as I see them they are a bunch of trouble on the horizon of civilization. They are bounded on the north by rocks and destruction, on the east by typhoons and hurricanes, on the south by cannibals and earthquakes, on the west by sharks and smugglers.
>
> The interior of the island is composed of mud and mountains. The population includes 80,000 carabaos (water buffaloes) and 8,000,000 roosters. Of the people 80,000 are insurrectos, 80,000 are amigos (friends at the muzzle of a .44), and the balance are Chinese gamblers and carineta drivers.
>
> The Philippine Islands are a nice bouquet for a deadly enemy. The climate is pleasant and healthy for mosquitoes, ants, lizards, bats, scorpions, snakes, and carabaos.
>
> Malarial fever is so prevalent that on many occasions the islands have shaken by the vibration of the inhabitants in their chills.
>
> To let you know the varieties of diseases the men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps have to contend with, with slum and beans as "chow," I will name some of the simpler, such as beri beri, smallpox, leprosy, adobi itch, bubonic plague, cholera, all of which are guaranteed to give satisfaction.
>
> The natives are very industrious, their chief industries being cockfighting and stealing. Their marriage ceremony is very impressive, es-

pecially that clause in the contract which provides for the wife the privilege of laboring for her husband as much as he desires. The home dress of the Filipino is artistic and attractive, consisting of transparent and primitive outlines. The native costume is flour sacks tied around the body (Harris Brothers' brands being preferred); children under 15 years of age wait until the next year for clothes.

The towns are aggregations of shacks full of fleas, cur dogs, cats, horses, pigs, chickens, carabaos, bedbugs, and the families, all living on terms of equality.

The Philippine Islands as a whole are a forsaken, cannibalized, Aguinaldo-infested blot on the earth—at least the marine thinks so when he has thirty long months to stay here.

Do I like it? Guess.

The whole controversy divides itself into two branches—tobacco and sugar. There is nothing else in dispute.

I am going to leave tobacco entirely to my friend from Connecticut, Mr. HILL, and my other friend from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, who are indefatigable in the collection of facts, who possess marvelous memories, with great power of observation, and who have visited the islands, investigating the matter on the spot. For years General GROSVENOR has borne the honorable title of "Old Figgers." Mr. HILL has earned the sobriquet of "Young Figgers," with which I now invest him. He will illustrate his speech by a set of samples of tobacco as remarkable as any drummer ever carried to his patrons. [Laughter.] I will say this, however, that from my youth up I have been familiar with tobacco and tobacco raising, both in Kentucky and Missouri. As a boy on a rocky farm in the hill country of Kentucky I burned the plant beds, sowed the seed, set out the plants—awfully hard work—hoed tobacco, plowed it, wormed it, suckered it, cut it, hung it up to dry, stripped it, made it into hands, pressed it into hogsheads, hauled it to market with ox teams, and smoked some of it. [Laughter.]

Kentucky, Missouri, Texas, and Tennessee can raise not only this country's supply of tobacco, but the world's supply; but the trouble about it is that the land is so rich that it produces such a heavy tobacco that it is not rated as the finest kind for cigar wrappers, which is the highest-priced variety. But to show what scientific cultivation will do, a few years ago in Lincoln County, in my district, a man raised tobacco that sold in the leaf for a dollar and a quarter a pound. In that district there are 200 brick houses and a hundred brick barns on the farms, equal in architectural beauty to the executive offices now occupied by the President of the United States. [Laughter.] Every one of those magnificent farmhouses and barns was the result of tobacco grown during the civil war at the high prices then prevailing. The day will come when, by scientific farming, we will raise as fine tobacco as grows on the face of the earth, every ounce that we need for American consumption, and then export some, and God speed the day. [Applause.]

As to this sugar question, it is interminable in its ramifications; the literature on the subject forms a large library; but there are a few salient facts that stand out in bold relief. Habit, if not nature, has made sugar a prime necessity among civilized peoples. The sugar habit is of modern contraction, but it is now confirmed and incurable. Nearly all sugar consumed is refined sugar, but it is easier to talk about it in the raw state. Sugar is not refined to any appreciable extent in the Tropics. The average consumption of raw sugar in the world is 10,000,000 tons annually. Sometimes it drops a little below those figures; sometimes it rises a little above them. The world's production of sugar is the same. This last year it happened there were 11,973,000 tons of raw sugar produced in the world; 7,865,000 tons of beet sugar; 4,908,000 tons of cane sugar. Of this quantity of sugar we consumed in the United States in 1904—the last year for which we have complete figures—2,767,162 tons, our per capita consumption being about 72 pounds per annum. In "the United States proper"—God save the mark!—we produced only 585,000 tons—265,000 beet sugar; 320,000 tons of cane sugar. From "the United States improper" [laughter]—that is, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippines—in 1904 we imported 409,270 tons. From foreign countries in 1904 we imported 1,798,381 tons. The average Hamburg price—which is the world's price—of raw sugar is 2 cents per pound. Now you have it in a nutshell. In 1904 we imported from the Philippines 25,489 tons only. Now, understand, the cane-sugar raisers and the beet-sugar raisers all think this bill is going to ruin them. Why, gentlemen, the Philippine sugar is not a drop in the bucket. The greatest quantity of sugar that was ever exported from the Philippine Islands in one year was 256,852 tons. That was just before the Spanish war broke out. That was in 1893. They consume at home about 80,000 tons annually. The total exports fell to 82,043 tons in 1904. Who is to blame for that, I am not going to stop to inquire now. Suppose it goes back to where it was at its maximum—that is, 256,852 tons for export. Even then they will export, all told, only about one-eighth of the amount of sugar that we must import. Does any man in his senses believe that the importation of that amount of sugar from the Philippine Islands, even if we imported every pound of it, will reduce the price of beet sugar in the estimation of a hair? If he does, he has a great deal more credulity than I have. But we will import only a small portion of it, free trade or no free trade, for China, with over 500,000,000 people, is their close neighbor, and Japan, with fifty-odd millions of people, is at their very doors, being less than a hundred miles distant. One of the amazing bits of evidence before the committee was that the Chinese are just learning to eat sugar. Why they did not contract the sugar habit two or three hundred years ago is what Lord Dundreary would denominate "one of those things no fellow can find out." The poor, benighted Chinese will never know what they have missed. But they are taking to sugar eating with a relish, so Secretary Taft says. If they all cultivate the saccharine appetite, how much Philippine sugar do you imagine will ever gladden the palates of the American people?

Some of you gentlemen are acquainted with the game called draw poker, one feature of which is to raise your opponent. I never saw anything in my life that reminded me so much of that game as the way the witnesses swore before the Ways and Means Committee as to the amount of sugar that could be raised in the Philippine Islands. I do not blame them for being interested in it. A man that does not work for his own interests in this world, and the interests of his people, is not worth his salt. Our duties in this House divide themselves into two great classes. One of them is to legislate for and look after the interests of the country in general, and the other is to legislate for and look after the interests of the people we represent on this floor in particular. I do not blame the sugar men, but I want to state some facts for their information. They come in and estimate that there are so many acres of arable land in the Philippines, and that you can raise so much sugar to the acre. Why, it is like raising ducks; you can take a sheet of paper and a pencil and start in with one drake and two ducks and figure yourself into a multimillionaire before you go to bed. [Laughter.] I have in my eye now a distinguished Republican statesman who lies awake at night inviting insomnia by pestering his head to cipher out how quick he can become a Crœsus by raising turkeys. [Laughter.] And as the best turkeys on the face of the earth are raised in my district, I extend to him my encouragement and felicitations. One woman in my district refused $500 for a gobbler [laughter] on which she took the premium at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. If my Congressional friend can start in with that sort of a gobbler and raise that grade of turkeys, in less than fifteen years Rockefeller's and Carnegie's fortunes rolled into one would pale into utter insignificance beside the amount of money that he will make in raising turkeys. [Laughter.]

The way these lightning calculators figure it out is this. The sugar men and the tobacco men assume that there are so many acres of arable land in the Philippines. The sugar men come in and assume that every acre of that land is to be planted in sugar. Then they draw on their imagination to the effect that the Americans will go thither by the hundred thousand to raise sugar, and that they will introduce American modern methods, and they will raise 8 tons of sugar to the acre. Now, the facts show that a ton of sugar to the acre is a pretty good average crop in the Philippine Islands, and facts are stubborn things—much more reliable than the imagination as the basis for mathematical demonstration. When our sugar friends get through ciphering, the Philippine Islands are not only going to raise all the sugar that we can consume, but all that all the nations of the earth can consume. The tobacco men then take their turn, and plant the same identical land in tobacco [laughter], every acre of it, and when they get through every fellow in this country and in the civilized world has a ton of tobacco for his own use.

I want to ask you a question for consideration. What are these Filipinos going to do for something to eat while they are planting every arable acre they have to tobacco and sugar? They can not live on sugar; they can't live on tobacco. The truth is, gentlemen, that this bill is not going to increase perceptibly the acreage planted there of either sugar or tobacco, and I will tell you why. Because an acre of hemp there pays three or four times in cash as much as an acre of tobacco or an acre of sugar. They have a monopoly of hemp; nature gave it to them; nobody can take it away from them, and the supply is not near equal to the demand. Inevitably, therefore, every acre of land that can be planted in hemp will be subtracted from the sugar and tobacco areas and devoted to hemp.

Now, as to the beet-sugar men. I have it not in my heart to say an unkind word to them; I am very fond of them. They are my friends, and they treat me royally when I go up to Michigan; but they are not in a strictly prime condition to raise any objection about the importation of sugar from the

Philippine Islands. [Laughter.] I will tell you when was the time to raise this question about the importation of sugar into the United States from tropical countries free of duties. They are just seven years too late. They are performing the condemned caper of locking the barn after the horse is gone. The time to have set their thinkers to operating rapidly was in the summer of 1898, when we were annexing the Sandwich Islands, when some of us stood up here and fought the Hawaiian grab tooth and nail—fought it, among other reasons, because it would bring American labor into direct competition with the cheap Chinese and Japanese cooly labor of those islands; fought it courageously, wisely, patriotically, amid the ceaseless villification of hundreds of newspapers subsidized for that very purpose. But in spite of all we could do, Hawaii was annexed, and our labor has been brought into competition with Chinese and Japanese cheap labor—more's the pity. It gives me no pleasure to say, "I told you so." On the contrary, it gives me much sorrow. Where were the beet-sugar patriots then? How fought they on that occasion, which was the Quatre Bras preceding Waterloo? Every man jack of them lined up for annexation. Did they think that they could eat their cake and keep it, too? Did they not realize the possibilities of sugar production in Hawaii then? If they did know, are they not estopped from complaining now, when they think that the evil of which they were forwarned is upon them? Surely they can not set up the poor plea of ignorance, because it is writen, "*Ignorantia neminem excusat*," and because they were told over and over again what would happen. That was the golden opportunity of the beet-sugar men. They let it pass unimproved; aye, more, they aided mightily to force it to pass by. "The mill will never grind again with the water that has passed."

If the beet-sugar men had lined up with us then against Hawaiian annexation there would have been no Hawaiian question about sugar; no Porto Rican question; no Philippine question about sugar to vex them now. That was the root of the whole evil. If they want to find out what this country has lost in revenues and what they have lost in profits I will tell them very suddenly, all because of this importation of sugar from the Sandwich Islands. It is enough to make you fall off your seats in an apoplectic fit, you sugar people. From 1875 to 1905, both inclusive, we imported from the Hawaiian Islands 4,295,061 tons of sugar. Think of that! In round numbers the tariff on raw sugar is $35 a ton. As a matter of fact it is $1.685 a hundred on sugar 96 per cent pure, and then the sugar trust has in addition to that a differential rake-off on refined sugar of the difference between $1.68½ and $1.95 per hundred, and in addition to that one-eighth of 1 cent per pound flat, making the total differential on refined sugar $5.30 per ton.

At $35 a ton the Treasury of the United States has lost $150,327,135 of revenue that it might just as well have had from the Sandwich Islands. In addition to that, as an absolute gratuity under the Newlands resolution of annexation, we squandered four millions more. Hawaiian sugar is coming in here now at the rate of 400,000 tons a year. That is a gratuity of $14,000,000 that we are giving annually to the Hawaiian sugar kings, besides this $154,000,000 already paid; and, sad to say, we will pay it annually—

> Forever and forever, so long as the river flows,
> So long as the heart has passion, so long as life has woes.

That is what you are paying for your Hawaiian whistle. Don't you think that the Hawaiians come rather high? Awfully high—too high? That is what we paid and are paying to coddle them into a condition of mind to permit us to swallow them. In addition to that, Porto Rico produces 100,000 tons of sugar a year.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly. I always gladly yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Perhaps it would be well in the making of history of the very important character that the gentleman is speaking of making to insert at that particular point that the sugar of Hawaii was coming into this country free since 1875, and that no attempt has been made by either party, when in power, to change that situation, so that in point of fact when we annexed the islands we annexed them with the running agreement and treaty binding upon us to continue a condition that was binding before.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly true. It is entirely pertinent. The difference in the situation then and now is this: Prior to annexation Hawaiian sugar was coming into the United States free of tariff duty, under a treaty which either party to it might denounce at any time that it chose. Now, we are married to Hawaii by an irrevocable decree, because the average American citizen can not make up his mind to ever divorce a single foot of land to which we have even the color of title. Land lust is in the breed. It is one of our master passions. That sugar could have been got rid of by treaty. As a Democrat, in favor of tariff for revenue only, I say there never was any sense in letting the Hawaiian sugar in here free, for, as we shall see further on, letting it in free of duty never reduced the price of refined sugar to the American consumer even in the smallest degree.

In addition to letting in the Hawaiian sugar free we are also letting in Porto Rican sugar free. Last year Porto Rico produced 100,000 tons. What her maximum production will be no man knows.

Cuba raised a million tons of sugar last year and it is estimated that this coming year she will raise 1,300,000 tons, and that sugar comes in here at 20 per cent off the Dingley rates; and the reason of that is apparent to everybody. We might as well be candid. We are fixing to perform the great anaconda act of swallowing the Cuban Republic at the proper time.

I have made these remarks as to Hawaiian, Porto Rican, Cuban, and Philippine sugars not because I love our cane-sugar raisers and beet-sugar raisers less, but because I love the corn raisers, wheat raisers, and live-stock raisers more. They are my people. They have six times honored me with their commission to represent them here. No witness appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means to speak for them and other consumers of sugar. They seem to rely implicitly on the fidelity of their Representatives on this floor, and so far as in me lies they shall not be disappointed.

No human ingenuity can protect them by a tariff, for the all-sufficient reason that they are essentially and necessarily exporters. The world is their market. What they want—all they ask—is that "square deal" of which we hear so much and see so little.

Notwithstanding this immense largess which we have paid and are still paying to the Hawaiian sugar kings, they had the infinite gall to send their agent before the committee to protest against this bill. That certainly is the most stupendous exhibition of cheek seen on this earth since the devil took the Savior to the top of a high mountain and offered Him the dominion of the world to fall down and worship him.

At this point I desire to give you some deductions I made from all this investigation, and if these figures are not substantially right I shall be obliged to any gentleman who will correct me. Here is the first deduction from all the evidence: It costs little, if any, more to raise an acre of sugar cane in Louisiana than it does to raise an acre of corn in Iowa, Illinois, or Missouri. I am boring for blood. If I can not get votes out of this House, I want to go to the place where they can be had, and that is among the corn growers of the Mississippi Valley. The cane seed to plant an acre costs $12. Seed corn for an acre costs much less, $1 or so, though there is a man up in the district of my friend the gentleman from Iowa, Colonel HEPBURN, at Shenandoah, who sells seed corn all over the country at $2 a bushel. Second, the sugar land costs no more in Louisiana than corn land costs in Illinois, Iowa, or Missouri. I take these three States simply because they are in a group and constitute the heart of the corn belt. Third, the average crop of sugar cane on an acre is 20 tons, worth $3 a ton, making $60 an acre, which, with $12 off for the seed, leaves $48. Fourth, the sugar beets produced upon an acre are sometimes worth as much as $50 an acre. Beet-sugar land costs no more per acre than good corn land. That was stated in the committee. To be fair, I take that to be above the average. Fifth, 40 bushels of corn to the acre would be a large average for the corn crop all over the country. Forty cents a bushel would be a high price in the field; it will not average it. That makes $16 an acre for corn. With perhaps $1 for seed, that leaves $15 an acre. There is one man in my district this year who raised 115 bushels an acre, and corn is selling at about 46 cents in St. Louis. Of course that is an extraordinary crop per acre. Five or six years ago one man in my district, on 11 acres, raised 133 bushels and a fraction to the acre. That is extraordinary in any country. I will undertake to sell every acre of corn, on the average, that will be raised in the United States this year for $15 an acre, and grow independently rich in the transaction. Sixth, so that the beet-sugar farmer or cane-sugar former receives twice or thrice as much per acre as the corn farmer. I would like to see any living man face an audience of corn raisers advocating a tariff of 1¾ cents per pound on raw sugar and at the same time tell them truthfully that the price of their corn is the world's price. It seems to me that Republican corn raisers would wake up very suddenly and that the "stand patters" would hear something drop with a dull, sickening thud.

Seventh. If the Republican stock raisers, wheat raisers, and corn raisers in this country voted their interests as assiduously

as do the beet-sugar men, instead of voting their prejudices, there would never be another Republican Congress or another Republican President in the United States, a consummation devoutedly to be wished. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I will tell you how it is worked. The Republican grain and stock raisers vote their prejudices directly against their own interests, while the beet-sugar raisers vote their interests.

Eighth. There is a tariff of 15 cents a bushel on corn, ostensibly for the benefit of the corn raiser, but really to catch suckers. A tariff of $15 or $15,000 a bushel would do him no good, for his market—the market that fixes inexorably the price of his corn—is Europe. You could raise on one good section of land all the corn imported into this country last year.

The tariff of 25 cents per bushel on wheat does the farmer no good whatever, for there is little wheat imported and that little is imported principally for seed wheat. The result is that the American farmer's seed wheat costs him more than it otherwise would.

Ninth. The American raw-sugar producer is protected to the extent of $1.68½ per hundred, or $35 per ton—a tariff protection of about 75 per cent.

In addition to that, the sugar manufacturer has protection to the extent of $5.30 per ton of refined sugar, which makes him monarch of all he surveys from the center all around to the sea.

Tenth. And in this differential the sugar-beet men share, for they sell only refined sugar.

Eleventh. To be candid and fair to all concerned, it ought to be stated that it costs more to raise an acre of beets than an acre of either corn or sugar cane. That grows out of the fact that one beet sends up many shoots, necessitating much hand work.

I am happy to state that Mr. Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson is experimenting on a single-shoot beet, which, if he succeeds, will greatly diminish cost of raising sugar beets. All good citizens bid him a hearty Godspeed in his undertaking.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The average yield of the cane per acre in the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas is 16 tons.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That will be $48.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Then the next year there is an average yield of, say, 9 tons on the stubble, the ratoon. The third year there is no crop raised at all, while the average yield of corn is year after year, so that the average yield of cane is 16 plus 9 or 25 tons for three years, and not 20 tons a year, or 60 tons.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Gentlemen, do you know what a "ratoon" crop of sugar cane is? It is the second crop that grows from the original planting—without any planting at all except the original planting.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman state that the cost of growing a ratoon crop, which can not be eradicated from the soil, but grows without replanting, as he has stated—that the cost of cultivating that crop is just as much as the first crop, though producing scarcely one-half the result?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. According to the gentleman's own statement, you have 16 tons of cane the first year, $48; 9 tons the second year, $27; 48 plus 27 is 75.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the gentleman state the third year?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. With $12 off for seed, that leaves $63 for two years, which is $31.50 per acre for sugar cane for each of the two crops. There is not one farmer in 10,000 who gets that much for his corn. It is $21 per acre per annum for each of the three crops raised from one planting—which is more, far more—than one farmer out of 5,000 the country over receives for his corn or wheat or oats or hay.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Is it not a fact that the bill which he is supporting now, either the majority or minority proposition—it makes no difference to me; I know he signed the minority report as a member of the Ways and Means Committee—is it not a fact that there is not one pound of refined sugar produced in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is true. Sugar, it appears, can not be refined successfully in the Tropics.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Does not the gentleman know it to be a fact, that the sugar trust—the American Sugar Refining Company—thrives exclusively upon the proposition that they get raw sugar such as is produced in the Philippine Islands as a feeder for their refineries in this country?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The price of raw sugar has nothing to do with the sugar trust within certain limits. It is a very intricate mathematical business. I will explain it briefly. The world's price on raw sugar is $2 a hundred or $40 a ton, in round numbers. I do not mean it is always that, but that is about it—the average price. Hamburg is the sugar market of the world, just as Liverpool is the world's market for corn and wheat. The tariff on raw sugar is $35 a ton. Now, when the sugar trust, which is the chief buyer here, wants sugar, namely, it has to pay the world's price of sugar as fixed at Hamburg first. Then it has to pay this tariff of $35 a ton, together with freight and insurance, whenever it gets it anywhere. If there was not any differential on sugar the sugar trust would go to smash before this time next year.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The gentleman is right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am going to finish up this differential business while I am at it.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I am with you on that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The differential is the difference between $1.95 a hundred and $1.68½ for 96° raw sugar, and then when the sugar goes down in degrees the differential goes down. That differential of 26½ cents on the average on refined sugar gives the sugar trust an absolute monopoly of the American sugar market, except as to the beet-sugar men. In addition, there is another differential of one-eighth of a cent per pound, making the whole differential 39 cents per hundredweight of refined sugar.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Except as to the beet-sugar men?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Except that. Now, wait a minute. The sugar men are the beneficiaries in this differential, because the beet-sugar man always furnishes his sugar in the shape of refined sugar and thus far competes with the trust unless it has an agreement with the trust. One of the most intelligent witnesses I have ever seen in my life was that gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Humphrey. I think a great deal of him, too. I asked him this question: "What is the reason you beet-sugar men do not fight the sugar trust?" He said, "If we had $90,000,000 of capital we would go in and fight them to a finish; but the difference is that, when we begin making sugar, we have to go on and complete it and make refined sugar, as we have not sufficient money with which to store the raw sugar, whereas the sugar trust stores this raw cane sugar and refines it whenever it pleases during any part of the year. The beet-sugar men have to make their sugar and refine it in two or three months after the beets reach the factory."

If the beet-sugar makers and the trust combine or divide territory, the only check on their absolute monopoly of our market is this: They can not put the price of refined sugar much above the world's price of raw sugar, plus freight and insurance on raw sugar from the place where it is bought, plus the tariff on raw sugar of $1.68½ per hundred, plus the cost of storage and refining, plus the differential of 39 cents per hundred on refined sugar, without letting in foreign refined sugar.

If the beet-sugar men of this House will vote to take that differential off refined sugar, I will vote against this bill or any other bill on the subject which may be brought into this House.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am with you on that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. All right; bring it on, but you will have to carry it through. [Laughter.] It won't go in on a bluff. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. I hope the gentleman will pardon me for a moment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait half a minute; after I finish this differential I will yield to you.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I am with you on the differential.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to refresh the memory of some of you gentlemen upon what was done here some two or three years ago. They had up a Cuban reciprocity bill here, and we added to it an amendment repealing the differential on sugar. One of the grandest sights I have witnessed since I have been in Congress was to see enough beet-sugar Republicans, led by the Marshal Ney of the beet-sugar forces, Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH, of Michigan [laughter], walk down this aisle and walk between the tellers with the Democrats to kill the sugar trust as dead as a smelt.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In a minute. Let me tell you what else occurred on that occasion. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] was in the chair. I would not do him an injustice on this or any other occasion. When that amendment repealing the differential was offered he ruled it was not germane to that bill, and the Republican beet-sugar men rose in their might, joined hands with us, and overruled the decision of the Chair. Now, if a proposition is made here on this bill to repeal the differential on sugar, the question of whether it is germane or not is res adjudicata. We have them nailed up on that proposition between heaven and earth, where they ought to be. [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. I will ask the gentleman if instead of being res adjudicata it was not overruled within fifteen minutes of that time?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Who overruled it?

Mr. DALZELL. The same force.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask my friend from Pennsylvania a question. Wasn't it the Republican machine that did it? And did not the Democrats and beet-sugar Republicans run over the House Republican machine roughshod?

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, they did it. [Laughter.] But I would like to ask my friend to tell us what became of Marshal Ney? [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is a perfectly pertinent question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, if the gentleman will permit me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a minute until I get through with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do not know whether the Marshal Ney of Michigan is going to make a charge on this occasion or not, or whether he will be like King Joachim Murat, of Naples, during the Waterloo campaign, remain away from the field of his glory, thereby losing his crown. Now, the gentleman from Ohio. [Great laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will ask the gentleman from Missouri, who is always interesting, and just now is peculiarly and specially so, if he can give the proportion of the sugar product of the world as between the refined sugar of all foreign countries other than Cuba and the entire product of the whole world?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I could not do that without sitting down and figuring it out, and I haven't leisure for that just now.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is it not a fact that it would be beet sugar—about two-thirds?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is true, I think.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Your proposition is to repeal the differential between refined and raw sugars?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSVENOR. For what purpose?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. For the purpose of killing the sugar trust as dead as a doornail. [Laughter and loud applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Suppose that that being so, you first killed the cane producer of Louisiana and, secondly, this force headed by Marshal Ney—the beet-sugar interests in the United States—and whether you will bring the world in competition with the refined sugar of the beet producers of the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not believe it will hurt the cane-sugar grower of Louisiana or the beet-sugar grower.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If that be true, now then what benefit would it be to anybody to repeal the differential?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It will benefit the American sugar consumer, for whom I stand, because he would get his refined sugar cheaper.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is probably true now. But in the end the sugar-beet interest of the United States must inevitably be destroyed. At the present time you would repeal the differenial and you would do that in the interest of the American people, as I understand.

Mr. CLARK or Missouri. Let me make a suggestion. Cut down the differential on refined sugar to 50 per cent of what it is now, then what do you do? I will tell you what you do.

Mr. GROSVENOR. You cut down the price of beet sugar, of course.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, suppose you do. It will increase the market. It would cheapen sugar to the consumer and at the same time protect the American producer of raw sugar sufficiently. Cut the differential on refined sugar down 50 per cent. It will not lose the American sugar market to the American sugar grower, but will merely cut down the profits of the trust 50 per cent, making refined sugar cheaper to the American consumer. You can not get out of that proposition.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I am thoroughly in accord with the gentleman on the question of the differential. There are two differentials on sugar coming to this country. There is the one-eighth of a cent per pound on all sugar imported into this country ranking above 96 polariscope. Really the differential on sugars coming into this country is the difference between 96 sugars and 100 sugars, which is the difference between $1.68½ per hundred pounds and $1.95 per hundred pounds. That is one differential which is concealed. Then there is another differential, of which I have already spoken, the one-eighth of 1 cent flat per pound. So there are two differentials. I am opposed to both of them. The beet-sugar people, as I understand, may or may not be opposed to one-eighth of a cent differential; and when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] comes at the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the gentleman from Missouri can properly say to him that when he is talking of differentials he is talking of the one-eighth of a cent per pound for refined sugar and not the difference between $1.68½ and $1.95 on sugars classing above 96 per cent polariscope.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. If the gentleman will allow me, what per cent of sugar is controlled by the sugar trust?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Practically the sugar trust controls the entire American sugar market.

Mr. BROUSSARD. All of it except the sugar produced by the beet-sugar people; in fact, all that comes into this country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I believe that raisers of American cane sugar when it is developed to its full extent and the American beet-sugar raisers can raise every pound of sugar that the American people will ever consume and export sugar besides, and I will hail that day with a great deal of pleasure. In the meantime I do not want to be paying two prices for sugar. There is another element which enters into this controversy—the question of labor. Our beet-sugar and cane-sugar friends are scared to death for fear that the Filipinos will go to work like we work in the United States. Why, gentlemen, there is no more possibility of that than there is that the sun will rise in the west to-morrow morning instead of the east. You can not induce the inhabitants of those islands or any other tropical country to work like we work here. It is not in them. Life is easy. They do not need any clothing hardly, and they pick their living off the trees. There isn't a man in this House who would work if he didn't have to work. I have been searching all my life for the man who would rather work than eat, and I haven't found him yet. He is a myth—an ignis fatuus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to continue until he concludes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may continue until he shall have concluded. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very much obliged to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the House. If you could take the Filipinos by the nape of the neck, every one of them, and throw them into the sea, and then send 7,000,000 American citizens over there, and if the climate did not debilitate them, I grant you that the product of sugar from these islands would be large compared with what it is now. But the climate takes the stamina out of our breed when they go over there.

There are very few fields there that are big enough to plow with a gang or steam plow. You can not use horses or mules over there because they die. I am very sorry for that, because Missouri is the greatest producer of mules on the face of the earth. [Laughter.] I inquired particularly about what it was that killed mules and horses, and some called it the surra; I don't know whether that is a kind of glanders or not, but it doesn't make any difference; it kills them. Our cattle won't live over there. They imported Jerseys and shorthorns, and they all died in a short time. You can not import our kind of poultry and make it live. The only work animal that seems to flourish there is the carabao; I never saw one of them and I never want to. I was invited to go over there by Secretary Taft, but I could not go, though I would have enjoyed a trip in such good company. According to all the evidence in the case the carabao is the slowest moving of all four-footed animals. He stays half of his time in a mud hole, and when the time comes for him to take his mud bath, he simply lights out, as we say in this country; and my opinion is, after hearing all the evidence, that, if we should take the most energetic man we have in our country and put him to plowing with a carabao, in two years he would be as slow moving as a Filipino or a carabao. We got a "gold brick" of huge proportions when we bought the Philippines.

I believe that they can raise sugar in the Philippines a little cheaper than we can raise it in this country, but not much; and even if they did, they could not raise enough to interfere with our sugar product.

You beet-sugar men fear the competition of Philippine sugar. I am teetotally opposed to keeping them. You bring in a substitute for this bill providing that we recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands and let them go, and I will vote for it as cheerfully as I ever took a drink of water or of anything else. [Laughter.] We can agree on that. You will get what you want, and I will get what I want. That is the proposition that we ought to be debating here this good hour instead of fooling away time about this tariff bill. What are you going to do with them? You beet-sugar men ought to rise up here unanimously and say, "Let them go."

Mr. DALZELL. I understood the gentleman to say about fifteen minutes ago that our breed never let anything go. Has the gentleman changed his mind?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, I have not; but I am trying to persuade you to change your minds. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Knowing that they won't change their minds.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I don't know anything of the sort.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman said only a few minutes ago that our breed—I suppose he means the Anglo-Saxon——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Don't say the Anglo-Saxon; say the Teutonic race or the Germanic race.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. He said our breed never relinquishes a foot of land to which they once had title. That was an unqualified assertion?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Why does the gentleman from Missouri ask for what is impossible?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Because wise men change their minds and fools never do. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman has put himself in somewhat of a dilemma there, because he said, not as a matter of opinion, but as a matter of fact, that historically—and I presume he meant always for the future—it was a fact that the Teutonic race never had relinquished and never would relinquish its title to a foot of soil. Now, because he has changed his mind within fifteen minutes, and thinks that perhaps he is a wise man, therefore does he think that all the rest of the Anglo-Saxon or Teutonic race who are not going to do it—and he said they would not—are fools?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can fight that out in his own mind. I am not going to try to enlighten him. [Prolonged laughter and applause.]

There is one other historical fact pertinent in this beet-sugar discussion. There is an old saying that we sometimes build more wisely than we know. Napoleon, despising the crimson glories of a hundred bloody fields, proudly declared that he would descend to posterity with the code in his hand. I will tell you what else he will descend with in his hand—the sugar beet. He is the man who discovered it, though the Germans have developed it. So that Napoleon and the Germans share the honor in this matter of being joint benefactors of the world. If the mighty Corsican had looked forward to this day with prophetic ken he would have put the theory of producing sugar from beets alongside of the code as his clearest titles to imperishable renown. In his case, as in many others, necessity was the mother of invention. The English blockade drove him into the effort to find a substitute for cane sugar. That's about the only good that came to the human race generally from the Napoleonic wars.

Now, about that Anglo-Saxon business—I have heard of that as long as I want to. It is a misnomer. We are not Anglo-Saxons. Most of us—such men as I am, tall of stature, with big bodies, blue eyes, fair skins, and flaxen hair (that's the way Tacitus describes the Germans of the days when Christ walked the earth)—are descended from the great Teutonic or Germanic stock, the imperial race of the world, which for two thousand years has gone forth conquering and to conquer, and not from that little band of Angles and Saxons that went over to ravage England. [Applause and laughter.] They were simply offshoots of the great Germanic or Teutonic people—small offshoots at that.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The gentleman said, or answered, that not a pound of sugar grown in the Philippine Islands coming into this country would go into consumption, but that all of it would have to be remanufactured in order to be used. The gentleman urged subsequently—and I agreed with him—that the differential ought to be taken off sugar entirely in order to destroy the sugar trust. Now, it is a fact that there is no purchaser of sugars that are not refined in this country except the sugar trust. How can the gentleman argue that he wants to destroy the trust by taking off the differential and then reduce the rate on raw sugar in order that the sugar trust might get additional advantage in purchasing sugar from the Philippines, as they do from Cuba, Porto Rica, and Hawaii, to come into this country and go into competition with the beet-sugar people in the West and with the sugar people in the South?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I say about that, Mr. Chairman, is that the sugar that comes in from the Philippine Islands is a mere bagatelle compared with the immense quantity of sugar that we import from other sources.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I know, but the drop in the bucket business does not answer anything. Is it a fact that the gentleman wants to take off the differential; and if that be true why does the gentleman desire to reduce the tariff on raw sugar the only purchaser of which in this country is the sugar trust, when that would enable the sugar trust to get advantage over the beet-sugar people of the country and the sugar producers in the South?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the question as to the status of the Philippine Islands with reference to the United States, if we are going to hang on to them, rises immeasurably superior to this small question about the tariff on sugar from the Philippine Islands. I did not want the Philippines. I did not want the Sandwich Islands. The Earl of Sandwich gave his name to them, and he is famous forever in the invention of an indigestible article of diet and for giving his name to the Sandwich Islands—and the latter is the greater curse of the two. [Laughter and applause.]

My skirts are clear. I fought the Sandwich Island grab. I have been opposed to the Philippine propaganda from the beginning, and I am now. I believe it is dangerous to the country, if not ruinous. I would let them go this minute. I wish to heaven they were gone. I voted against paying the $20,000,000 to Spain for the Philippines even after the Senate had ratified the treaty. I want that carved on my tombstone when I am dead. Now, I say, gentlemen, that we can not have this anomalous condition of affairs existing any longer; that the Philippine Islands must be considered a part of the United States or they must be considered as foreign territory—one or the other. For our own sakes we ought to put an instant end to this monstrous anomaly of their being half in and half out. That is the paramount question. What disheartens me about this whole business is what leading Republicans say. Four or five years ago a whole day was devoted here once to a debate between the present Speaker of the House, Mr. CANNON; the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR; the gentleman from Missouri, Judge DE ARMOND, and myself. We took it turn and turn about, thirty minutes at a clip, that day. The Philippine problem was our theme. Finally, in a burst of exuberance and enthusiasm, the present Speaker of the House said we intended to hold on to the Philippine Islands forever and a day. A year ago in the Committee on Ways and Means, Secretary Taft said that we would hold on to them only till such date as we could educate them into a measurable fitness for self-government. When asked how long that would be he said it might outlast this generation. That was more encouragement than what the Speaker said. That filled my heart with gladness; but the other day the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in a dialogue with Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, in the committee room declared that the question of what we are going to do with the Philippine Islands is a question for the next century. So he goes back practically to what the Speaker said. I disliked exceedingly to hear him make that declaration, but he did make it seriously. To hold the Philippine Islands for a hundred years, as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee says we will, is to do what the Speaker of the House said, hold them "forever and a day," because in that length of time every dollar's worth of property in the Philippine Islands will be owned by Americans, and then if we undertake to get rid of them every blessed one of them will be over here with his cousins and his uncles and his aunts bedeviling Congress not to turn them adrift.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask my friend from Missouri if he has observed the repeated changes of position in this game of progressive euchre, the Philippines being euchred? In the report of the Fifty-eighth Congress, with reference to the American tenure of the Philippines, the report says: "It is distinctly settled we retain them until the people are prepared for self-government." Further along, in that part of the report written this year, the report says: "It is quite certain that, regardless of any opinion we may entertain with reference to our entrance into the Philippine Islands, we are there to stay." Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri, admitting this represents the opinion of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, if in his judgment that represents the opinion of a majority of the American people, and if they have changed from last year to this year to the same degree that characterizes the movements of the chairman of that committee?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not believe they have. I will tell you what I do believe. Notwithstanding what my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] suggests—and what I said, too, as far as that is concerned—I believe if the Members of this House and Senate could vote to-day a secret ballot, so that no mortal man would be ever able to find out how they did vote, that the Congress would vote almost unanimously to turn those islands loose, and the reason you will not stand up here and vote it is on account of pride. You said the horse is 17 feet high and you are going to stick to it, I suppose. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. If it be true that the only consumer of raw sugar, such as will come from the Philippine Islands under

this bill, is the sugar trust, and the gentleman wants to take off the differential in order to cripple and kill the sugar trust, with which I agree, how can the gentleman justify his position now in voting to reduce the raw material which is going to feed additionally the sugar trust?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say in the first place it does not amount to a hill of beans——

Mr. BROUSSARD. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but that is not answering my question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can not answer it any other way except as I know how to answer it. It is no doubt my stupidity that prevents my making myself intelligible to my friend, which I regret.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Well, the gentleman may agree or may not agree with the gentleman that it does not amount to anything. If it does not amount to anything, why does the gentleman support the proposition to permit these people to come into competition with American people with the view of benefiting them, if, in the gentleman's opinion, it does not amount to a hill of beans?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is this: This anomomalous condition in the Philippine Islands, they being half in the United States and half out—foreign territory when we want to consider it that way, and domestic territory when we want to consider it that way—is absolutely in contravention of any idea the American people ever had on the subject of government.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, that is all the answer I can make. I do not wish to be impolite, but that is the best I can do with the gentleman from Louisiana. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman from Louisiana said a moment ago, in answer to my question, that the sugar trust controlled all the sugar except the beet sugar.

Mr. BROUSSARD. That is right.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now he says that the sugar trust controls all, practically.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will tell you how that is. The fact is this, that the beet-sugar people can not sell their sugar higher than the trust sells its sugar. It has got to sell it for less.

If they do not sell it for less, the trust, using its immense power, will run them out of business. That is the whole thing. In that way they control the whole output of American sugar factories.

Mr. BROUSSARD. And, of course, as a logical sequence, if they could get additional supply of raw sugar, they could additionally injure the beet-sugar people.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You cipher out this proposition, my brother, of the relation that 25,000 tons bears to 2,768,000 tons, and then you have got the influence of the Philippine sugar in this market.

Mr. BROUSSARD. That is an easy matter to calculate if a man will sit down with a pencil, but the gentleman is here not legislating against the people who are engaged in industry in this country in favor of a people who are not a part of this country. If that be true, then it follows as a natural sequence that he would not try to benefit those who are trying to injure the people engaged in that business, with a view of helping somebody that is foreign to this Government under the decision he just quoted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not desire to vote against anybody's interest. I want all Americans and all American industries to have an equal chance—no more, no less. That's all my constituents desire. But I do not propose for them to be gouged all the time—not if I can prevent it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How many acres of land are in sugar in Louisiana?

Mr. BROUSSARD. They raised this year 300,000 tons of sugar.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How many acres?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I do not know.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman not think that it would be a good idea to go down and buy these sugar plantations and turn them out, rather than tax the sugar-using people of all the States to keep up the sugar farms of Louisiana?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. While this debate has been in progress a friend sent me a public document entitled "International Sugar Situation," by Mr. Frank R. Rutter, Assistant Chief of Foreign Markets for the Agricultural Department. This document was issued from the Government Printing Office in 1904. On page 93 is a table giving the average production per acre per annum of sugar cane in Louisiana from 1884–85 to 1901–2, both inclusive. Here it is:

Average production per acre:	Short tons.
1884–85	17
1885–86	20
1886–87	14
1887–88	24
1888–89	19
1889–90	18
1890–91	27
1891–92	16
1892–93	15
1893–94	20
1894–95	20
1895–96	20
1896–97	20
1897–98	23
1898–99	21
1899–1900	16
1900–1901	22
1901–2	19

Which shows that for eighteen years the average was 18⅘ tons per acre. For the ten years from 1892–93 to 1901–2, both inclusive, the average was 19.6 tons per acre per annum, which is within 0.4 of a ton of 20, which I stated in the beginning was the average per acre. For 1902–3, 1903–4, 1904–5, and 1905–6 it is perhaps fully 20, which fully establishes my contention that cane-sugar raising is thrice as profitable as corn raising.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there is a question in the American public mind that rises in importance above this little Philippine sugar bill as Pikes Peak towers above the foothills at its base, and it is pressing for solution. You may try to dodge it and escape it here, but it is certain to be on the tapis until it is settled. I refer to the revision or the readjustment of the exorbitant rates in the Dingley tariff bill. If there were nobody asking for that except Democrats I would be almost hopeless, in the present posture of affairs, of any revision; but the demand is widespread; it is insistent. It extends from Marthas Vineyard to Sioux City, Iowa, if no farther. [Laughter.] It will finally become loud enough to penetrate even the thick walls of this Capitol. I will tell you what Hon. Albert B. Cummins said the other day. All of you—especially the members of the Hawkeye delegation—know who Albert B. Cummins is. He is one of the foremost citizens of Iowa, a magnificent Commonwealth, rich in statesmen, unfortunately chiefly of the Republican school. He is a Republican, filling his second term as governor, and, as I understand it, a candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination, or a candidate for a third term in the gubernatorial chair; if neither of these, then a candidate against Senator Dolliver for his seat; if none of these, a candidate against Governor HULL for his seat in this House.

In a speech not long since he said, inter alia:

> The total life insurance grafts for all time had not been one-fifth of the annual amount of which the people have been despoiled by the excessive tariff rates.

The annual amount of tariff extortions, mark you!

This language is so plain that it needs no diagram to explain it. Here is an editorial comment on it from the Creston, Iowa, Advertiser, a Republican paper:

> Who said that? Bryan? Guess again. BOURKE COCKRAN or JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS or Grover Cleveland or ex-Congressman Wade or CHAMP CLARK? You still have a guess coming. Better give it up. Well, those are the words of Governor Cummins. Is it any wonder that he is patted on the back by every Democrat who speaks of him? Nor should it be forgotten in this connection that Governor Cummins, who thus attacks a law that was enacted by the Republican party and which was hailed with joy by the whole Republican party, puts in a great deal of his time questioning the Republicanism of those who will not accept his leadership. Governor Cummins no doubt believes that he is a Republican and a protectionist or he would not say so. From the standpoint of morals he is an honest man. But it seems to us that he is intellectually dishonest; that a perfervid imagination which finds expression in extravagant language and an egotism which causes him to regard all opposition to his views as a personal affront have rendered him incapable of properly estimating the trend and effect of some of his utterances. One shudders to think what he would say of a Republican protective tariff law if he were not a Republican and a protectionist.

This editorial comment of the Creston, Iowa, Advertiser, is approvingly quoted by the American Economist, organ in chief of the stand-patters. I read the Economist very closely, because it is very ably edited and because it is the highest authority on stand-patism. As you let that extract from Governor Cummins percolate through your brains remember that he is one of the strongest Republicans in the United States, a power in his party. By reading it in connection with the Advertiser's comment, as quoted approvingly by the Economist, one may accurately measure the quantity and quality of harmony now existing in the Republican party. It is Kilkenny-cat harmony intensified and aggravated.

Mr. LACEY. I would ask my friend if that statement is Republican, was not there a stronger Democratic symptom in it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes [laughter]; a Democratic symptom that in all human probability will land somewhere

from 25 to 50 per cent of the Republican voters of Iowa in the Democratic columns. God be praised! [Great laughter.]

I am not going to rest on what Governor Cummins said, for there is an old saying that "one swallow does not make a summer." Here is the testimony, clear and strong, of another eminent Republican witness. In November the Republicans of Massachusetts got their second wind and elected a Republican governor in the person of Hon. Curtis Guild, jr. When he was elected he was so tickled by his success that he took his pen in hand and wrote a very affectionate epistle to the President of the United States. It is one that Horace Greeley would have characterized as "mighty interesting reading." Here it is, some of it:

MY DEAR PRESIDENT: We have had a hard-fought election in Massachusetts.

Notwithstanding the fact that Roosevelt carried the State by 170,000 in 1904. Now, listen:

The Republican ticket, in my judgment, would have been overwhelmingly defeated if our platform, on which both Mr. Draper and I stood—

Draper was the candidate for lieutenant-governor—

had not contained a plank indorsing the position taken last spring by our delegation in Congress favoring an immediate tariff revision.

Bless your soul, "immediate tariff revision!" Light is breaking in the East at last. These Old Bay State Republicans can't wait; they demand "immediate tariff revision"—yes, "immediate."

Now, if Massachusetts, which Charles Sumner claimed cradled the Republican party, although the Michiganders claim that it was born out in Jackson under the oaks—if Massachusetts is in danger of going with the Democrats on tariff revision, it is high time the solons of this House were turning their most careful attention to the subject.

The Governor continues:

Both parties in this State desire it.

That is, immediate tariff revision.

We recognize, as Republicans, the magnificent prosperity that has come to us so largely through your own personal work.

He means President Roosevelt's work.

The opinion of Governor Guild, when he wrote that letter, evidently was that President Roosevelt makes the seasons come and go, makes the sun shine and the rains from heaven descend.

After handing that taffy to the President, Governor Guild, still declaring himself a protectionist, referring to the Dingley bill, says:

In that tariff, however, there are certain duties that we must all admit are no longer needed. Nothing was said in the campaign here in regard to the iron schedule, as a whole.

I think you will find, however, that even the iron manufacturers themselves will admit that a duty on iron ore is no longer necessary and that a reduction on such iron products as we are exporting so heavily could be made without injuring our domestic industry.

Here in Massachusetts the duty on hides is an anathema. It is known that only 23 per cent of the hides and skins that come into the United States are subject to duty, and it seems perfectly illogical that calfskins, sheepskins, and goatskins should come in free as a by-product not needing protection, while a duty is assessed on the skins of full-grown cattle.

I have the honor to inclose a canvass of New England on the subject of such hides. It will show you that the shoe manufacturers of this section are clamoring merely for tariff revision on the products of other States, but that they themselves are willing to submit to a reduction of the duties on boots and shoes if the last remnant of this needless duty can be removed from their material.

There can be no question of the desire of the overwhelming majority of the people of this State for attention to such matters as this in the immediate revision of the tariff.

Nor can there be any question of their urgent desires that you should see your way clear to incorporate some suggestion of the kind, which, of course, I should not for a moment presume to dictate in your message.

I am sure you know, sir, the deep loving affection of the people of this Commonwealth for you. They trust you, sir, more absolutely than any other man in public life. I am sure you will understand that I have not the slightest intention of forestalling any action of yours; nor is this letter given to the press although I have not the slightest objection to your quoting it or using it in any way you desire. I do deem it, however, my duty with the trust that has just been placed in my hands to inform you of the real condition of public feeling in this Commonwealth, as your every act shows that no Commonwealth is dearer to you than the Bay State, and that not even her own representatives are more earnest than you in wishing her welfare.

That pathetic and eloquent appeal seems to have fallen on deaf ears.

Let us see what the situation is. Here is Massachusetts "kneeling with the rest," to borrow a phrase from one of her most illustrious sons, joining hands with Iowa, clear across the continent nearly, in favor of tariff revision, Cummins and Guild—par nobile fratrum—and that crowd are, in the parlance of the present day, called "tariff rippers;" the rest of you gentlemen are called "tariff stand-patters." That is a phrase Senator Hanna borrowed from the poker table. [Laughter.] If he were living to-day and read the newspapers he would think the Republican party held "a bobtailed flush" on the tariff question. [Loud laughter.]

Last summer there was a reciprocity convention out in Chicago. It was attended by a great many eminent Republicans, among them Uncle SHELBY M. CULLOM, senior and perpetual Senator from Illinois, who prides himself on his physical resemblance to Abraham Lincoln. [Laughter.] He made about as good a reciprocity speech on that occasion as a "tariff ripper" could have made. Since that he seems to have returned to his stand-pat wallow. The cause of his apparent change of base was, I apprehend, that when the reciprocity convention was in session he was hard pressed about his reelection to the Senate. Having got all the opposition out of the way he falls in again with the dominant wing of his party.

The devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
The devil was well, the devil a monk was he.

That convention declared in favor of one of the most beautiful theories I have ever heard of, "a maximum and minimum tariff." That is the great panacea which is to cure all the ills that American human flesh is heir to, and its supporters were from Massachusetts to California. Now, that scheme worked all right until Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE introduced a bill in the United States Senate fixing a minimum and a maximum tariff rate with the Dingley rate for the "steady-tariff company," so to speak, with a sliding scale favoring the nations below us in tariff rates and a sliding scale to punish other nations above us in tariff rates. Clearly the Senator strives to please. That is such an elastic proposition that it might please anybody, because nobody can tell precisely what it means. Therefore everybody can construe it to suit himself. To stand-patters it means to "let well enough alone." To "tariff rippers" it means tariff "readjustment." To advocates of reciprocity it means "reciprocity." The moving cause of the Senator's activity is the awful scare Massachusetts Republicans received last fall. He is decidedly in favor of free hides for Massachusetts factories, for he says so himself. But, priding himself on his Republicanism, he rashly declared that he wanted no help from Democrats in tariff revision. It must be done by its friends, the Republicans, so he says. If he lives till the stand-patters give Massachusetts what she seeks in the way of tariff revision, they will have to substitute the name of HENRY CABOT LODGE for that of Methuselah as "the oldest man that ever lived." The illustrious Senator is mistaken. He will change his mind and accept the help of Democrats, for Massachusetts factories must have free raw materials or they will perish from the earth. Indeed, he misstates the case, for he and his constituents will be forced to help the Democrats instead of the Democrats helping him and his. A reasonable revision of the exorbitant Dingley rates is a Democratic proposition, not Republican. It is well to have an understanding on that point now. We welcome Senator LODGE and his Republican constituents as allies in this sane and pleasing movement for the general welfare.

What do the Massachusetts Republicans want in the way of tariff reform? They want free hides, free coal, free lumber, free raw materials for their factories; but the Massachusetts tariff reformers need not conclude suddenly and prematurely that all the rest of the tariff reformers in this country are idiots. They can get free hides provided they will cut down the tariff on boots and shoes and harness and leather sufficiently, but they will not get free hides unless they do that. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Missouri support a proposition for free hides coupled with a proposition to take the duty off the products of leather?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So quick that it would make your head swim. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. At all events, then, we have a valuable ally.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You have got me right now on that.

Senator LODGE, as I understand it, advocates repealing the tariff on hides, because "it is such a little one," two million and something. Now, if they will go the whole hog up there and remove the tariff on boots, shoes, and leather, we can come to an agreement and pass it through this House.

But there are "stand-patters"—and I have one in my eye right now—who never yield an inch. My distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. MCCLEARY] heads the list—like Abou Ben Adhem's, "his name leads all the rest." He has introduced into this House "a maximum and minimum tariff bill" that makes the cold chills creep up and down the spinal columns of the reciprocity shouters. His maximum and minimum tariff

bill is to make the Dingley rates the minimum and only Omniscience can tell what the maximum would be. [Laughter.] I admire his courage. He is consistent in wrongdoing. When the Republican reciprocity brethren read the McCleary bill they must have been in a frame of mind to exclaim with Truthful James on a celebrated occasion:

Do I sleep, do I dream?
Do I wonder and doubt?
Are things what they seem?
Or is visions about?
Is our civilization a failure?
Is the Caucasian played out?

Somewhere in the Bible there is an account given of a man out of whom the devils were cast, and he seemed to be in good condition, like a house swept and garnished. Then the devils in increased numbers got into him again, and the verdict of the Bible on that man is that "his last state was worse than his first." And that will be precisely the fix in which the reciprocity reformers will find themselves when Brother McCLEARY'S bill is enacted into law.

There is another remarkable statement in the papers. I do not vouch for the truth of it at all. I give it as I read it. That is, that the President of the United States entered into a modus vivendi with the Speaker of this House [laughter] by which the Speaker is to permit or facilitate—whichever is the proper word—railroad-rate regulation during this session, provided the President will not send in any message in favor of tariff revision.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my friend a most important question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does he believe one word of that story?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not on the witness stand. [Laughter.] Modus vivendi! John G. Saxe says that Sancho Panza said: "God bless the man who first invented sleep." Divers other persons must say: "God bless the man who first invented that convenient phrase 'modus vivendi.'" Like the mantle of charity, it covers a multitude of sins. The President of the United States entered into a modus vivendi with his great and good friend President Morales, of Santo Domingo, and Morales has taken to the woods, carrying his Government and the modus vivendi with him. Now the papers say that the Administration is trying to cook up a modus vivendi with Germany. We are likely to have a surplus lot of modus vivendi on hand. [Laughter.]

I saw the other day in a newspaper that Mr. Secretary of State Root is engaged in tutoring Mr. Secretary Shaw, of the Treasury, on the subject of the tariff with Germany! That is the most astounding statement that has been made since "the stars fell." I am not certain but it is the most amazing statement that has been made since the morning stars first sang together for joy. Tutor Mr. Secretary Shaw in the art of tariff making? It's a thing incredible! Does he not stand at the very head of the "stand-pat" element in this country? The chief among 10,000, if not altogether lovely! [Laughter.] Does he not, with hand on his heart, solemnly reiterate the declaration of the Republican platform that "A Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a Republican tariff by business prosperity?"

Does he not religiously believe that a man can lift himself over the fence by tugging at his own boot straps? Is he not firm in the faith that a people can make themselves rich beyond the dreams of avarice by taxing themselves within an inch of their lives? And, last of all, did he not a little while ago discover the remarkable fact that a high protective tariff increases imports into this country, when the doctrine had always been, and the very reason that the law was passed was, that a high protective tariff diminishes imports and if high enough shuts them out altogether, thereby giving the American manufacturer the control of the American market? That discovery certainly entitles Secretary Shaw to rank with Copernicus, Galileo, Sir Isaac Newton, Lord Bacon, and Christopher Columbus.

Now, if Secretary Root should undertake to tutor him on any subject under heaven other than the tariff there would be some sense in it. I would like to be where I could hear and see that performance of tutoring him on the tariff. Certain as you live the Secretary of State will lead a strenuous life when he essays that stunt. Under his administration of the Treasury it has been solemnly decided that frogs' legs imported into this country must come in as poultry. [Laughter.] Under his administration of the Treasury it has been decided that a pony shipped into this country must come in as household goods. Under his administration of the Treasury it has been decided that a rooster is not a breeding animal! Governor Shaw is a very amiable man. He is possessed of a brilliant intellect. He is one of the best public speakers in this country. He is a delightful raconteur. If the stand-patters control the next Republican national convention—and it is a ten to one shot that they will—and if they do not nominate him for President of the United States, they will demonstrate that not only republics, but stand-pat Republicans as well, are ungrateful. If they control that convention, he is destined to be the Republican standard bearer, unless there rides into the Presidential lists that grim and grizzled warrior, JOSEPH G. CANNON, of Illinois. [Great applause.]

What is the trouble about the tariff here now? What is the pressing necessity of the case? I will tell you what it is. Germany has passed a new tariff bill, raising its rates on imports from this country sky-high. That bill goes into effect next March.

Every American citizen is or should be interested in the subject.

In the calendar year 1904—the last for which I have seen the figures—we bought from Germany about one hundred and twenty-four millions of dollars' worth of her products and sold to her about two hundred and thirty-six million dollars' worth of our products—constituting about one-sixth of our total exports. Of our two hundred and thirty-six millions of dollars' worth of exports to Germany, $53,877,500 were food products, as follows:

Fresh apples	$625,000
Oil cake	5,525,000
Sausage casings, etc	2,625,000
Clover seed	832,500
Linseed	375,000
Bran	186,000
Malt germs	417,750
Wheat	6,675,000
Wheat flour	291,000
Maize	4,825,000
Cotton-seed oil	2,825,000
Tallow	1,425,000
Lard	16,300,000
Oleomargarine	4,475,000
Beef	525,000
Pork	25,000
Hams	25,000
Bacon	375,000
Salt fish	600,000
Butter	125,250
Dried fruit	4,800,000
Total	53,877,500

During the calendar year of 1904 Germany bought of us raw materials to the value of $160,262,000, as follows:

Cotton	$84,375,000
Cotton waste	2,075,000
Copper	30,025,000
Lead	1,050,000
Aluminium	220,750
Zinc ore	358,250
Resin, etc	2,975,000
Turpentine, etc	4,200,000
Acetate of lime, etc	775,000
Phosphate of lime, etc	3,800,000
Wood spirit	$342,750
India rubber	265,250
Hides	1,200,000
Fur skins, etc	1,675,000
Petroleum and mineral lubricants	17,425,000
Stearic and palmitic acid	875,000
Lumber	6,675,000
Tobacco	1,950,000
Total	160,262,000

These two tables show:

Food products	$53,877,500
Raw materials	160,262,000
Grand total	214,139,500

The rest of the $236,000,000 worth of products which we sold to Germany in 1904 consisted of manufactured articles.

Let each Representative here from the great agricultural or mining section scan those tables closely and decide whether his constituents will be benefited by a tariff war with Germany—to say nothing of a tariff war with combined Europe, of which the tariff war with Germany is only the forerunner.

I represent one of the richest agricultural districts in the world, and my constituents are interested in selling to Germany nearly ever article in the foregoing table of exports of food products to Germany and in several of the articles in the table of our raw materials which Germany buys from us.

I want to read to the Members just a few of the things that this German tariff is going to do for us.

The memorial I am about to read was sent to Congress by the American Reciprocal Tariff League. Does this league consist of a batch of "hare-brained free-traders?" No. On the contrary, this memorial is headed up with a fine portrait of President McKinley, flanked by quotations from his farewell speech at Buffalo. It is signed by eastern and western Republicans, New England manufacturers, Iowa farmers, editors of farm journals, and men from all walks of life. It is a great protest

against the Dingley tariff bill, which has brought upon us already the beginnings of a tariff war in which most of the nations of the earth will probably join, unless something is speedily done to prevent it. Germany, Argentina, and China are already getting into the band wagon—the latter countries doing so doubtless because of the influence of Germany, paramount in both cases.

This memorial is one of the results of the Chicago conference, and the league is formed of delegates to that remarkable meeting. Among the influential Republicans signing the memorial no names carry greater weight to the thoughtful mind than those of Alvin H. Saunders, of the Breeders' Gazette, and Harry C. Wallace, of Wallace's Farmer, the greatest farm journals in America, one published in Chicago, the other in Des Moines. No one can estimate too high the influence of these great journals with the farmers of the beef and pork producing regions. There is scarcely a farmer in Iowa who does not read one or both of them. From them they get the world's best thought on topics of direct interest to the farmer and stock raiser. Here is a fair sample of the argument contained in the memorial to which these men's names are signed. Will such arguments make Republican or Democratic votes in the West?

This convention was preeminently and at base an agrarian demonstration. The farmers and stockmen of the corn belt and the range are not sharing in any fair degree in the undoubted prosperity that has come to the chief beneficiaries of the law as mutilated by a Senatorial minority. They are being robbed of markets for their surplus products which could be opened to them through the medium of reciprocal tariff concessions. For example:

Germany is the second largest buyer of food products in the world. She would probably take from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000 worth of American farm products annually under any fair scheme of reciprocity. France would buy perhaps one-half as much under reasonable trading arrangements. The American farmer has a $4,500,000,000 crop of cereals this year. The application of scientific methods is vastly enlarging our soil production. There is ordinarily an enormous surplus of farm products in excess of domestic wants. Heavy buying by Germany in anticipation of the closing of the ports of the Empire against us March 1, 1906, is helping our grain markets some just now, but what of the future? Let us quote from the Department of Commerce and Labor on the conditions to be met after the date mentioned:

"The rates on provisions have been greatly advanced by the new German tariff. Bacon, which hitherto paid the highest ad valorem in the list of provisions coming from the United States—viz, 23 per cent—is advanced 80 per cent in the new general tariff, while no rate is provided for in the conventional tariff. The duty on pork, which amounted to 21 per cent ad valorem in 1903, is advanced 176 per cent.

"The duty on beef, amounting to 15 per cent ad valorem in 1903, is raised 200 per cent under the new general and 80 per cent under the conventional tariff. Lard, with a duty of 11 per cent ad valorem in 1903, will be subject to a rate 25 per cent higher in the new general tariff, while in the new conventional the rate remains unchanged. Agricultural machinery, which pays on the average about 4 per cent ad valorem, will be subject to rates from 20 per cent to 88 per cent higher, according to the weight."

Indian corn is king in the agriculture of the Middle West. It can be best marketed in the form of meats, in the production of which we lead the world. It is all well enough to point to the enormous dividends and surplus of the iron masters and sugar refiners and to cite that as a good and sufficient reason for "letting well enough alone," but the prospects of thousands of hardworking farmers in the great feeding and grazing States are not so alluring. Receipts of cattle at Chicago this fall have run from 10,000 to 30,000 head weekly in excess of the known home requirements, the result being heavy losses to growers. A market that can care for, say, 60,000 cattle per week at prices profitable to the producer can not digest 100,000. While this glut is seen at home, a meat famine exists in Europe. With train loads of bullocks selling as low as $3.50 per hundredweight in Chicago and with dressed beef wholesaled there at 6 cents per pound, live cattle and swine are worth in Germany 15 cents per pound. Surely there is something out of joint economically when such a state of affairs exists.

Those are a few of the things that that German tariff is going to do for us, unless we enter into rational reciprocal relations with her. I have not time to go over the entire list. I want to say, and I say it in all earnestness, that if the German tariff goes into effect next March the price of cattle will go down, the price of hogs will go down, the price of wheat will go down, the price of corn will go down, the price of lard, butter, dried fruits, and every product of the farm will go down.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the gentleman from Missouri therefore advocate that the American people shall be dictated to by every foreign nation that undertakes to fix our tariff rate for us or shall we have some independent character of our own, as we always have had, and let these people take care of themselves as they have always tried to do?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is a pertinent question fairly asked, and I will answer it with as much candor as it is asked. I hope I am fully as good and true an American as he or any other man is. While I am always willing to fight, if there is any sufficient reason for it, I have no hankering after a fight merely for the sake of a fight. I believe in the Jeffersonian doctrine: "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none." The gentleman in this tariff matter seems to be in the frame of mind of the fellow that Edmund Burke told about, who was bent on shearing a wolf. Kind friends explained to him the hazard, futility, and profitlessness of the undertaking, but he insisted on shearing the wolf, to his own great grief and to much laceration of his own flesh.

Commerce is not a one-sided or jug-handled affair. It must be arranged and maintained on a basis of fair exchange. If we could run the world's commerce, if we were the only producers of food products and raw materials, we would be in position to dictate terms to all the peoples of the earth and to assume the position which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] seems to assume. But "there are others"—several other nations engaged in creating food products and raw materials—and we would be more courageous than wise to slap Germany squarely in the face, for she, next to Great Britain, is the largest customer for our food products and raw materials. Our farmers have a vast surplus of products to sell, and they desire more to secure profitable markets for their surplus than to maintain at a dead loss—a great loss, a ruinous loss—the stand-pat tariff theory.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is there now or was there ever in the history of commercial intercourse between two nations a time when a nation that was compelled to buy $500,000,000 worth of bread—using the term for foodstuff—can dictate to a nation that produces enormous quantities to sell the terms upon which international exchanges shall be made? Suppose, now, that they bar our breadstuffs and everything else of the kind, how long would it be until Germany would be on its knees begging for an opportunity to buy our breadstuffs? It has been stated to me by an authority which I have no doubt about that if there was a cordon of ships drawn around the British islands so that there could be no import of food products, in ninety days there would be enormous suffering for food by the British people. Does that proposition not apply to every other nation of the world that does not produce its own food products?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That proposition applies partially to every nation on earth that does not produce its own food supply. If this were the only nation that produced a surplus of food supplies, then the gentleman's question would be decisive of this contest.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman state a nation that is able to do it—in actual figures. I have such a great admiration for the gentleman's imagination that I must ask him to deal in facts on this question. I want to know what nation now can supply its own demand first and then supply the German people if they bar the American producer out of their market?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The South American republics can furnish Germany and England all of the food supplies that they need. One deplorable result of our high-tariff policy is that it has set South America, Australia, India, and Russia to raising in large and ever-increasing quantities the identical food products which our farmers produce. And now the stand-patters are recklessly for a tariff war with combined Europe.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And at cheaper rates, I presume, than we can?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then, may I ask my friend why we have had the enormous traffic in these commodities up to the very date of the assembling of this Congress—traffic with those two nations? Do they buy where they can buy the cheapest, or where they have to pay the dearest price?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The reason they have been buying from us more than they have been buying from the South American republics is that we have bought more from them. Precisely. They, as well as we, made money by trading with each other.

I thought I had here the exact figures about the Argentine Republic's production of foodstuffs, but I find I have misplaced them; but here is an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat bearing directly on the subject. The gentleman from Ohio ought to believe the Globe-Democrat, for it is high Republican authority. It says:

The United States exports of wheat and flour are increasing, but they are far below the figures for some of the recent years at this time. For the fiscal year 1905, which ended on June 30, the exports of wheat and of flour counted as wheat were only 44,000,000 bushels, which were below the shipments of any previous year for a third of a century. There is likely to be a gain for the twelve months ending with next June, but the exports will be small compared with those of 1902 or 1903.

The wheat crop of 1905 will figure up about 700,000,000 bushels. It is the largest crop ever grown in this country except in 1901, when it was 748,000,000. While we exported 216,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1901, we will not send out half that quantity this year. Our balance of trade will have to be created by the exports of cotton, of mining and forestry products, and of manufactures. Happily our sales of manufactures abroad are increasing with great speed.

We still lead all the countries of the world in wheat production, and raise more than a fifth of the world's aggregate yield, but Russia and Argentina are furnishing more wheat now to the great importing markets of Europe than the United States. We produce more than two-thirds of the world's corn, but Argentina is getting ahead of us in corn exports. She consumes comparatively little of her wheat and corn at home, while we use the greater part of ours.

That Globe-Democrat editorial fits the case like a glove and fully answers the question of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will allow me, I would supplement that statement with the following statement: That during good times—a synonymous term for Republican times—the average American citizen consumes 25 per cent more of the products of the earth than he does during hard times—the synonymous term being Democratic times—and in that way the gentleman will understand the reason why we have not shipped our food stuffs abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well; we shall see about that. You are entitled to all the applause you will receive on that statement when we are through discussing it. Now, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is a very distinguished man. I think a great deal of him personally. I have tried my everlasting best to enlighten his intellect in a great many debates we have had, but his mind seems to be as impervious to a fact of history as a duck's back is to a gentle April shower. As a complete reply to and refutation of what he has just said about Republican times being synonymous with good times and Democratic times being synonymous with hard times, I will now read you the evidence of a most distinguished Republican. I would not think of quoting a Democrat to Republicans. James Gillespie Blaine assuredly had some standing in the Republican party. He was fondly called "the Plumed Knight." He was its well-beloved leader—its chosen chieftain—one of the most brilliant men that ever figured in American politics. I will not run a parallel between him and the gentleman from Ohio. When Blaine came to write a book—mind you, not making a stump speech—not even in the heat and excitement of a debate in Congress, where any man might be mistaken as to his facts, but when he sat down calmly in the quiet of his library with all of the facilities and the leisure for investigation to write a book on which he proposed to rest his fame with posterity, he wrote what I am going to read, and I will give it as my literary opinion—you can take it for what it is worth—that Blaine's book is the best historical work ever written in America: that is, the first volume, which was composed before he was embittered by his defeat for the Presidency. There has been constant iteration and reiteration by Republicans of the statement in the Republican platform, which the gentleman from Ohio has parodied, that a Republican tariff is always followed by business prosperity and a Democratic tariff by business adversity. There is not a syllable of truth in it. Here is what Blaine said, and if I had my way about it every Republican in the United States should commit this passage to memory and recite it every morning regularly, when he got up, as part of his prayers. [Laughter.]

> The Whig victory of 1848 was not sufficiently decisive to warrant any attempt, even had there been desire, to change the tariff. General Taylor had been elected without subscribing to a platform or pledging himself to a specific measure, and he was therefore in a position to resist and reject appeals of the ordinary partisan character. Moreover, the tariff of 1846—

and that is the only genuinely Democratic tariff bill ever passed by the American Congress. It is called the "Walker tariff," and was so thoroughly Democratic that it was only gotten through the Senate by the casting vote of the Vice-President, George M. Dallas. Usually the Vice-President's chief function is to wait for a dead man's shoes—truly a most grewsome position—but two or three times in our history the Vice-Presidents, acting in their capacity as Presidents of the Senate, have given casting votes which have made history, and Dallas did it. Now, here is what Blaine said about that tariff:

> Moreover, the tariff of 1846 was yielding abundant revenue, and the business of the country was in a flourishing condition at the time his administration was organized. Money became very abundant after the year 1849; large enterprises were undertaken; speculation was prevalent, and for a considerable period the prosperity of the country was general and apparently genuine. After 1852 the Democrats had almost undisputed control of the Government, and had gradually become a free-trade party. The principles embodied in the tariff of 1846 seemed for the time to be so entirely vindicated and approved that resistance to it ceased, not only among the people but among the protection economists, and even among the manufacturers to a large extent. So general was the acquiescence that in 1856 a protective tariff was not even suggested or even hinted by any one of the three parties which presented Presidential candidates.

And that is the only period in our history when such unanimity existed on the subject of the tariff—the only one. I defy any mortal man to point out another period concerning which Blaine's statement would be true.

With all due respect to the gentleman from Ohio, with all due respect to the majority, with all due respect to every politician or statesman now living, the extract I have just read is a complete and overwhelming answer to the declaration of the Republican platform that was repeated by General GROSVENOR in substance, that is repeated by Secretary Shaw every time he makes a speech and thinks of it, to the effect that the Republican tariff is always followed by business prosperity and a Democratic tariff by business adversity. We ought never to hear that fable again so long as the earth spins around on its axis or slides down the elliptic.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, if the gentleman will allow an interruption, I know it will not disconcert him, because nothing I can say will disturb the peace of mind in which he constantly moves upon this question. The tariff of 1846, the Walker tariff, was immediately followed by the Mexican war, and that by the great discovery of gold in California.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And Mr. Blaine wrote of that period of 1852 in which an abnormal condition existed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But Mr. Blaine has pointed out that in 1857 the hardest times that ever came to the American people came when the Democratic party destroyed the Walker tariff bill and substituted another one that finally precipitated the country into practically general bankruptcy; so that in order to read Mr. Blaine correctly and get the full benefit of his opinion you must not stop at a single period, but you must carry out the illustration that the gentleman himself draws so graphically and eloquently.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is the gentleman willing to stand on that statement?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do, most undoubtedly. I have stood on it a great many times.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, it is true, gentlemen, that the Mexican war intervened, and that undoubtedly helped prosperity. It is true that the great discoveries of gold in California intervened, as well as those in Australia. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] left out that part of his case. But that discovery helped. It is true that there was a panic.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Is it not true, too, that during that period the Crimean war came?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is also true; that was an element in the prosperity of those years. I want to be fair. We can all be honest if we can not be great. [Laughter.] I will state the whole case, and I will state it so that nobody who hears can ever forget it. That those events helped the prosperity that Blaine speaks of as extending from 1846 to 1857 is beyond all cavil. In the fall of 1857 there was a spell of hard times.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It lasted two years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; it lasted two years. The Globe-Democrat, in an unguarded moment, when some great banks broke recently, said editorially, in comparing the present situation with that of 1857: "The wild speculation in western lands and in constructing railways beyond the immediate needs of the country, which were the chief causes of the wreck in 1857, are conspicuously absent now." That is the truth, and was stated to help reassure the people last summer when there was a decidedly panicky feeling abroad in the land. Surely the gentleman, who has a great reputation at stake in all he says or does, will not claim for one moment that the Democratic Administrations of Pierce and Polk or the Whig Administrations of Taylor and Fillmore were in any way responsible for that wild speculation in western land and in railway construction, for that would be preposterous, too preposterous even for him to assert or for even Republicans to believe. Neither is it true that in 1857, or at any other time, the Democrats destroyed the Walker tariff bill and substituted another which precipitated the country into general bankruptcy. That is where the distinguished gentleman from Ohio fell down. I will give you a history of that transaction.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman state whether the tariff of 1857, which was a Democratic tariff, did not reduce the schedules of the Walker tariff bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If you will let me alone for ten consecutive minutes I will state it exactly as it is.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am sure I have no right to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; the gentleman has a perfect right to do so. I am always glad that he does it. It may be said of him what Doctor Johnson said of Oliver Goldsmith: "He touches nothing which he does not adorn."

The tariff bill of 1857, which the gentleman says precipitated universal bankruptcy, was not a Democratic measure, as I will presently demonstrate. That's fact No. 1 in the chapter of our legislative and political history which I am now stating.

The Walker tariff bill, which I repeat was the only thoroughly Democratic tariff bill ever placed upon our statute books, and for which Democrats not only cheerfully but proudly and enthusiastically assumed all the responsibility and claim all the honors for it wrought gloriously for our country's prosperity, was in force from July 30, 1846, when James K. Polk signed it, till March 3, 1857, when Franklin Pierce signed the tariff bill

of 1857, modifying the Walker tariff bill. Please bear these dates carefully in mind, as they are absolutely decisive of the controversy between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and myself here to-day and betwixt all Democrats and all Republicans at all times, at all places, and under all circumstances. If plain, unvarnished, undisputed, and incontrovertible facts of history can prove anything in this world, I will suddenly and for all time establish the Democratic contention on the eternal rock of truth and prove beyond even the shadow of a doubt that the Republican platform declaration of 1904 that "A Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity, a Republican tariff by business prosperity," is a glittering, transparent, and stupendous fable. I use the word fable instead of a shorter and harsher synonym because I desire to observe all the parliamentary proprieties. I confidently place the well-established truths of history against bald assertions. I am so certain that the tariff bill of 1857 was not a Democratic tariff measure that I most heartily thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] for his interruption.

That bill became a law of the land on the last day of the life of the Thirty-fourth Congress, the 3d day of March, 1857.

The House of Representatives of that Congress was not Democratic. It was composed of 83 Democrats, 108 Republicans, and 43 Americans, popularly dubbed "Knownothings," making 234 Members all told, 118 constituting a majority of the House. The combined opposition to the Democrats had a majority of 68. The Senate was Democratic; so was the President, Franklin Pierce. After a long and bitter contest Gen. Nathaniel Prentiss Banks, of Massachusetts, was elected Speaker, the first Republican Speaker.

It is known to every intelligent person that tariff bills, called revenue bills, must originate in the House. Consequently the tariff bill of 1857, of whose effect the gentleman from Ohio complains, and which supplanted the Walker Democratic tariff bill, originated in and was passed by an anti-Democratic House, therefore it is clearly a non-Democratic measure. Its character was not changed into a Democratic measure by being agreed to by a Democratic Senate and signed by a Democratic President.

Truth to tell, it may be said to have been passed by common consent of all parties, and it was so passed, because on the 3d day of March, 1857, the country was enjoying unbounded prosperity and there was an overflowing Treasury. Among hands they cut the rates too low for a good revenue measure, and when the evil days came in the fall of 1857, produced, as the Globe-Democrat says, by wild speculation in western lands and in building superfluous railroads, it did not bring in enough money to run the Government.

How any well-informed or candid person can claim that that bill of 1857, non-Democratic though it was, produced the panic in the autumn of 1857 is a puzzle; for hard times extended at that period over the face of the entire civilized globe, and certainly no man who has any reputation for wisdom or veracity to lose will jeopardize it by asserting that any tariff law passed by us can create hard times all over the world.

The only difficulty about the tariff bill of 1857 was that, hard times coming on unexpectedly, it did not raise revenue enough to pay the expenses of the Government.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Is not that the gentleman's present position?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No, sir; most assuredly I am always in favor of revenue enough to run the Government, economically administered—which is the Democratic theory. You are running behind now at the rate of about a half million dollars a day, are you not?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, no. The gentleman's prognostication upon that subject is not good. In the last Congress, it will be remembered, he predicted that at this time we would be hunting around for some source of revenue, and talked about increased taxation. Where is that ghost of increased taxation now?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You will be hunting around for it before you get away from here.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Not at all. We are able to meet every demand of the time and leave a surplus at the end of the year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the gentleman a question now, while he is on his feet. Turn about is fair play.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are we going to have any river and harbor bill at this session?

Mr. GROSVENOR. If we need one.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman knows that we need it. Don't try to get out of it in that way. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. My recollection is that under a Democratic Congress, during which I had the honor to be on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, at the end of the second session we passed a moderate river and harbor bill, and a Democratic President vetoed it. Now, last year, at the end of the Fifty-eighth Congress, we passed a large river and harbor bill. Under our new system of contracting we shall not need a new river and harbor bill except for new or comparatively new projects, so that the sundry civil bill will carry the amount of appropriation for the rivers and harbors far in advance of any that the Democrats have ever passed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, gentlemen, I want you to bear witness to that testimony. That statement is made ex cathedra. The gentleman well speaks as "one having authority."

Mr. GROSVENOR. But not as a scribe.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He belongs to the great triumvirate in this House that runs things, composed of the Speaker and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and the gentleman from Ohio. He is one of the "Three Czars," and you men who want anything done for the rivers and harbors in your districts hearken unto his voice, for according to his statement just made there is not going to be anything done except on work that has already been started.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I hope the gentleman will not misrepresent the organization of the House. The river and harbor bill is a privileged bill, and does not require the action of the Committee on Rules. I hope the gentleman will remember that in all the future of his life.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will; and I will tell you what else I will remember—that whenever they get up a bill of any importance and get it through the House without the consent of the Committee on Rules I will be willing to exclaim with one of old: "Now, Lord, lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace." [Great laughter and applause.] I do not want you kindergarten Congressmen here, especially, to labor under any misapprehension as to what is going to happen to you, because the gentleman from Ohio has told you. If there is any work going on in your district that has to be continued to keep it from going to ruin you will get a little money; but if there is any new work, no matter how important or pressing, you are not going to get a cent for it, because they have not got the money to give. This blessed Dingley bill, the fount of every blessing, has produced a deficiency in the revenues to the amount of sixty or seventy millions of dollars. Now, I will ask the gentleman from Ohio——

Mr. PAYNE. Now, the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. Which bill do you refer to?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Dingley bill. If you had a good tariff bill you would have had enough money to carry on these improvements.

Mr. PAYNE. Such a one as the Wilson bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A revenue-producing bill, such as I would draw if I had the power to pass it.

Mr. PAYNE. The Wilson bill, under which we were running behind every year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Supreme Court had not held the income-tax provision unconstitutional we would have got plenty of revenue from the Wilson bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman that the income-tax provision would have not produced money enough to make a grease spot under the Wilson bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The only reason why it would not was stated by Mr. COCKRAN, of New York, who said that it would have made the wealthy men of New York get into the habit of committing perjury to keep the taxes from being collected on their incomes.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is quoting from a distinguished Democrat upon that. To return to what I was just saying, as to there not being any deficit this year because there will be no river and harbor bill. It would not make any difference whether there was a river and harbor bill this year or not. All that money would not come out of the Treasury until the end of the fiscal year. In the last session we provided liberally for rivers and harbors, and that money is now being paid out of the money in the Treasury.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, let me ask you whether there is going to be any public-building bill reported this year? Now, answer that—yes or no.

Mr. PAYNE. I am not a member of that committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But you are the floor leader in this House.

Mr. PAYNE. If any such bill was brought in here as was brought in during the last Congress I should oppose it with the utmost vigor I have.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Gentlemen, I am sorry to see the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means resort to dodging in this debate. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I mean is that you do not tell us frankly whether we are going to have a public-building bill or not.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why don't you know? [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. Because, like the gentleman from Missouri, I have not been consulted on that subject.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why do you not consult the Speaker and those gentlemen on the Committee on Rules?

Mr. PAYNE. So far as I am concerned, I am not interested in public buildings.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, yes; that's it; you have got yours. [Great laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is right about that. I commenced in a Democratic Congress many years ago.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You have been here a long time. When these kindergarten statesmen have sat here as long as you have they will get some too.

Mr. PAYNE. On that I had little experience, and if I were commencing with the "kindergarten class" I would not introduce a bill for a public building in my district.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What does the gentleman from Ohio say about a public-building bill? I want to get at the facts. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. On that question I am a single Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, you are; and much more. You are one of the governing trio—one of the ruling elders.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I shall pass upon a public-building bill exactly as I pass upon other questions that come before this House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will ask you a leading question: Do you know whether it is the intention of the managers of this Congress that there shall not be any river and harbor bill, except as you have described, and there shall be no public-building bill at this session, in order to make buckle and tongue meet?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not understand either branch of that question in the affirmative. I have a suspicion on the river and harbor question, because of an interview given out by the chairman of the committee. As to the public-building question I have no knowledge, no information, and no belief.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to state to you that unless you gentlemen who want public buildings in your districts and improvements of your rivers and harbors break away from and overthrow this Republican machine in the House, which dominates in all things, you are not going to get any at this session of Congress. You can write that on the tablets of your memory now. This is an argumentum ad hominem. I have seen that game played two or three times since I have been here.

But I have been distracted somewhat from the propositions I was stating. While the Walker tariff bill was law there was great growth and prosperity, but the gentleman from Ohio says truly that while it was in force there came a war and there were great discoveries of gold; therefore the gentleman from Ohio concludes, or rather he wants this House to conclude, that the great prosperity described by Mr. Blaine as existing from 1846 to 1857 was produced by the Mexican war, the Crimean war, and the gold discoveries in California and Australia.

Mr. HEPBURN. I suppose you would say that the prosperity of a country might somewhat be measured by its foreign trade?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Possibly to some extent, but not very much.

Mr. HEPBURN. You have extolled the tariff of 1846, and have said that that tariff, continuing up to 1857, was the model Democratic tariff. I have here a statement showing the balances of foreign trade, from 1851, for eleven years; and during ten of those eleven years the balance of trade under that tariff was against the United States.

In the aggregate in the years when the balance was against us, the total balance against us was $442,000,000. In one year, the year 1858, the balance was $8,000,000 and some odd thousands in our favor. Now, under a Republican tariff, with the exception of the period when the Wilson tariff was in force, during eleven years including 1891 and following years, the balance of foreign trade in our favor was $2,692,000,000. So that under the Democratic tariff balances were against us to the aggregate of $442,000,000, while for the same period of time under a Republican tariff the balances were in our favor to the amount of $2,692,000,000. Is not that an indication that this latter system is the better system for the foreign trade?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a minute before you sit down. I want to ask you a question, and then I will answer yours as fully as I can with the material at hand. Do you deny that statement of Blaine's that the years from 1846 to 1857 were years of great prosperity?

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, I would say this: I lived in this country at that time, but I lived upon what might be called the frontier, and I know that those were not times of prosperity for that part of the country. There was penury and want, but probably it was only that which was incidental to a new country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I leave Colonel HEPBURN'S statement and Blaine's statement together, as far as that is concerned. You gentlemen can take your choice. Now, the question that you ask is in the main fair. When it is boiled down it is this: Do balances of trade indicate prosperity or not? That depends entirely upon circumstances. A nation may be very prosperous with a balance of trade against it. It may be very prosperous with a balance of trade in favor of it. Adam Smith stated that many years ago, and he is recognized as one of the leading authorities on political economy.

Mr. HEPBURN. You say that the business of the country may be prosperous and there may be general prosperity with a balance of trade against us. Now, during this period and for two or three years preceding, but during the time that that tariff was in force, eight hundred millions of gold were extracted from the mines of California.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That may be the amount. I do not remember the figures.

Mr. HEPBURN. Of that eight hundred millions of gold we sent out of the country four hundred and twenty-six millions to make good the balance of trade against us. Would you think that it would be possible for this country to have been prosperous at that period but for the accidental discovery of gold in California, with which the Democratic tariff had nothing to do?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A part of that is true and a part is not. Holland has been one of the most prosperous countries for years, with the general balance of trade against it. So has Germany. So has England. Buying stuff does not impoverish a man if he needs the stuff and makes good use of it. So with a nation. While we were a feeble people and did not have any great factories of our own, while we were purely an agricultural people, the balance of trade was against us as a general thing, no matter what party was in power.

The balance of trade may or may not be a test of prosperity. I will put Mr. Blaine's statement as to prosperity of these years as a fact that can not be contradicted. There are two universally accepted standards of prosperity, increase of population and increase of wealth—not in aggregate, but by percentages—and the statistics show that, judged by percentages of increase of wealth and population, any one of the eleven years of the Walker tariff bill was more prosperous than any one of the nine years of the Dingley tariff bill. In no one of the eleven years of the Walker tariff did we increase in population as much in the aggregate as we have in any one of nine years of the Dingley bill, simply because 30,000,000 of people do not propagate as many children as 80,000,000 of people. In no one of the eleven years of the Walker bill did we pile up as much increase of wealth in the aggregate as in any one of the nine years of the Dingley bill, because 30,000,000 of people can not make as much wealth as 83,000,000 of people; and we now have all of these labor-saving devices which so much multiply the wealth-producing capacity of a people. But, judged by percentage in increase of wealth, we increased as much in any one year of the Walker bill as in any one year of the Dingley bill.

But what I started to say was that, granted the Mexican war and the Crimean war and the discovery of gold helped along the prosperity—and I do not desire to deny it—how does that apply to the present situation? Now, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] is no ordinary Congressman. He is a veteran statesman. He is one of the three or four great Republican debaters in this House. He claims that there has been greater prosperity under the Dingley bill than there ever was before. Every Republican claims that and that the Dingley bill produced it. But if the Mexican war and the Crimean war helped to increase the prosperity in 1846 and for the eleven succeeding years, how does it happen that the Spanish war and the Philippine war and the Boer war and the Russo-Japanese war and the greatly increased production of gold in recent years should not be credited with a part of the great prosperity that has come to the American people under the Dingley tariff bill? Why, as a sample, when the Spanish war began the very best mules in Missouri were selling for $75 to $100 apiece. These wars consumed the world's supply of mules. The consequence is that a good pair of mules in Missouri now sells for $300 to $500, and yet that, according to the Republican logic, is credited up to the blessings of the Dingley bill, which didn't have a bit more to do with it than had the ten commandments. [Laughter and applause.] Every man from the South who raises sugar and cotton knows that mules have gone up from the days when the Spanish war began; and if we had that great European war that they are talking about, the price

of mules would go soaring out of sight. A man lives in my district who imports large numbers of Spanish jacks. He had ninety-seven left on hand in the spring of 1898, simply because he could not sell them at any price. He kept them over from necessity. One fine morning he awoke and found himself worth $100,000 in these ninety-seven jacks. The wars did it, not the Dingley bill.

Another thing about it: Suppose the gold production did help to bolster up prosperity from 1846 to 1847—and a man would be an idiot to deny it—what has helped to bolster up this prosperity but the new discoveries of gold that have brought $800,000,000 of gold into this country? That is how much more you have now than in 1896. Also a discovery of a new and cheap process of extracting gold out of the ore, which brought in another third of it in round numbers. When that process was discovered, it did not pay to work gold that did not run ten or fifteen dollars a ton; now you can work it with profit where it produces less than a dollar a ton. Where does the other third come from? I will tell you. In 1897 and 1898 and 1899 and 1900 we had the finest crops that ever grew out of the ground, and they had a crop famine in Europe and Australia, and those hungry people had to pay our farmers practically what they wanted for their products; so that it sent a stream of gold like the river Pactolus flowing into this country, into the arteries of commerce, quickening and fructifying the whole American commerce; and it is a poor rule that does not work both ways.

Mr. HEPBURN. Has the gentleman taken this into account? There is no extraordinary production of gold in the United States, nor has there been during the past eleven years—I mean the domestic production—in relation to the population and the business of this country as compared with the period that I name, from 1849 on. The production of gold then, in proportion to population and in proportion to business, was vastly greater than it is to-day; and then if the gentleman takes into account the production of gold outside of the United States will he explain to us how the United States would have benefited by that if the balance of trade all the time were against us? That foreign production of gold is valuable when customers of ours must send their gold here to liquidate or pay the balance that is against them in foreign trade.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman labors under the misapprehension all the time that if we send a dollar anywhere to buy anything we lose that dollar, and that if a man sends us a dollar over here for any purpose, no difference what we give for it, we gain a dollar. That is not true at all. On the contrary, if we give two dollars' worth of products for the foreigner's one dollar, we lose a dollar in the transaction.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the gentleman will allow me to correct him, I do not have that idea at all; but I have this idea, that if we send a dollar abroad to buy something that we do not make, we get the article that we want and the exchange is equal. There is no advantage to us save that which comes from that commercial transaction. But if we make that thing here at home, we not only have it but we save the dollar that otherwise we should have to send abroad, and that is what makes prosperity.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is not true either.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, one at a time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I know it is hardly fair to double team on the gentleman, but the difference between the man on the floor speaking to an entertained audience and an interloper is about even, two to one. I desire the gentleman to state now, in further illustration of conditions, he having spoken of the vast accumulation of gold which is now in circulation in the United States, supposing that a law had been passed in 1897 making free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, how much of the gold coin that has come from these extraordinary productions—which I by no means admit—would, in his judgment, be circulating to-day in the United States? And in that connection will he tell me what would have made any difference in the circulating medium of the United States and that of China, where there is no gold coin, and in Mexico, where there is no gold coin? Is it not a fact beyond the possibility of discussion that as rapidly as that gold was produced in the United States it would have sought occupation in gold-standard countries to the utter exclusion of the circulation of gold in the United States, and is not that the inevitable and irrepealable law of this proposition?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will answer first the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. It is true that it is entirely foreign to a tariff discussion, but he has done me the honor to ask it, and I shall do him the honor to reply to it. If William J. Bryan had been elected President of the United States in 1896, and there had been an honest and persistent effort, as there would have been, to have bimetalism established all over the world, everywhere on the civilized globe to-day a silver dollar would be worth a gold dollar. The Republicans in 1896 did not declare honestly, squarely, and courageously in favor of the gold standard. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] had, I think, a great deal to do with the writing of the money plank and of the Republican platform of Ohio in 1896. He was there or thereabouts when that remarkable and ridiculous document was prepared. They went to St. Louis with that platform to nominate McKinley on it. I will give any man in this House the best hat that Stetson can make if he will take the money plank of the Ohio platform of 1896 which they carried to St. Louis with them and tell me what it means. You can read it right side up and wrong side up and catawampus, like somebody said he read Blaine's letter from Genoa, and you can not tell to save your life what it means. But when they reached St. Louis Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE and the eastern gold bugs got hold of the trimmers down there and rammed part of the gold standard down their throats; but they did not declare unequivocally in favor of the gold standard. They were too smart for that. They said, "We are in favor of the maintenance of the present gold standard until"—until what?—"until bimetalism, the coinage of gold and silver, can be secured by international agreement."

Mr. GROSVENOR. Do you not think that was a pretty good ram?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that is one of the most skillful devices of American politics—a most successful bunko game. I will tell you what that enabled the Republicans to do, and I heard them do it with success. They went to the country on a proposition that they were actually better silver men than we were. Brother MCCLEARY shakes his head. Maybe he did not do it, but they did it all over the country, and they roped in enough free-silver votes to elect William McKinley President of the United States, and then, when they had elected him, he appointed an international commission, composed of Senator Wolcott, Adlai E. Stevenson, and some statesman from Boston whose name I do not recall, to go to Europe and effect this international agreement; and those three men came very near performing a miracle over there. They persuaded England to agree to go into the coinage of silver again, and just the very minute the news reached this country that England was about to agree to it, Lyman J. Gage, who ratted to the Republican party in order to get office, the Secretary of the Treasury, had himself interviewed (or interviewed himself), in which interview he stated that that commission did not represent the Administration and did not represent the people of the United States, and that was the last of that great confidence game. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] That was just exactly it. If the gentleman from Ohio has any lurking suspicion in his head that I have any apologies to offer for supporting William J. Bryan in the campaigns of 1896 and 1900 he might as well disabuse his mind of it now. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt about it, and I have no doubt about the gentleman's willingness to follow him in 1908.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will if he is nominated, sure as you are living. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. And I think you will follow him to the same result. But will you not kindly answer the question put to you?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I am answering.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, I did not know it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can not answer it in a sentence. When I think of Bryan and think of the men who pulled him down, I recall the splendid lines of Shakespeare—

> An eagle, tow'ring in his pride of place,
> Was by mousing owls hawked at and killed.

[Applause.]

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. One at a time. I will get through with the two veterans before I tackle the juniors. [Laughter.] My further answer to the gentleman from Ohio is this: If there had been an honest effort made to secure international bimetalism there would never have been any gold exported out of this country, unless somebody had peculiar necessity for the gold in the arts and sciences; that it would have put the gold and silver absolutely on the same basis the world over.

Mr. GROSVENOR. There is no doubt about that, but has the gentleman from Missouri ever in the last twelve years noticed any tendency among the nations of the world to agree to bimetallism?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Never heard the slightest whisper about it since that international commission was hamstrung by Lyman J. Gage. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The condition of affairs right now demonstrates that we were right in our contention in 1896—that is, in the main contention. What was the main contention? Democrats said that the more money you had the more prosperity you had. We say it now. Sixteen to one was a mere incident to the main proposition. Republicans said that you had money enough. Now, if you did have money enough, what did you want with any more? And why go around exploiting yourselves?—because you have $800,000,000 more gold in the United States than you had then? You have also more prosperity than you had then, and the prosperity of the country keeps pace with the volume of the currency in the country. Now, to answer, as far as the contention of the gentleman from Iowa is concerned. Our output of gold has increased. Of course I could not bring all the documents and statistics in the country here to-day, and never expected to be asked that question in a debate on the tariff, but I affirm, without any fear of successful contradiction, that our output of gold has increased in the United States since 1896. We are also the chief beneficiaries of all the gold that is dug out of the Klondike region. So much for that.

Mr. WATSON. The gentleman has described the great joy with which he followed Mr. Bryan in 1896 and in 1900, and I wanted to ask him whether or not he did not with equal joy follow Grover Cleveland in three Presidential campaigns?

And with which one now does the gentleman stand? And what is the particular brand of Democracy that the gentleman now has in the bottle out of which——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Champ Clark Democracy. [Great laughter.] The very best brand that there is in the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. I want to ask this question: In 1897 the gentleman from Missouri made a speech on the floor of this House in which he said that if he had his way about it he would destroy every custom-house in the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I think I said that.

Mr. WATSON. On the 28th——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not going to have that 9-year-old speech of mine incorporated in this speech. [Laughter.]

Assuming for the sake of argument that I was a free trader in 1897, and am one yet, for that is what the gentleman's questions mean, I want to ask this entire Republican side if it is a crime to be a free trader?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; in this country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will pump something into the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] very suddenly. [Laughter.] He is the very man I have been looking for. Now, listen. I will read this paragraph, without telling the gentleman from Pennsylvania who wrote it:

> The repeal of the salt tax was an especial favorite of his. He was perfectly right in attacking the tax, and deserves the greatest credit for the persistency which finally won him the victory.

The man who wrote that paragraph is a free trader pro tanto, is he not?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No, sir.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, the gentleman from Ohio knows who wrote it. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] answers that the man who wrote that paragraph is a free trader. The gentleman from Ohio is too smart to be caught in the trap. Who wrote that paragraph?

Mr. MAHON. I did not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know the gentleman did not; but a much greater man did. Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, the gentleman will——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait until I get through with this Pennsylvania brother and I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I want to add something to the hilarity of the occasion before I go, and I must go in half an hour.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I am glad of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Just yield to me for one moment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. All right.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman who wrote that paragraph in his youthful days is the present President of the United States, and the statement appears in the Statesmen Series of the Life of Thomas H. Benton. Benton made a great reputation at one time by attacking the tariff on salt, and the President indorses his conduct and gives him great credit for it. I, as a stand-patter of the most intense character, indorse what the President says in that writing, and extend it over as an additional testimonial in favor of Thomas H. Benton. Why? The production of salt in the United States at that time was so small that a tariff upon salt then would have been, and was substantially the same as a tariff upon coffee or tea would be now. And therefore Mr. Benton could very well be a protectionist, which he was not, and oppose a tariff on salt, as I have always, although a protectionist, opposed a tariff on tea and coffee. That answers the whole of my friend's very adroit and very forcible proposition—until it is answered. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, now, General, I want to say something to you. I am not authorized to speak for President Roosevelt.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Neither am I.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am certainly glad to hear it. [Laughter.] Colonel Roosevelt is my personal friend, and I am his. I wish him well. The gentleman from Ohio comes in here and undertakes to do by proxy for Colonel Roosevelt what Colonel Roosevelt will never do for himself, and that is to plead the baby act. Cowardice is not among his sins. He wrote this paragraph about Thomas H. Benton, into which trap my friend from Pennsylvania walked, when he declared that to be a free trader in this country is to be a criminal. Therefore, according to the logic of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON], President Roosevelt is a criminal. [Laughter.] There is no Republican in this House who will dare to stand up here in the face of this assembly and categorically declare that Colonel Roosevelt is a criminal, because if he does, President Roosevelt will cut off his supply of "pap," and a Republican Congressman without "pap" is lost in the world. [Renewed laughter.]

The gentleman from Ohio got himself into a hole before he sat down. He says that he is a double-back-acting "stand-patter." I deny it. He voted for the Cuban reciprocity business. He is going to vote for this bill, which is free trade piecemeal. I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the rest of them on getting a part of the way to a reasonable tariff bill. The gentleman from Ohio said that he was like Colonel Benton when Benton fought the tariff on salt—that he was against the tariff on tea and coffee. Why, there is no parallel between the two cases. We make salt in this country in abundance. All we have to do is to go to work and boil it, or dig it out of the ground in train-load lots. There is no tea or coffee grown in the United States for commercial purposes, and there is no parallel between the two cases.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why, the gentleman ought to be fair, and he has been very successful in that respect, but this act of Benton's was prior to the manufacture of salt commercially in the United States.

It was even prior to the production of Turk Island salt, and we were compelled to import our salt from Liverpool and other points of that character. There is no dispute about that.

Is there no difference between the tariff upon tea or a tariff upon any article that is produced mostly in a foreign country and another article that is produced in this country?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. God made salt nearly as plentiful as the air we breathe and the water we drink; and man has wickedly levied a tariff tax upon it. Even the pagan Romans knew better than that. A standing order to the Roman army was that they should never levy a tribute of salt on a conquered people. I wish I had time to make a speech on Thomas H. Benton and the work he did in putting salt on the free list. For years in the Roman senate Cato, no matter what was the subject of his speech, wound up with "Carthago delenda est"—"Carthage must be destroyed." And no difference what the subject of debate in the American Senate Colonel Benton lugged in the subject of protected salt. He was one of the greatest Democrats that ever lived, and the speeches which he delivered in the United States Senate upon this subject will amply repay perusal, even at this late day, for the learning they contain and which at last put salt on the free list. When he had accomplished his purpose so pleased was he that he said, in his pompous way, that he imagined he heard the flocks and herds on a thousand hills bellowing out their love and gratitude to him for it. No doubt they would have done so could they have understood his splendid labor in their behalf.

In conclusion, I want to ask you all a question. If Thomas H. Benton deserves the highest credit for putting salt upon the free list, as Colonel Roosevelt said he did, would not I deserve the highest credit for putting salt back on the free list? I have introduced a bill in five or six Congresses to do it, and I intend to introduce it into every Congress as long as I stay here, so help me God, until I triumph as did "The Great Missourian," whose high career constitutes one of the priceless heritages of the imperial Commonwealth which he loved so well and served so nobly. If Benton deserved the highest credit for doing that, as President Roosevelt says he did, why would not Mr. WILLIAMS, or Judge DE ARMOND, or any other man in this House, deserve the highest credit for putting any other prime necessity of life upon the free list?

These gentlemen have lured me far afield by their numerous, ingenious, and interesting questions. Let us return a moment to the consideration of the present crisis in our tariff affairs.

What sort of a modus vivendi is it that Secretary Root is endeavoring to induce Secretary Shaw to enter into with Germany? Why, if the papers are to be believed, it is to be nothing more than a systematic juggling with invoices of German products imported into this country from Germany—a sleight of hand performance by which invoices from that country are to be rated lower than they should be in order to placate Germany temporarily and tide the Republican party over the rocks during this session. In the meantime, we are to be amused with this maximum and minimum toy. Then Congress having done nothing, absolutely nothing, to permanently improve the situation and having adjourned, the Republicans will play another stupendous confidence game by going to the country with gorgeous promises of what they will do by way of tariff revision at the short session—in which great game they will be all things to all men, hoping thereby to carry the Congressional elections. This trick may prove successful, but I do not believe that it will. The people are not all fools.

Gentlemen, I have exceeded by very much the time that I expected to occupy. I thank the House profoundly for its courtesy and its kindness. This speech is somewhat disjointed, because it was not written out beforehand and because there have been ceaseless interruptions. I have tried to be fair about it. I have denied no Member a chance to interrogate me. I hope that this day's work will open up a discussion that will be the cause and beginning of a wider discussion in the country, which will do one of two things—it will either drive the Republicans of the agricultural districts into electing outspoken Republican tariff revisionists here, or else the next House will be a Democratic House. Truth is mighty and will prevail. If I have contributed even "the widow's mite" to the approaching triumph of a righteous cause, the three hours which I have consumed have been profitably spent. I have an abiding faith that when the eyes of the taxpayers of the land are opened to the situation they will not longer stand for the monstrosities of the Dingley tariff bill. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY rose and was recognized.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may be allowed to conclude his remarks without limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BISHOP] asks unanimous consent that his colleague, who has been recognized by the Chair, may be permitted to speak until he shall have concluded his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am in this matter placed in a rather peculiar position. I wish it to be understood at the beginning where I stand on this measure. I will try to make myself clear in what I have to say about it, so that there will be no misunderstanding as to what my views are. I am opposed to this bill for many reasons. In the time given me I will try in a plain, businesslike way to explain why I oppose this bill.

In the first place let me say I understand the measure is called a Republican measure. From the wording of the bill and the effects which may arise from it no human being, in my opinion, could understand whether it is a Republican or a Democratic measure. I have always understood that the Republican party, to which I belong, stood for protection to American industries. I believe that the President of the United States is a protectionist, and that many Republican Presidents before him were protectionists. I believe that the platforms adopted in national conventions by the Republican party have declared for protection to American industries. To bear me out in that statement, I want to ask the time of the House while I read a portion of the Republican platform adopted in the national convention in St. Louis in 1896. It is the plank in that platform that refers particularly to sugar.

We condemn the present Administration for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of this country. The Republican party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which they pay other countries more than $100,000,000 annually.

I believe that the Republicans in convention that framed that plank in this platform meant what they said, meant that if the people of this country would return that party to power they would carry out their pledge. Have they done it? Let me read you just a little of the platform adopted in 1900 by the Republican party in convention assembled:

We renew our faith in the policy of protection to American labor. In that policy our industries have been established, diversified, and maintained. By protecting the home market competition has been stimulated and production cheapened. Opportunity to the inventive genius of our people has been secured and wages in every department of labor maintained at high rates—higher now than ever before, and always distinguishing our working people in their better conditions of life from those of any competing country. Enjoying the blessings of the American common school, secure in the right of self-government, and protected in the occupancy of their own markets, their constantly increasing knowledge and skill have enabled them to finally enter the markets of the world.

Further on in that platform let me read to you what was said about reciprocity. I believe that this measure is claimed by its friends to be a reciprocity measure. Oh, I have become so disgusted with the term reciprocity, as used by the Republican party—not the Democratic party—since I have been a Member of this House that I can not believe for an instant that the friends of this measure and the friends of Cuban reciprocity ever knew what reciprocity meant as referred to by James G. Blaine and William McKinley.

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms—

Now, listen, please, and then compare it with the effects of this bill—

for what we do not ourselves produce—

That is reciprocity; that is what was meant by the Republican party at that time when they mentioned reciprocity—

in return for the foreign markets.

That is reciprocity as I understand it, gentlemen. Reciprocity does not mean that we propose to open our markets to the goods of foreign countries to come in here without duty on competitive articles. That is not what was meant by the term "reciprocity." By opening our markets to the raw sugars of the world, produced by the cheapest labor on earth—is that reciprocity, when we can produce that product on American soil? I say "No."

Let me read to you what our President, Theodore Roosevelt, said in his letter of acceptance in 1904, and then, if you please, I will ask the friends of this measure to reconcile it with the principles in this bill, if they can.

Here is what the President said in his letter of acceptance in the last campaign:

The one consideration which must never be omitted in a tariff change is the imperative need of preserving the American standard of living for the American workingman.

I will show you later on what this bill proposes to do in the standard of wages for the American laboring man:

The tariff rate must never fall below that which will protect the American workingman by allowing for the difference between the general labor cost here and abroad, so as at least to equalize the conditions arising from the difference in the standard of labor here and abroad—a difference which it should not be our aim to foster in so far as it represents the needs of better educated, better paid, better fed, and better clothed workingmen of a higher type than any to be found in a foreign country. At all hazards and no matter what else is sought for or accomplished by changes of the tariff the American workingman must be protected in his standard of wages—that is, in his standard of living—and must be secured the fullest opportunity of employment. Our laws should in no event afford advantage to foreign industries over American industries. They should in no event do less than equalize the difference in conditions at home and abroad.

That is what our President said in his letter of acceptance before entering upon the campaign that elected him President of the United States, the position he now holds. Let me read you what he further said:

It is a matter of regret that the protective tariff policy, which during the last forty-odd years has become part of the very fiber of the country, is not now accepted as definitely established. Surely we have a right to say that it has passed beyond the domain of theory, and a right to expect that not only its original advocates, but those who at one time distrusted it on theoretical grounds, should now acquiesce in the results that have been proved over and over again by actual experience. These forty-odd years have been the most prosperous years this nation has ever seen, more prosperous years than other nations have ever seen.

Again he says:

Every class of our people is benefited by the protective tariff. During the last few years a merchant has seen the export trade of this country grow faster than ever in our previous history. The manufacturer could not keep his factory running if it were not for the protective tariff. The wage-worker would do well to remember that if protection is "robbery" and is to be punished accordingly, he will be the first to pay the penalty.

Taking all in all what I have read from our Republican platform and what I have read from the letter of acceptance by Theodore Roosevelt, I still, my friends, cling to the high protective tariff as the safeguard of American liberty, and I believe the President of the United States stands with me on that principle.

Now, let us see if this bill becomes a law, whether or not we are carrying out the pledges that we made to the people of this country upon which every Republican in this House stood and pledged himself to the letter of the law. When I accepted the nomination in my district, my friends, I pledged myself to these platforms, and I propose to stand there until the last ditch, if I am the only man on this side of the House to stand in that line.

It is my opinion and my belief—and I am candid and firm in that belief—that we can not tear down this protective wall which the Republican party has put around American institutions and let in the product of foreign cheap labor without injuring that industry, if it is a competitive article. Let us see whether or not the sugar from the Philippine Islands and the sugar from Cuba is a competitive article with something made in this country. The year of 1883 was about the time the sugar industry in this country began to grow. It ran along gradually and slowly until 1897, when William McKinley called together Congress in extra session for the purpose of repealing the Wilson bill, and put in its place a high-protection tariff measure. The Dingley bill provided that sugar coming from foreign countries, 16 Dutch standard, or 96 per cent pure, should pay a duty of 1.68½ cents per hundred pounds. By the provisions of that bill the American sugar manufacturers of the United States had that much advantage over the cheap-made sugar in foreign countries. That tariff stood there as a stone-wall against the foreign nations of the earth. That stimulated the sugar industry in the United States, and right in the State of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent in part in Congress, the first sugar factory began to make sugar from beets grown in the fields of Michigan.

In 1898 the first factory in that State turned out some sugar. Under the belief that the Republican party meant just what it said in its platform, and that that party so long as it remained in power was going to carry out its pledge, capital became confident and sugar factories began to spring up all over our State, and by 1900 we had 17 magnificent sugar factories in that State. That industry kept going on so rapidly that the average man could not keep pace with it, but the very instant the Republican party introduced into Congress a so-called "Cuban reciprocity measure," immediately the hope of every business man in the State of Michigan who had a single dollar invested in that industry vanished. They hesitated, and said: "What does our party propose to do? It has given encouragement to this industry. We have invested our money—all we had, in many insances—and now by the adoption of Cuban reciprocity and the removal of 20 per cent of the $1.68½ duty that stood there as a stone wall we can readily see that the great sugar trusts of this country are going to have an advantage over us, and with their $90,000,000 and not one drop of warm human blood flowing in their veins we know that the inevitable must come unless the Republican party will stand by its pledges made in 1896 and again in 1900." And imagine their surprise! When Cuban reciprocity was introduced, and the Committee on Ways and Means gave notice that the hearings would be given, from all over the United States came delegations representing the beet-sugar industry and representing the cane-sugar industry in the South, and earnestly registered their protest against the passage of that measure. But what was the use? It was a packed jury, and a conclusion had been reached before the bill was introduced. They pleaded for mercy. They said they had their money invested. They said that the sugar trust could import into the United States from Cuba raw sugar, pay the Dingley rate of duty, pay the prevailing price for the raw sugars in the markets of the world, pay the cost of refining, and put refined sugar upon the market for just about what the manufacturer could produce sugar from beets for and put it on the market.

Ever since the first pound of sugar was produced in this country from beets and cane the sugar trust has fixed a standard of prices, and it receives for sugar made from cane 10 cents a hundred pounds more than the sugar-beet manufacturer can get for his sugar; and no matter whether the price in the market is high or whether it is low the manufacturer of beet sugar dare not undersell or oversell the sugar trust in any market of the United States. No merchant—no wholesale grocery merchant in the United States—can buy from the sugar-beet manufacturers in this country his supply of sugar for the twelve months in the year. There is a time during the twelve months when every merchant in the United States must go to the sugar trust for his sugar, and the sugar trust has laid down this rule, and they have carried out this rule to the letter: "If you buy more than so much sugar from the beet-sugar manufacturer, by the gods, you can not have a pound of sugar from us when beet sugar is exhausted." I know a case in the State of Michigan where a wholesale grocery man in the city of Detroit had an interest in a sugar factory in the Eighth district, at a town called Caro. The sugar trust served notice upon him that he must not use over a certain amount of sugar coming from his own factory, and if he did, not a pound could he get from them when his sugar was gone. Oh, what kind of competition is that? If in your opinion Cuban reciprocity or this Philippine free-trade measure would help to stimulate the markets for the sugar trust under such circumstances, is there a man within the sound of my voice who would support such a measure? If so, he is not a friend of mine. But, thank God, gentlemen here have the right to think as they please and act as their good judgment dictates. If they differ with me, it is their privilege. But if there are any gentlemen in the House of Representatives, or in either end of this Capitol, who would support a measure that will drive out of existence one single industry in the United States to the benefit of the trusts, I would like to know who he is. Is there a man here who would do it? I believe not. But let us see whether or not this bill does that, in effect. I have stated to you before that when Cuban reciprocity became a law the sugar trust, if they should receive the benefits of the 20 per cent reduction, could put upon our markets raw sugars imported from Cuba at a third of a cent per pound less than sugar could be produced from beets. Mr. Willetts, of Willetts & Gray, sugar statisticians, of New York, one of the greatest experts among the statisticians and mathematicians of this country, stated last spring before the Committee on Ways and Means that at that time the sugar trust was purchasing raw sugar from Cuba at 13 cents a hundred pounds below the Hamburg or London prices, and the refined sugar produced by the American Sugar Refining Company and the Arbuckles was at that time being sold and put upon our markets for 11 or 12 cents a hundred pounds above the price obtained for refined sugar in Hamburg and in London.

If that is so, my friends, the 20 per cent reduction given to Cubans for their sugar in that Cuban reciprocity measure amounted to 33.7 cents per hundred pounds. Then Mr. Willetts shows conclusively that the sugar trust had absorbed 24 cents of the 34 cents, while at the same time every man, woman, and child within my hearing or out of my hearing in this country knows that the consumer paid 1 and 2 cents a pound more for his sugar than he did before the enactment of the Cuban bill. How do you reconcile those differences, my friends? I can not do it other than by the fact that the sugar trust absorbed, as I stated, two-thirds of that reduction and the poor devil of a Cuban got but one-third. Now, to bear out the statement that this is possible, that Mr. Willetts was correct, a public announcement was made in the newspapers of this country on or about January or February, 1905, that the sugar trust had declared a dividend—an annual dividend, mind you—of 26 per cent on their $90,000,000 of capital, and that 26 per cent did not include the profits on coffee and in the banking business, in both of which they are heavily engaged. Is that any good excuse? Why, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yesterday lightly spoke of the correctness of Mr. Willetts's statement the other day before the Committee on Ways and Means, giving him credit for being a very fine and scholarly gentleman, but doubting his figures. Let me say to you, if you read the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means that took place just before the holidays, and then listened to the gentleman's remarks from the State of New York made yesterday, or read his remarks, and you will find that he discredits, or attempts to discredit, the statements made by every man who appeared in opposition to this measure. The gentleman referred to Mr. Hathaway, a gentleman employed by several sugar factories in the State of Michigan to go to the Philippine Islands and investigate the sugar situation, so that at the beginning of this Congress, knowing that this bill would again be brought up for consideration, they might be in possession of some facts to meet the committee's recommendations. Mr. Hathaway is a resident of my home town, an estimable gentleman. Not one word in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee appears to discredit the honesty and integrity of that gentleman, yet Mr. PAYNE yesterday in his remarks on the floor of this House referred to him as representing $5,000,000 of capital going to the Philippines to purchase sugar land. Mr. Gove, another gentleman who happened to be in the Philippines at the same time Mr. Hathaway was there, gave his testimony or statement, and the question was asked him by Mr. SMITH of Michigan, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, "What did you hear as to what Mr. Hathaway represented himself to be in the Philippine Islands? Did you hear him claim that he was a representative of millions of dollars and that he was over there for the purpose of buying sugar plantations and building factories?" His answer was, "I traveled for days and days and weeks with that gentleman and never heard such a statement until I heard it here in the committee room." I take Mr. Hathaway's statement as being absolutely honest and fair. I believe what he has to say. I would believe him as quick as any other honorable gentleman whom I know. I know of no instance where Mr. Hathaway, either in speaking of the Philippine Islands or of the sugar industry of this country, ever made a misstatement, unless it happened to be a clerical error. All men are apt to do that, but I know of none, even clerical, made by that gentleman.

In the first place, let me say that when Cuban reciprocity

was introduced, in 1900, there were 52 sugar factories in the United States, and they were springing up so fast, as I have stated before, that the average business man could not keep track of the progress of that industry. Fifty-two factories produced sugar from beets in 1900, and the report of the Agricultural Department shows that there were 34 more factories either under construction or contemplated in the United States at that time; but upon the agitation of Cuban reciprocity what happened, my friends? To-day we have but 54 in the United States, and I will give their location to you and their slicing capacity. I want to call your attention to this for the reason that I want to show you how much money the American people put in that industry upon their faith in the Republican party, pledged by their platforms, to which I have referred. California has 7 factories to-day in operation, as shown by statistics. Their slicing capacity daily is 9,100 tons. Colorado has 12, with a daily slicing capacity of 9,300 tons of beets. Idaho has 3, with a slicing capacity of 3,000 tons. Illinois has 1, with a slicing capacity of 350 tons per day. Michigan has 17 factories, with a slicing capacity of 11,150 tons daily; Nebraska, 2, with a slicing capacity of 1,450 tons per day; New York, 1, slicing 600 tons daily; Ohio, 1, slicing 400 tons daily; Oregon, 1, slicing 400 tons daily; Utah, 7, slicing 4,000 tons daily; Washington, 1, slicing 500 tons daily; Wisconsin, 3, slicing 1,700 tons daily. The total number of factories running in the United States, year 1905, 56; total slicing capacity, 42,000 tons of beets; total investment of capital in these factories now in operation, about $42,000,000.

When Cuban reciprocity was introduced in the House, Michigan factories sent such a delegation down here to oppose that measure, composed of such representative and honorable business men that the sugar trust was simply awed. They immediately sent a representative to the State of Michigan and purchased an interest in some of the best factories in that State in order to hush up that opposition. And one man from Bay City, Mich., came down here, and I had the pleasure of accompanying him to the White House to appeal to Theodore Roosevelt to urge Congress to withdraw Cuban reciprocity. He appealed to the President most earnestly, but got no relief.

In a few days the trusts got hold of him and purchased a half interest in his factory. In the course of a week or ten days afterwards he came back here, sent in his card, asking me to meet him in the hall and go to lunch with him. He begged me to accept the 20 per cent reduction. Why? Because he had been purchased by Havemeyer, and it was to Havemeyer's interest to have that bill become a law. When I found what he wanted of me, I begged to be excused. I could not turn my coat as quickly as all that. To-day, my friends, let me say to you the sugar trust has purchased, through a representative, a trustee, in order that they might not be known in the transaction, an interest in eight or nine of the best factories in the State. One, at Kalamazoo, has, I understand, been torn to the ground. If I am wrong in that, I hope my colleague [Mr. GARDNER] will correct me. They became interested in another factory, at Oscoda. After that factory had been built it was found that there were not enough farmers in that immediate vicinity to raise beets for the factory and that the land was not the best adapted for the raising of beets in the State; and the consequence is that factory has been torn down or is now being demolished. They purchased another factory, known as the "Michigan Sugar Factory," at Bay City. Its doors are closed and nailed up, never to run again.

They purchased an interest in the Saginaw Sugar Company, in my own town—a magnificent structure, a monument to our town or to any city in the land, that cost something like seven or eight hundred thousand dollars. To that factory they obtained absolute control or title, and within ninety days' time they put upon its roof 150 men, tore it to the ground, and nothing but the smokestack remains. God forbid, gentlemen, that you and I or any other set of men should ever pass a measure to help such a hydra-headed, damnable corporation as that!

Why do they not want American beet-sugar factories to run? I will tell you why. They have sufficient capacity in their refineries to-day to refine all of the sugar that all of the people in the United States consume and 20,000,000 of people more without adding one dollar's worth of machinery to their present plants; and with this beet-sugar competition out of the way they can buy the raw sugar in the markets of the world, bring it into the United States, refine it, and hand it out to the consumer at just what price they see fit to charge for it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will my friend from Michigan yield for a question. I want to get some information on this subject.

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I wish he would tell me the number of factories controlled by what is called the "sugar trust," as well as the number of factories that are not so controlled. In other words, I want to find out how many factories are owned by what is known as the "sugar trust." After the gentleman tells me that, will he tell me to what extent the sugar trust dominates the beet sugar?

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman for the inquiry. I can give him that information only as applied to the State in which I reside. I am not acquainted with the fact as to how many factories they are interested in in the United States.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Are they interested in beet-sugar factories?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir; in beet-sugar factories. I am talking about beet-sugar factories. Does the gentleman ask me what they control?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I want to find out how many factories they own. Do they own any beet-sugar factories, and to what extent does the sugar trust dominate beet sugar?

Mr. FORDNEY. I know of no factory they own absolutely in the United States. I will give you the names of the factories in which they have an interest in the State in which I live; some other gentleman may be able to answer your question as to other States later on. Now, as to the factories in which they are interested. They are interested in the following factories in the State of Michigan: The Saginaw Sugar Company, the Caro Sugar Company, the Bay State Sugar Factory, the Alma Factory, a factory at Croswell, another factory at Sebewaing, and a third interest in a factory at Menominee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What is the output of the factories?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will give you the whole annual output of the beet factories. The factories in Michigan have a slicing capacity of 11,150 tons of beets per day. In other words, to build a sugar factory in this country it costs $1,000 a ton for the slicing capacity of that factory. A factory that would slice 600 tons of beets per day costs $600,000. I will read the complete list a little later. Let me go on with my remarks in reference to the conditions.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for this information.

Mr. FORDNEY. What would you say that the average American citizen, capitalist, laboring man, and farmer would naturally expect from the Republican party after he had read their platform, which I have put in my remarks here? Would he not naturally suppose, as I have said, that they meant it and that he could with confidence go on with his business industry and be protected against foreign manufacturers and the foreign cheap labor of the world? Certainly that would be the natural conclusion he would arrive at. I never had a dollar invested in a sugar factory. I would not want it to-day. I would not take sugar stock in any factory within the State in which I live at 50 cents on the dollar of its actual par value unless my friends of the Republican party would awaken from this sleeep, from this forgetfulness, that they are going through and say to the public, "We meant what we said. We will repeal the Cuban reciprocity and we will shut out from American markets every pound of raw sugar made by foreign cheap labor and foster that home industry in the United States until we produce on American soil every pound of sugar that the American people consume." [Applause.]

For the benefit of some of you gentlemen let me show you how that industry went with leaps and bounds on the supposition that they were going to receive protection from the Republican party. I have gone back as far as ten years in statistics, and I find that in the United States in 1895 there were 20,092 tons of sugar produced from beets; one year later, 29,220 tons; in 1897, 37,536 tons. In 1898—watch, now—from the time the Dingley bill became a law, in which bill there was a provision placing a high tariff on foreign cheap sugar coming into our markets and protected that home industry to the extent that American capital could make an investment and feel secure in their protection and that they were going to make a profit in the business—in 1898 there were produced 40,398 tons. In 1899, for some unknown reason—a bad year, I presume, for the raising of beets—the crop dropped off to 32,407 tons; but in 1900 it jumped up to 73,000 tons; in 1901, 77,000 tons; in 1902, 163,000 tons; in 1903, 195,000 tons; in 1904, 208,000 tons; in 1905, 209,000 tons; and this year, 1905–6, 285,000 long tons, or 300,000 short tons, in round numbers; and this, my friends, with about the same number of factories we had in commission in 1901.

Some criticism has been made about the figures given by the manufacturers of beet sugar in the State of Michigan and throughout the United States. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means yesterday referred to the profit made from a by-product, pulp. He said that one institution—I know

the one he had in mind; it is located at Alma, in the adjoining county to my home county—had experimented with beet pulp, and he hooted at the idea that it was an experiment. He is mistaken about this not being an experiment. There are only four such institutions in the United States. That company spent $9,800 in getting rid of that pulp. They were obliged under our State laws to in some way dispose of it so that it would not be a detriment to the sanitary conditions, and they erected a plant, a dry kiln, at an expense of $65,000, if I remember rightly, to dry this pulp and put it upon the market as a food for stock; and one of the proprietors of that factory told me yesterday that they about broke even last year on that institution.

Some criticism has been made as to the amount of molasses sold for the production of alcohol. Mr. PAYNE referred to a Mr. Humphrey, who appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means, and he spoke lightly of the answers that Mr. Humphrey gave when he was asked what they received for molasses. His answer was that they received about $2.50 per ton, about what it cost to run the molasses into cars and dispose of it.

There are but three institutions in the whole United States making alcohol from the sirups from sugar extracted from beets. Two of them are in the State of Michigan, and it is a godsend to the manufacturers in that State to find a market for that bitter sirup. The gentleman from New York said that the sugar factories were interested in that alcohol plant. I want to correct him. That is a mistake. There is not a sugar factory in the State of Michigan that has any interest in that alcohol plant. It is owned by a separate corporation, which pays to this Government about a million and a quarter of dollars a year in revenues, at a dollar and ten cents per proof gallon, for their alcohol that they make from that bitter sirup that comes from the beet-sugar factories. They have sold considerable of their output to the Government at $1.26 per gallon, or 16 cents a gallon above the revenue upon it.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Upon what theory does the Government tax alcohol made from the beet and not tax alcohol made from the destructive distillation of wood?

Mr. FORDNEY. Perhaps I can not give you the correct answer, but it is my understanding that the alcohol made from the sirup from beets is much the same as grain alcohol, while the wood alcohol is a fuel alcohol.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Let me ask one further question for information. What is the net selling price of that alcohol—the wholesale selling price—above the tax?

Mr. FORDNEY. Sixteen to 20 cents a gallon. The gentleman interested in the factory told me the maximum price that he had ever received above the tax was 20 cents per gallon, and it often sold as low as 12 cents per gallon.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Do the beet-sugar factories sell their refuse at a fixed price?

Mr. FORDNEY. The beet factories sell to this alcohol manufacturing institution their sirup after extracting all the sugar they can from it. They sell the residuum—what is called the "bitter sirup"—to the alcohol factories.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. And that alcohol when produced and refined is good for fuel and light and power, just the same as grain alcohol would be?

Mr. FORDNEY. While I am not an expert on alcohol, I think that is the case.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. And it can be produced at a cost of 12 cents a gallon?

Mr. FORDNEY. That was not what I said. I said they had sold it for 12 cents a gallon above the $1.10 tax upon it.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I meant aside from the tax on it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; in other words, at a total wholesale price of from $1.22 to $1.30 per proof gallon. They have sold it as low as 12 cents and as high as 20 cents above the $1.10 revenue tax per proof gallon.

Mr. PAYNE. Did the gentleman say they sold the alcohol for 20 cents?

Mr. FORDNEY. Above the tax.

Mr. PAYNE. The records of the Navy Department show that they sold it at 5 cents a pound, and there are 6.76 net pounds in a gallon of alcohol, which would be about 34 cents a gallon. The records show that that was the price at which it was bought from this distillery up there.

Mr. FORDNEY. I fear the gentleman confuses the proof gallon with the wine gallon. The difference between them will make the difference in the figures, I think.

Mr. PAYNE. Why, the gentleman must know that the Navy Department buys the proof gallon, of course.

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, I have the statement from Mr. Smith, the proprietor of the factory.

Mr. PAYNE. I have it from the Navy Department, that bought it.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not care what the Navy Department said. I believe Mr. Smith, for I know he is an honorable man.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not care what Mr. Smith says. I believe the Navy Department.

Mr. FORDNEY. All right. My colleague [Mr. LOUD] offers a suggestion. Was that the price at the factory or the price laid down to the Government at some point with freight added?

Mr. PAYNE. I really do not know.

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not believe that you did know.

Mr. PAYNE. The freight would be so infinitesimal that it would make very little difference. The freight on 6.76 pounds, which is the weight of a gallon, would be very small.

Mr. FORDNEY. I leave it to gentlemen to judge for themselves.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know where it was delivered, but I will say to the gentleman that I presume it was delivered to the Government at the place where the smokeless-powder factory is located.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have no reason to dispute the figures given by the gentleman from New York, if those figures represent the delivered price.

Mr. PAYNE. I presume that is the fact, and I give the gentleman the benefit of my assumption in the case.

Mr. FORDNEY. All right. As the Irishman said when the other fellow called him a liar, "We will lave it so." [Laughter.] He did not want to have any further dispute, and neither do I, because the gentleman's last statement explains the discrepancy in his figures.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not understand that the gentleman makes any direct application of that. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, not at all; it was only a joke to suit the occasion. Now, I do not know whether my friends are afoot or on horseback. I do not know whether they are on a Republican horse or on a Democratic free-trade horse, but I know where I am. I am not on a free-trade horse. I am not as much confused as some other gentlemen are about this bill. A story is told of my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] when a young man practicing law. There was an old darky in his town that was accused of stealing chickens. He looked around and finally found the gentleman from New York, who was willing to undertake his defense. When he came into court, the judge said to the darky, "Are you the defendant in this case?" The darky didn't exactly understand what was meant, but he said, "No, Judge." Pointing to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], he said, "That is the defendant; I am the man that stole the chickens." Now, I believe I am going to contend in this case that I and my constituents are the defendants. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. I think my friend from Michigan must be indulging in some of the poetry that hangs around this question. Where did he get the story?

Mr. FORDNEY. From a storybook. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. I never heard it before.

Mr. FORDNEY. I don't know but that the gentleman from New York wrote it. Now, let me show you what this industry amounts to in this country and particularly the State in which I have the honor to reside. In the State of Michigan this year there were somewhere from seventy-five to eighty thousand acres of land planted to sugar beets, from which were sold by the farmers 640,000 tons of beets delivered to the beet-sugar factories in that State.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Is it not a fact that most of these factories now rent the land direct from the farmer and cultivate the soil themselves?

Mr. FORDNEY. No. I know of but one factory in the State of Michigan that owns any land on which beets are raised. They are all contracting for planting except a portion of the beets raised by one concern at Owosso, Mich. It may be the case in other States, but not in Michigan. From those beets this year there was produced about 67,200 long tons of sugar, which, at four and a half cents a pound, would amount to $6,775,000. That is in the State of Michigan for that crop this year. We only consume some ten or fifteen thousand tons in the State more than we produced this year.

Let me show you what was produced. In the United States this year there were from 280,000 to 300,000 acres of land planted to beets—call it 280,000 acres—and the average yield of beets per acre was 10 tons in the United States. In the State of Michigan it was considerably less this year because we had a bad season, a great deal of rain in the month of July, which retarded that crop very much. That 280,000 acres produced 2,800,000 tons of beets, and the average price of those

beets paid to the farmers by the factories in the United States was five and a half dollars per ton, or $15,400,000, quite a sum to go to the farmers. They were raised by 70,000 to 80,000 farmers in the United States. The average planter plants only about 4 acres, on an average, throughout the whole United States. Fifteen million four hundred thousand dollars to the farmers, and about 300,000 tons of sugar extracted from those beets, which, at four and a half cents per pound, would amount to $30,000,000. Information was given to the Committee on Ways and Means that the cost of the production of sugar in the State of Michigan this year was $3.90 per hundred pounds. For easy figuring, let us take last year's cost—4 cents per pound. That cost is all money paid to the farmer for labor and for money paid to the laborer in the factory and for supplies consumed by that factory, produced by American labor somewhere in the United States. You may go back to the records where Mr. Havemeyer gave testimony before a committee of the Senate, where he said that the cost of refining foreign imported sugar in his refineries—the minimum cost was 37 cents per hundred pounds and the maximum 62½ cents per hundred pounds. Let us take 50 cents as a fair average. One-half a cent per pound American labor gets for the sugar refined by these two great institutions, and if we produced that sugar on American soil American labor would get eight times that much on the average amount produced by the refineries in this country. And you must understand that all the refined sugar, practically all, that we consume in this country, that is not made from beets, is refined by the two great refining companies—the Havemeyers and the Arbuckles.

Labor received, for the sugar refined by those two companies, from seventeen to twenty millions of dollars for the amount refined last year, and if that sugar had been produced from beets or from cane grown in the fields of the United States labor, as I have said, would have received eight times that amount, or nearly $150,000,000. In the name of God, men, is it your aim to do something for the American farmer and the American laboring man? If so, put this bill as quick as God will let you into the wastebasket and repeal Cuban reciprocity and add another cent a pound to the present Dingley rate of duty on foreign imported sugar, and this industry in this country will run up like a mushroom in the night. [Applause.] I am going to tell you about how much sugar is consumed by the different people throughout the world. I show it to you to convince you that we are among the people of the world who consume the most sugar. In the United States the amount consumed per capita is about 73 pounds. I heard it given by Mr. Welborn to the Committee on Ways and Means that it was 71 pounds.

Mr. KEIFER. Seventy-seven.

Mr. FORDNEY. Seventy-seven. I thank the gentleman. I have plenty of reason to doubt the correctness of the statements made by Mr. Welborn, a gentleman brought by the Government to Washington from Manila, in the Philippine Islands, to testify as an expert as to the cost of production in the Philippine Islands. After reading all he has said before the Taft Commission in the Philippine Islands and what he said here and putting two and two together, so help me God, if it were me I would not have paid the freight on it. The United Kingdom consumes about 90 pounds per capita; Switzerland, 63 pounds; Denmark, 52 pounds; Russia, 11 pounds; Austria, 18 pounds; Belgium, 22; France, 24; Germany, 28 pounds; the Netherlands, 31 pounds; Spain, 11 pounds, and Italy, 7. So that it is shown there is only one country on the face of the earth that consumes more sugar per capita than do the people of the United States, and with American vim and Yankee push and plenty of capital and an abundance of soil why not foster that industry on American soil and produce all of the sugar that all of the people of the United States consume and keep that one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five millions of dollars that we send annually abroad for foreign sugar? Why not do it? I am ready and willing to lend my helping hand.

All I ask is sufficient support here, and I believe time and time again it has been proven to us that this can be done if we will only give as much protection to this industry as has been given to the iron and steel industry in this country and to the tin and to every other principal industry in the United States. [Applause.] We imported last year about the following amounts, and I will give you the different countries from which we brought it. We imported about 100,000 tons from Porto Rico, and the statistics show that they produced 145,000 tons there. From the Hawaiian Islands we imported from 350,000 to 370,000 tons. From Cuba and all other countries, 1,750,000 tons. We produced from cane in this country about 300,000 tons and from sugar beets 300,000 tons, or in the neighborhood of a total of all of about 2,800,000 tons, and of this 1,750,000 tons which were imported last year, let me show you what statistics say about the amount that came from Cuba. I give the calendar year, not the fiscal year. One million two hundred and thirty-two thousand five hundred and eighty-nine tons came from Cuba. At the time Cuban reciprocity was before this House for consideration it was claimed by the friends of that measure that there never could be produced enough sugar in Cuba to affect the market in the United States. At the time that bill was first introduced they produced about 615,000 tons in Cuba. The opponents of this measure claimed that they had sufficient lands suitable for the production of cane in Cuba to produce about one-half the sugar used by the entire world, and I think everything has been proven to carry out the correctness of that assertion. Cuban reciprocity so stimulated that industry in Cuba that the output has run up from 615,000 tons in 1900 until the estimates furnished this year show that they will produce 1,300,000 long tons, all of which must come to the United States, except what little is consumed by the Cubans themselves; and, mind you, there are no purchasers for Cuban sugar in this country or for the sugars from any other country in the world but two men, H. O. Havemeyer and Arbuckle. God knows I should regret exceedingly if all of my eggs were in one basket that would be obliged to be sent to those two gentlemen to purchase them without any further competition.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows that all of the refined sugar that is consumed in Cuba is controlled in its manufacture by the two gentlemen whose names he has just mentioned, does he not?

Mr. FORDNEY. I think so.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I know it.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not doubt the gentleman.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I know it, I have been there, so therefore the consumption there does not affect the price of sugar in this country at all, because whatever enters into consumption of sugar in Cuba is manufactured by the same gentlemen who are engaged in this country in beating down the price of your sugar and the price of the sugar down in the country in which I live.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. Now, gentlemen, I believe just what the gentleman says. I believe that he is absolutely correct, and I have every reason to believe that he is strictly honest. I want to say as briefly as I possibly can that the benefits of Cuban reciprocity do not go to the Cubans, as the opponents of that measure contended at the time that bill was being considered in this House and as my friend [Mr. PAYNE] in a few brief remarks here in February last, just before Congress adjourned, attempted to show that Cuban reciprocity had so stimulated the foreign market for our American goods that it was an absolute and complete success. I was not on the floor when the gentleman made these remarks. I am not accustomed to talking too much, I believe, and I did not attempt to answer it——

Mr. PAYNE. No; I guess the gentleman could not have been here from what he has said, or he would not have made his statements.

Mr. FORDNEY. I read the remarks of the gentleman from New York the next day.

Mr. PAYNE. I did not state it was a complete success. On the contrary, I stated it was not, but I said it was not such a failure as your people were representing, and then I gave figures and did not characterize it. That is very different from your statement.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not want to misquote you, and that was my recollection, and if I have misquoted you I beg your pardon and wish to correct it. But let me tell you I want to show to you it was an absolute failure and in no way a success, and I can prove it to you, and if not I will yield. Before proceeding further, a gentleman sends me a note—from the gallery, I believe, or from the hall—who is interested in an alcohol factory at Bay City, about which we were talking, as to the cost or price received for his alcohol, and I will read what he states:

The contract with Navy Department, referred to by Mr. PAYNE, was 5 cents per pound. This is about 29 cents per wine gallon, or 16 cents per proof gallon, free of tax.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, the gentleman will remember in the hearings that his friend, Mr. Humphrey, stated they received for the alcohol from 30 to 40 cents a gallon. That was his statement.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to you Mr. Humphrey is in no way interested in that institution. This information comes from its proprietor.

Mr. PAYNE. He pretended to know about it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; that might be, but he might have been a little off in his figures.

Mr. PAYNE. I think he is usually a little off, and he might have been in that. He was the sugar expert who was testifying, and he may have been a little off.

Mr. FORDNEY. But not an alcohol expert. He was really not a sugar expert. My friend Humphrey is a lawyer—one of the best in the State—an estimable gentleman, and an able man, who would like to come to Congress, and that is the only thing on which we differ. [Applause and laughter.] Now, after our dealings with Cuba, let me show you whether or not this Cuban reciprocity was a success or a failure. In the start let me say to you I was opposed to that measure. I fought it bitterly. I was ready and willing, because I thought the interests of my constituents were at stake, to believe that I could afford to override the decision of the gentleman in the chair when the amendment was offered to that bill, which the Chairman declared was not germane. I was one of the forty-two or forty-seven insurgents who have been referred to who joined with our Democratic friends on that side of the House in overruling the decision of the Chair, adding an amendment to Cuban reciprocity that sent it to its fate. It failed. The value of our exports to and imports from Cuba for the calendar year of 1895 were as follows. The imports from Cuba for 1905 were $51,718,880. Our exports for that year were $9,498,000. I will not give the odd dollars, as it does not amount to anything. In 1896 we imported $24,703,000 worth and sold them $7,296,000 worth. In 1897 we took $16,233,000 worth from them and sold to them $9,308,000. In 1898 we took $18,321,000 and sold them $10,750,000. In 1899 we took from them $29,668,000 and sold them $24,861,000. In 1900 we took $31,747,000 and sold them $26,934,000. Remember these two last dates, because I want to refer to them. In 1901 our imports from Cuba jumped up to $46,633,000 and our exports amounted to $27,007,000. That was in 1901. In 1902 we took from them $48,619,000 worth and sold them but $23,061,000 worth. The last year before Cuban reciprocity, 1903, we took from them $57,228,000 worth and sold them $23,504,000, or $3,500,000 less than we sold them in 1901. This is the year referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Was not 1901 the year we were occupying Cuba?

Mr. FORDNEY. I think it was.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, that made a great deal larger sale for American goods.

Mr. FORDNEY. I agree with the gentleman. I think that is right. Now, let me go further. The first year under Cuban reciprocity we took from them $74,950,000 worth and sold them $32,644,000 worth. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] last spring, in referring to that, showed those figures, in order to demonstrate that it was at least a partial success, as he says. In 1905, the first ten months of the year, we took from Cuba $87,001,000 worth and sold them $36,276,000 worth, or a little over $2,000,000 more than we sold them last year, only a natural increase of our foreign trade that we should expect with them, which would be a natural increase with any nation on the face of the earth with our increase of exports all the time.

Now, let us say that Cuban reciprocity did increase our sales with Cuba from $23,000,000 to $32,000,000 last year, while our imports ran up from $48,619,000 in 1902 to $87,001,000 for the first ten months of 1905. Let us see what happened in the way of loss of revenues to us. I have here the figures. The sugar that we purchased last year, during the calendar year, from Cuba was 1,232,589 tons. That 20 per cent benefit we gave them as a reduction of the duty, 20 per cent below the Dingley rate of duty, amounted on that sugar alone to $9,304,567.84. And for the sugar imported into the United States for the first ten months of the calendar year of 1905, 1,100,000 tons. That loss of duty to us amounted to $8,303,680, or in the twenty-two months, $17,608,247.84. All this for the measly seven to ten or twelve millions dollars' worth of business with the Cubans.

Oh, great Scott! If I had a boy 10 years old at a 10-cent department counter that could not make a better trade than that I would spank him so that he would have to eat his meals from the mantel for a week. [Laughter.] The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], when talking for the Cuban reciprocity measure, and when his republicanism or his devotion to the tariff measure was questioned, said: "I am a protectionist. I have been taught protection from my father's knee." I do not doubt it. He got started all right. How is he going? How is he running? If that father could come back to-day and read the speech made by his son on the Dingley bill, he would pat him on the back and say "Well done, my son." When he would read his speech on the Porto Rican bill, again he would say, "Well done, my son." But if he could rise up and hear his speech made on Cuban reciprocity, he would hesitate and look surprised. But if he could have been here yesterday and heard that gentleman assail our protective policy and defend his free-trade measure, he would say, "You young scoundrel, SERENO, what has come over you?" [Great laughter.]

Now, let me go further and show you what we gained by Cuban reciprocity, my friend. We passed that measure as a reciprocity measure. That bill provided that Cuban imports coming into this country should receive admission at a rate of duty 20 per cent below that fixed by the Dingley law, provided that goods coming from the United States into Cuba should be admitted into Cuba at 20 per cent less than that on any other goods of any other country in the world. That was reciprocity as it appeared and as it said, but it was reciprocity on competitive articles generally, which is only an abortion for reciprocity, a subterfuge for reciprocity.

Let us see how much benefit the farmer gets. My friends, I have taken from the Cuban tariff some items that would affect the American farmer. Let us see how much the American farmer has been benefited by that measure. Poultry and American game going into Cuba from this country paid before reciprocity 8.81 cents per kilogram.

Six weeks after the passage of our Cuban reciprocity measure and its acceptance by Cuba the Cuban Congress revised their tariff law, and, if I have the dates correctly, on the 14th day of February, 1904, they raised the duty on all imports going into that island. So that when they gave us the benefit of the 20 per cent reduction here is what we pay compared with what we paid before the Cuban reciprocity became a law, and I ask you if it is a square and fair deal?

As I have said, poultry pays 8.01 or 8.1—I have confused the figures there, but it is 8.1 or 8.01 as against 8.32. That first item was a misprint. Meat in brine, 100 kilos, paid $2.80 before, and pays $2.912 now. Beef and pork, $2.80 before; $2.912 now. Lard paid $2.80, and it pays $2.912 now. Tallow paid $2. and pays $2.08 now. Bacon paid $4, and pays $4.16 now. Hams and shoulders paid $5.50, and pay $5.70 now. Beef, fresh, paid $5, and it pays $5.20 now. Mutton paid $4.50 then, and pays $4.68 now. Oh, an excellent deal for the American farmer! Goodness, how proud he is of it, eh?

Pork paid $4 then, pays $4.16 now; eggs, $5 then, $5.20 now. Rice—now, remember rice was something they wanted. The southern people were raising rice; the Cubans were obliged to have rice, because their labor gets but little else than rice and wind and atmosphere—rice, $1, now 72 cents. They gave the benefit of 20 per cent and some more, but when it comes to rice flour—"No, sir," they said, "we are not going to let you put in the finished product on that article;" and where it paid $2 before, it pays $2.08 now. Great help to American farm labor! Oh, yes. Flour of oats, $1.20 before Cuban reciprocity; $1.248 now. Beans and peas, $1.10 before, now $1.144.

I may tire you. I know the friends of this measure are getting awfully tired. Eggs, 70 cents before; 72 cents now. Potatoes, 50 cents before; 52 cents now. Oh, what a lovely deal for the Irish! [Laughter.] Clover, $3.60 before; $3.60 now. Flax, 82 before; 82 now. Timothy, $2 then; $2 now. All farm products, mind you. Swine, $1 then, and $1 now; sheep, $1 then, and $1 now; goats, $1 then, and $1 now. Various other animals the same. Petroleum oils, $3.50 then, and $3.50 now. Horses, $2 to $15, according to the quality and value; $2 to $15 now. Agricultural machinery they were obliged to have, and they gave us the benefit of 20 per cent on agricultural machinery. We actually did get the benefit of the provision of that measure on agricultural machinery. It was $10 then, and $8 now. Wheat, 25 per cent—they were almighty hungry there and wanted wheat and they gave us a little more than the 20 per cent. Corn, 30 before, 27.3 now. Rye, 40, as against 41.6 now. Barley, 50, as against 52 now. Oats, 40, as against 41.6, and bran, 25, as against 26 cents. An excellent deal for the American farmer! It is true our farm products—all these articles I have named—go into the islands at 20 per cent less than articles of the same kind from any other country in the world. But they bought these articles before Cuban reciprocity, and they would buy them now if that measure had never passed.

Mr. PAYNE. That being the case, and we get a reduction over any other country, the more they raise the duty the more the differential, is it not? For instance, they double the duty and the amount of differential would be doubled?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. You get in that much cheaper than anybody else?

Mr. FORDNEY. We get in under 20 per cent less duty than anybody else.

Mr. PAYNE. If they raise the duty to the people then there is a greater difference between the duty and the 20 per cent?

Mr. FORDNEY. Concede that you are absolutely right—and

I will do it for the sake of the argument—why, in the name of God, did not Theodore Roosevelt ask Congress to act at once and raise their duties in proportion? Would not this be a square deal, and tax the Cuban sugar an equal amount after giving them 20 per cent reduction, and make them pay just what they paid before? And you would see how quick they would get off their perch.

Mr. PAYNE. I think that the Senate, under the lead of the gentlemen who were advocating the same side of the question as the gentleman is now advocating, put into the treaty or into the law a provision whereby we were to keep the same duty on sugar, so far as Cuba was concerned.

Then, I want to remind the gentleman of another thing. He was boasting about helping beat the bill we had before the House. The bill before the House gave the differential in favor of our people of 20 per cent ad valorem upon the value of the goods, which would have been a much greater difference than what the treaty gave. So, if anybody is responsible for the small growth of which the gentleman complains in our trade with Cuba, and the amount we are selling down there, it seems to me it is not the man who introduced the bill into the House and who tried to put it through who is responsible, but the gentlemen who succeeded in defeating the bill in the House after trampling on the rules of the House.

Mr. FORDNEY. For God's sake, do not connect me with any such proposition, or charge me with advocating any proposition that ever reduced one penny the duty on sugar. Since I have been a Member of this House I have opposed all of them, and I am going to continue to oppose them, and I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from York State [Mr. PAYNE] does not agree with me that it is our plain duty to protect our own people. He said yesterday it was our plain duty to protect the little brown people over in the Philippines, who, he says, are as innocent and inefficient as 12-year-old children in this country, Our plain duty is first to the American laboring man and the American farmer, as I understand it. I am trying to do what I think is my plain duty at home.

Now, let me go back for a minute to compliment our President for the position that he takes in his letter of acceptance on the question of the difference between American and foreign labor, maintaining a price that will furnish to the American laborer a fair living.

I have talked longer than I intended to, but I will conclude what I have to say in a few minutes.

Several MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman from York State [Mr. PAYNE] said yesterday that there was a difference of 1 cent a pound on sugar coming in from the Philippines, as compared with the sugar from other countries—Cuban sugar, we will say—of 16 Dutch standard. I read an article from the Weekly Statistical Sugar Trade Journal, prepared by Willetts & Gray, of New York, dated December 28 last:

Muscovadoes in New York, $3.12½ per hundred pounds; other sugars, $3.62½.

This shows that there is a difference of but one-half cent per pound. Comparisons are made here for the past three years, and for the fourth year there is only 15 cents difference. I want to say that I believe the gentleman from York State [Mr. PAYNE] is biased, and that he came as near to hitting the bull's-eye on that proposition as he does on any other proposition connected with this Philippine free-trade bill. It has been shown by abundant evidence, which I have not the time to quote at length, in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means that the cost of the production of sugar in the Philippine Islands is about three-quarters of a cent per pound, laid down for water shipment at Manila; and the gentleman from York State yesterday stated that the freight was 30 cents per 100 pounds to New York, which I believe he said included insurance. He is not so very far out of the way.

Mr. Hathaway, who gave the matter very careful consideration, states that for the last two or three years it has ranged from 21 to 27 cents, the average price being about 25 cents per 100 pounds, or a quarter of a cent a pound. Now, if the statement made by Mr. Welborn and by Mr. Heyl, the foreman of the government farm in the Philippines, is correct, that sugar can be produced and laid down at Manila for water shipment for three-quarters of a cent a pound, the freight at 25 cents a hundred pounds makes it $1 per 100, or 1 cent per pound on board ship in New York. Figuring the duty on 96 per cent pure, which is about the duty on Philippine sugar, the duty would be $1.2638 per hundred pounds, and the cost of refining, 50 cents, as I have stated before, would make Philippine sugar, figured at cost and put upon our market refined ready for the consumer, at 2.7638 cents; in other words, in round numbers 2¾ cents per pound. Now, give the Filipino half a cent per pound profit and you have 3¼ cents. Make the difference as shown there of half a cent a pound, that would be 3¾. Now, if the sugar trust absorbs that product, which there is no doubt in my mind they will do, because they never let anything get away that they can get their claws on, they can get sugar from the Philippine Islands under modern improved methods for sugar production and put it upon our market at a quarter of a cent per pound less than it can be produced from sugar beets.

This testimony has been given over and over again. I have an abundance of it here to show that the labor in the cane fields, the maximum price, is 16 cents a day in money and food combined. Mr. Welborn states that he has found the Filipino an efficient employee, and as good a teamster, as good a man to plow in the field, as any American he has ever employed. Time and time again through the hearings it has been stated by the gentlemen who went there for the purpose of obtaining information that the wages paid in the Philippine cane fields were 15, 16, and 17 cents a day, and in many instances, notwithstanding the statement made by Mr. Taft, who said that there was no such thing as peonage in the islands, it has been shown here by the testimony of two or three gentlemen that there are to-day many slaves upon the sugar plantations. They cited this one instance where a poor woman has been recently relieved from bondage, who has to-day a family grown up of her own, who was given to her master when she was 7 years old to pay a debt of 75 pesos ($37.50), which these people advanced to bury her parents.

Mr. Gove said that he called upon another Filipino, a magnificent specimen of humanity, and he said to him: "What are you doing here?" "I am working for this planter." "How long have you worked here?" "All my life." "How much do these people pay you?" "I don't know; I never had any money in all my life; he gives me all the rice and sugar I want and all my family wants, and I am satisfied. I am happy and I don't want any more." His clothing consisted simply of a shirt and nothing else. That is the kind of labor these people have there to-day in the cane fields of the Philippine Islands, and this bill proposes to bring down the American labor to that level. Oh, in the name of God, do not think of it for a minute, gentlemen; do not slaughter the rights and privileges of your neighbors at home for such miserable, contemptible labor as that! We never want to associate with them. You do not want them in your family; I do not want them in my family. They say this is American territory, and the only claim the friends of this measure are making for this bill is that it is American territory and we must help the little brown fellows. That is all. I beg of you, gentlemen—I beg of you in the name of all that is reasonable to come forward and carry out your pledges as set forth in our platforms, and crush out such measures as this, that would bring degradation to American labor, the American farmer, and American capital. I thank you. [Great applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3—the Philippine tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks for the RECORD. I think I will cut them down instead of extending them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks permission to revise his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 99. An act to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the reprint of the bill H. R. No. 3—the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the reprint of the bill H. R. 3. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the following change of reference was made: Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriations for participation in an

exposition at Milan, Italy, from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. FLETCHER was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Eli Pettijohn, Fifty-eighth Congress, second session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MOON of Tennessee was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Abraham Clever, Fifty-eighth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SHARTEL, for ten days, on account of important business.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Ilwaco Harbor, Washington—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for establishing the Bellevue Range light station—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for light-house off Greenville, N. J.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the post cemetery at Old Camp Floyd, Utah—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report from the accounting officers of the Department as to delinquencies in rendering accounts—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for improvement of the legation grounds at Peking, China—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting an estimate of appropriation for continuing the construction of the new building for the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of the claim of Felipe Zamora, of Manila, P. I.—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for enlargement of Fort Sill Military Reservation—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the Surgeon-General of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, requesting that Brig. Gen. J. F. Bell and Capt. Grote Hutcheson be permitted to accept decorations conferred by the French Government—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, requesting that Brig. Gen. Thomas H. Barry, Col. John Van R. Hoff, Lieut. Col. Walter S. Schuyler, Maj. Montgomery M. Macomb, and Capts. Carl Reichmann and Sydney Cloman be permitted to accept decorations conferred by the Emperor of Russia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of State, requesting that Capt. T. Bentley Mott, United States Army, be permitted to accept the decoration of the Order of the Legion of Honor—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10498) to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto over and across the Columbia River, at a point at or near Wenatchee, in the county of Chelon, State of Washington—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 10499) authorizing the accounting officers of the Treasury to readjust the accounts of the Pacific Railway and other companies for transportation of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps since July 1, 1896, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 10500) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 10501) to incorporate the National Educational Association of the United States—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 10502) appropriating the receipts from the sale of public lands in the State of Minnesota to the construction of drainage works for the reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 10503) to provide for the erection of fireproof buildings at the Presidio of San Francisco, State of California, to be used as storehouses for military supplies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10504) for the erection and equipment of a general hospital on or near the shores of Bristol Bay, Alaska, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 10505) to provide a site and erect a public building at Plymouth, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10506) to provide a site and erect a public building at Nanticoke, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10507) to provide a site and erect a public building in Pittston, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10508) to provide for a site and erect a public building at Hazleton, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 10509) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands for grazing purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 10510) to further protect the first day of the week as a day of rest in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 10511) to provide for an equal division of the lands and moneys of the Osage tribe of Indians, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 10512) to provide for additions to the Light-House Establishment in the Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10513) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hilo, Island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 10514) for the erection of a public building at Lasalle, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 10515) to distribute the surplus in the Treasury of the United States to the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia for the sole purpose of improving the roads therein—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GILLETT of California: A bill (H. R. 10516) to amend an act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10517)

to purchase a collection of original essays, designs, drawings, and die and plate proofs of the revenue stamps and private proprietary stamps of the United States, known as the Deats collection—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10518) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell a portion of the site of the post-office site at Marblehead, Mass.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 10519) to increase the limit of cost of public building at Woonsocket, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAHON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 64) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to authorize the United States to regulate the insurance of the lives and property of citizens thereof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A resolution (H. Res. 124) that W. P. Scott be appointed a special employee in the Clerk's document room—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RAINEY: A resolution (H. Res. 126) for the relief of William B. Payne—to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 10520) granting an increase of pension to John H. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 10521) granting an increase of pension to John F. Cluley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 10522) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Everitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10523) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Gorton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10524) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer W. Akerley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10525) granting an increase of pension to Artemas D. Many—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 10526) granting an increase of pension to Mortimer F. Root—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10527) for the relief of Pay Director E. B. Rogers, United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 10528) to rectify the status of Union war officers on the retired list of the Navy and Marine Corps—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 10529) for the relief of James Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASSEL: A bill (H. R. 10530) granting an increase of pension to Matthew S. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10531) granting an increase of pension to William G. Binkley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10532) granting an increase of pension to William Filby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 10533) granting a pension to Martha J. Pruitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10534) granting a pension to Harrison Browning—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10535) granting an increase of pension to James E. Harrison—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 10536) for the relief of Hans M. Anderson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10537) granting an increase of pension to John G. Blessing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 10539) to refund the taxes illegally collected from the estate of Charles A. Brown—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10539) to refund the taxes illegally collected from the estate of Amelia Morrison—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10540) to refund the taxes illegally collected from the estate of Harriett Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10541) to refund taxes illegally collected from the estate of Mary Peckham—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10542) to refund the taxes illegally collected from the estate of William McKie—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10543) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Josiah A. Wait—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10544) to refund the taxes illegally collected from the estate of Cordelia E. Paris—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10545) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of John I. Thompson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10546) referring to the Court of Claims for adjudication and determination the claims of the widow and family of Marcus P. Norton and the heirs at law of others—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 10547) granting a pension to Jesse A. Hines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10548) granting an increase of pension to Chauncy A. Bradley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10549) to correct the military record of James Orton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 10550) granting an increase of pension to William F. Snow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELD: A bill (H. R. 10551) granting an increase of pension to Ezekial Polk—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10552) granting an increase of pension to James Wilkerson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 10553) for the relief of Eli Pettijohn—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 10554) granting a pension to John W. Holcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10555) granting an increase of pension to Willard Farrington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10556) granting an increase of pension to Marcus Haskins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10557) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Dodge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10558) granting an increase of pension to Edgar W. Gage—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10559) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Searles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10560) referring to the Court of Claims for adjudication and determination the claims of E. W. Jewett and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 10561) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Piersell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 10562) granting a pension to Alpheuis M. Beall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10563) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Cummins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10564) granting an increase of pension to Levi N. Bodley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10565) granting an increase of pension to George I. Walters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10566) granting an increase of pension to James W. Hullinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10567) granting an increase of pension to James Haskell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10568) granting an increase of pension to Robert Simpson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10569) granting an increase of pension to James Duggins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10570) granting an increase of pension to A. M. Webber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10571) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10572) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hackley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10573) granting a pension to Maria Baughman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 10574) granting a pension to Edward W. Hoban—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10575) granting an increase of pension to Margaret F. Tyson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 10576) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of George A. Nickerson—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10577) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Isabella Kopperl—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 10578) granting a pension to William McCall and others—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10579) granting a pension to R. B. Justice and Andrew G. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 10580) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Fish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10581) to amend the military record of Joseph S. Hurst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10582) granting an increase of pension to Oscar B. Caswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10583) granting a pension to Elisha Painter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 10584) for the relief of F. H. Driscoll—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 10585) granting a pension to John W. Terry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10586) to amend the military record of John W. Terry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 10587) granting an increase of pension to James M. Ellett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10588) for the relief of John Parker, a sailor in the Navy of the United States before and during the Mexican war—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10589) for the relief of James H. Oliver, a commander on the retired list of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 10590) for the relief of C. J. Shelverton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10591) granting an increase of pension to Mable E. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 10592) for the relief of William Sheppard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10593) for the relief of the heirs of James Freeman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 10594) granting an increase of pension to James Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 10595) for the relief of Nye & Schneider Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10596) granting an increase of pension to William Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10597) granting an increase of pension to Oscar F. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10598) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10599) granting an increase of pension to Henry Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10600) for the relief of Francis M. Watrous—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 10601) for the relief of Charles H. Stevenson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 10602) granting a pension to Henry S. Rider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10603) for the relief of Mary E. Brotherton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 10604) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Holcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10605) for the relief of Edward F. Stahl—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10606) for the relief of James I. Patten—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 10607) granting a pension to James W. Eastman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10608) granting a pension to Mary A. Harrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10609) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 10610) for the relief of James N. Robinson and Sallie B. McComb—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 10611) granting a pension to John J. Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 10612) for the relief of Frank J. D'Avy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 10613) granting an increase of pension to William Larraby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10614) granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Levis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 10615) to correct the military record of Joseph Strobel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10616) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Hearn—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 10617) for the relief of James N. Bowles—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10618) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Rhodes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 10619) authorizing Maj. Thomas W. Symons to accept the decoration of the Order of the Double Dragon, conferred by the Emperor of China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10620) granting an increase of pension to Edward Varley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: A bill (H. R. 10621) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 10622) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10623) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Bostwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10624) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10625) granting a pension to John M. Hyden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10626) granting a pension to Mary Ann Getting—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 10627) granting an increase of pension to Lewis L. Bingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 10628) granting a pension to Lucetta Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10629) granting an increase of pension to Frank Picard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10630) granting an increase of pension to Amon R. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TYNDALL: A bill (H. R. 10631) granting a pension to Nancy Walker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10632) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10633) for the relief of the estate of Jacob B. Russell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10634) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of A. C. Barton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10635) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry C. Sills, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEEMS: A bill (H. R. 10636) for the relief of John H. Willis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10637) granting an increase of pension to Levi I. Shipman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 10638) for the relief of Martha S. Carmichael—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10639) for the relief of the estate of R. T. Brown, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10640) for the relief of Abner P. Bush, of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10641) for the relief of the estate of W. T. Collins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10642) for the relief of the estate of Wesley Crisler, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10643) for the relief of the estate of Dr. J. P. Davis, deceased, late of Yazoo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10644) for the relief of Mrs. M. M. Champion—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10645) for the relief of the estate of George M. Coker, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10646) for the relief of the estate of J. J. Galtney, deceased, late of Yazoo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10647) for the relief of the estate of Jane N. Gibson, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10648) for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Grant, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10649) for the relief of J. B. Hall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10650) for the relief of James K. Hamblen, of Madison County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10651) for the relief of Frank Harris, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10652) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. H. C. Henderson, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10653) for the relief of the estate of R. H. Hoffman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10654) for the relief of Mattie J. and W. P. Horn, heirs of Preston A. Horn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10655) for the relief of Robert M. Lay, administrator of Nancy Lay, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10656) for the relief of the estate of Tillman Loggins—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10657) for the relief of John L. McClendon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10658) for the relief of the estate of B. V. McGuffee, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10659) for the relief of R. R. McMullen, administratrix of Thomas J. McMullen, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10660) for the relief of the estate of Thomas S. Maben, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10661) for the relief of the estate of Jesse Mabry, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10662) for the relief of the estate of Emily R. Martin, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10663) for the relief of the estate of Reuben Millsaps—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10664) for the relief of the Methodist Church South, of Phoenix, Yazoo County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10665) for the relief of the legal representatives of Benjamin Roach, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10666) for the relief of the heirs of Hiram G. Robertson and Charlotte G. Robertson, deceased, late of Hinds County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10667) for the relief of the estate of James P. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10668) for the relief of Charlotte Spears—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10669) for the relief of Smith Summers, administrator of John Waters, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10670) for the relief of L. A. Whitehead—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10671) for the relief of J. E. Whittington—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10672) for the relief of Mrs. C. V. Wilkins, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10673) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. C. M. J. Williamson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10674) for the relief of William D. Wilson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10675) for the relief of the estate of Henry E. Windley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10676) for the relief of the estate of James S. Winters, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10677) granting a pension to Maria Elizabeth Posey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10678) granting an increase of pension to Henry Knox Sikes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10679) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Mrs. Harriett Miles—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10680) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Charles Baker, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10681) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of William O. Moseley, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10682) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Elizabeth Johnson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10683) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of S. N. Clark, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10684) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Sarah G. Clark, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 10685) for the relief of Hiram Stewart—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10686) granting an increase of pension to George W. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10687) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Leavitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9296) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth D. Hoppin—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4607) to restore to the pension roll the name of Annie Gaebel—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of the Scott Legion, of Philadelphia, favoring bill H. R. 15742—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of citizens of Pennsylvania; Refuge Lodge, No. 142, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Ellwood City, Pa.; Falls City Council, No. 385, of Beaver Falls, Pa., and Knights and Ladies of Honor, No. 2231, of Newcastle, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Canonsburg, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution abolishing polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, against Government recognition of Mormonism—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Hon. John Sheaffer, John Colberson, Samuel Baker, Ebenezer Springer, and John Murray, favoring early passage of the Penrose-Dalzell bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Keystone Driller Company, of Beaver Falls, Pa., for two classes of mail only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sanford A. Pinyan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of the Newburgh Reed Company, of Newburgh, N. Y., favoring bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of the Congregational Church of Desmet, S. Dak., against the sale of liquor in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of the Maine State Grange, favoring bill H. R. 345—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Maine, against any change in the Grout law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Waterville, Me., for general arbitration treaties with all nations—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Paxson & Comfort Company, against the tax on domestic alcohol unfit for a beverage—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Petition of the Caney Social Union, No. 1482, C. P. J. of A., and citizens of Caney, Kans., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Maud O. Worth—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: Petition of the Cigar Makers' Union of America, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of the J. Thompson & Sons Manufacturing Company, of Beloit, Wis., for removal of the tax on domestic alcohol rendered unfit for a beverage—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the merchants of Monroe, Wis., for repeal of the tax on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of James Caldwell, Samuel Creelman, John Walter, and Joseph Fisher, urging immediate passage of the Penrose and Dalzell bills relative to pensions for ex-prisoners of war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Kleber Brothers Company, for removal of the tax on domestic alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Reformed Presbyterian Church and the superintendent of the First Presbyterian Sunday School, of Wilkinsburg, Pa., for a constitutional amendment abolishing polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Tobacco Growers' Association, of Lancaster, Pa., and the Rice Association of America, against passage of the Philippine tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Titus Lodge, No. 207, Knights of Pythias, of McKeesport, Pa., and Saratoga Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg, Pa., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DEEMER: Petition of Citizens of Arnot, Tioga County, Pa., and Arnot Lodge, No. 465, Knights of Pythias, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Stony Fork Grange, No. 1033, Patrons of Husbandry; Riverside Grange, of McElhattan, Pa., and the legislative committee of Patrons of Husbandry, Grange No. 1203, of Harrison, Pa., to strike out word "knowingly" in the oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York State, favoring creation of a Federal judicial court in the Orient—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Bar Association and other associations, against repeal of the present bankrupt law—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring treaties of reciprocity with certain foreign countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the International Reform Bureau, for certain conservative enactments in defense of law and temperance—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Eastern Oklahoma Miners' Association, against grant of mineral lands to Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Woman's Club of Staten Island, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Edwards, N. Y., against sale of liquor in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Presbytery of Argyle United Presbyterian Church, against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Missionary Society of Argyle, N. Y., against seating of REED SMOOT—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Robert B. Reilly Company, of New York City, against a tariff on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also petition of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, against the spread of Mormonism—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 60,000 Americans in Alaska, for representation, etc., in the American Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Phoenix and Maricopa County Board of Trade, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DWIGHT: Petition of Harford Grange, No. 500, of Harford, N. Y., against tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASSETT: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 17, of Elmira, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FIELD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Wilkinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ezekiel Polk—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the sixteenth annual session of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress, urging improvement of the Gulf of Mexico and Pacific coast harbors—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of citizens of Illinois, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James N. Piersell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 157, of Rockford, Ill., against a reduction of the duty on cigars from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARNER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Floyd L. Frisbie—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of the Central Federated Union of New York City, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of citizens of Peoria, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GUDGER: An affidavit by J. H. Gagle, a recruiting officer of the civil war, affirming that William McCall et al. were his recruits, and affidavits by McCall et al. attesting same facts—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of R. B. Justice and Andrew G. Williams, of Asheville and Fletcher, N. C., for special legislation placing them on the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of the Percival Furniture Company, the Carpenter Company, and the Estey Organ Company, of Brattleboro, Vt., and the Salisbury Brothers Furniture Company, of Randolph, Vt., for removal of the tax from domestic alcohol unfit for a beverage—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Horace W. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Stephens—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Clark—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Western Star Council, No. 142, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Baltimore, Md., and Rock Hall Council, No. 149, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Rockhall, Md., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, expressing alarm at growth of Mormonism—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Protective Association of Hudson County, N. J., urging a new post-office for Jersey City—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petitions of citizens of Palmyra and Mount Holly, N. J.; Monmouth Council, No. 25, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Freehold N. J.; Washington Camp, No. 7, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Trenton, N. J.; Fieldsboro Council, No. 52, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bordentown, N. J., and Washington Camp, No. 23, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Palmyra, N. J., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of New Jersey; Washington Camp, No. 14, of Trenton, N. J., and Victor Camp, No. 179, of Baskingridge, N. J., Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HUNT: Petition of the Baxter Molding Company, for free denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 13 citizens of Hillsdale, Wis., against removal of the duty on sugar from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of Major Weston Council, No. 129, of Fishkill, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KLINE: Petition of Indianola Tribe, No. 384, Improved Order of Red Men, and citizens of Birdsboro, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John W. Terry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ida L. and Clara H. Winters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 8122) for a public building at Sumter, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LILLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mabel E. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Cigar Makers' International Union of America, No. 132, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and the Central Federated Union of New York, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Club of Staten Island, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of T. J. Sheppard, of Dekalb County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Freeman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas B. Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah A. Boush—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry S. Rider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. H. Bean—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of A. Joyeux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James F. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of McKenny Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of citizens of Nebraska, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John L. Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Bridget Hearn—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Zachariah Parker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: Resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Navy for information as to conditions at the Naval Academy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: Petitions of citizens of Buffalo, N. Y.; Local Union No. 43, Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers, of Buffalo; Wood Finishers' Union No. 515, and Onondaga Tribe of Red Men, No. 250, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of 1,200 members of the National Military Home, Kans., for a law for payment of commutation and rations to members of the several military Homes when out on furlough—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Petition of John S. Beveridge and 100 others, for creation of a retired list for generals of the Volunteer Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 6571) for relief of Elizabeth Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill (H. R. 6544) for relief of Buford P. Moss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill (H. R. 6720) for relief of Emma P. Sykes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill (H. R. 6547) for relief of Virginia Bryant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill (H. R. 6596) for relief of Alex O. Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill (H. R. 6601) for relief of James Drewry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill (H. R. 6613) for relief of Thomas J. Stevens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill (H. R. 10026) for relief of Mary F. Matherly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill (H. R. 6674) for relief of the First Presbyterian Church of Lebanon, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill (H. R. 6765) for relief of estate of Thomas Heyser—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Petition of the Board of Trade of Grand Rapids, Mich., commending appropriation for new Government building in Grand Rapids, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring special agents for the promotion of American industry abroad—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens and the Board of Trade of Smyrna, Mich., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Cornelius De Haas—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles M. Bowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Margaret Emmons—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Reeds Corners, N. Y., against restoration of the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petition of citizens of Arizona, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the mayor and city council of Tucson, Ariz., against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolution of a mass meeting at Clifton, Ariz., against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Lewis L. Bingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of Beers Post, No. 140, Grand Army of the Republic, of Tecumseh, Mich., for an amendment to the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kendall, N. Y., against the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 142, of Lockport, N. Y., against proposed Philippine tariff law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Charles F. Durner, of Quakertown, Pa., for passage of bill H. R. 7079, for free alcohol in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Colonel Edwin Schall Camp, No. 92, Sons of Veterans, of Lansdale, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Milton F. Brooke and others, of Lansdale, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEEMS: Petition of citizens and Fremont Council, No. 14, of Beallsville, Ohio; citizens of Barton, Ohio, and Perfect Lodge, No. 737, Knights of Pythias, of Barton, Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of citizens of West Virginia; Glenville Council, No. 50, and Freed Council, No. 105, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of West Virginia, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *January 6, 1906.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REPORT OF SPECIAL IMMIGRANT INSPECTOR MARCUS BRAUN.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization from the further consideration of the following privileged resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask for its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution No. 76.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to send to the House of Representatives, at his earliest convenience, the reports, or copies of the same, heretofore made to said Department of Commerce and Labor by Special Immigrant Inspector Marcus Braun and dated on or about August —, 1904; June —, 1905, and July —, 1905.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, is that a privileged motion?

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is now privileged. It was introduced by me on the 13th of December last, and the committee has not acted upon it. So it is now privileged under the rule.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to the resolution; but I make the point of order that it is not privileged.

The SPEAKER. It occurs to the Chair, after hearing the resolution read, that the motion is privileged.

Mr. MANN. It is not a resolution of inquiry.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, it is a resolution of inquiry. It inquires for reports by way of information. This information is very desirable. There should be no objection.

Mr. MANN. It is a resolution directing the sending in of a report. I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution, but it does not seem to me that it is a resolution of inquiry. If that practice should prevail the House might require the sending in of all kinds of reports to be printed.

The SPEAKER. It occurs to the Chair that it is in the substance of a respectful request that amounts to an inquiry. Sometimes the House directs; but this is a request that, if not incompatible with the public interests, he send to the House of Representatives at his earliest convenience, etc.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am informed the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor has no objection to the resolution. The immigration question is a pertinent matter, and will come before Congress ere long for discussion. We should have these reports of Mr. Braun. I am told they contain much valuable data and information on this important question. The people should know their contents.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SULZER. And I know there are quite a few Members of Congress who want to know what Inspector Braun has reported in regard to matters of immigration between Austria-Hungary and other European nations and this country. This is the only way we can get this information, and we are entitled to have it.

Mr. MANN. Well, I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The only suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois is as to whether the motion is privileged.

It occurs to the Chair under the rule that it is, the time having expired within which the committee is required to report. The question is on the motion to discharge the committee.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to, and that that motion lie on the table.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

SUPPRESSION OF TRAIN ROBBERIES.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 349) for the suppression of train robberies in the Territories of the United States and other places, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I would state that the chairman of that committee is perfectly willing that this should be done.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for change of reference of the bill referred to as requested. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved March 8, 1902.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill No. 3.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. BOUTELL. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Connecticut proceeds, I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to conclude his remarks without interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut may be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was none, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, it has occurred to me during the progress of this debate that perhaps one cause of some opposition to this bill has come from a misunderstanding of the general conditions of the Philippine Islands. It was my intention to make a carefully prepared speech for my own constituents as well as for the Members of this House on the subject of tobacco alone, and I have prepared that and shall give it to you by and by; but previous to that it seems to me that there would be a better understanding of the whole situation if I should as briefly as possible review the general conditions in the Philippine Islands The red line on the map before us shows the latitude and longitude of the territory which was ceded to the United States by Spain under the provisions of the treaty. It covers an area about 1,250 miles in length and about 400 to 500 miles in width. The actual land area of the Philippine Islands, according to the census—and there is a slight difference of about 5,000 square miles between the census and the Gazetteer—is 127,000 square miles, which is 7,000 square miles more than the area of Great Britain, which supports 40,000,000 people, and about 20,000 square miles less than the Empire of Japan, where from forty to fifty millions of people are living. There is a very wrong impression in regard to the physical geography of this country. Two gentlemen were at my house the other evening who had the idea that the country resembled to a large degree Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska.

Far from that, it resembles and follows out almost exactly the physical geography of Japan, where it is well known that only 14 per cent of the area is tillable, and where, after two thousand six hundred years of recorded history, they have only succeeded in cultivating 12 per cent, notwithstanding that it has a density of population that probably exceeds any other country on earth and has had an intensive cultivation that is not equaled anywhere in the world. The tillable area of these islands is 9½ per cent of the total surface. The question was asked here yesterday or the day before where that fact could be found. I will state for the benefit of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that it will be found on page 181 of volume 4 of the Philippine census.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly; at any time.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman at this time, because I expect to take that question up myself if I have an opportunity to speak. I simply wish at this point to ask the gentleman if it is true that at that page in the census or anywhere else in the census there is a statement to the effect that there are only 9½ per cent of the lands in the Philippine Islands that are tillable?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. It is given 9½ per cent as agricultural lands.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, yes; I will explain that later.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Furthermore, the gentleman will find on the same page of the census that this is not mere guesswork, the work of somebody sitting at Manila guessing at the area of the tillable lands of the Philippine Islands, but it is a report from each separate province, made by the people in the province itself. Out of the whole forty-nine provinces—I think it is forty-nine—these reports are brought together and consolidated, and they show that there is agricultural land in these islands to the extent given, nine and a half per cent, as constituting the tillable area, and that of this only 4½ per cent, after three hundred years of occupation by civilized people, ever has been under cultivation. Right here let me say in regard to the one particular island where eight-tenths of all the sugar comes from, Negros, and from the province of Occidental Negros, 21 per cent of that is estimated as agricultural land, and 46 per cent of that 21 per cent is already under cultivation. In this archipelago there are said to be about 3,000 islands. Of course that covers everything—pinheads of rocks that come up out of the sea and everything of that kind, but the principal islands, the productive islands, the exporting islands, are the only ones I desire to talk about.

The island of Luzon is eight times the size of Connecticut and has four times the population.

The island of Mindanao is seven times the size of Connecticut, and has one-half of the population. On all of the easterly side of this group of islands the mountians come down direct to the sea without intervening shore as a rule. On the westerly side is where the arable land is found. The mountains come down at a distance from the seashore of from 3 to 20 miles, and there is where the cultivable area of the island is found to a very large extent. Now, the best demonstration of the truth of the statement that 9½ per cent only of the islands is agricultural land is shown by the fact that two-thirds of the entire population of the archipelago live within 3 miles of the seacoast, and the interior to a very large extent is unoccupied because it is uninhabitable. Take, now, the population. I have had this map colored to show the location of the different kinds of population in the islands. The brownish-gray color represents that portion of the island inhabited by Christian people, civilized people. The yellow represents the portion of the island inhabited by wild tribes, absolutely uncivilized. Igorrotes and Negritos are in this section of the country—savages, head-hunters, 250,000 of them, within a hundred and twenty-five miles of Manila—and more than that, the Negritos are over here in the Mariveles Mountains to a quite considerable extent—absolutely wild people within 50 miles of Manila.

This summer while in Manila they had an industrial parade, and one feature of that parade were eight of those Igorrote savages. They were clothed with a gee string and a smile, and carried a bow and arrow and nothing else. They were absolutely wild savages, and yet you see right in the heart of the principal island of the group that 250,000 of these head-hunters live today. The portion colored green is occupied by Moros, semi-civilized, half savage Malays, Mohammedans, slavery and polygamy prevalent among them—a mild form of slavery, but slavery nevertheless—and there are 250,000 of these in that island, and

yet this is the island of which we have heard so much of its wonderful fertility and the danger that is going to come to the United States if this bill is passed, and it becomes possible to cultivate it all with tobacco, sugar, cocoanuts, hemp, rice, etc. No white man would be safe for a moment in this section of the country outside of a town or village where a garrison was stationed.

Mr. SULZER. There is where the head-hunters live.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. They live out here in this island in the section colored yellow. Now, another thing; a curious fact about this country is this, perhaps not bearing on this case, that this is the only nation or people in the world in history that ever has been converted from Mohammedanism to Christianity. It was done by the Catholic Church, and they are entitled to great credit for doing it. Now, desiring to proceed in order I take up the question of——

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire if the gentleman objects to questions?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Not at all.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Do you regard the census report from that territory occupied by Moros as of value in connection with the raising of tobacco and sugar there?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will take it up by and by when I come to the question of the localization of the various industries of the country. Take the question of the education of those people. I find by the census report that of the whole mass of the population, which is about 7,600,000, 700,000 of them are wild people and 6,900,000 Christian people, that of these people, including only those from 10 years of age and upward, 20 per cent can read in some language, but taking the whole population together, about 14 per cent can read in some language. There is no Filipino people in the sense in which we speak of an American or English or German people. There are eighty-seven different tribes and peoples, speaking from fifty to sixty different languages, and as a rule it is impossible for them to communicate with each other from island to island and from a part of one island to another part. It is as it would be if Washington and Baltimore were utterly disconnected and their citizens could not converse or communicate with each other in a language which they could mutually understand. There are no highways for intercommunication. The only railroad in the island now runs from Manila to Dagupan, at the foot of the Lingayan Gulf. There are practically no highways. There may have been here and there one, a short one built by the Spaniards, and a bridge built here and there by the Spaniards, but so far as real communication from one part of an island to another is concerned there were no methods provided and none existed.

The people of this valley could not converse or communicate with the people on the seashore across the mountains. I said that about 14 per cent of these people could read in some language; in Spanish only 3 per cent of the people; a few in English, but generally in their tribal dialect, of which, as I said, there were some 50 or 60 varieties. Under such circumstances you could not expect a very high order of intelligence among them. Now, I do not wish by saying this to throw any discredit upon the people of the Philippine Islands. There are probably 1½ or 2 per cent of those people who are the very best product of the universities of Europe and America—as brilliant, as polished, as cultivated, and as refined as you will find anywhere in the world. I am simply speaking of the great mass of the people, who have been denied all the privileges of civilized life by reason of the conditions under which they lived.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. DIXON]?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Will the gentleman point out the island of Negros?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Also will he tell us the journey the people who went to the Philippine Islands last summer took?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I should have stated that the black line shows the trip I had the privilege of taking with other Members of Congress through the islands, and you will see it included all of the principal islands and ports in the archipelago.

Now, gentlemen, we have a great problem on our hands in the Philippine Islands, and I am going to call your attention to just one feature of it. Three centuries ago, when the Spaniards went there and took possession of the islands, there were half a million of people. To-day there are seven and one-half millions. They have increased fifteen times over—through wars, through pestilence, bubonic plague, cholera, insurrection, smallpox, and every conceivable thing that one could think of to prevent the increase of population; and yet they have increased fifteen times over. And I want to say to you gentlemen that, in my honest judgment, instead of having a problem of a Philippine Archipelago, with seven and one-half million people to deal with, in fifty years from now you will have a population of twenty-five millions if stable government and peaceful conditions continue under our administration of the government. So the problem is really much greater to deal with than that which we think we have on our hands to-day.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. I am curious to know how those savages back in the mountains, away from the seashore, subsist. Do they live by fishing and hunting, like our Indians, or how?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The peculiarity of any tropical country—that is, of any which I have ever visited, and especially so of this—is that work is not required for subsistence if one is willing to accept the kind of food which can be taken out of the ground or plucked from the trees. It is a marvelous factor, and it should be very carefully considered when you come to calculate upon the future productions of those islands. There is a population there that for 300 years has never been prompted by necessity to economy, to industry, and to any of the virtues—we call them virtues in a civilized country—that obtain in the United States. I believe it is absolutely true that, taking the tao or peasant in the Philippine Islands, as a rule if you would pay him 25 cents a day he would work enough days to maintain his living through the week; if you doubled that pay to 50 cents, he would work half the time; if you increased it to a dollar or two dollars, he would cut down the hours of labor exactly in accordance with the amount of pay you give to him, all his ambition being simply to maintain an existence. And why should it not be so? You and I would probably do the same thing under the same circumstances and in the same torrid climate.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. I am merely trying to get information; I am not criticising any position you have taken. I understand you to say that away from the seashore the soil was sterile and that civilized people could not subsist there. Well, how do they subsist if the soil is not sufficient to support them by its products?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. By hunting and by wild fruits and by a very crude form of agriculture—very crude, indeed.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Civilized tribes could subsist upon that soil, could they not?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. There is no question but that they could, but they would certainly go to that portion of the islands where subsistence is easiest.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. It is inhabitable, is it not, for civilized people if we could get rid of the savages?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think it is true to a considerable extent, and I will take up the matter later. When I went across the island of Mindanao I found it practically as it was at Creation's dawn; there is scarcely a particle of that land in cultivation, and I went through it from the seashore on one side to the seashore on the other.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question, just for information?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I heard a very distinguished admiral of our Navy some time since talking about the Philippine Islands and he said that there was a race of savages in the Philippines something like the little brownies that we read about in the books.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Yes; and they are about 70 or 80 miles from Manila; they are the Negritos. They are dwarfs—practically negroes—with kinky hair.

Mr. NORRIS. I call for order; I can not hear.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. There are very few of them, being largely outnumbered by the full-sized Igorrote—a savage.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. What is their proportion of increase?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think that class of people—the Negritos—and I am speaking from an impression only—are not increasing, but are dying out. I would think that that is also correct with reference to the Igorrotes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Do you know of any effort being made to civilize those people?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not think it is possible, any more than it is possible to civilize the Moros.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Do you know of an effort being made to carry some of them to England and undertake to civilize them?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. And that on their return to the islands they resumed their savage habits?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not think it is possible, from conversations I had with a number of men and women, to civilize the Igorrotes. I do not think it is possible, from all that I have learned in regard to it, to have much success in civilizing the Negritos.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I ask you these questions in view of the statement that you said that after twenty years we would have some 25,000,000 people. If that be so, then we will have more savages.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I was referring to the Filipinos—the various tribes of the Filipino population—when speaking of that.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to ask the gentleman if I understood him to say that he did not think it is possible to civilize the Negritos?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not believe it, but I do not think my opinion would be very valuable upon that subject. I want now to refer to the principal island and tell you, as far as I understand it, what there is on the seacoast. I mean the island of Luzon. The tobacco which is exported from the archipelago, all of it substantially, comes from the island of Luzon, and it comes almost entirely from this river valley running right down there. I have another map, which I will use later, showing that tobacco district. The export tobacco comes entirely from the Cagayan Valley, the fields extending about a mile on each side of the river from the town of Alcala up to the town of Echague. It is probably a distance of from 50 to 75 miles. On this island rice, cocoanuts, sweet potatoes, and a very little sugar are also grown. The largest area of tillable land is just in this other valley, stretching from Manila to Dagupan. It is a splendid, wide, cultivated valley. I have been through it from the seacoast to the seacoast—right through the whole of it. It is a garden spot, if there is one in the world.

It is largely devoted to the cultivation of rice. I went through there in May, four years ago, and did not see a piece of sugar cane. I do not know whether it was in the right season of the year or not, but I did not see any sugar cane in that entire 120 miles. But in the Pampanga district there is some little production of sugar cane.

Coming south into the provinces of Cavite and Batangas you get principally rice cultivation and very little sugar. Right south of the Laguna de Bay is the largest area of cocoanut plantations that there is in the whole archipelago. Then coming this way into the peninsula of Luzon you get purely a hemp country or almost entirely so. Of course there is some rice and there are some sweet potatoes, but nothing in the way of export food products or in the way of supplying any of the other islands. The whole country in here is practically given up to the cultivation of hemp. Legaspi, which we visited, is one of the largest export points for hemp in the island.

Now, coming on down through the other islands, this was our course——

Mr. BONYNGE. Before leaving that——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly; at any time.

Mr. BONYNGE. What is the area of the island of Luzon?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The area of the island of Luzon is 40,969 square miles.

Mr. BONYNGE. What proportion of that island is included in the lands that are arable? Can you tell us that?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I can not tell. I will have to refer you to page 181 of volume 4 of the census reports. You will find that table all complete there, and you will find the volume in the Ways and Means Committee room.

We went from Manila southward to Iloilo, in the island of Panay. It is a city of about 20,000 people. It is the main exporting point for sugar from the islands, the reason being that across from Iloilo, on the island of Negros, are the main sugar plantations of this archipelago. I have not gone into the figures carefully, but I understood the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means to say yesterday that from Negros came eight-tenths of the sugar that was raised in the Philippine Islands. Am I correct?

Mr. PAYNE. That was the statement of Mr. Welborn.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Now, I want to say, and especially to our beet-sugar friends, that I do not think they have any conception of the difficulties under which the sugar business is carried on in the Philippine Islands. That sugar comes from the west side of this island. That is Occidental Negros. On this side is Oriental Negros, where very little sugar is raised. There is not a harbor on the island—not one—and when Secretary Taft and his friends wished to go to that island to study the conditions of that industry there, they had to be carried ashore on bamboo rafts. I was engaged in other things that day and did not make that visit, but I have no doubt that some of the gentlemen here who did go there can explain the embarrassments of navigation at the island of Negros. It therefore follows that all the sugar from this island has to be carried across this channel to the port of Iloilo, where ships can go, and from which place the exports are made.

Now, just imagine for a moment an American farmer or a sugar-cane grower in Louisiana being required to put all his sugar in little bags and carry the entire product of his farm, with a boy and a bag of sugar on the back of a carabao, out throught the mud and put it on a little rowboat and carry it out to a larger boat, and then carry it 30 or 40 miles to Iloilo before finding a market. And yet that is the condition under which eight-tenths of all the sugar of the Philippine Islands is produced. And that does not half give you an idea of the methods that obtain on the farms and plantations where the sugar is grown. No western man can comprehend the primitiveness, the simplicity, the crudeness with which all these agricultural operations are carried on in the Philippine Islands until he goes there and sees it for himself. It is impossible to have any comprehension of it otherwise. And I say as a business man to other business men here that there is not a single industry in the Philippine Islands of any kind or character which any industry in the United States has the slightest occasion to fear. The burden upon us is to lift them up, to enable them to do better. It is not for us to stand back and shiver and measure the honor and dignity and greatness of this nation by a pound of beet sugar or a 5-cent cigar as a measuring rule. [Applause.]

Mr. DWIGHT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. DWIGHT. Do they have to depend upon irrigation to raise crops in any of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will take that up in a moment. There is no irrigation in the Philippine Islands as we understand it. There is no artificial irrigation. Now, that very question settles the whole problem to a large degree, because the industries are localized by that fact. Why does hemp grow in that province? Why does hemp grow in those islands and not in the others? Simply because hemp must have a porous soil and be cultivated where rain comes every month in the year, otherwise it is not a success. Hemp is the natural product of the Philippine Islands. It is not hemp at all; it is abaca, a species of the banana plant. It is a natural product, and is not cultivated as sugar and tobacco are any more than apple trees or peach trees are cultivated.

Now, down here in Negros there are large areas of arable land. Twenty-one per cent of the whole island is arable land, and there the sugar is grown. On Panay a variety of crops are raised, like rice, sweet potatoes, corn, etc.

From Iloilo we came down to the Moro country, and had an exceedingly interesting visit there, but the recital would not bear on this subject or on the subject of this bill particularly, because there are no agricultural operations carried on there. They raise a little rice, perhaps a little sugar, a great deal of cocoanut, and fish for pearls and pearl shells. The strange thing about it is that the entire product of the pearl-shell fisheries is sent to London, and our manufacturers of cutlery go to London and buy that product and bring it back to the United States and sell it to you at an increased cost. Why should we not have it shipped to the United States and have it at first cost?

Now, you can judge of the civilization of this portion of the archipelago and the extent of its agricultural and manufacturing operations when I say to you that a man down here will sell for $40 or $50, while a woman brings from $60 to $100. A good diver who is a success will sell for $100—twice as much as the ordinary laborer will bring. So there is nothing down there which this country should have any reason to fear. The same thing is true in regard to Jolo, where the Sultan of Sulu resides.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. Did I understand the gentleman from Connecticut to say that traffic in human beings is still going on down there?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I did not see any of it, but I believe it is.

Mr. CLAYTON. Selling human beings?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think that is true.

Mr. CLAYTON. We have been there how many years?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Five years.

Mr. CLAYTON. And we have not stopped that traffic in human beings yet?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. No.

Mr. CLAYTON. And this benevolent assimilation has been going on all that time?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think that is true. There is absolute savagery, and I think you will find it anywhere where savagery exists. I am glad that at this late hour the moral tone of the gentleman from Alabama has been raised.

Mr. CLAYTON. And the great Republican party has been in power all this time?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. That is true.

Mr. CLAYTON. And has not been able to put down slavery and traffic in human beings?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think that is true, and it would be in the United States to-day but for that great Republican party. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.] Now, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I do not want to get into a discussion, but desire to confine my remarks to this bill.

Mr. CLAYTON. But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask our school-teacher a few more questions. He still has not answered my question. I would like to know why we have been there five years and the traffic in human beings has not been stopped.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I decline to answer that question at this time. I want to confine my remarks now to this bill.

Mr. CLAYTON. Why, the gentleman is illuminating the whole question of the Philippine Islands—the different people there, the soil and the climate and the business methods, and he pictures in glowing terms the possibilities—a teeming population of 25,000,000 people—and I would like to know when we are going to get rid of this traffic in human beings over there.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, we came up to the south side of the island of Mindanao. It was very greatly desired by the Secretary that the Members of Congress should go through this new, absolutely uncultivated country, and judge of its fertility and the general character of the island. We landed on the south side of Mindanao and made a two days' journey directly through the heart of the Moro country. Of course we were protected by troops. There was a company of cavalry ahead of us and a company of cavalry behind us and four cavalrymen around each wagon as we rode through. We met occasional straggling Moros and passed by Moro villages. I think it is the most fertile soil I have ever seen in any part of the world—that is, on the high table-lands, rising from 2,500 to 2,800 feet above the seacoast. We came up to Lake Lanas, which lies in a pocket about 800 feet deep and, crossing the lake, drove down to Camp Overton, on the other side of the island. We were surprised at the marvelous forests and the perfectly wonderful jungles of the Tropics. But, in my opinion, the island is impossible of cultivation as long as 250,000 savages—Mohammedan Moros—live there, who not only hold the white men as enemies, but above all other things are deadly hostile to the Filipinos—both the Visayans and the Tagalogs.

From there we came up to the island of Cebu. Negros is a sugar island, and right opposite is Cebu, where there is no sugar. Now, why? Simply because of the character of the soil and the location of the island. That is all. Cebu is the most densely populated island in the whole archipelago, and its agricultural products, while, of course, perhaps a little sugar is grown for home consumption, are of such a character as are necessary to the maintenance of the dense population of the island itself, and aside from that, hemp, for the city of Cebu is next to the largest or the largest hemp-shipping port in the archipelago. All of these islands over here are in precisely the same situation in regard to products. Cebu is a hemp island, and if anything in the way of exports comes from either Cebu or Bohol, it is hemp—nothing, practically, in the way of sugar or rice or anything of that kind. Next we went to the city of Tacloban, in the island of Leyte, and a more prosperous looking community it would be difficult to find in any country anywhere—clean and well-made streets, sidewalks, good houses—everything indicating prosperity.

At every place where we went there were hearings concerning the products of the locality, and generally an industrial procession, and oftentimes an industrial exposition, showing the products of the province. In the procession at Tacloban I noticed this banner: "This province has never asked for free rice." Now, what did that mean? It was this: That over in the island of Cebu a million dollars' worth of property was consumed by a severe conflagration last spring, and following that a very severe drought, practically destroying their hemp crop, and we found there or were told there that from four to five thousand persons were daily receiving free rice in order to sustain life throughout the year until another crop could be put in and produced. They were in extremely embarrassed circumstances and unfortunate conditions on the island of Cebu. Tacloban was boasting of its own prosperity. From Tacloban we went to Legaspi, and then to Sorsogon. From there we returned to Manila. Now, as to the localization of their industries. The cocoanut product of the islands is confined to certain localities. The tree must grow near the salt water. It must drink salt water through its roots every day. That, at least, is the proverb.

Copra is the dried meat of the cocoanut. From it oil is extracted and used largely in the manufacture of soap. It is the only article which will make soap which can be used with salt water. It is a seacoast product and is shipped principally to France. Why is not that copra shipped to the United States? It is admitted free of duty just as we admit hemp. Why is it not shipped here instead of being sent to France and then brought back to us to a considerable extent made into fancy soaps for which we pay a very high price? I am in favor of such a policy as will cause the products of these islands to come here and be manufactured here, instead of bringing them to our markets in a manufactured state filtered through European factories and increased in value by European labor. That is the kind of a protectionist I am. I am a protectionist from the crown of my head to the soles of my feet, but I am a protectionist against foreign nations and not against our own people. [Applause.]

Mr. CASSEL. What effect would this bill have upon an article which is now brought into this country free?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I am going to show you by and by; I am glad you asked the question. I will not do it now. Now, take the rice crop. Three million two hundred thousand acres all told in the archipelago are under cultivation. Sixteen hundred thousand acres—one half of them are in rice, and instead of increasing the sugar and tobacco crop they must increase the rice production in order to sustain life. I think there were seven or eight million dollars worth imported from the East Indies last year. Gentlemen, these people must ultimately take all the extra land that they have which is arable and put it in rice, and they would now if they could. Why can not they? Because soil that will raise hemp must be porous, so that the water will run through it; but the soil that raises rice must be heavy and hold water, because they have no artificial system of irrigation. I tried to get a provision in the general bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin three or four years ago, providing for irrigation companies in that country, as gentlemen will remember, but there are none there now. They have no capital for artificial irrigation and they do not understand it, but such irrigation as they have is secured by planting in heavy soil that will hold water and letting the rains provide irrigation by natural processes instead of artificially.

Mr. CASSEL. Is not that the way they do in Louisiana?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will ask the gentleman from Louisiana if it is not all artificial there.

Mr. PUJO. All.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. There is a great difference between the two places, and I believe that if this bill is passed, in five years—yes, in three—we will be sending rice to the Philippine Islands and selling to those people right from the fields of Louisiana and Texas.

Mr. PUJO. At the proper time, if the gentleman will excuse me, I intend to take the position that it will bring about great injury upon the rice industry of this entire country.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Now, gentlemen, I have shown you the system of cultivation of the four principal crops. Of hemp last year they exported $22,000,000 worth. Its cultivation is confined by natural reasons to certain portions of the island. Of sugar they exported four millions. Its cultivation is confined by natural reasons to certain portions of the island. Tobacco is in precisely the same situation. I will go into that more thoroughly by and by. I have spoken of the rice production. Copra or cocoanut is confined to the seacoast, and they exported about $1,999,000 worth in the year past.

Mr. PAYNE. I think it is about 4,000,000 of copra.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. One million nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand dollars worth of copra and about the same of tobacco and about 4,000,000 of sugar.

Mr. PALMER. What is copra?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. That is the dried meat of the cocoanut. Now, gentlemen, after visiting the islands we came back to Manila. I question very much whether it is wise for me at this time to go into any consideration of the hearings which were held in the city of Manila in view of the questions that my genial friend from Alabama asked me a little while ago, because I want to confine my remarks solely to this bill, but I can not refrain from saying this in regard to them. The meetings were held in the city hall, commencing at 9 o'clock each

morning and continuing until noon, then lunch, and continuing generally until 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon. The governors of all these provinces were present.

Gentlemen interested in the various industries all through the islands were present. Anybody whom they chose to put on the stand was gladly received and welcomed and his statement heard with respect and with attention. That was the procedure during the first week. At the urgent solicitation, however, of some members of the party it was decided when we returned to Manila, after making the trip around through the islands, that the hearings should be thrown open to anybody who chose to speak on any subject whatever, in addition to the questions of hemp, the shipping bill, tobacco, and the agricultural products of the islands. And I must say one thing in connection with that, for it seems to me to redound to the credit of the American nation. When the delegation went away word was left that if there were any criticisms to be made, any charges of malfeasance in office, any charges of improper conduct in office by any American officials in the islands, if they would be submitted in writing they would be carefully considered and investigated by the Members of Congress who were there on their return, and I want to say for the credit of the great American Republic that when we came back and the doors were thrown wide open for discussion and consideration not a single charge of any kind or character was made against any American official. And in response to my question to several of them as to why they had not done as they had intimated the week before that they would do, the reply was that there were no such charges that could be sustained. [Applause.]

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. There were complaints in those hearings about excessive salaries.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. There may have been, but I remember none in the hearings. But there was one case I now recall of criticisms made at the Filipino banquet. I think myself there is some cause for complaint concerning excessive expenditure in the Philippine Islands. I say frankly as a Republican to-day, it is your fault and mine, and not their fault out there. If five years ago the United States Government could have fixed a definite and clear policy as to the course it would take in regard to those islands, in my honest judgment the expense for maintenance of government there could have been very largely reduced. But we were divided as to what course should be pursued. Some of us said, "Oh, by and by, when they are fit for self-government." Others wanted independence right away. Others said: "Never." What was the result? The American officials there would have been derelict in the performance of their duty if they had not gone forward and used every possible effort to build those people up to an understanding not of a government such as they had under Spain, but along the line of self-government. And those things could not be done without an elaborate expenditure of money.

The trouble has been in America, not in the Philippine Islands, with regard to extravagance of expenditure, and difference of opinion among ourselves as to the policy to be pursued there has compelled it. There is not a Member of this House but knows that if a good, strong man could have understood five years ago just exactly what the policy of the United States Government would be in the islands he could have managed the matter with far less expense than has been incurred. Of course he would not have obtained the same results. You can not reduce that expense, gentlemen, until you come to a clear and definite expression of policy, in my judgment. Now, why——

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I would like to ask if there is not a very considerable disagreement as to the future policy of the United States in the archipelago?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will answer that in a certain way—perhaps I ought not to, but I will—by saying that a gentleman for whom I have the highest regard, differing with me politically—I will not mention his name and I do not want you to ask me his name—said to me as we were leaving Yokohama to come home, "Mr. HILL, you and I came out here with differing views on this question." He was a great deal further from right than he supposed he was. I have always been a pessimist in regard to this proposition. He said, "You and I came out here with very differing views as to the policy that should be pursued here. I have seen a great many things, and I have made up my mind to this—that it makes no difference, and will make no difference in the future as to whether the Republican party or the Democratic party is in power, the United States will never give up these islands, and the best thing we can do is to take the question out of politics and do the best we can for these poor people." [Applause.] And it was the wisest expression of opinion I have heard for many a day.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. If the gentleman will permit an additional question. I say, understanding that to be the policy of the Government of the United States, to hold on to the archipelago and to give them the best government it may be within our power to give——

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky (continuing). I understand that to be pretty well the established policy now; and while I differ with my friend politically and differ with him widely and radically upon this proposition, yet when a policy is established I think that when we all think we can not abolish that policy we ought to go along and do the best we can for these people. Now, what is to hinder, when this policy has been established, a reduction in the expenses of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think it is being done now and has been going on for some time. I am very certain that Vice-Governor Ide has been at work for many months making a conscientious effort to bring about a very material reduction in the expenses of the island, and my personal judgment is that it ought to be done.

The gentleman from Kentucky asked a question in regard to the expression of opinion of the Filipinos. Of course I can not go into the details in regard to that. I am simply expressing my judgment. The professional men——

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Before you leave that branch of the subject I want to get at what per cent of decrease could be made in the expenses of the island?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would rather refer you to the hearings which are printed and ready for distribution in the Ways and Means Committee. I think you will find full details there given by Governor Ide.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I did not know but what the gentleman had it in mind.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I have not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In reply to the question of the gentleman from Maine, I wish to say that a member of the Philippine government told me in Manila this summer that they hoped to make a reduction in the expenditures of a hundred thousand dollars a year.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What percentage would that be of the annual expenditure?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I could not tell you what percentage of the expenditures it would be.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Does the gentleman from Connecticut know?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not recollect; I simply say as my individual judgment that a very large reduction of the expenses can be made, except in one direction, and that, gentlemen, is in the line of education. I am going to take that up in a minute or two. I should regret exceedingly to learn that anything less should be done in the direction of giving more and better education to those people.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. One other question, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Was it not the general impression of the intelligent people with whom you communicated that it would be unfortunate and a calamity to thrust the English language down the throats of these people in the schools?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not think that is true. I think practically the contrary. The independencias—the people who believe in immediate independence—favor the retention of the use of Spanish as the official language of the islands, but I think the people generally desire to have the children taught English. At these hearings Mr. Lukbau, Mr. Illustre, and Mr. Gomez, who claimed to represent the labor unions of the island, and other gentlemen claiming to represent various classes of people, attempted to show to us that there was a general concensus of opinion among those people who dissented from the American administration that they would like to have the immediate independence of the islands, neutrality to be guaranteed by the civilized powers of the world and they to be put in possession, with a protectorate established under the United States and to be maintained by the United States Army and Navy at our expense, while they carried on the government. Now, that was the general consensus of opinion of all those who advocated immediate independence, but, in my judgment, 99 per cent of the business interests of the Philippine Islands, the professional men, the church representatives—I mean all the churches; I do not simply mean the Catholic Church, which is the dominating church in the islands, but all the churches—the lawyers, the doctors, the teachers, all stand for American control and sovereignty.

And there are only a very few men, who are professional agitators, who are making this demand for a protectorate or for an independent government, and they base it on this proposition. Let me put it to a legislative body in a self-governing republic. Their idea was this: "That the Philippine Islands have demonstrated their capacity for self-government, because," as they say, "there is among us a small directing class who know how to govern, and the great mass of the people know how to obey. They have demonstrated that for the last three hundred years. We therefore think we are capable now of conducting this government if you will put it in our hands as the directing class." We asked the gentleman who made this statement to which class he belonged, and he said that modesty would forbid his saying; but the fact that he was there was proof positive that he belonged to the directing class. He thought that we should put the government wholly into the hands of a few who consider themselves the directing class, and that the great mass of the people were a class who knew how to obey. We asked them how long they thought a republic based on the government of the people by themselves would endure, according to their idea. Yet that is precisely what has been going on there substantially for the last three hundred years, and they know nothing else.

Now, in regard to the criticisms which the gentleman spoke about as to American administration, there is no doubt that some criticism has been made. I did not hear it voiced any more thoroughly and completely than I did by a very bright lawyer who spoke, as these gentlemen who were there will remember, at the dinner at the Metropole Hotel—the Philippine dinner. He said—I am giving his statement from memory—"We accept American sovereignty, but it has not been our custom to go as fast as you people are going. We do not criticise the breakwater, the sidewalks, the streets, the sewers, or the railroads in themselves. We do not say you have spent too much money or that we have not got our money's worth. We simply say that in an Asiatic, oriental country we are not in the habit of doing all these things to-day. We think it is better to wait and to leave some of them until to-morrow." In other words, it was the radical difference between oriental sluggishness and the American hustle. That is the occasion for all the criticism there is. These people are just exactly what you would expect after three hundred years of the kind of government which they have had.

There has been no incentive to economy. Why should a man be economical when he knows that a taxgatherer, who is the agent of a Spanish governor-general, if he finds that he has a dollar and a half in his pocket, is going to take away a dollar and a quarter and leave him only a quarter? Why is he going to try to be economical? It has come from custom, from tyranny, from plunder, and from the robberies of three hundred years, to be hereditary in those people, so that there is no such thought as economy or industry or energy or activity in the common masses. How are we going to cure it? We can cure it, but it is a great problem, and in my judgment the only possible thing is to commence at the bottom with the children and give them education, generation after generation, and build them up into a new people. They are quick, they are eager, they are ready and anxious to learn, they are interested in the subject. The last year of Spanish occupation Spain expended $80,000 for educational purposes in those islands. When I was there five years ago we had 120,000 children in school. To-day we have half a million children in school, and last year we spent $2,000,000 for educational purposes, and I wish from the bottom of my heart that it had been $4,000,000. [Applause.]

I would vote for free trade to-day between the Philippine Islands and the United States if it was not for the mere necessity of giving them revenue in some shape or other to increase their educational facilities in the islands. [Applause.] It is right in principle that they should have free trade with this country. No man can stand here and talk about putting a tariff between one American and another. They are our people. They are not ours by their choice, but by the act of God or the conquest of the American nation. They are helpless in your hands. What are you going to do? Are you going to treat them worse than Spain treated them? God forbid. [Applause.] Now, what have we done?

Mr. BONYNGE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. BONYNGE. You say you would give them the same tariff laws that we have and that it is right they should have the same tariff laws?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I say frankly that if I had my way I would treat them exactly as we are treating Porto Rico; I would put the American Dingley tariff right around the islands and have absolute free trade between the islands and the United States, if it could be done; but you can not do it to-day.

Mr. BONYNGE. In the last session of Congress I suppose you voted for the Philippine tariff bill, did you not?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I did; I did.

Mr. BONYNGE. I will ask the gentleman if we are treating the Philippine Islands, even upon the tariff question, as we are treating the rest of our possessions?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. We are not, but I want to see the day when we will.

Mr. BONYNGE. Importations from other countries into the Philippine Islands are governed by different laws than importations into the United States from other countries. Is not that true?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will say to the gentleman that I have seen Members of Congress who were compelled by the exigencies of the case and the peculiar conditions that in years gone by have surrounded them who have been obliged to vote contrary to their convictions. It is just as true of governments. They must do the best they can under the circumstances as they find them, but there is no reason on earth why a great nation like ours, full of Christian people, should not bring their moral ideas up to the treatment of these poor people and enable them to help themselves.

Mr. BONYNGE. I want to arrive at the gentleman's idea.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. You can not arrive at it; it is utterly impossible. [Laughter.]

Mr. BONYNGE. The gentleman says I can not arrive at his idea?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not think you can. I have been trying myself to formulate it on this question for five years. [Laughter.]

Mr. BONYNGE. If the gentleman has no idea formulated, I will not press the question further.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. It will not interrupt me at all; it is only a question at a time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish the gentleman would explain to the House in this connection what is the reason we can not have that free trade now with the Philippine Islands?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Because the revenue is absolutely necessary to enable these people over there to carry on their government, give education to the people, give them more schoolhouses and more teachers, and go on with the public works which have been begun. If the American people will stand up and say we will pay these bills out of our Treasury instead of the Philippines getting the money in the ordinary way, by internal revenue and customs duties, I am for free trade now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is one other element which enters into it which I wish the gentleman would speak of, and that is the Spanish treaty.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not fear that at all. I will say to the gentleman that I do not believe it is possible in the next three years for the Spanish Government to adjust itself so as to get any marked advantage out of any free trade it might have with the Philippine Islands. I do not fear it if it did come, and under the provisions of this bill, whereby Spain would be obliged to give the Philippine Islands the same concession which we give, she would lose enormously more than she would gain, because she has a monopoly of tobacco, and if she threw her ports open to shipment to the Philippine Islands she would lose, because practically all of the tobacco from the Philippine Islands is shipped to Spain.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is one thing which bothers me, and has a great many other gentlemen, and that is, What is the reason they can not run the Philippine government there from the internal revenue?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Because they never have had in the Philippine Islands a system of internal revenue until it was put into operation a year ago the 30th of last July. They are not used to it, and, furthermore, it is working with considerable friction now. In my judgment, in the end it will work out in such a way as to give a sufficient revenue, so that we can have free trade with them, and they can dispense with the duties. But I do not think this can be done in less than two or three years. When I make my remarks on tobacco I will refer to their experience with the internal-revenue tax.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has spoken about a subject that I have most at heart, and that is the maintenance of the revenue in the islands, so that you will not have to have a land tax on the islands and turn the people out of the possession of their lands by taxation. Is it safe to leave that clause in the bill which says we are going to have absolute free trade?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Why, certainly not. I assert over and over again that if conditions were such that we could do it,

I would be glad to dispense with this whole restriction on trade between one part of our own people and another part, but we can not do it. The gentleman himself has called attention to the land tax.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman from Connecticut understands the question.

Mr. PARKER. I ask if it is safe to maintain that clause of this bill which says that we will abolish all duties in 1909. Is it not safer to wait until then and find out whether they can get along without the revenue?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not think so. I do not think there is any question about the ability of the Philippine government with a fair degree of prosperity to get internal taxation sufficient to take care of themselves three years from now.

Mr. PARKER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask whether it is safe to put internal taxation upon as poor a people as they, who know so little how to manage and keep their land, whether the example of Porto Rico and the difficulties of the population there, with the small trades being destroyed by the competition of the American shopmade goods, ought not to make us careful in taking away from them at any time or saying that we are going to take away the right to make their revenue out of tariff duties?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not think there is any question in regard to the ability of the Philippine Islands after an experience with a well-organized internal-revenue system to raise funds to carry on the government economically administered.

Mr. NORRIS. I would suggest to the gentleman from Connecticut that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the chairman of the committee, in answer to a question the other day, said he had a doubt about the benefit that would accrue to the Philippine people, as a matter of fact, from the reduction of this tariff on sugar and tobacco.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to get the gentleman's idea on that subject.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The gentleman will get it precisely and specifically and definitely—one, two, three—when I get to the tobacco part of this question.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has been speaking of internal-revenue receipts. Do they receive anything from the customs there now?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Yes; and I am glad the gentleman spoke of that, for it illustrates another feature of our legislation. The gentleman asks me if they receive anything from the customs duties collected here. They do. We turn them all over to them. It goes into their treasury instead of into the United States Treasury. When we had a 15 per cent duty on goods coming from Porto Rico, we turned that duty all back to them. Porto Rico to-day has her internal-revenue receipts and customs receipts. They all go into the Porto Rican treasury. And further than that, we are trying to get the Philippines to the same point and the same treatment afforded to Porto Rico.

Now, the customs duties on goods coming from the Philippine Islands, on the tobacco and sugar that will come here under this bill, if it does come, will be paid back to the Philippine Islands. More than that, the tonnage dues on ships sailing from the Philippine Islands to our ports—foreign ships—all go back to the Philippine Islands. I will tell you what kind of a bargain we made in that matter. A law was enacted three years ago that the duties which were received on Philippine products should be paid back into the Philippine treasury. There was a concurrent provision made that export duties from the Philippine Islands should be abated on goods coming to the United States, and where they get $7.50 a ton on hemp exported from the Philippine Islands to all parts of the world, when it comes to the United States they do not get anything, so that taking the rebate on the export of the hemp coming to the United States to our factories, and figuring it up from the passage of the bill down to 1905, we have had the benefit of $1,547,002.18, and we have paid back to them customs duties amounting to $1,256,250.01, and we are about a quarter of a million dollars better off for the three years than they are, and their treasury has been deprived of so much money, every dollar of which could have been used to advantage in the education of their people.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Does the gentleman mean that that sum of a million and a half has gone into the Treasury of the United States or the importers have received that?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I mean it has practically gone to our people who imported the hemp and used it—to the farmers in the West for cheaper binding twine, for instance.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. It did get into the Treasury?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The duties collected here went into our Treasury, but they went out again and were paid over to the Philippine treasury.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I wanted to get at that distinction, and I want to make another inquiry, if I may be permitted——

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. And I ask the gentleman if he thinks that is fair treatment of those people who can not help themselves?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I do not stand for this proposition at all. I do not believe in exploiting that for a minute in this country, and never have. Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question: In relation to this clause providing for the repeal of the duties at the end of something like three years, I understood the gentleman to say, if they had a condition of business and industrial prosperity in the Philippines, that that internal-revenue tax would provide funds enough to carry on the government——

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I did say so.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Did the gentleman find a condition of industrial and agricultural prosperity in the Philippines when he was there that would produce this result of which he speaks?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. So far as the copra and the hemp industry is concerned, yes. So far as the sugar and tobacco industry is concerned they are in a very deplorable condition, as I will show when I take up the question of tobacco.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. And unless something is done to rehabilitate those industries, would it be prudent for us to pass legislation repealing that tariff at the end of three years?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. In regard to that I will try to demonstrate it at the tobacco end of the question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman state the revenue the Philippine government will get if this bill is enacted—the estimated revenue?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. It is entirely problematical, I will say to the gentleman. I think I can give a better answer to that in arguing as to the effect of this change in policy with reference to the tobacco industry. It is entirely problematical.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has stated how much has been paid by the Philippine government during the past fiscal year in the way of customs duties. Now, there will be all except 25 per cent.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I could not tell; I do not know.

Mr. PRINCE. Will the gentleman yield for a further question on the same line?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. PRINCE. What I would like to know is, do the government officials there acting for us and for the Filipinos receive any customs duties there? If so, how much and where does it go?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. A very large amount. I think the Philippine Islands got from customs duties last year somewhere in the neighborhood of $7,000,000, and I think that about $1,200,000 of it was from goods going from the United States to the Philippine Islands. Now, I may be all wrong. That is simply a mere guess.

Mr. PRINCE. In which treasury does it go?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Into the Philippine treasury.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why did the committee fix 25 per cent instead of some other percentage if it had no idea of how much revenue is going to be derived?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I can not answer that question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, can any member of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I can not answer for the other members of the committee. I think very likely it will be answered before the debate is finished, but it did not seem to come into my part of the discussion. Gentlemen, I want you to understand distinctly the condition of the people of the Philippine Islands. It is precisely what you would expect in view of the experiences that they have gone through. I need not enlarge upon the system of despotism which has characterized the government there under Spanish domination, but just stop and think a minute of other things. Since I was there four years ago in a single year the rinderpest caused the death of 75 per cent and possibly more of the draft animals in the islands. Now, imagine the condition that would obtain in the State of Pennsylvania to-day if 75 per cent of the cattle, the horses, and the mules in the State were absolutely exterminated in one year, and yet that would not give you a fair idea of the situation. You must take a purely agricultural State like Iowa, Nebraska, or Kansas, and imagine what the condition would be there if 75 per cent of the draft animals were swept out of existence in a single year.

Mr. CASSEL. Would the Government help us to pay for those animals?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The Government has not helped them to pay for those animals. They have brought animals

there and sold them and tried to help them in any way they could, but they have not given them animals.

In addition to that, they had in 1902 an epidemic of cholera by which 120,000 lives were lost in a single year. They have had insurrection, bubonic plague, cholera, smallpox, and typhoons, and it seems as though the whole country had been swept by the besom of destruction.

Now, that is their condition. What are we doing? In the first place, we are taking the children and trying to educate them, and we are trying to make highways through that country. We have covered this whole archipelago with telegraph lines, giving prompt and ready communication all through these islands, one with another. We have taken Manila—and so far as Manila is concerned it is as much the Philippine Islands as Paris is France, there being the same relation between them—and we have made it, first, a clean city, throttling the cholera and driving it out of the islands, and making the bubonic plague unknown.

That is the first thing—making it so that white people could live there. Then, what else have we done? Why, in place of a little, miserable mule system of transportation five years ago, simply "two streaks of rust and a right of way" through the streets of Manila—nothing more—they have now 33 miles of as fine a trolley system as you will find in any city in the world. We have widened the streets, moved back houses, have turned narrow lanes into public highways, have made artificial stone sidewalks, and put down curbs and gutters. We have enforced sanitary regulations there, and have made a harbor at Manila.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to know the name of the promoter of the trolley in Manila.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not know and I do not care. It is a good trolley system, and it is serving the city in first-class style.

Mr. SULZER. I thought probably the city of Manila owned it.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The franchise, as I understand it, was sold at auction and a good price paid for it, and so far as I could judge it is all right. At any rate it serves the people and is doing a first-class business, and paid 15 per cent last year.

Mr. SULZER. Then it does not belong to the city.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not know. I hope not.

Now, gentlemen, four years ago, when I went there, the ship anchored 3 miles out from shore in the bay, and subject to every wind that blew, as dangerous an anchorage as I have ever seen. This time we passed right in behind a $4,000,000 breakwater into a magnificent harbor, absolutely safe. On the Sunday night before we came away a typhoon came up, and with the wind blowing 70 miles an hour not a ship or boat was damaged. They laid there in perfect safety. And, in addition to that, in making that breakwater and dredging that harbor they have made from the waste material 196 acres of new ground on the shore front—ground that would sell at enough to pay for the entire cost of the breakwater. Are they going to sell it? I asked that question. "No." What are they going to do? They intend to run streets through that land and build bonded and free warehouses and piers, and when they have finished them Manila will be the only city in the Orient from Vladivostok to Singapore where a 30-foot draft vessel can go to a wharf and discharge at a warehouse.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman has said that we have built the harbor.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. They have done it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The impression might get out that we paid for it out of the Treasury. They paid for every dollar of it out of their own treasury.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. They have done it out of their revenues. They have made these improvements all the way through. It has not been done at our expense; it has been done at their own. Not only that, but a number of buildings have been erected in Manila. They have a government printing office, an internal-revenue building, and a refrigerating plant which cost a million dollars and is paying 20 or 30 or 40 per cent on the entire cost; and the thing is going along in good shape out there, gentlemen.

Now, then, I say, I have been a pessimist. Four years ago when I left there—and I had been there with my eyes open—I was utterly discouraged at the vastness of the problem which the United States had taken upon its hands. This time, gentlemen, I felt a little better; but I tell you I begin to realize the immensity of the problem. It is a burden upon this nation, but we are too big and too rich and too strong and too courageous to lay that burden down, in my judgment. [Applause.]

It is in the interest of civilization that we should carry it, and we ought not to consider simply our own poor selves. I do not know whether God Almighty put us there or not. I do not want to discuss that question. I simply know that we are there, and as a great, strong, rich nation we have no right to shut ourselves between two oceans here and say we will be indifferent to the progress of the rest of mankind. We contribute our money annually to the missionary work of the respective churches to which we belong. There is a practical missionary question for you, gentlemen, and one glimmering gleam of good sense has come to the missionary institutions of the United States in the work in that field. When they went there, instead of getting into competition, they have distributed the territory, with Manila as common ground. I come to you advocating no fixed course that the United States should pursue, but I came away with an object lesson that has very nearly converted me to the idea that after all this experiment may ultimately be profitable to the United States, and I will tell you what it is. We sailed from Manila right over to Hongkong, 600 miles away. I had never been at Hongkong before, and I did not know what I was going to find. Sixty years ago it was a barren rock 12 miles long and 6 or 8 miles wide.

The city of Kowloon is the nearest Chinese city, right at the mouth of the Pearl River, and on the other side is the city of Victoria. China ceded to Great Britain this barren mountain that rises 2,500 feet so steeply a man could not go up it straight. There it stood with nothing on it, and China ceded it to Great Britain sixty years ago. There never was a year for the first twenty years that England held that island of Hongkong that some man did not rise in the English Parliament and move a retrocession back to China—not a year. And what is it to-day? One of the most magnificent cities in the world, with a population of 220,000.

In Manila we start with a population of 240,000 or 250,000. Hongkong has a population now of 220,000. The Englishmen scraped down the loose earth and piled it up behind a sea wall, and now they have three rows of streets, splendid streets, between that and the mountain; and then they went to work and built rock terraces and fine macadam zigzag walks and roads up the mountain side and now it is covered with magnificent residences, making one of the most beautiful sights I have ever seen when lighted at night. It is a splendid city, the sixth largest shipping port in the world, and Great Britain is to-day as likely to part with Liverpool as with Hongkong. Yet, as I say, for the first twenty years there never was a year that some one did not try to get a retrocession back to China on account of the great burden it was to be to England.

Gentlemen, do not let us get discouraged in this great work, but let us take up our burden like Americans and ask God to bless us and give us prosperity and help us to go on to final success. [Loud applause.]

I am going to give you now a plain, straight, practical, business talk on tobacco, and you will pardon me if I do not try to reach the outer limits of this Hall with my voice. Its acoustic properties are not too good, anyway.

In entering upon the consideration of the tobacco question I desire to ask the especial attention of those Members whose constituents are at all interested in the growing of leaf tobacco or its manufacture in any form. The proposition in the bill is that the tariff on tobacco coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands shall be 25 per cent of the present Dingley rates in lieu of 75 per cent, as now. This will make on unmanufactured leaf tobacco, commonly known as "filler tobacco," 8¾ cents a pound duty, and on wrapper tobacco 46¼ cents a pound duty. It will make the duty on cigars $1.12½ a pound, plus 6¼ per cent ad valorem, and in addition to this the regular internal-revenue tax paid on domestic cigars of $3 a thousand. This to continue for three years, and then, under the terms of the bill, reciprocal free trade to be established between the Philippine Islands and the United States.

The growing of tobacco was introduced into the Philippine Islands in the sixteenth century by the Spaniards. Its cultivation and sale was held as an absolute monopoly by the Spanish Government for one hundred years.

With reference to the success of the industry and the quality of the product I shall not express my individual opinion, but shall quote from well-recognized authorities on the subject.

First, from the commissioner of internal revenue of the islands, from the advance sheets of his report for the fiscal year of 1905, not yet printed, and to which I have fortunately had access within the last few days. He says:

In the provinces of Cagayan and Isabela is produced the only tobacco fit for use in the manufacture of the better quality of cigars and cigarettes. Except for limited local consumption by the persons raising it or for purposes of blending it with the better leaf, there is no demand for the tobacco raised outside of the provinces of Cagayan and Isabela. The Spanish Government had a monopoly which lasted one hundred years in the manufacture of all leaf tobacco produced in these islands. The Government supervision over the planting, curing, and sorting of the leaf was absolute, and the quality of the tobacco was improved and the quantity increased by such supervision. In 1882 the Government monopoly was abolished and the planting and manufacture

of tobacco became free for all. Since then the quality of the leaf produced in Cagayan and Isabela has constantly deteriorated from season to season. No sufficient preparation of the soil, no care in the selection of the seed, of the method of planting, or of the growing of the leaf, crude methods in curing the leaf, and dishonest practices of middlemen in sorting it for sale have all contributed to discredit the former fair fame of Philippine tobacco both abroad and at home. A constantly increasing number of smokers in these islands are discarding the domestic cigar and cigarette and are smoking cigars imported from Sumatra and elsewhere, imported Chinese smoking tobacco, and even cigarette and pipe tobacco from the United States. On May 18, 1905, some of the leading cigar and cigarette manufacturers of Manila entered into an agreement having for its object an increase in the production and improvement in the quality of the tobacco leaf in Cagayan and Isabela, as well as to secure, if possible, more uniformity in the sorting of the leaf by middlemen. Little effective work, however, has as yet been done along these lines. Meanwhile the quality of the leaf continues to deteriorate, and the local manufacturers find it an increasingly difficult task to supply demands for domestic consumption.

Further on he states:

The tobacco now cultivated in the Cagayan Valley may be said to be without doubt almost a wild plant.

From the best information which I can obtain I judge that the cultivation of tobacco is substantially a garden-patch business, except in the case of three or four manufacturers of Manila, notably among them the Tobacoleria Company.

Speaking of the efforts of these few companies to improve the conditions in the industry, I quote again from the report of the Commissioner:

These plantations, which were to be in a measure agricultural schools, are in the same regrettable state of backwardness as that of a poor laborer who learned nothing more than the path shown him by his grandfather. No machinery is to be found there. On the other hand, the ever-present carabao and the antiquated plow are there furrowing these extensive tobacco fields and not penetrating into the soil more than 12 to 14 centimeters. There is not to be found a single rail or tram way, nor any portable road whatever to gather and carry the product of the fields to the warehouses or shipping places. No fertilizer is used, nor any irrigation other than the fertilizing slime or mud annually left there by the great floods of the river and the rains sent down by Providence.

If such is the case in the large plantations, what must be the conditions among the small, poor planters who have no instruction, no capital, no animals, nor any kind of indispensable appliances to cultivate the land?

I quote further as to the curing of the product on these farms:

Tobacco is at present allowed to dry in the sun. If it rains they cover it, but not always, with a few banana leaves, which cover it so deficiently that in most instances it becomes completely soaked. At night it is left out exposed to the weather and receives all the dew sent down by God. With that method of drying it is entirely impossible to obtain good tobacco, for the leaves, with excess of humidity, attain a variegated color, with black and greenish stains. They lose combustibility and aroma, and acquire a bad odor produced by mold.

Let me quote from the Commissioner's report again as to the methods which were applied by the Spanish Government to the growth of the product. On page 174 the following is found:

Under the tobacco monopoly each family in the tobacco district of Luzon was compelled to grow 4,000 pounds and deliver the entire crop to the agents of the government, and a fine was imposed when the crop was short. Early in the nineteenth century many riots and disturbances arose out of the difficulties in meeting the harsh provisions of the law.

Again I quote, from page 195:

Up to 1882—

The year in which the monopoly terminated—

the Filipino planters of Cagayan and Isabela grew tobacco at the muzzle of a gun. Every family was under the orders and supervision of a government employee, and the worker who disregarded the rules laid down for operation in the fields generally had administered to him a few smarting cuts with a bejuco. This slave driving resulted in first-class tobacco.

It is beyond dispute that the abolition of this government supervision and the leaving of the natives to their own devices and methods and crude cultivation has been exceedingly disastrous to the quantity and quality of the tobacco product of the archipelago. So that the general conclusion, quoted by Internal-Revenue Agent Brown on page 191 of the report referred to, may be accepted as accurate at the present time. He says:

Manufacturers of cigars in these islands, dealers in native leaf tobacco, consumers in the islands of Manila cigars, manufacturers and merchants abroad who have handled in past years Philippine tobacco, consumers abroad of Manila cigars, and the Filipino, whether grower or tobacco merchant, are all of one mind on the tobacco question. Philippine tobacco has gradually sunk to a deplorable level.

There is another fact which tends in this same direction, due, undoubtedly, to lack of care and attention to the growing plant by the native farmer. I quote again from the same report, referring to the manufactured product:

The comparatively small stock kept on hand by most of the small manufacturers is due to the worm which attacks the cigar after its manufacture. In some cases the cigar is attacked by this worm within three months after its manufacture, and in other cases seems to escape until nine months, but seldom escapes beyond that period.

Now, it is not a pleasant task to cite these statements, and in so doing to even have the appearance of depreciating this product of the Philippine Islands. Let it be distinctly understood that I am not in any sense whatever expressing my own opinion, but am quoting from official records in every case.

What have been the causes of this decay of the tobacco industry in the islands? Beyond any question, first, the indifference and carelessness of the natives since the abolition of the Spanish monopoly in the growing of the product, and, second, the methods of its preparation and the manner in which it has been gathered and brought to market. I need not go over again the native method of cultivation. Let me briefly call your attention to what the commissioner says with reference to the marketing of the product. Referring to the fact that the great bulk of the tobacco is now bought from the farmers by the itinerant Chinese merchant, he says:

The Chinaman commenced his gathering of leaf tobacco in the Cagayan Valley on a small scale at first, in the same way as white ants make their first appearance in a sumptuous building, until they finally get hold of it and demolish it. Cagayan and Isabela produce an average yearly crop of 250,000 quintals, the value of which is between one and one-quarter and one and one-half million dollars. It would seem at first sight that with such a handsome capital received by the inhabitants, who do not number 300,000, they ought to enjoy prosperity. Nothing of the kind; said provinces are at present utterly poor. The aforementioned unscrupulous trader, called the "Chinaman," has secured all the trade the native needs to avail himself of, and furnishes it to him at fabulous prices. Should another merchant, coming from a different quarter, engage in the same business it does not take them long to overthrow him, and in this way complete monopoly is exercised. They are the sole money lenders, whose usual interest is peso for peso, and considering they grant loans for six months at the most they earn an annual profit of 200 per cent. This is even more when the loan is made in goods. They are in the habit of increasing the values to 25 per cent higher than the selling price, making barter compulsory, or to deliver tobacco for the total value of goods received, such delivery to be made on the 30th day of June at the latest.

Much more could be quoted along this same line, but sufficient has been given to show the manner in which the crop is raised and gathered from the farmers.

Let me show now the way in which it is packed and put upon the Manila market by these same itinerant merchants. I quote again from the Commissioner:

The classification offered in this city—

Referring to Manila—

is really scandalous, or to say it more properly, an iniquitous robbery is being committed. As previously stated, the 4ª superior, which is a leaf of good quality, although broken, is mixed with the superior classes, above all with class 1ª, which is of the same size. The first-class tobacco is formed of whole leaves, clean and of a uniform color. The bunch, or bale, as it is called here, weighs from 2½ to 3 quintals. The average quintal consists of approximately eighty hands of 100 leaves each, and, taking as a base the bunch of 2½ quintals, we obtain a total of 200 hands, which multiplied by 100, which each hand contains, would give us 20,000 leaves. As the leaves consist of two halves, divided by the stem, it is evident that each half gives us at least one wrapper, in which case each package should afford as a minimum 40,000 wrappers. However, you may well be frightened, but there is no exaggeration in what I am about to tell you. Any factory turning out at present from forty to fifty thousand cigars of special brands needs to open at least twenty packages of No. 1ª, which, if properly classified, should afford 800,000 wrappers. It may be seen, therefore, that the tobacco industry can not stand this a long time. We are on a slippery road which leads us to a precipice.

In other words, the sorting and packing of the tobacco is so conducted by these Chinese middlemen, led on by greed for gain, or because of the necessities of the case and the absence of wrappers in the Philippine product, that only 5 per cent of class 1A nets a good cigar wrapper, where it is supposed to have been packed so that the entire bale should be of that quality.

The Chinese merchant handles tobacco simply as an article of commerce. It is true that they know good tobacco, but their one object is money. If 5 pesos profit can not be made by them on a bale then 5 cents will suffice. In buying, the Chino visits the ranches and offers money and merchandise for any class of tobacco, and if not ripe he will buy the leaf as it stands in the fields. Every year these Chinese get more of the growers into their clutches, and that this is a real danger to the reputation of Cagayan and Isabela tobacco all agree. Amongst all the white buyers in the field representing the Manila houses, harmony and competition can hardly be said to exist. All have one object in view—to buy for their superiors in Manila good tobacco, paying therefor a good price. By all of these Europeans bad tobacco is rejected, but this plan is not adopted by the Chino; all is grist that comes to his mill—tobacco, good or bad, to him means money. His methods are in a business sense legitimate, but in another broader sense his operations are not fair. He himself produces no tobacco and is hurting greatly those who do produce.

If it were necessary in any way to corroborate these statements of the officials of the islands, let me call the attention of the House to a memorial addressed to the Secretary of War and the Congressmen visiting the islands during the past summer. This memorial came from the province of Cagayan, and was prepared by the delegates of twenty municipalities, who made the long journey to Manila to welcome the visiting party and outline the situation of that province. They asked for the provisional suspension of the land tax and the removal of the Dingley tariff, for a reduction of the internal-revenue taxes on tobacco, to be effective during three years, with a subsequent gradual increase of said taxes until existing rates have again been reached, for legislation restricting the commerce of the Chinese by confining it to the seaports, and various other remedial measures.

They say that—

The consequences of this state of affairs has been an economic crisis and a general paralyzation which frightens the bravest to such an extent that many of the tobacco growers have resolved not to plant tobacco next season, but use their land for other crops.

And close with this plea:

During the Spanish rule in these islands Spain, in order to protect the tobacco produced by its former colonies, the Philippine Islands, Cuba, and Porto Rico, prohibited the growing of tobacco in its domains, and the Government itself bought up a great portion of the tobacco produced by the aforesaid colonies in order to protect its cultivation and aid the planters. Even after the removal of the government monopoly of the tobacco the Spanish Government continued to protect this product, a goodly portion of which was consumed by the national factories. It also used all means within its powers to induce the other nations to buy this article. The protection afforded to the Philippine tobacco by the Spanish Government ceased with the Spanish sovereignty. Its exportation has considerably diminished, and the fact that Spain still prohibits the cultivation of tobacco within its territory and consumes some of ours is due to the existence of a contract between the Spanish Government and the Spanish company, to which the tobacco has been farmed out, by which it binds itself not to permit the free cultivation of tobacco in Spain and to consume quantities of Philippine tobacco. These benefits will cease upon the expiration of that contract, and the Philippines will then lose the only market left to them in Europe. For these reasons the Government of the United States ought not to delay, but ought to protect this branch of our agriculture in a decided manner before its complete annihilation, which would bring with it the ruin of thousands of persons engaged in the growing of tobacco, and in order to avoid this we ask for the removal of the Dingley tariff at the next session of Congress.

Your visit to these islands will leave an imperishable recollection in the heart of every honorable Filipino, as there is not one who is not confident that we shall soon feel the effects of it and that our economic crisis will be replaced by an abundance of work and of means for gathering the necessities of life, and thus our beloved country will be placed on the same level with the most of the prosperous nations. We beseech you, in the name of the province of Cagayan, to inform the Chief Magistrate of your great country, the United States of America, upon your return there, of our gratitude and of our hopes awakened by your visit, of the affection of these people toward him, and of our confidence that he will lead us to our moral and material advancement.

Signed by the delegates of the Province of Cagayan.

Supplementary to this, and in line with it, let me quote again from the internal-revenue commissioner's report the following:

At the expiration of the Spanish treaty, when Spanish goods cease to be favored by the treaty, it is almost certain that the Spanish monthly mail steamers will also cease to ply, and then it is very probable that the doors of Spain will be closed to Philippine tobacco.

So much for the growth and culture and marketing of the leaf tobacco of the Philippine Islands.

Let me now take up the manufacturing industry. According to the census of 1902, Table 4, entitled "Philippine manufactures, by industry groups," page 482, volume 4, it appears that there are 113 manufacturing establishments, with an aggregate capital of $2,250,201, with a total of 10,150 employees, 5,233 of whom are male and 4,927 female, and with an aggregate value of products of $4,370,258. This includes all forms of manufacture of tobacco—except snuff, which is not made in the islands—cigars, cigarettes, smoking and chewing tobacco. Compared with the enormous product of the United States it is trivial; indeed, one gentleman, Mr. Walter A. Shiffer, of the United Cigar Manufacturing Company, of New York City, stated that the capital of that one company was from seven to eight million dollars, that they had more than 10,000 employees, and produced about 400,000,000 cigars per annum. According to Mr. Shiffer's testimony, one concern in the United States is using, in the manufacture of cigars alone, more than three times the capital invested in the whole industry in the Philippine Islands, employing substantially the same number of persons and producing five times as many cigars as the whole Philippine Islands produced for export last year.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the insignificance of the industry in the Philippine Islands compared with the greatness of the product here, let me give the figures taken from the Internal Revenue Commissioner's report for the year beginning the 1st day of August, 1904, and ending the 30th day of July, 1905—the first full year for which we have any accurate data in the history of the islands—as it consists of records of the industry made for purposes of taxation, and in giving these statistics I shall change kilograms into pounds and pesos into dollars:

Of manufactured tobacco, smoking and chewing, there was a total output consumed in the Philippine Islands of	pounds	425,678
Exported to Spain	do	17,488
Exported to Straits Settlements	do	6,191
Exported to England	do	5,104
Exported to China	do	4,307
Exported to Japan	do	7
Making a total of		458,775

Eighty-four per cent of the tax on this tobacco is paid in Manila and 16 per cent in the provinces. Chewing tobacco is used by the lower class of natives, and they chew it mixed with the betel nut.

With reference to the cigar industry, I find that 90.5 per cent of taxes on cigars was paid in Manila and only 9.5 per cent in the provinces. The total production for home consumption was 69,652,820 cigars of all grades and kinds. There were also manufactured and exported as follows:

China	49,735,660	
Straits Settlements	7,857,821	
Australia	6,059,808	
India	1,779,614	
Japan	584,727	
Indo China	502,910	
Java	476,167	
South Africa	455,391	
New Zealand	131,716	
Korea	16,296	
Persia	5,000	
Consumed on the high seas	862,782	
Total for the Orient and countries tributary thereto		68,467,892
England	5,258,583	
Spain	3,230,170	
France	1,875,000	
Germany	747,007	
Italy	273,570	
Switzerland	82,175	
Holland	55,000	
Egypt	43,050	
Belgium	25,500	
Scotland	19,700	
Total Europe and Egypt		11,609,755
South America		752,137
Canada		116,153
Hawaiian Islands		144,500
United States		167,693
Total cigars exported		81,258,130

Of which it appears that more than 68,000,000 were sold in the Orient and only 167,693 sold in the United States, and as a matter of fact the bulk of these were sold from the Philippine concession at the St. Louis Exposition during the past year and largely as a matter of trial and experiment by our people.

Concerning this export product, the Commissioner says:

China is the best customer, taking about 60 per cent of all the cigars exported from these islands; but much the larger portion of the cigars exported to China are of very inferior grades; they are really large cigarettes wrapped, paper and all, in a strip of leaf tobacco, and are classed as cigars through courtesy and for the lack of a better name.

Let me add to that my own observation, after a thorough and protracted visit to four of the largest cigar factories in Manila. When I say this I mean practically the examination of the industry in the islands, for my conclusion was that outside of eight or ten such factories, all of which are located in Manila, the industry is trivial in its character and amount. I am satisfied, both from the tax records and personal observation, that 90 per cent of the cigars made in the islands for home consumption are extremely low grade, consisting simply of a bunch of tobacco with a piece of leaf wrapped around it and pasted the whole length of the cigar, and, like the cigars shipped to China, designated by that name, as the Commissioner says, "through courtesy and for lack of a better name." Under all the circumstances, I am compelled to agree with the Commissioner in his conclusion that—

The bulk of the cigars produced in the islands could not be sold in the American market at any price, and even if the Philippine cigar was admitted customs duty free into the United States it would not for a long time to come equal 1 per cent of our domestic trade.

And my own judgment is that it would not equal 1 per cent of the average annual increase in the consumption of cigars in the United States. The average annual increase for the past ten years in the production and consumption of cigars in the United States has been 327,753,188, or more than four times the entire export product of the Philippine Islands to all parts of the world last year and 1,955 times as much as the entire importation into the United States from the Philippine Islands last year. The United States produced last year 7,589,337,206 cigars, as against a Philippine export product to all parts of the world, as before stated, of 81,258,130. If it were possible to change the course of their trade from the direction in which it has run since before our nation existed and turn their entire export product into our market, it would be like pouring a bucket of water into the sea—absolutely without effect. As a matter of fact, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue here informs me that there were imported into the United States last year an estimated amount of 63,596,500 cigars from all nations, of which this insignificant amount which I have mentioned came from the Philippines; and this, bear in mind, with a preferential tariff rate of 25 per cent over all other countries. Is it not perfectly manifest that all fear of competition with this great and growing industry in our country, by making the tariff changes proposed in this bill, borders on the absurd and ridiculous?

The product of the Philippine Islands in cigarettes last year was 2,979,351,855, of which all but 14,910,265 were consumed at home, and practically all of the small amount exported was taken by the oriental trade. The record shows none shipped

to the United States, but, on the contrary, our record shows small shipments from the United States to the Philippine Islands. The probabilities are that the internal-revenue tax on cigarettes last year did not represent one-half or one-third of the consumption of the islands, as very large quantities of cigarettes were removed from the factories prior to August 1, 1904, to escape the tax which accrued on that date, and as a result the product for the year following was comparatively limited; indeed, it is claimed in Manila that the consumption of cigarettes in the islands will aggregate nine billions annually, and if this is true it will have a very serious effect in diminishing the export product of tobacco, with the rapid growth of population which is sure to occur in years to come with a stable government and the islands blessed with peace and a hoped-for prosperity.

I will insert at this point, for the use of the Members of the House, tables furnished me by the Insular Bureau of the War Department, showing the entire tobacco traffic between the Philippine Islands and all nations.

Table No. 1 shows the exports of tobacco and its products from the Philippine Islands to all countries since American occupation, including the years 1899 to 1905.

Table No. 2 shows the imports of leaf tobacco and its products into the Philippine Islands for the same period.

TABLE NO. 1.—*Exports of tobacco from the Philippine Islands to the countries mentioned during the fiscal years 1899–1904.*

LEAF TOBACCO EXPORTED.

	1899.[a]		1900.		1901.		1902.		1903.		1904.		1905.	
	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.
Exported to—														
United States			110	$7					244,377	$42,293	211	$35		
Hongkong			1,774	402	15,075	$2,060	16,236	$2,185	6,358	1,421	8,510	1,078	103,461	$11,328
United Kingdom	954,056	$46,463	1,271,115	72,581	2,254	569	204,170	7,337	309,731	15,024	10,349	1,981	21,950	6,985
Germany	258,000	25,800			36,134	4,823	11,909	2,067	18,009	2,240	59,952	4,586	5,731	895
France			408,051	14,044	1,394	169	2,299	364	33,816	1,106	755,277	31,472	378,157	16,810
Spain	6,315,232	343,886	9,102,729	487,492	14,372,911	726,418	16,665,735	600,714	14,624,495	531,669	13,073,021	646,405	13,455,065	830,533
Austria-Hungary			1,948,986	157,021	3,378,178	197,641	3,285,677	83,108	3,284,877	153,107	3,425,488	225,145	473,356	29,715
China	1,846,631	130,138	136,882	14,055	8,863	1,128	6,563	1,786	3,209	374	1,038	125	14,642	1,382
Japan			1,030	102	75	15	12,999	1,461	6,116	1,346	4,607	683	30,799	3,601
Egypt			777,571	21,894					3,384	155			329,740	18,708
East Indies	65,717	6,552	288,735	46,793	83,354	16,192	291,476	29,410	408,617	37,916	317,339	31,190	305,258	27,578
Australasia	2,510,476	252,080	1,009	145	10,992	3,275	2,816	910	16,459	2,793	21,014	1,230	17,773	2,116
Other countries			72,364	3,304	19,870	1,230	544,735	55,181	1,670,720	113,426	1,367,484	78,019	1,140,334	55,753
Total	11,950,112	804,919	14,010,356	817,840	17,929,100	953,520	21,044,615	784,523	20,630,168	902,870	19,044,290	1,021,949	16,276,266	1,005,404

VALUE OF CIGARS EXPORTED.

	1899.[a]	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Exported to—							
United States	$7,002	$1,885	$5,027	$8,539	$3,866	$1,795	$6,790
Hongkong		206,283	337,111	350,140	355,628	376,154	333,534
United Kingdom	558,441	233,082	201,591	624,445	128,211	85,113	94,185
Germany	583	30,226	43,421	27,485	28,994	15,637	5,446
France	14,584	31,699	35,303	31,190	29,293	25,374	19,028
Spain	14,428	47,578	13,901	2,049	1,563	2,664	11,700
Austria-Hungary		7,068	12,115	4,899	5,776	3,947	5,417
China	475,922	222,299	63,978	93,554	58,561	98,759	113,921
Japan	61,729	11,546	10,260	24,008	5,869	17,569	7,497
Egypt	11,092	2,411	1,813	887	2,443	2,038	928
East Indies	59,548	223,771	139,141	195,048	184,995	198,972	172,576
Australasia	89,924	131,809	341,899	227,268	88,360	90,328	93,327
Other countries	1,448	38,504	44,615	77,210	53,945	50,519	46,828
Total	1,294,701	1,188,161	1,250,175	1,666,722	947,504	968,869	971,177

VALUE OF CIGARETTES EXPORTED.

	1899.[a]	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Exported to—							
United States				$76	$3	$27	$30
Hongkong		$145	$4,416	5,341	9,931	8,041	11,289
United Kingdom		150	15	308	41	171	219
Germany			5,335	214	109	119	
France		375		120		143	851
Spain		837		250	400	301	249
China	$525	178	860	576	1,236	1,750	1,699
Japan		63	197	150	627	169	32
East Indies			269	2,590	1,361	1,528	1,017
Australasia		150		136	215	95	302
Other countries				334	6,776	242	716
Total	525	1,898	11,092	9,995	20,699	12,586	16,404

VALUE OF ALL OTHER MANUFACTURED TOBACCO EXPORTED.

	1899.[a]	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Exported to—							
United States							
Hongkong		$37,508	$1,832	$230	$181	$133	$405
United Kingdom	$10,864	12,753	407	706	5,033	490	32
France		57	200	246	600	1,670	500
Spain	12,191	21,205		36,944	1,562	1,247	2,582
Austria-Hungary		2,900			25		
China	79,047	77,003	12	118	44	301	223
Japan	30	375		11	5	42	
Egypt				2		3	3
East Indies	7,604	13,180	490	667	6	89	20
Australasia	2,593	9,142		3			
Other countries	288			1,200	3,489	5,908	2,323
Total	112,617	174,123	2,941	40,127	10,945	9,883	6,088

[a] From August 20, 1898, to June 30, 1899, inclusive.

TABLE NO. 1.—*Exports of tobacco from the Philippine Islands to the countries mentioned during the fiscal years 1899–1904*—Continued.

STEMS AND TRIMMINGS.[a]

	1905.	
	Pounds.	Value.
Belgium	1,230	$65
Hongkong	620	55
Total	1,850	120

[a] Not included in the above figures.

TABLE NO. 2.—*Imports of tobacco into the Philippine Islands from the countries mentioned during the fiscal years 1899–1905.*

LEAF TOBACCO.

	1899.[a]		1900.		1901.		1902.		1903.		1904.		1905.	
	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.
United States					4,655	$435	2	$2	1,417	$783	26	$1		
Hongkong			6,711	$2,802	7,817	683	4	10	1,228	155				
United Kingdom					1,805	170							196	$18
Germany	3,900	$1,560					22	9						
France														
Spain							2	1						
Austria-Hungary														
China	1,076	108	5,314	994	48,812	6,695	17,014	2,321	8,977	1,216	14,031	2,749	15,476	2,926
Japan							376	85						
Egypt							1	3						
East Indies					16,273	1,767	318	46	2	1	7	1	1,920	620
Australasia														
Other countries			692	212			810	433	5,302	1,157			2,622	2,081
Total	4,976	1,668	12,717	4,008	79,362	9,750	18,549	3,510	16,926	3,312	14,064	2,751	20,214	5,645

CIGARS.

	1899.[a]	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
United States	[b]	[b]	$25	$1,832	$632	$16	$24
Hongkong	[b]	[b]	6	602	252	102	84
United Kingdom	[b]	[b]			3	17	
Germany	[b]	[b]	5	334	10	82	7
France	[b]	[b]					
Spain	[b]	[b]				3	2
Austria-Hungary	[b]	[b]					
China	[b]	[b]		3	2	77	155
Japan	[b]	[b]		1,586			
Egypt	[b]	[b]					
East Indies	[b]	[b]	156	75	190	219	
Australasia	[b]	[b]			16		
Other countries	[b]	[b]		4	174		3
Total	[b]	[b]	192	4,436	1,279	516	275

CIGARETTES.

	1899.[a]	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
United States	$16,150	$9,068	$10,971	$7,566	$1,711	$773	$265
Hongkong		1,829	1,641	852	1,359	976	494
United Kingdom	12		500	1,354	367	298	321
Germany		135		139	1	3	
France			72	3		1	
Spain	230	754	382	15	5		
Austria-Hungary	7,410						37
China	3,002	4,120	7,209	7,622	207	502	303
Japan		18		207		13	
Egypt		1,669	2,422	2,991	1,111	2,207	2,091
East Indies	396	385	150		548	202	105
Australasia							
Other countries				5	61	1	
Total	[b] 27,200	[b] 17,978	23,347	20,814	5,430	5,066	3,616

ALL OTHER MANUFACTURED.

	1899.[a]	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
United States	$1,083	$1,391	$5,328	$1,208	$153	$1,696	$174
Hongkong		604	245	110	491	266	470
United Kingdom	9,966		421	141	85	233	126
Germany	1,120			21	4	3	
France	8,300						
Spain		116				3	298
Austria-Hungary							
China	4,276	842	4,917	11,417	674	2,089	4,016
Japan			54	35	206	15	28
Egypt		5	802				2
East Indies		585	12,840	56	11	87	139
Australasia							
Other countries			300		6		20
Total	24,745	3,543	24,907	12,988	1,630	4,392	5,273

[a] From August 20, 1898, to June 30, 1899, inclusive.

[b] Imports of cigars during 1899 and 1900 are included under cigarettes.

NOTE.—These figures do not include tobacco and cigars imported for use of the Army or Navy.

I am sure that an examination of these tables will satisfy any fair-minded person that there is absolutely no danger whatever to the United States from the competition of the Philippine Islands in any line of the tobacco industry. So far as leaf tobacco is concerned, I call the attention of the Members to the fact that of 16,276,266 pounds exported from the Philippine Islands last year 13,455,065 pounds went to Spain and not a pound to the United States; indeed, practically all of this tobacco went to Spain and to the monopoly countries of Europe, and it is a striking comment upon the fears of any grower in this country that Philippine tobacco will supplant his product that Mr. Shiffer, of the United Cigar Manufacturers Company, when asked before the committee whether in his enormous product of 400,000,000 cigars a year his company had ever imported and manufactured any Philippine tobacco, he replied that they had not. He admitted that they were looking for Habana and Sumatra, but that he had never even experimented with Philippine tobacco.

The fact of the case is, as will be admitted by the overwhelming majority of those who have used Philippine tobacco, that the domestic product of the United States is far superior in quality, and, to say the least, no higher in price than the Philippine tobacco—comparison being made with both products in their own home market—and that it would be impossible to import Philippine tobacco into the United States at 8¾ cents a pound duty for filler and 40¼ cents a pound duty for wrapper, except to satisfy the fads and fancies of a very small number of people who had acquired an oriental taste for that product.

I will insert in the RECORD here prices of the various samples of tobacco brought by me from Manila and now on exhibition in the lobby of the House. The large samples were furnished at my request by the Insular Company, and the prices are the average prices for the past five years, as taken from their books, and is the bale price.

The samples in envelopes are sorted leaves, furnished by the Yebanna Company, in Manila.

I also put with these prices extract from the Supplement of the Crop Reporter of the United States, published by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, at Washington, December, 1905, page 77, showing average production and value of the tobacco crop of the States and Territories for the year 1905.

Large tobacco samples, Isabela de Luzon, in hands as taken from bales:

1. 1ª de 1904. Ysabela de Luzon: Eighteen cents, United States gold, per pound; average price during past five years.
2. 2ª de 1903. Ysabela de Luzon: Fifteen cents, United States gold, per pound; average price during past five years.
3. 3ª de 1903. Ysabela de Luzon: Twelve cents, United States gold, per pound; average price during past five years.
4. 4ª de 1903. Ysabela de Luzon: Nine cents, United States gold, per pound; average price during past five years.
5. 5ª de 1900. Ysabela de Luzon: Six and one-half cents, United States gold, per pound; average price during past five years.

Tobacco samples in envelopes, sorted and in separate leaves:

1. Isabela leaf, different crops (wrappers): Selling price, ₱60 to ₱80 per quintal (30 to 40 cents, United States currency, per pound). Best tobacco districts, average yield of good wrappers from Isabela tobacco, 3 to 5 per cent. "La Yebana," Fabrica de Tobacos, Cigarrillos y Picadura. Baer Senior & Co.'s successors.
2. Isabela 1900 crop, bunch filler: Selling price ₱40 (20 cents, United States currency, per pound). Best tobacco district, "La Yebana," Fabrica de Tobacos, Cigarrillos y Picadura. Baer, Senior & Co.'s successors.
3. Isabela leaf, new crop (1905): Selling price, ₱15 per quintal (7½ cents, United States currency, per pound). Only fit for cigarettes; thick, gummy; village of Angadanan, best tobacco district. "La Yabana," Fabrica de Tobacos, Cigarrillos y Picadura. Baer, Senior & Co.'s successors.
4. Tobacco Barili Seacoast Cebu (ordinary kind): Selling price, ₱10 per quintal (5 cents, United States currency, per pound). "La Yebana," Fabrica de Tobacos, Cigarrillos y Picadura. Baer, Senior & Co.'s successors.
5. Bad tobacco, province of Union: Selling price, ₱9 to ₱10 per quintal (4½ to 5 cents, United States currency, per pound). "La Yebana," Fabrica de Tobacos, Cigarrillos y Picadura. Baer, Senior & Co.'s successors.

[From supplement of United States Crop Reporter.]

State or Territory (1905).	Tobacco.				
	Acreage.	Yield per acre.	Production.	Price per pound.	Total farm value.
	Acres.	*Lbs.*	*Pounds.*	*Cents.*	*Dollars.*
Maine					
New Hampshire	125	1,700	212,500	17.0	36,125
Vermont	191	1,650	315,150	17.0	53,576
Massachusetts	4,488	1,850	8,302,800	16.9	1,403,173
Rhode Island					
Connecticut	13,340	1,725	23,011,500	17.0	3,911,955
New York	6,151	1,148	7,061,348	10.5	741,442
New Jersey					
Pennsylvania	15,324	1,370	20,993,880	10.8	2,267,399
Delaware					
Maryland	30,143	650	19,592,950	6.0	1,175,577

State or Territory (1905).	Tobacco.				
	Acreage.	Yield per acre.	Production.	Price per pound.	Total farm value.
	Acres.	*Lbs.*	*Pounds.*	*Cents.*	*Dollars.*
Virginia	118,447	675	79,951,725	7.6	6,076,331
North Carolina	136,770	608	83,156,160	8.8	7,317,742
South Carolina	12,574	736	9,254,464	8.7	805,138
Georgia	2,036	525	1,068,900	17.0	181,713
Florida	5,321	600	3,192,600	18.0	574,668
Alabama	521	450	234,450	16.0	37,512
Mississippi	155	430	66,650	15.0	9,998
Louisiana	63	500	31,500	25.0	7,875
Texas	469	500	234,500	19.0	44,555
Arkansas	1,049	700	734,300	14.0	102,802
Tennessee	41,502	768	31,873,536	7.5	2,390,515
West Virginia	4,005	790	3,163,950	8.5	268,936
Kentucky	275,874	830	228,975,420	7.0	16,028,279
Ohio	59,229	850	50,344,650	8.4	4,228,951
Michigan					
Indiana	6,244	819	5,113,836	6.0	306,830
Illinois	1,132	900	1,018,800	6.0	61,128
Wisconsin	39,294	1,370	53,832,780	10.0	538,328
Minnesota					
Iowa					
Missouri	1,665	778	1,295,370	8.0	103,630
Kansas					
Nebraska					
North Dakota					
South Dakota					
Montana					
Wyoming					
Colorado					
New Mexico					
Arizona					
Utah					
Nevada					
Idaho					
Washington					
Oregon					
California					
Oklahoma					
Indian Territory					
United States	776,112	815.6	633,033,719	7.7	48,674,113

But even if at the expiration of the Spanish treaty and the termination of the Spanish contract the entire export product should come to the United States, the effect would be imperceptible, based on the production of last year of 16,000,000 pounds total exports from the Philippine Islands, and over 800,000,000 pounds produced in this country, to say nothing of the importations of Sumatra and Cuban product consumed in addition to our own production.

Two dangers, however, seem to continually present themselves to our people. One the fear of increased production, and the other the cheap labor of the Orient and the employment of Chinese coolies in the industry.

With reference to the first let it be borne in mind that little or no tobacco is exported from the Philippine Islands, except from two provinces—Isabela and Cagayan—and from a very limited area in those provinces, and that it is practically the product of the bottom lands adjacent to the Cagayan River and fertilized by the slime and mud deposited upon this land in the annual overflow. So that there is not the slightest occasion for fear of any increased area of production, for in the remainder of the archipelago, as in the Sandwich Island group, it has been demonstrated beyond question that good tobacco can not be grown within a distance of about 20 miles from the seacoast, unless it may be in some sheltered valleys which are so situated that they do not feel the effect of the salt air. I know of no tobacco grown in Connecticut within 20 miles of salt water, and I know from personal observation in Porto Rico that the best tobacco in the island is grown in and about Cayez, in the center of the island. Furthermore, the small area of the Philippine Islands available for agricultural land being only about 9½ per cent of the total acreage, and the insignificance of the industry, compared with the other export products of the islands, make it impossible that the production could ever be largely increased, except by improved cultivation of the present area and, possibly, fertilization in the years to come when prosperity shall have made this possible.

In round numbers for export, the hemp product of the islands last year amounted to $22,000,000, sugar four millions, and cocoanut and tobacco less than two millions each. Furthermore, the labor question, which is the unsolved problem of the East to-day, makes it certain that the development of these islands, during the life of the present generation at least, is bound to be in those directions where the least labor is required, as in the growth and cultivation of orchard products like hemp and cocoanut, rather than of field products, such as sugar and tobacco, and that any help which is extended to the islands toward a general prosperity must be given to those industries

which need it most—tobacco and sugar—rather than to the others which will take care of themselves.

It is claimed by some that the lowering of the duty on cigars puts the American workman in competition with a cheap class of labor in the Orient, and efforts have been made before the committee and in other places to show that Chinese coolies are employed in this industry in Manila. A greater mistake could not have been made by the opponents of this bill. I have heard these statements and received these communications with great surprise, for in four of the largest factories in Manila which I visited this summer I did not see one Chinaman employed, and I respectfully refer all who entertain this fear to the census statistics of the islands. These persons do not seem to understand that Chinese exclusion and alien contract labor laws exist in the Philippines, and that upon the demand of the Filipinos as well as Americans they are even more vigorously enforced there than they are here.

I called upon the Bureau of Insular Affairs in the War Department to submit the figures to me with reference to the two matters, that of the number of laborers employed and the nationality of the same, and also the rate of wages paid, and shall insert the replies on both subjects with my remarks in the RECORD.

WAR DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, December 21, 1905.

Mr. HILL: In looking over the Philippine census report I find the following statistics relating to tobacco in the Philippines:

Page 113 of volume 2: There are 1,714 cigarette makers, which is less than 0.1 per cent of the total number of wage-earners; 11,036 cigar makers, which is 0.4 per cent of the total of wage-earners.

Page 116 of volume 2: "So far as the number of operatives is an index, the cigar and cigarette industry in the islands was about on a par with that of the United States, the proportion of wage-earners being equal in both countries and much less than in Porto Rico (1.2 per cent) and far less than in Cuba (3.9 per cent). The operatives in the Philippines were as to sex in the proportion of 29 males to 71 females."

Page 985 of volume 2: In the table showing the civilized population engaged in the principal gainful occupations it appears that there are 1,714 cigarette makers, classified by sex and color as follows: Brown, 448 males, 1,263 females; mixed, no males and 1 female; yellow, 1 male and 1 female; white and black, none of either sex, and that there are 11,036 cigar makers, classified by sex and color as follows: Brown, 3,168 males and 7,764 females; mixed, 9 males and 24 females; yellow, 29 males and 1 female; white, 38 males and no females; black, 3 males and no females.

Page 486 of volume 4: In the table showing the relative importance of manufacturing industries in the Philippines it is shown that the manufacture of cigars, cigarettes, and tobacco is graded as seventh, with 108 establishments, distributed in 10 provinces, the productions of which are valued at 8,698,634 pesos, 1 peso being equivalent to 50 cents United States currency.

Page 496 of volume 4: In the table showing the summary of manufacturing establishments it is indicated that there are 108 tobacco, cigar, and cigarette establishments, with a capital of 4,485,503 pesos, and 5 smoking-tobacco establishments, with a capital of 14,900 pesos.

Very sincerely,

FRANK MCINTYRE.

Hon. E. J. HILL,
Representative in Congress.

P. S.—In the third paragraph, as to color, brown refers to the Filipinos, mixed to the mestizos or half-castes, yellow to the Chinese, white to the Americans and Europeans, and black to the American negro.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, December 21, 1905.

SIR: Referring to conversation with reference to wages paid workmen in cigar factories in the Philippine Islands, I have the honor to inform you that the census of the Philippine Islands shows that prior to 1898 and in 1902 the following wages (local currency) were paid, and while I regret to state that we haven't an official statement of the rate of wages paid now, it is very generally known that the wages of employees in the Philippine Islands have, up to the present time, increased steadily since American occupation, and that at present the wages received are considerably greater than those indicated in the census report for 1902:

	Average wages paid prior to 1898 (pesos).[a]		Average wages paid in 1902 (pesos).[a]	
	Per day.	Per month.	Per day.	Per month.
Cigar box factory foreman	0.75	.....	2.00	.....
Cigar box fillers	.80	.....	2.00	.....
Cigar box makers	.50	.....	1.50	.....
Cigar factory foremen	.....	35.00	.....	80.00
Cigar sorters	.80	.....	2.00	.....
Cigarette packers	.50	.....	1.00	.....
Cigarette makers	.40	.....	1.37	.....
Cigar makers	.80	.....	2.00	.....

[a] Take one-half of these rates for value in American gold.

Very respectfully,

FRANK MCINTYRE.

Hon. EBENEZER J. HILL,
House of Representatives.

So far as Chinese labor is concerned, in the census of the year 1902 out of 1,714 cigarette makers all but 2 were Filipinos, there being of the Chinese 1 male and 1 female. Of the 11,036 cigar makers, there were of Chinese 29 males and 1 female; of whites, 38 males, and of negroes, 3 males. In other words, there were 8 more white cigar makers than there were Chinese, and only 71 of any other nationality than Filipino. But last February Mr. A. Determan, appointed by the cigar manufacturers and workmen of Manila to represent them before the Ways and Means Committee, made a statement in writing, found on page 231 of the hearings, in which he says, "There is not one Chinese cigar maker in Manila, to correct a false statement to the contrary." I am entirely satisfied from personal observation that the statement is correct. I stood at the gate of the Oriente factory one Saturday afternoon during the past summer and saw the employees, 1,400 in number, pass out at the close of the week's work, and a more clean, orderly, intelligent-looking body of employees it would be difficult to find anywhere outside of the United States. They were all Filipinos.

It will be noticed also from the letters submitted that the wages quoted are in pesos, the average being given during the Spanish occupation and since. They include men and women and relate to Manila, where 99 per cent of the cigars and 96 per cent of the cigarettes are produced. Before the Americans took the islands the wages of a cigar maker averaged 40 cents a day; in 1902, the census year, $1 a day, and it is well known that there has been a material advance since, to the advantage of all concerned. The fact of the case is that the work is practically all of it piecework, and the wages depend largely upon the skill and experience of the employee and the character and quality of the work upon which he is engaged. I saw men working on first-class cigars and earning from $1.50 to $2 a day gold, but I think it will be generally admitted that the fair average cost of manufacturing a thousand cigars of the different grades and qualities in Manila has been in past years about $7 a thousand, as against $12 in the United States. Of course, there are special brands in both places which far exceed these figures. This makes an average difference of $5 a thousand in the labor cost.

During the holiday recess I have been making some further inquiries with reference to the American cost and have been shown the actual pay rolls of three different establishments. In one, where nine-tenths of the product was of the ordinary 5-cent cigar, the labor cost was $6.63 per thousand. In another factory, where two-thirds of the product was the regular 10-cent cigar, the actual cost was $11.20 per thousand, and in the third case, where nothing but Habana tobacco was used and none but Cuban workmen were employed, the labor cost was $19.81 per thousand. The average labor cost of the three factories was $12.55 per thousand. I am satisfied that the daily production of the average American workman is far beyond that of the average Filipino, but, basing my conclusion on these pay rolls, I seriously question whether the cost of hand-made cigars of American style and fine grade is much, if any, less in Manila to-day than it is in the United States. I understand that the claim is made by the United Cigar Company that with the machinery used by them the entire cost of making the cigars in common use in this country, including all processes, from the prepared leaf to the finished cigar packed in boxes, does not exceed $5 per thousand, and I have the best of reasons for believing that this is true. If it is, the hand maker here and his fellow-worker in Manila, where no machines are used, have far more to fear from the trusts, who are opposing this bill, in this country than they have of competition between themselves, for that they can and should control by the power of their trade organizations. But, be the difference more or less, it is indisputable that at the present time it is covered several times over by the protection given under the provisions of this bill, by which 25 per cent of the Dingley rates are continued in force for a period of three years. Indeed, with the United States as with practically all other nations, the import duty on cigars has been far and away beyond the point of protection, and based—and justly so—on the principle of taxing a luxury for purposes of revenue.

Let me illustrate. Take the most expensive cigar in the islands, the Pigtail, manufactured by the Tobacoleria Company, and sold at the factory at wholesale at 25 cents apiece gold. The duty and internal-revenue tax would be $52.37 a thousand.

On the Unico brand, made by the Germinal factory, selling at 15 cents apiece gold, wholesale, in Manila, the customs duty and internal-revenue tax would be $37.12 gold per thousand. On the American Beauty brand, made by the same company, and selling for 10 cents gold in Manila, and which approaches nearer in size, taste, and style to an American cigar than any other which I saw in the islands, the duty and internal-revenue tax would be $25 per thousand. Take the ordinary Perfecto, made by the same company and selling at wholesale at $30 a thousand gold, and which has a labor cost in the Philippine Islands of $7 per thousand, the duties and internal revenue would be $27.37,

and for acceptability to the American people it would not even be considered in comparison with the ordinary 5-cent cigar in this country, to say nothing of the fact that it would be wholly impossible under the terms of this bill to import it.

Go still lower and take the ordinary cigar of the masses of the people of the Philippine Islands, known as the "Londres brand," a cigar that in my judgment under no circumstances whatever could be sold within the limits of the United States, and the duty and internal revenue under the terms of this bill on that brand of cigars would be $21.12 a thousand.

Indeed, considering the quality of the cheap cigars of the islands, there is no more fear of their becoming competitors in our market than there is of the family cigar of northern Luzon, where I am told that a cigar is made from 1 to 2 feet long and, suspended by a cord from the roof, hangs in the center of the hut, always ready for common and promiscuous smoking by the whole family and visiting friends.

In every case, from the top to the bottom, the duties exceed several times over the difference in labor cost, on the basis of the present scale of wages.

I think it is demonstrated beyond dispute that under the terms of the bill for the next three years not the slightest fear of competition should exist. But there is another claim which is made, and that is that we are helping foreign manufacturers. Here equally as great a mistake is made, for of the fifty-eight factories in Manila, large and small, twenty-four of them are owned by Filipinos and use Filipino capital, fourteen are owned by Europeans, one by an American negro, and nineteen are said to be owned by Chinese merchants, and employ Chinese capital but Filipino workmen. Of the four which I visited, one was German, one English, one Spanish, and one Filipino, and my judgment is that these four make more cigars than all the rest of the factories in the islands put together, for they certainly employ more people than can be found in all the rest of the them.

It is true that foreign capital to a very considerable extent is invested in the cigar and cigarette industry of the Philippine Islands, but the one thing that the islands need for their development over and above all others is capital, and if Americans will not go there and invest their money, certainly criticism should not be made of people from other parts of the world who choose to avail themselves of the opportunity. It is hardly fair, however, to say that the effect of this bill will benefit the investments of foreign manufacturers in Manila to the detriment of American capital at home, in view of the fact that when I was at Manila last summer it was made known to me that quite a number of foreign manufacturers, including both German and Spanish, were protesting most emphatically against the passage of this bill on the ground that it was going to be detrimental to them, and there was presented to Senator Scott, as presiding officer at the hearings at Manila, a memorial of these manufacturers protesting against this change in the tariff on the ground that it was to be injurious to their business. They admit in that memorial that the industry is in a precarious condition, but hold that the abolition of the duties into the United States will make it worse rather than improve it, for they claim that in the first place the price of their leaf tobacco will advance considerably, and that wages will be largely increased; that the American people will not smoke Manila cigars, and that they will be in far greater danger of losing their trade in the Orient than of gaining a market here, and they close their memorial with a statement that the only way to improve the cigar industry is by a vast and very possible improvement of the Manila leaf tobacco.

I do not wholly concur in their view of the case, nor do the Filipino manufacturers, for they were strongly of the opinion that in so far as lower duties and ultimate free trade gave an alternative market in the United States, by just so much they could be benefited by lifting the price of their present product in their present channels of trade in the Orient, and that they would be gradually relieved of the difficulties in connection with the industry if they were placed in a position where they could meet a very peculiar condition of affairs existing not only in the Orient to-day, but throughout the civilized world, and that is the ability to meet the fashion in cigars as well as to compete in price, for, as we all know, the use of tobacco is governed fully as much by fad and fashion as it is by price. That the cigar industry in the Philippine Islands is at a low ebb can easily be seen by reference to Table No. 1, and it only needs calling attention to one feature of it to show the reason why. It will be seen there that in the banner year of the Philippines in the cigar industry since the American occupation cigars to the value of $1,666,722 were exported in 1902, and that since that time in no year have the exports of cigars equaled a million dollars. The Filipino manufacturers of Manila claim, and I think claim rightly, that the falling off in their trade in the last three years has averaged 42 per cent, and that it is due to the utter inability of the Philippine Islands to produce a light-colored cigar, which the Tobacco Leaf Journal of this country admits to be a craze all over the world, and which is certainly working its full effect in the Orient, as it is here.

That this is one of the great troubles of the tobacco product of the Philippine Islands is clearly shown by the fact that the larger manufacturers of cigars in Manila on the 18th of May last made an agreement, the terms of which will be found in the internal revenue commissioner's report for this year. It provides that there shall be a fixed standard of grading, and that they shall buy only of the planters and at fair appraisement. It eliminates the Chinese itinerant trader by declaring that no brokers or middlemen of any kind whatever shall be employed and that no lots shall be purchased at lump prices, not even from the planters themselves.

If this agreement can be maintained it will at least make honest grading. In Appendix P of the same report will be found a memorandum furnished by the Tobacoleria Company, which sheds much light upon the peculiar conditions with reference to the tobacco situation in the provinces of Cagayan and Isabela, page 168, Internal Revenue Report. This shows that, taking five successive crops as a basis, there is an annual yield there of 200,000 quintals, practically equivalent to 20,000,000 pounds, or about equal to the product of a single county in Pennsylvania. It gives the proportion of the tobacco that can be utilized as follows:

Class A, for wrappers, 10 per cent, but only one-half of 1 per cent being suited for fine-grade cigars.

Classes B and C, for fillers and cut tobacco, etc., 90 per cent.

I quote further from the sixth clause of this memorandum:

There is great difficulty in meeting the demand for the different "claro" (and "oscuro") colors through the scarcity of wrappers. The demand for "claro" wrappers is greater day after day, for where in the Philippines "maduro" was formerly sold, now only "claro" is demanded. There has been much decrease in the production of light-colored, clean, nice leaves of fine texture since the discontinuance of the monopoly. Since that time tobacco-leaf culture began to be neglected, and especially has this been the case since 1900, owing to raise in prices and to local competition.

In view of this condition of affairs, it was not a surprise, particularly to me, to find the manufacturers of the Philippine Islands experimenting with Sumatra and light-colored United States wrappers, and to hear the earnest plea of one of the manufacturers that whatever action was taken by the home government in regard to the tariff on their product coming into the United States that they might at least be permitted to have access, free of duty, to the United States product of light-colored wrapper tobacco.

I found one factory where they had been experimenting with five cases of Connecticut wrappers. The first case was bought at 50 cents a pound, and so much satisfaction had from it that a second purchase of four cases was made at 55 cents a pound. In addition to this a duty of 23 cents and expenses of shipment halfway around the world brought this domestic wrapper of ours to their hands at a practical cost of 80 cents a pound. The manager of the Yebanna Factory, at Manila, said to me, with an earnestness that was almost pitiful, that the Manila factories were rapidly losing their hold on the oriental trade because of German and Dutch competition with cigars made from German and Holland filler covered with light-colored Sumatra wrappers, and that he was fully satisfied that if he could get United States wrappers free of duty he could not only meet that competition, but with them could drive Germany out of the Orient. I am fully satisfied that he is correct in his conclusions and that the pending bill will open up a very considerable market in the Philippine Islands for the wrapper tobacco of Florida, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, New York, Connecticut, and other States of the Union, as the Porto Rican market has already begun to be opened up, and that in the end it will be of great advantage to our tobacco growers, with no detriment whatever to any other branch of the industry.

I desire to call the attention of the growers of other States to the fact that it is a necessity that we should be looking about for such a market for our wrapper tobacco, as shown by the testimony of Mr. J. L. McFarlin, of Florida, where, on page 146 of the hearings on this bill, he states concerning the growing of shade-grown wrappers in Florida, Alabama, and Texas as follows:

If given the same protection that we have enjoyed in the past, in a few years these three States that I have mentioned above will produce enough tobacco of the finer grades, comparing with Sumatra, to supply the United States.

If this is true, and I have no doubt of it, it behooves the growers of the Northern States now to so legislate that the shortage of fine wrappers in the Philippines may be supplied from the coming surplus here.

That such a market is possible now to the wrapper-leaf growers of the United States is clearly shown by the statement

of one of the largest manufacturers in Manila concerning the operations of his company last year. He said that the best tobacco was the Isabela. Last year they bought 25,000 quintals of that tobacco, worth 9½ cents gold on the average. Out of this they selected 6,000 quintals generally fit for wrappers. The remaining 19,000 quintals they sold to the cigarette factories at prices which brought the wrapper bales up to a net cost to themselves of 30 cents per pound. From these 6,000 quintals he claimed to have gotten 60 per cent of wrappers, taking 100 pounds of this tobacco costing $30, deducting 40 pounds of filler at 9½ cents, $3.80, it leaves 60 pounds of wrapper costing $26.20, or 43.7 cents per pound.

It takes 8 to 10 pounds of such tobacco to wrap 1,000 cigars, but to be absolutely safe figure it at 7 pounds, which at 43.7 cents per pound would amount to $3.06. Of this, 4 pounds would be clippings and cuttings, which would go into filler, and should be figured at 9½ cents and deducted, 38 cents, making net cost of wrappers for 1,000 cigars $2.68.

He said that according to his own experience 4 pounds of light Connecticut wrapper would do the same work, and without making any allowance for clippings they could afford to pay 68 cents per pound for light wrappers, delivered free of duty in Manila, even in competition with their own tobacco.

But they do not have enough of their own, and must look elsewhere for a supply, even at a higher price.

Sumatra wrappers cost, duty paid, in Manila $1.50 gold per pound, and at 2 pounds per thousand the cost would be $3 per thousand, or 32 cents more than Isabela tobacco, or equal to a price of 75 cents per pound for our wrapper delivered there, which, of course, is impossible with the existing duty.

Under these circumstances I can not but concur with the Manila manufacturers, that if United States wrapper tobacco had the same privileges and protection in the Manila market which it has in our own it would not only prove to be a great boon to the Manila manufacturers, but it would ultimately result in considerable advantage to the several States here, both North and South, where wrapper tobacco is produced.

As a purely commercial proposition, then, this legislation will result:

First. In broadening the market for our domestic wrapper leaf, giving to the growers a higher price, or, what is more probable, causing an increased production.

Second. To a slight extent in increasing the very small importation of Philippine cigars, by permitting Americans who have resided in the Philippines and acquired a taste for them to purchase them here at a reasonable advance over the domestic cigar, where now the duty is prohibitory.

Third. And by far the most important, in a stimulus given to the industry in the Philippines which, coupled with the efforts of the manufacturers there, will result in better methods of cultivation, curing, and marketing the crop, which will in time vastly improve the quality of the Philippine tobacco and its products and without which I honestly believe that the industry is doomed to a slow but certain death, for it does not need an expert now to see that they are not only losing their export trade, but will soon be unable to hold their own home market for high-grade goods.

Fourth. In giving to the Philippines alternative markets in America and the Orient for high-grade products at increased prices, for this is the only possible offset to an increased labor cost which is sure to follow a general improvement in Philippine industries.

But aside from any commercial consideration and above and beyond them all is the existence of a national conscience which will not long permit the American Congress to legislate for both sides of this question without doing equal and exact justice to all, and especially for the side which can not help itself. Poor, tax-ridden Spain held her colony with an iron hand, but gave to its products a preferential of 80 per cent in her own tariff rates. For us to destroy that preferential by wresting the sovereignty from Spain and then to refuse as generous terms to them as a helpless dependency of this great nation would give the lie to every claim which we are now making of our right to stand in the forefront of the nations of the world as the best exponent of a genuine Christian civilization.

Mr. Chairman, last summer, when the Taft party were at Manila, there came into the hearings there a resident of the province of Panay, a province which, in opposition to the Tagalog insurrection of Aguinaldo and his followers, organized a Visayan republic and transferred their allegiance to the American flag. He was a gentleman in every sense of the word, polished, refined, cultivated, educated at a Paris university, a fluent linguist, speaking French, Spanish, English, and Visayan, and gifted with an oratorical power which would make him a brilliant ornament of any parliamentary assembly in the world. Let me quote from memory the substance of his opening remarks: Said he:

> Before entering upon the discussion of the subject upon which I am to speak I wish to ask a question or two. Are we a part of the American nation, or are we not? We welcome American sovereignty and bow with reverence to the nation's flag. Why are we not accorded the same treatment that you extend to Hawaii and Porto Rico?
>
> Again, you have put upon your statute books a law which will go into operation on the 1st of July, 1906, providing that the ports of these islands shall thereafter be domestic ports, and that none but American ships shall ply between these islands and the mainland. If the ports here and there are to be domestic ports, open only to domestic ships, why are not the products of these islands domestic products and entitled to all the privileges which the products of any other part of the great American Republic now have, including free entry into your domestic markets?

Mr. Chairman, whenever the Members of this House shall have answered those two questions fully, frankly, and conscientiously, I for one will have no fear whatever concerning the passage of this bill. [Loud applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing, the following occurred:

Mr. ALEXANDER. When you found out that there had not been a pound of tobacco imported into this country from the Philippine Islands, were you surprised at that fact?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Not at all, after I found the quality of tobacco that was raised there.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That was the reason, was it not, because the people who otherwise would have imported it had seen the tobacco and smoked it?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Why, certainly.

Mr. CASSEL. You said a little while ago that under Spanish rule the Philippine tobacco was very much better in quality than it is now?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. CASSEL. Will they not produce as good a quality of tobacco later on as they produced under the Spanish régime?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I hope so. If they do not, their industry is doomed. But I want to say this, that many of our people have the same fear with regard to this matter that our sugar friends have. Our sugar friends figure on the production of sugar in the world and compare it with the consumption at the present time. Now, in my judgment, it is impossible for the Philippine Islands for the next twenty years, and probably longer, to much increase their production of sugar, and by that time we will be using from three to four million tons more than we consume now. The advancement of the United States in the consumption of these tropical products is infinitely beyond the increased supply of the United States, and a quarter of a century from now, when we have 40,000,000 more people in this country and are using 3,000,000 tons more of sugar, where can we get it from? All the possible production of sugar in the Philippine Islands sinks into insignificance compared with this increased consumption.

Mr. MADDEN. Can the gentleman tell the House what it costs to produce a pound of beet sugar?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not know anything about beet sugar. When I was in the Philippine Islands I gave my entire attention to the tobacco industry and made no critical analysis of the sugar question at all. I have not studied it, and I do not think it is necessary for me to go into that question after the magnificent speech made day before yesterday by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman was referring to sugar a moment ago, and I thought he could answer the question.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to ask a question for my own information.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. PERKINS. Who are the people that manufacture the cigars?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The largest manufacturers in the United States, I think, are the United Cigar Company.

Mr. PERKINS. I mean in the Philippines.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will come to that. I will cover that point in my remarks on the subject.

Mr. CASSEL. I have here a report which says that there has not been a pound of tobacco imported into the Philippines from the United States for the last two or three years.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Well, there are a dozen gentlemen here who saw the tobacco and cigars made from it, and I saw the bill of shipment from New York. I am satisfied that he is correct in his conclusions.

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I had a conversation with the gentleman from Connecticut, in which he said that I might interrupt him.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. That is correct, I am glad to answer the gentleman.

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania. Most of these questions have been answered quite satisfactorily. I understand the gentleman from Connecticut to say now that this bill will not aid the Filipinos in the sale of their tobacco.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think it will aid them, but I think it will be a long process.

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania. Let me go a little further. This is the problem that agitates the minds of those in my country who are raising tobacco. They think—those who school their own children and wear good clothes, and whose daughters take music lessons, and who work with their hands, and who plant from one to three acres of tobacco—they think that they ought not to be put in competition with those who have scarcely passed the fig-leaf problem. Now, the gentleman from Connecticut has answered that completely if he says to me that this does not bring them into competition with leaf tobacco.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I submitted the prices of tobacco selling there and the prices of tobacco selling here, and I can not see how it is possible, even with free trade, for competition to exist on these prices. Furthermore, the question of quality stands as an insuperable bar to sending Philippine tobacco into the United States now.

I hope, I sincerely hope for the benefit of these people, that in time they may be able to improve the quality of their tobacco, but long before they will reach that point of course the consumption in the United States, with its enormous population, will more than take that up if it should all come here, and we would never feel it. You would not know it any more than if you poured a bucket of water into the sea. But immediately, or in the near future, there is no possible competition.

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania. One more question. Coming to the basis of absolute free trade between this country and the islands, how will it affect the products there?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. That is a question I am coming to directly.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Clerk to now read the extract which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the hearing before the Committee of Ways and Means January 27, Secretary Taft, in the testimony submitted, in speaking of the fears of the cigar makers, when a similar bill was under consideration, as to the effect of the proposed legislation, said: "There may be some justification for the apprehension of the cigar makers that this measure would injure them. I admit that a Perfection-shaped cigar, for which the cigar makers in this country receive $34 per thousand for making, is made in the Philippine Islands for $6 per thousand."

According to Secretary Taft, this shows a difference of $28 per thousand in the price of making them. He also said the same cigar was sold for $100 per thousand here, while a like cigar from the Philippine Islands can be laid down here at a price of $45 per thousand.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, all the reply I have to make to that is that when this same thing was said and read—for it was read—in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, the chairman requested that the gentleman should publish the whole statement of Secretary Taft and not part of it, and it will all be found in the hearings—the additional statement of Secretary Taft.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Are they manufacturing now as good cigars in the Philippine Islands as they were when Secretary Taft made that statement?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not know. I have not examined the case at all. I question very much whether there is a cigar made in the United States where the labor costs $34 a thousand. If the gentleman will take the printed hearings, he will see his question entirely answered there, without taking up the time of the House to do it over again.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, from the emphasis placed upon a few words by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LILLEY], I take it he is laboring under a misapprehension of facts relative to the defrayal of the expense of educating these Filipinos.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. It is all done by taxation upon the Filipinos, except that we return to them the tonnage dues and the import taxes received in this country from their importations here. That goes back, and we bear the cost of that education in so far as it tends to increase the prices of their products when they are offered in the markets of this country. It is indirect—just the same as an indirect addition that comes from any customs duties from any part of the world.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. As a matter of fact, the improvements in the harbor, the improvements of the wharves, the improvements of the roads, as I understand it, are all paid for by money collected in the Philippine Islands, and that money does not come out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The sewers are paid for by issuing the bonds of the city, just the same as in Indianapolis. It is not a burden on the United States at all.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. It does not come out of the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Absolutely not.

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is our complaint and one that we have had, that you are trying to raise money for the Philippine Islands and you are assessing the sugar growers and the tobacco growers; and if they need it, why not pass the hat and all pay a little?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would say to the gentleman that it would be bad enough to do that in an American civilization, but to do it in a community which I have described, 80 per cent of whom can not even read, the result would be disastrous; and I submit to the gentleman himself whether it would not be wiser to stimulate the industry of these people and let it come from their own revenues and have them feel that they were doing it themselves, rather than by a direct payment out of our Treasury, I think that was one of the great mistakes in our dealings with Porto Rico two or three years ago, when we paid money out of the Treasury in a lump sum for them to distribute. It would have been much wiser to do it the other way.

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania. But what about the poor sugar grower and the poor tobacco grower, if it is true that they are to be compelled to pay all?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Oh, the hemp industry pays its share and the cocoanut industry pays its share and the merchants pay their share. Do you mean in the United States?

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes; they are complaining that you are assessing that upon them by this bill.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. In this country?

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania. In this bill.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. My judgment is that they will never know there is any such thing done.

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania. I hope not, but that is what they complain of.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think the Filipinos will know it, but I do not think the people in the United States will ever know there has been any change in the law.

Mr. BROOKS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has described with great particularity the condition of the people and the industrial condition in the islands to-day, and the gentleman predicates his opinion that no longer will come to this country because of that backward condition. Does the gentleman think that condition will maintain after an opportunity has been afforded for American capital to go into the islands and after the protection of this bill has been given to the islands?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would like very much to have American capital go there. I am hopeless in regard to it. I can not find any to amount to anything there now. I would be very glad if it did, and my honest judgment, as I said a while ago, is that before any effective change could be wrought in the industry to which the gentleman refers, the sugar industry, that our increased consumption will be so great that it never will be noticed, and I do not think it will be noticed now. Now, I can not comprehend, with seventeen hundred thousand tons of sugar bought from foreign nations, why any American would object to buying one hundred thousand from our own people and sixteen hundred thousand from foreigners instead of buying the whole of that amount from foreigners. I can not understand what the motive can be that lies back of an action of that kind. We have to buy seventeen hundred thousand tons from Jamaica, Java, Sumatra, and other countries in addition to what we raise and can get from Porto Rico. Why the Louisiana and the beet sugar industry should object—what earthly harm there can be in buying 100,000 tons from the Philippines and buying only sixteen hundred thousand in the foreign markets—I can not understand.

Mr. BROOKS of Colorado. Now, if American capital does go in there the production will be very much larger than 100,000 tons, will it not?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I have just now replied to that question, that while I would be very glad to have American capital go there, I do not find it there now and have very little expectation of it in the immediate future.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, before I begin my remarks I wish to apologize to the House for beginning at this late hour Saturday afternoon the discussion of a matter of such importance, the proper presentation of which will of necessity consume some time. The House will recall that at the beginning of this discussion I suggested that those opposed to the bill would like to have some reasonable time for the presentation of their side of the case. Up to this time, after three days of debate, the presentation of the Filipino side of the question has occupied all of the time, with the exception of two hours in the shank of the evening yesterday, and the American side of the question,

the question as it affects the American farmer and producer, has had the latter end of last evening, and now we are graciously allowed the short end of this evening. I would prefer to address the House at some other time, but it seems that there is no possibility of securing time to discuss this question from the standpoint of the American producer, except after the House has listened to prolonged debate on the other side.

Mr. Chairman, I approach this question from the standpoint of an American citizen, mindful of all the duties and obligations we may owe the Filipino people by reason of the relationship existing between those islands and our country. I also approach it recalling the quoted remarks of the gentleman, who has been held up to our commendation here and lauded as a patriot, Señor de la Rama, to the effect that charity does and should begin at home, and mindful that we have high authority for the truth that he who does not care for those of his own national household "is worse than an infidel." Holding the views I do, I must necessarily approach the question from the standpoint of a protectionist, and a stand-pat protectionist at that. I have heard much of late of the virtue of standing pat, and if that be a virtue I think that this is a most excellent time to exercise it. [Applause.]

There may be some who will challenge my position on the ground that it will be claimed that this is a party question and therefore should have the support of Republicans.

In defense of my position I want to refer briefly to some of the history of our party and of its action relative to a great agricultural industry, which, in my opinion, is threatened with destruction by this measure. It should be recalled that the beet-sugar industry—for I shall confine my remarks entirely or almost wholly to the effect which I believe this measure will have on that industry, leaving the discussion of its effect upon other lines of industry to men better qualified than I am to discuss them—that the beet-sugar industry of the United States is a child of Republican legislation—protective legislation. Under our legislation, State and national, it had its birth and its splendid growth, and it developed steadily and rapidly until that unlucky day when we "did something for Cuba," when we traded for twenty additional millions of Cuban trade fifteen millions of good hard cash which would have otherwise gone into the Treasury of the United States.

I voted for that measure. I voted for it because I understood that it was a finality so far as legislation reducing the tariff on sugar was concerned. I believed we owed something to Cuba. I feared that if we did not give her some little relief from the condition which war and the low price of sugar—much lower than now—had placed her in that there would be trouble down there. We might have to intervene and thus annex, and then we should be threatened with what this bill proposes—free trade in sugar with a tropical sugar country—so I took the Cuban 20 per cent reduction as the lesser of two evils.

If any of the other gentlemen who voted for it and supported it can derive any satisfaction or comfort from their vote on that measure, they have the advantage of me. [Applause.] I know of no place on earth where it has cost 75 per cent for new business, except in the case of the insurance companies which they have been investigating in New York and in our trade with Cuba under reciprocity.

In the year 1896 we took the Democracy to task "for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of the country," though they had given them a protection of 40 per cent. In 1900 we renewed our pledges to that splendid industry in our platform and in our campaign book, which was the Bible of those of us who fought under the Republican banner, we declared, after referring to the attitude of the party in placing a duty upon Porto Rican products of 15 per cent, when, let it be remembered, the Philippines were ours, that that action—

was an explicit declaration by the Republican party that it proposed to retain the power to fix such tariff as it might deem judicious against the products of cheap tropical labor wherever located or under whatever conditions.

In other words, it was a distinct promise to the farmer that he need not fear the Republican party would permit the cheap labor and the cheap sugar of any tropical territory to be brought in in a manner which would destroy the infant industry of beet-sugar production.

The illustrious author of the Dingley bill stated on this floor, during the discussion of the bill that bears his name and which it is now proposed to mutilate, that the time had "come when the production of our own sugar from the beet ought to be and can be successfully entered upon," and that "we will not disturb our tariff in the next quarter of a century." Gentlemen then and now leaders on this floor time and again, during the debates relating to Porto Rico and to Cuba and the Philippines, gave assurance, direct and implied, that their influence would be exerted against further reduction in the duty on sugar than the reduction of 25 per cent to the Philippine Islands and the reduction of 20 per cent to Cuba.

The gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in presenting this bill to the House day before yesterday, said:

At that date—

April 11, 1909—

we are to place the Philippines upon the same plane as all the territory of the United States as far as the tariff is concerned.

Did the gentleman mean just that? I can not think so. He was not happy in his expression; for we are not placing the Philippines on the same plane as our people here at home under the terms of this bill. We are making of them pampered, and we will ultimately make of them spoiled, children of the Republic. We give them all the markets of this great nation free, the greatest markets the world has ever known, and then we allow them to place their tariff on goods going from foreign countries to their ports and collect and keep the revenue. If this bill does the Filipino any good at all, so far as the sugar industry is concerned, it will build up princely haciendas over there; it will call for the investment of millions of dollars in machinery, and while we give the Filipino a bounty of $1.20 on every hundred pounds of sugar he brings here, the American manufacturer takes his chances with the world in furnishing the machinery needed for the building up of the industry. You take the sugar industry from Michigan and Colorado and California and plant it in Luzon and Negros and bar the American manufacturer from participation in the benefits of its growth.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MONDELL. I will, gladly.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like the gentleman to state, if he can, what it costs to make a pound of sugar in the Philippines?

Mr. MONDELL. I will try to reach that.

Mr. MADDEN. Just a moment. I would also like to have him state what it costs to transport it from the Philippines to the United States—what it costs per ton for duty and then what it costs to make a ton of beet sugar refined; then what the ton of sugar sells for. I ask this because I want to see what the commercial difference between the two propositions is.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, my time is limited, but I will try to answer all of those questions in just a few moments. The Philippine duty on agricultural machinery, including sugar machinery, is 5 per cent, less than the difference in the freight rate as between New York and Manila, and London and Hamburg and the same port, and if this bill becomes a law and if it does anything helpful for the Filipino, if it helps him to build up his industry, the German or the Englishman will furnish every dollar's worth of machinery that goes into the plantations there, will they not? And could this occur in the continental territory of the United States? Can Colorado or Alaska or Arizona import English or German machinery at 5 per cent duty and then keep the 5 per cent? Is not the gentleman mistaken about "the same plane" proposition?

The gentleman from Connecticut should remember that when folks get to smoking Filipino cigars up his way—and they are pretty good, some of them, and mighty cheap—his cigar-making and tobacco-raising constituents are likely to be reminded that they are not only losing that much opportunity for labor and of market for their produce, but that at the same time they are helping to pay a high internal-revenue tax on those cigars, and that is going over to the islands to help build up and strengthen the industry there. Even the man who smokes may sometimes reflect that when he bought his cigar he not only paid a profit to Filipino tobacco raisers and cigar makers, but he actually taxed himself to raise the price to himself for the sole and exclusive benefit of the Filipino. The poverty-stricken widow, pouring the costly fluid into the alcohol lamp by the bedside of her sick child, is not likely to be cheered by the reflection that the greater portion of the cost, which her slender means can ill afford, is the internal-revenue tax which has gone to help relieve the wealthy Philippine landowner from the payment of taxes. And yet this is what they call putting the Philippines "on the same plane as all the territories of the United States."

We are going to give them every advantage in our market, a bounty of a dollar and twenty cents a hundred over the world's price of sugar, something that no extensive tropical cane-growing region ever had; destroy, or at least threaten the destruction of, our beet-sugar industry; give them a market, the greatest and best in the world, for their tobacco and their alcohol; tax ourselves with a high internal-revenue tax, collect it, and send it over to them, we praying the freight. And what do we get out of it? Market for our machinery? Oh, no. We would not want to hurt the feelings of the little brown brother by suggesting that we secure the same advantage that we have in the home

market, but we take our chances with the balance of the world, with distance and freight rates against us, barring what consolation we can get out of the saving of 5 per cent ad valorem.

Is it possible that the Republic has reached that stage of its development when we must pay tribute to the revolutionary sentiment in the Philippine Islands? If not, what does this all mean? When we pay the internal-revenue tax on the Filipino's product used by our people; when we transfer an American industry to his shores, are we not paying tribute to the Moro and the Visayan and Togalog that he may not be restive under our government?

But, Mr. Chairman, they say this is not going to hurt us; that they are a poor, miserable, shiftless people; that the soil is unfertile, unproductive; no possibility of securing good labor, and no fertility in the soil to produce considerable crops. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] tells us that the soil is too poor to produce good sugar; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] says that it is too rich to produce good tobacco. I presume they did not refer to the same soil. But they say there is not much good land over there any way, and gentlemen have claimed that the Philippine census contained a statement to the effect that only 9 per cent of the land in the Philippine Islands is arable and fit for agriculture. It is a curious thing that before this debate began a gentleman who saw me looking over the Philippine census said:

> Mind you, watch out during this debate, or some fellow will claim that the table of agricultural lands on page 181 of the census is all the arable lands there are in the islands.

I laughed at him, but the thing has happened—happened several times—during the debate, and I want to particularly call the attention of the House to this phase of the question, and if you are not satisfied that I am right get a copy of the Philippine census and satisfy yourself. Nowhere in the census is there any pretense of giving the total area of the arable lands of the archipelago. Everybody knows that it would be impossible to do anything of the sort in taking a census. Beginning with page 180 of the Philippine census, volume 4, are 18 tables and accompanying text relative to the "agricultural"—in other words, the farm lands—of the islands, and it is stated at the top of page 180 that these relate to "farms and other parcels of land used for agriculture." The total is given in Table 1, page 181, as 2,827,704 hectares, of 2½ acres each, or about 7,000,000 acres, and it will be noted that throughout all these tables—page 187, Table 7, under the head of "Farm areas"—on page 188 and elsewhere this area is given as the area in farms. On page 181 it is stated "the small proportion of land in farms or agricultural lands as compared with the total areas of the various provinces, commandancias, and islands, shown by the following tables."

In the pamphlet issued by the Philippine Commission relating to the public lands in 1905, pages 9 and 10, these same tables are used, with this explanation on page 10: "It is not known whether the land reported by the census as being in farms or agricultural lands includes all the lands in private ownership." Certainly all this ought to be sufficient evidence to anyone who desires to know the truth that this reference in the census is only to agricultural lands in private ownership.

Nobody knows, nor can they know until a careful classification is made there by the actual test of agriculture, how much arable land there is in the Philippines, but the last word of the Philippine government on this question is contained in the public land pamphlet to which I have referred, in which, on page 6, the total area of the islands is estimated at 73,000,000 acres—12,000,000 in private ownership, of which 12,000,000 the census, as stated before, gives a little over 7,000,000 as agricultural and in farms. Taking from the total area of 73,000,000 acres 12,000,000 in private ownership, and we have the estimate of the bureau of public lands of 61,000,000 acres of public lands. With regard to these lands the following statement is made: "The chief of the bureau of forestry estimates the forest lands on the public domain at about 40,000,000 acres. This would leave an area of 21,000,000 acres of land not forested, the most of which is agricultural in character and which will be subject to disposal under the law permitting leasing, selling, and homesteading as soon as the act now awaiting the final action of the Commission shall have received the express or implied sanction of Congress." So it seems that to the census 7,000,000 of agricultural lands we must, according to the bureau of public lands, add "the most" of 21,000,000 acres of public, arable lands, not timbered, and of course a considerable portion of the timbered lands would be good agricultural lands if cleared, and provision for the sale of such lands as agricultural lands is made in the Philippine land laws.

Secretary Taft said before the Insular Committee, while he was governor-general, "We are going to be a great sugar-producing archipelago," and he stated that, while the islands are a trifle smaller than Japan, "they have much more arable land and very much more rich soil." The report of the Philippine Commission for 1901 states: "The land is most fertile and for the most part naturally irrigated." Governor Wright, before the Senate Committee in 1902, said that in his opinion, and judging from what people who knew had told him, the Philippine sugar land was more fertile than Hawaii, where they have produced as high as 12 tons of sugar per acre. The Hawaiian Islands are so small that you could almost cover them with the palm of your hand, so to speak; contain but 100,000 acres of tillable land, and yet Hawaii produces over 400,000 tons of sugar.

Here is an archipelago, the fairest and most fertile in the Tropics; nearly as large as Japan, having six or eight times as much tillable land. Older from a geological standpoint, under the influence of 150 inches of rain per annum and the heat of tropical suns, her mountains have disintegrated, rank tropical vegetation has in the course of ages, mingling with the mineral elements, formed a soil of marvelous richness, so that agriculture can be carried on almost to the tops of many of her mountains. There are many wide valleys and vast stretches of fertile uplands. If there are no agricultural lands in the 60,000,000 acres we own over there, why in the name of high heaven did the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] bring in a bill for the disposition of public lands over there, and why does Secretary Taft say they ought to have 25,000 acres in a hacienda rather than 2,500? If there is not any land over there that is arable or tillable, why are we trying to impose on people by offering to dispose of the public land?

We all recall the rosy predictions made of the possibilities of these islands from an agricultural standpoint in other days. Gentlemen, they were not exaggerated; they were true. There are no islands in the tropic seas of the world equal to them. They contain eighteen times the area of Hawaii, which produces 400,000 tons of sugar per annum, and vastly more good lands in proportion; two and a half times larger than Java, which to-day could supply the United States with all the sugar she needs other than that she produces within her own territory. But they say they are poor, miserable, shiftless, no-account folk, and you can not make anything of them; and finally, in despair, at the last moment, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said he could not hold any hope that this legislation would accomplish anything for them. Then, in heaven's name, how can they justify themselves in raising this menace to American industries if they are not going to help anybody by doing it? [Applause.]

What are the facts? The facts are that the Filipino is a wonderfully effective laborer. Every disinterested observer has said so, down to the time when in the interest of this legislation there went up this united official chorus of disparagement and detraction of the people, the climate, and the soil of those islands. Mr. Welborn, head of the agricultural bureau, in his report of 1904, states: "We have experienced no difficulty in securing all of the help we wanted." He says that at first they got them for 26 centavos (13 cents) a day, but that later, in order to secure more efficient help, they paid 15½ cents a day; and in that same report he gave the average wages of the mill hands on a plantation as $4 per month, the field hands $3 per month, and stated that the board of these men cost, in addition, about a peso per week, or 50 cents, making the cost of the mill hands, with board, 25 cents a day on the basis of a month of twenty-five working days, and the field hands 21 cents a day. But, taking the highest amount that has been stated by anyone of the cost of Philippine labor, it is ridiculously low compared with the $1.50 and $2.25 a day of the mill and field hands in American beet-sugar factories. Of course, it will be argued that this labor is nowhere nearly so efficient as the labor employed in connection with the American beet-sugar industry. Admit for the sake of argument that it is not—though much of the labor employed in the cultivation and preparation of beets is far from efficient, from the average American standard. In any event there can be no such thing in ordinary manual or even in semiskilled labor as one man being from six to eight times as efficient as another, and Mr. Welborn, in his report to which I have just referred, states that the Filipinos did the work on the government farms "as well as the Americans ever did," and at from 6 to 8 per cent of the cost. We have an abundance of evidence along the same line and to the same effect as to the efficiency of Filipino labor for ordinary work, and even in the trades and in skilled labor.

While there has been a wide range of testimony as to the wages paid over there, and it has run all the way from 10 cents a day to 30 cents a day, it matters little what it is within those limits, for I am willing to take as the basis of my argu-

ment the highest and most extravagant claim as to the present facts and the future prospects relative to labor and wages on the sugar plantations in the Philippine Islands, and from them prove my contention.

In fact, if we had never heard a word of testimony on the subject of wages in the Philippines, if we were as ignorant on the subject of wages in the beet-sugar industry of the United States as the advocates of this bill seem to be of the character and importance of that industry, I could still confidently rely for the proof of my assertions upon the general knowledge we all possess as to the difference between the labor scale of the United States and that of any tropical region on earth inhabited by a brown, a black, or a yellow race; for the wage scale is the standard of living reduced to a cash equivalent, and come what will, the wage scale of the Philippine Islands and of the United States will continue, as now, to be as wide apart as the relative standards of living, and removed from one another as far as the well-clothed, well-housed, and well-fed necessities of an American citizen of our northern latitudes are from the one-shirted, nipa-hut protected, and rice-fed opulence of a native of the Tropics.

The range of evidence with regard to the cost of sugar over there is as wide as that with regard to the cost of labor. A representative of the Agricultural Department, who was in the islands two years ago and made a most careful and painstaking examination, was given by the owners of seven large plantations on Negros, an estimate of from 62 cents to 89 cents per hundred pounds delivered at Iloilo. The average testimony up to a very recent period placed the cost at less than a dollar a hundred. Secretary Taft stated that his best information was that the average cost, laid down at the port of Iloilo for foreign shipment, was a dollar and twenty-five cents a hundred. Colonel Edwards, in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee last winter, stated that the ocean freight to New York was 22 cents. Some have put it at 25, but Colonel Edwards ought to be right, for he cabled the governor-general for the information. Add to this nine-tenths of a cent per hundred for insurance, as per Mr. Willett, and you have a cost of Philippine sugar laid down in New York, without the duty—and of course there will be none in three years from now if this bill passes—of $1.56.

Sugar is low just now. It is nearly a cent lower a pound than it was last year, but on December 21 muscovado sugar was quoted at $3.13 per hundredweight at the port of New York. It has not gone below $2.88 this year. It has been as high as $4.75. But take the low average of $3.10 a hundred, which is much below the average for the year, and the Philippine shipper would have a profit of just about 100 per cent. The beet-sugar producer's product costs him from $3.90 to $4; the market has been ranging from $4.60 to $4.70. With these relative prices and costs, the Filipino under this bill would have a profit of 100 per cent while our own cane-sugar producer would have a profit of less than 20, and remember that his estimate of cost includes nothing for interest or wear and tear.

Even with the present duty, which averages 88 cents per hundred, on Philippine sugar, accepting Secretary Taft's estimate of cost, which makes the New York price $1.56 per hundred, add to this the duty and you have $2.44 as the price of Philippine sugar laid down in New York, duty paid, a profit, at the present price, of 66 cents a hundred, or about 28 per cent, as against the beet-sugar producer's less than 20 per cent profit.

It costs $30 an acre to plant, cultivate, and harvest an ordinary acre of sugar beets. It costs more in our western country. I do not mean in my State. We do not raise sugar beets there to any extent yet. We have no beet-sugar factories, but in the adjoining States it costs more than $30 an acre to raise sugar beets under irrigation. The average product last year was 7 tons to the acre. With a price of $5 per ton at the factory, $5 an acre is the highest profit to the farmer under the present existing conditions, on an average.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wyoming about how many acres one hand can cultivate in the sugar-beet business. I never heard it stated.

Mr. MONDELL. I am not a sugar-beet expert and I do not know that I can offhand answer that question. They pay from $2 to $2.25 a day in the mountain region, and I do not know how many acres an ordinary field hand could cultivate. I do know this, that there is no such difference between the labor ability of any two men under the sun as is measured by the difference between a 30-cent wage and a $1.75 to $2.25 wage. There may be men who are twice as effective as other men. There may be men three times as effective as other men, but nobody who ever employed labor in the ordinary pursuits ever saw or heard of one man who could be so utterly worthless as to be only 10 per cent as good as another.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from Wyoming permit a suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. In answer to the gentleman from Kentucky, I want to say that it costs on an average about $30 per acre to raise an acre of sugar beets. Divide that by the wages to the farm hands—$1.50 or $1.75 per day—and it will tell you how many days' work it will cost to produce an acre of sugar beets.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I wanted to know how many acres one man could cultivate.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman's question, but, after all, from the standpoint of the gentlemen on this side, that ought not to be a very important question. It reminds me of the new method whereby we are now proposing to fix the tariff. When the revisionists next control, judging from the procedure in connection with the framing of this bill, we are to invite before the Ways and Means Committee the men representing the industries of the United States—or rather, allow them to come, if they will insist upon it—and then we are to politely invite the gentlemen interested in manufacturing and industrial pursuits across the water in competition with our people, and after we have heard their testimony we are to take as gospel truth the interested statements of gentlemen from beyond our borders as to the cost of production in their lines and laud and commend them as patriots to our people, and speak in terms of disparagement and disrespect of every man who appears before the committee representing an American industry. [Applause.] That is the new standard. Is the Republican party ready to accept it?

The gentleman from New York said he had taken upon himself his share of the "white man's burden." Let him continue to bear it and not put it on our shoulders. I would like to know and have often wondered if, instead of it being products of the farm—the only products I think of where the benefit of the tariff goes direct to the "man with the hoe"—that are threatened, there were a different situation over there, if there were mountains of iron and coking coal and all the conditions that would make iron and steel manufacturing profitable, would the gentleman from Pittsburg be as anxious for this legislation as he is to-day? [Applause.]

No danger, poor, miserable, weak brethren; the soil too poor for sugar and too rich for tobacco! Why, gentlemen, if this thing goes on, it is going to put many of us in regard to the Filipino in the attitude of mind expressed by a gentleman down at the banquet of the "Military Order of the Carabao" which I attended. He sung a song. I do not recollect all of it, and it is possible that I can not recite even the first verse correctly, but it runs something like this:

I am only a common beet-sugar man, and as for the Philippines,
They tell me I have a brown brother there who wants to beat me out of my means.
I like the word fraternity, but at this I draw the line;
He may be a brother of Secretary Taft, but he ain't no friend of mine.

[Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is growing late and I can not touch even hurriedly and briefly on many of the questions I would like to discuss in connection with this matter. I want, however, to call the attention of the House to his fact, that this is the first time in the history of the world that it has ever been proposed anywhere in any legislative body to place a bounty upon the sugar product of a tropical country of any area. In all the history of the world it has been understood among protectionists and nonprotectionists alike that there are certain products that require no protection bounty in the markets of the world, which protect themselves regardless of the price of labor employed in their production, by reason of the peculiar conditions surrounding their growth. The cotton of the south needs no protection. It might need some protection against the fellah of Egypt—and that was referred to the other day—if it were not for the fact that 5,000,000 people are living off of 5,000,000 acres, paying most of their income in taxes. Nobody has ever imagined that the corn crop of the great Mississippi Valley needed protection, it matters not what wage you pay for tilling it. It is a product peculiar to the region and can compete with all the world. The Red River Valley needs no bounty on her wheat, and by the same token it has always been understood that the growth of cane in the Tropics is an industry that can support itself against all the world.

Not so, however, with the sugar-beet industry. It is in a very large sense not a natural but an artificial industry. In its natural state the beet does not contain a sufficient amount of saccharine matter to make it worthy of consideration as a sugar producer. The increase of its saccharine constituent from

5 to 15 and 18 per cent is, perhaps, the greatest of all the triumphs of scientific agriculture, and to maintain in the beet a high percentage of saccharine matter requires persistent, unceasing, and highly intelligent effort in selection and cultivation. The extensive manufacture of sugar from this splendid product of scientific agriculture has been made possible only by wise legislation at home and abroad, which has always had for its object the protection of the industry from the fatal competition of the cane sugar of the Tropics.

As the sugar-beet industry has been the child of scientific agriculture and protecting and stimulating governmental policies, it has, by its magnificently beneficent effect and influence, richly rewarded and abundantly justified the efforts of its friends and wellwishers. It has everywhere diversified agriculture, necessitating a helpful rotation of crops, stimulating improved and intensified methods of cultivation, and by reason of the methods and practices necessary to its successful prosecution has enriched where other crops have impoverished the soil. To the tiller of the soil it has brought the blessings that follow intense cultivation; it has robbed agriculture of its loneliness; it has furnished steady and agreeable employment, and minimized the vicissitudes of agricultural pursuits by uniformity of yield and of the price of the product. At home and abroad this industry has built up and maintains thousands of thriving communities, and, unlike most agricultural industries pursued upon an extensive scale, its tendency is to multiply independent farm homes, to a subdivision of the land into small individual holdings.

In the field of trade and commerce this industry demands more transportation, utilizes a greater variety of products, calls for a greater outlay in labor, in building material, and in machinery in proportion to its value than any other agricultural product. In this country, under adequate protection, the field of its expansion is practically limitless. The forty millions of capital now invested in its manufacturing plants alone, the 250,000 tons per annum of its product can and will expand into the hundreds of millions of investment necessary to the production of the 1,800,000 tons which we are now buying of foreigners at a cost of $150,000,000 per annum. Is not an industry that accomplishes these results, that carries direct to the farms of the nation the benefit of a protective policy, whose future development presents so alluring a picture of progress and prosperity, entitled to more than passing and indifferent consideration?

It is passing strange that, in a country which affords the most marvelous object lessons that the world has ever seen of the benefits of a protective tariff, a party whose constant devotion to the protective doctrine has made that country rich and mighty, and its people prosperous above all the peoples that have ever lived beneath the skies—it is passing strange that in such a country any member of such a party should favor a measure like this; and one's wonder grows when one considers that the industry about to be wiped out is one of the very few where the farmer receives the direct benefits of the tariff.

Europe, protective and nonprotective alike, has always protected and still protects this industry. It was fed by bounty, guarded by tariff, stimulated by cartel until it grew by leaps and bounds and outstripped the cane industry. When the Brussels convention sought to put an end to overstimulation and demanded the abolition of bounties and cartels, the statesmanship of Europe recognized that the industry could not withstand free competition with tropical cane sugar.

When England and other importing countries demanded that the excessive bounties and cartels should be abolished in order that her tropical sugar-producing regions should have a fair show in the production of sugar, European nations were compelled to take off their bounty and lower their import taxes, but the Brussels convention recognized the fact that the beet-sugar industry even in Germany, with her scientific methods, Germany with her 15 to 16 per cent of average saccharine constituent, Germany with her high production per acre, Germany with her cheap labor compared with ours—even she required some protection against tropical cane sugar, and so all Europe retained upon their product a surtax of from 48 to 53 cents a hundred, generally retaining the same old consumption tax, based upon an estimate of the sugar contained in the beet below the fact, so that as a matter of fact the beet-sugar producer of Europe to-day with his industry all developed, with his fields tilled for a generation with the beet, with his labor accustomed to its production, is enjoying a protection of from 60 to 70 cents a hundred, and the great Republic of protection and the party of protection in that Republic is proposing now to place this industry, just beginning in its development, on a par with the cheapest labor of any sugar country in the world!

Java, with nothing to aid her but a chance to fight for a place in the sugar market of the world, increased her output 500,000 tons in ten years, and she did it on the lowest sugar market the world ever knew, produced by the bounty-fed beet sugars of Europe. Cuba, devastated by war, with 88 per cent of her factories in ruins, and with her plantations grown up to grass, increased her output a million round tons in five years, and who shall say that these islands, which we have always claimed were rich and fair and fertile beyond those of any other isles in the eastern seas, can not under this hitherto unheard of stimulus increase their output by leaps and bounds? Why, think of it! They say themselves it only costs them $1.25 a hundred pounds to lay it down at Iloilo. Three years ago they said it cost them 60 to 80 cents a hundred, and we are proposing to give them a bounty of $1.20 a hundred. We are going to take from the pockets of American citizens a tariff duty equal to $1.20 for every hundred pounds of sugar they send us. Stimulate the industry! If the islands are not too poor and miserable to make it worth while to take up the time of the American Congress in the discussion of them, under that stimulus there is no reason under heaven why their output should not increase more rapidly than Cuba's did under a bounty of one-fifth the amount.

The beet-sugar grower in my country or in the West or anywhere you will find lives on a little farm—a small farm. He owns it himself. He has his little home. The cane-sugar grower the world over has a hacienda and peon or semipeon labor. Go to the sugar plantations of Hawaii, if you will, and you will find their labor is as well cared for or better cared for than any tropical cane sugar labor on the face of the earth, and see the crowded hovels in which the Japanese congregate who till those fields; and we are going to make it impossible to multiply the little farm in the West to build up imperial states over there beyond the seas! The beet-sugar industry is one of those few agricultural industries carried on on a large scale where the tendency is to a division of the land into small areas—the ideal condition. Out in our region if a settler desires to go into the business under the reclamation law of the Government he can homestead from 40 to 160 acres of land. He must make it his home, and he pays the Government the cost of reclamation—from $30 to $55—after which he must grub, clear, and level it and make his laterals.

No such limitation, no such condition, no such expenditures hamper the man who, under the provisions of this bill, is going to build up the sugar haciendas of the Philippines.

A simple article of incorporation is the open door to the purchase of twenty-five hundred and sixty acres of land at from $2 an acre upward; to the lease of an additional twenty-five hundred acres of land adjoining it at a rental of 10 cents an acre and upward for twenty-five years and a renewal for twenty-years more, and yet these princely estates of 5,000 acres are five times too small, according to Secretary Taft, to build up this industry, which is going to take the industry away from the Michigan and the Colorado farmer.

Gentlemen, remember the beet-sugar industry is in its infancy. In that respect it has no advantage over the industry over there. They are both comparatively small, but open the door, give the cheap labor of this wonderfully rich land the same market that you give the American sugar producer and does anyone imagine that any more sugar factories will be built here? Aye, we have an object lesson of what will occur in the fact that even the reduction of 20 per cent in favor of Cuba almost put an end to the further extension of the industry. And what an industry it is! None in the whole domain of agriculture is more helpful. It is twice blessed in that it produces a sure, a certain, and fairly remunerative income and enriches the land instead of impoverishing it.

The industry requires more transportation, more machinery, more material per dollar of the product than any on earth. The $40,000,000 invested in the fifty-three beet-sugar factories in these United States represent at least $30,000,000 of machinery and material bought of American manufacturers, at least that much, and with the splendid opportunities before American industry and capital there is no reason why, if this bill does not pass, $200,000,000 of capital should not be invested in this industry in the next twenty years.

The gentlemen who propose this legislation have tried to quiet the beet-sugar producers by insisting that in any event they can not be injured; they say the country buys so much sugar from foreign countries at full tariff rates, that in no event can their industry suffer. That is what they said to us when the Cuban bill passed, but the fact is that with the increase of production in Cuba, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, and the increase of beet and cane sugar production at home, we will receive this year under this bill, which would give us all the Philippine product, barring a possible increase in consumption, within 187,000 tons—and not 800,000 tons, as gentlemen told us the other day—of a condition where every pound of sugar coming into the United States comes

in under a reduced duty; and if we secure no more than the present production of the Philippines, within twelve months the beet-sugar industry of the country must face a reduction of 20 per cent on its product, the delayed effect of Cuban reciprocity, which will come when all sugars we import are coming in at a 20 per cent reduction.

We are facing that right now, and the man asked to invest in beet-sugar factories will, if this bill passes, be facing that other day when the sugar of those tropical islands, rich and fertile, fed with a bounty equal to the cost of production, will pour in here in a never-ending stream. I will put in the RECORD a statement of the amount of sugar we are likely to receive this year compared with our consumption.

Sugar consumption in the United States and sources of supply.

	Tons.
Consumption in 1905	2,767,000
Sources of supply:	
Porto Rico	210,000
Hawaii	420,000
Domestic cane	300,000
Domestic beet	265,000
Total domestic	1,195,000
Cuba estimate "Willett"	1,300,000
Philippines	85,000
Other sources	187,000
Total	2,767,000

In my hurry, Mr. Chairman, I have passed over a number of matters I should like to discuss, but I must pass on. Gentlemen have talked a good deal about plain duty; they have said we must do this thing because the Philippine Islands are part of these United States. I can not understand how anyone who supports this bill can take any such position. You are not treating the Filipinos in this measure on an equality with the American citizen. You are giving them all the benefits of our splendid market; you are compelling our people to pay an internal-revenue tax on their products; you are giving them the revenues collected in the islands.

The proponents of this bill say, "Why not treat them as we treat Alaska or as we treat Arizona?" Aye, if that was done, then gentlemen could consistently support the measure. But they do not do it. They do not propose to do it. They do not dare to do it. And if it is right to pass a bill that gives all the benefits of the American market to these people and does not place the obligations of American citizens upon them, it is certainly right and proper and just, and it is our duty, to levy such import tax as shall measure the difference in the cost of production of a natural product of the Philippine Islands, and of a product of our farms and factories—one which brings unnumbered blessings in its train.

But there is one sledge-hammer proposition—a sockdolager—which has been fired at us from every quarter as the final argument which fixes, defines, and certifies our duty. Shall we be less fair to these poor people than was tyrannical Spain? Did she not give them the advantage in her markets? We have that from Secretary Taft. We have had it from Colonel Edwards. We have had it from the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and we have had it from the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], and possibly from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who favors this measure.

The latter does not favor it, I think, because it does not affect the tariff on Missouri mules or Missouri zinc or lead, but he does favor it. They said that we must do as well by the Philippines as Spain did. Why, I wonder if the gentlemen have never discovered what the facts are with regard to that wonderful market that Spain gave the Philippines. There are more tons of sugar to-day, Mr. Chairman, in the bonded warehouses of the United States, hoping to come in when this legislation shall pass, at a reduced duty of half a million dollars, than Spain received from the Philippines in ten years. The highest importation in any year of the last twenty before we took the islands into the Spanish peninsula from the Philippines was 10,000 tons, not the product of one good-sized plantation. Why? Because while she gave the Philippines a preferential entrance into her market, she still maintained against her a tax high enough to protect good and plenty the Spanish beet and cane sugar grower.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. And taxed everything they did locally.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentlemen have simply been misled by one of those delightful operations of legislative legerdemain dear to the Spanish heart, whereby they fed the imagination of their colonists while they robbed them of their substance.

"But," said one of the distinguished gentlemen who appeared in an official capacity before the committee, "it is not the American market we are seeking by this legislation. We will not ship much sugar to the United States, even with this reduction of tariff. We simply want to use the opportunity of the free market of the United States as a club to compel the Chinese merchants to pay us as much for our sugar for consumption in China and Japan as we could get in the United States." Has so absurd a proposition ever been heard before outside of an institution for the feeble-minded? And yet it was gravely urged before a great committee of this House that the reduction of our duty on Philippine sugars would raise the world price in all of the oriental markets by the amount of our reduction, and thus keep the Philippine sugar on the other side of the world. I should not refer to so utterly and ridiculously absurd an argument if it were not for the fact that the gentleman who made it was put forward by the proponents of this bill and paraded before the committee to display his fantastic theories as an important part of the highly variegated, largely imaginative, and altogether illogical display of arguments in behalf of the measure.

I am reminded, Mr. Chairman, that all of those who urged this legislation before the committee have talked from a Philippine standpoint—governmental or personal. Secretary Taft does not claim to know the condition of the American beet-sugar industry. He would not say he would not be in favor of this legislation if it would destroy the industry. He said that he spoke from the standpoint of the Filipino.

Now, it is possible that something needs to be done over there. The gentlemen who appeared before the committee, as I read their testimony, suggested all sorts of remedies except this. So far as I recall, nobody except the officials of the Filipino government and the politicians of the islands, most of them ex-insurrectos, urged the reduction of the tariff duty. The men who seemed to speak for the Filipino people, as I read those hearings, asked for other things. They asked that the vexatious, ridiculous restrictions on the use of timber from the public domain be removed—restrictions under which they say it costs twice as much to build a plantation as it did in the olden days.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman be given time in which to finish his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks that the gentleman from Wyoming be given time in which to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. A country of 12 feet annual rainfall, where timber grows rapidly, with 40,000,000 acres of timber; a people whom they tell us are barbaric, half civilized, speaking many different languages; and yet they have, according to this circular which I hold, enough red tape enveloping the use of timber on the public lands to puzzle the legendary Philadelphia lawyer, and they charge so much for the timber that between charges and vexatious regulations it costs twice as much as formerly.

Remove the restriction on the use of timber in that country, where it grows so rapidly that you can not cut it fast enough to keep pace with the increased growth. They want better roads. Take some of the millions we are turning into their treasury and build better roads. If the sugar industry requires nursing, nurse it with the tariff taxes collected here on their products and returned to them. They are suffering from usurers. Must we then break down the protective policy of the United States; must we go back on the history of a great party because the people in a few islands of the Philippines require protection from usurers? Give them banks if necessary. They want better transportation facilities. Start those railroads we have been hearing so much about.

The gentlemen on the other side say that they are opposed to high protective tariff, and yet if they vote for this bill they are extending the domain and effect of the protective tariff. They want to break down the tariff wall, they say, to take tariff burdens off the people, and yet in their minority report they insist this will not lower the price of the products affected, and therefore, according to their view, will not bring relief to any American citizen, while it threatens an American industry. If support of this measure is illogical from the standpoint of a protectionist, how much more illogical is this misfit legislation, giving the markets of the United States to the Filipino people and adding burdens on our own people, threatening American industries, and not relieving a soul on earth of any dollar of direct or indirect taxation, from any possible standpoint of a free trader.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I hope the bill will not pass. I hope that ere it reaches the final stage, even if it should pass this body, the final stage leading to its enactment, that wiser counsels will prevail. I hope that in our own party the quickened conscience of the protection sentiment will shame the petty, miserable arguments of expediency that are pressing this measure to its passage.

I hope that this menace to an American industry will be thrust aside. I hope the Philippine people will be spared this thing that eventually can bring them nothing but ruin and disaster. For after you build up there with German and English machinery and foreign and American capital princely haciendas with their peon labor, the enterprises carried on with all the extravagances that this unheard-of bounty is sure to produce, the time will come when the legend, "Killed by the Republican party," having been writ on the walls of the beet-sugar factories of the United States, the American people will awaken to the fact that we are paying $1.95 more than the world's price for sugar, and that no American within our continental possessions is profiting a penny thereby. [Applause.] And when that day comes the tariff will be repealed. Then these men, unable to compete with Java, because they have had a bounty of 100 per cent over her; unable to compete with Cuba, because of their hot-house fed industry; unable to compete with any other tropical country on even terms, the money wrung from American taxpayers spent in riotous living by the owners of these haciendas in the capitals of Europe, their estates will be closed up, abandoned, and their last end will be infinitely worse than their first; but in the meantime our industry will be destroyed.

We passed here a couple of years ago a bill which some of us labored earnestly for, under which we are irrigating arid lands in the western country, charging the settler on these lands every dollar of expenditure by the Government, and amounting from twenty-five to fifty-five dollars an acre for ungrubbed, unleveled land. Some of the lands are peculiarly adapted to sugar beets. After the beet-sugar industry is destroyed by this legislation one of the principal means of paying the Government for these lands will be gone.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Do I understand the gentleman from Wyoming to assert that it is his opinion that the retention of the Philippine Islands under the present policy will work destruction to the beet-sugar industry of the United States proper?

Mr. MONDELL. I have not spoken to much effect if I have not conveyed that idea, and I will try and state it explicitly and clearly. It is my opinion from a study of the subject that runs back a number of years that the beet-sugar industry can not exist anywhere on earth in competition with tropically grown cane sugar, and I think the only question involved is whether or no the Philippine Islands can produce and will produce any considerable quantity of sugar. That they will produce it under this tremendous stimulus there can be no doubt, if they are worth their salt. If they are not, why are we threatening American industries in attempting to do what some gentlemen say is impossible?

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I should like to ask the gentleman another question: If his position be correct, does not the choice come to us then of letting the Philippines go or letting our beet-sugar industry go?

Mr. MONDELL. Why, I think not. I think so far as gentlemen on this side are concerned—I do not know how the gentleman himself feels about it—that question was settled long ago. The Supreme Court of the United States decided that we have the power to pass special tariff laws applicable to these islands. That is what the decision amounted to. And on this side it is party policy that we not only have the right, aye, but that it is just and equitable and proper both to the people of those islands and to our own people to fix such tariffs between us as shall measure the difference in cost of production of similar products.

Are we come to this on both sides of the House? Are we finally so lacking in ability for constructive legislation that we can not go into this subject with a clear and unbiased mind and fix the difference in that cost? I think it has been fixed now in favor of the Filipino. He is getting a better price in proportion in the markets of New York to-day than the beet-sugar producer is; and if this bill passes he will get a hundred per cent profit where the beet-sugar producer, on the present market, gets a profit of 19 per cent. Under present conditions, paying 88 cents average duty, his profit, on his own statement—his own exaggerated statement of cost—is 21 per cent in our markets, as compared with the 19 per cent profit of the beet-sugar producers.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I should like to make this further suggestion to the gentleman from Wyoming: I believe, upon constitutional grounds, that we ought to have absolute free trade between the Philippine Islands and this country. I believe they constitute a part of this country, and I do not believe that we have any right to impose a tariff against them. Of course I understand that gentlemen on that side of the House take a different view; yet the leaders on that side take the position now that from the moral standpoint we owe it to the Filipinos to have free trade with them.

Now, in its practical result it does not make any difference whether they favor free trade from the constitutional standpoint or from the moral standpoint. If they stand for free trade, as I do, with the Philippine Islands, the result must necessarily be the same to the beet-sugar industry or the people in the Northwest. So, as I said before, you are confronted with this position, that you must either see the destruction of the beet industry or you must let go of the Philippine Islands. Now, it does not answer that, in my opinion, to say, as the gentleman has said, that it has been determined to hold onto the Philippine Islands. I take it that if it develops in the subsequent history of our relation with the Philippine Islands that they are absolutely destroying the people of the continental United States, we will let go of them. We are not bound to hold onto them if they are absolutely destroying the industries of the United States.

Mr. MONDELL. I will say, in answer to the gentleman, that I am not in a position to give an opinion that is worth while as to how long we will hold the Philippine Islands. I have stated that, so far as our party is concerned, we have already taken the stand that it is legal and proper and right to fix tariffs between the mainland and tropical possessions, if I may use that term. But taking the position the gentleman does, I am at a loss to know how he can support this legislation on the alleged ground of plain duty. If it is our plain duty to give these people our market, it is our plain duty to make them assume all the responsibilities and burdens of American citizenship. [Applause.] And if gentlemen will take that stand then, at least, they will be consistent. But voting for a measure that gives them the benefits of our splendid markets, built up by protection, as we on this side believe, and still leave them free to tax American citizens for their alcohol imported here, for the cigars imported here, free to collect taxes that belong to the United States, that should go into the United States Treasury, and use them for their own purposes; free to so arrange their tariff on agricultural and sugar-manufacturing machinery that our manufacturers have no advantage in their markets while they have a hundred per cent advantage in ours, if there is any justice or equity in that proposition, I confess that I am too dense to see it.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think there is just about as much justice in that proposition as there is in the proposition to tax the people of Kentucky to maintain manufacturing institutions in the New England States. I think it is just about on a par. I do not believe in any of it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am against the protective tariff, and if I can not get rid of protection in the tariff schedule altogether, I will get rid of as much of it as I can. That is why I shall vote for this proposition.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman admits that it is inconsistent, that it is inequitable, but he is going to vote for it on the theory—and it is a good enough excuse on that side of the House—that it is going to make trouble. The minority state at the beginning of the minority report that they hail with satisfaction the disaffection that now appears when we are proposing to bring the products of an underpaid tropical labor in competition with American labor.

Mr. Chairman, I have already taken the time of the House longer than I should, and I wish to thank gentlemen for their attention, and I beg everyone, on this side of the House at least, to seriously consider the effect of this legislation, what it means to that great principle that is one of foundation stones of our party policy, this party—that has stood through good report and ill, through storms and fair weather for protection; that has declared that protection is not a local question, that it is a question nation wide; that under the beneficent wing of the Republican protective tariff policy every American product and every American industry shall receive fair treatment and equal justice—can not afford to do this thing.

The gentleman from New York is going to unload his portion of the white man's burden onto the sugar producer, the tobacco producer, and the rice producer of these United States. I do not believe it will be done; it is too directly in contradiction of everything that has been said and everything that has been done on this side in all the years since the Philippines came to us.

As I said, wiser counsel will prevail. The splendid industries of a free people, the industries that build up homes, the industries that make and maintain American citizenship, these will be protected. We will do justice by the Filipino; we will not curse him with our misguided sentimentality, but will remember, as De la Rama said to the gentleman from New York—and I commend that statement to him as he commended it to you; not the half-civilized De la Rama, as the gentleman suggested,

but the highly civilized, French educated De la Rama, the absentee landlord of many a glorious sugar hacienda with the carabao mill and the old iron kettles, who, very properly speaking for himself and his industry, begging for a bounty great as the cost of his product, even he, in the moment when he had some hope that this would be accomplished, could not fail but recognize the fact—"that charity begins at home." I hope this House will remember it. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration has been reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means because it is believed to be in the interest of the people of the Philippine Islands. The report submitted by the majority of the committee says that they are the wards of the nation; that their relations do not differ from that of the people of Porto Rico:

To teach them the lesson of industry we must furnish opportunity. The free interchange of commodities among all the people under the American flag is one of the fundamental principles of our Government. It is as much our plain duty to grant free trade to the people of the Philippines as it ever was to the people of Porto Rico. There is no excuse to continue our tariff against them except for the purpose of revenue.

The members of the minority of the committee offer a substitute, but say in this report that if such substitute is voted down they will support the bill of the majority. So it is safe to assume that tariff legislation in the interest of the Filipinos will be enacted during the present session of Congress.

While there is perhaps an increasing number of our citizens who wish that Dewey had sailed away from the islands after the battle of Manila Bay, it is very generally recognized, I think, that we shall retain them for at least a generation—it may be many—until the people are prepared for self-government. In the meantime it is but common justice that we should give them every reasonable opportunity for development and prosperity.

Now that the Committee on Ways and Means has heard and favorably considered the prayer of the wards of the nation, I trust it will not be considered treasonable for a Republican to suggest to that committee that it give some consideration to the appeal of the citizens here at home for relief from oppressive tariff schedules. For some time they have been asking for free hides and free coal and free iron ore and free lumber. They have begged for free alcohol in the arts and for a reduction of some of the duties fixed in 1897 and now believed to be too high. They would like to have the Committee on Ways and Means make a thorough investigation to determine if changes in existing tariff rates are not now demanded by changed conditions. The Republican party has said that the tariff would be revised by its friends when demanded by changed conditions. I believe that tariff revision and readjustment should be undertaken now, and that is the expressed opinion of the Republicans of my State.

At the Republican State convention held in Boston on October 6, 1905, the committee on resolutions submitted a platform which included a resolution favoring an immediate consideration of the tariff for the purpose of revision and readjustment. That tariff plank occasioned spirited discussion in the convention and has been the subject of varied comment ever since. It goes without saying that in a matter of this kind it is impossible to satisfy everyone. The committee on resolutions of the Massachusetts Republican State convention clearly realizing that fact did not attempt a feat so unwise, imprudent, and impossible. This much, however, was accomplished: The platform was satisfactory to all but one of the nineteen members of the committee on resolutions, and it was adopted by the convention by a vote which was almost unanimous. Although there was some opposition to the resolution, no one ventured to test the sentiment of the convention by offering an amendment—a fact which speaks volumes. It was clear that the views of an overwhelming majority of the Republicans of Massachusetts had been satisfactorily expressed. I feel that I have a right, therefore, to ask my party associates in Congress to give to that deliberate and carefully considered expression of opinion their honest and favorable attention.

The resolution to which I ask your consideration reads as follows:

We believe that the policy of protection to American labor and American industry should be maintained. The Republican party of Massachusetts reaffirms its devotion to the principle of protection, and is opposed to tariff changes tending to depress or destroy any of our industries or to lower the wages of American labor. But we recognize the fact, as declared by the national Republican convention at Chicago, that rates should be changed when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands the alteration of schedules. The time at which revision of the tariff should be undertaken must be determined by the representatives of the party from all parts of our common country. We approve the position taken by our Senators and Representatives at the last session of Congress in favor of present action, and we urge that they should continue to press upon their party associates in Congress from other States the wisdom of a consideration of the tariff for the purpose of revision and readjustment.

By this resolution Massachusetts Republicans reaffirmed their devotion to the principle of protection and expressed their opposition to tariff changes tending to depress or destroy any of our industries or to lower the wages of American labor. Surely any who desire changes which would wreck our industries or lower wages have no standing in a Republican convention or in the Republican party. Republicans are protectionists. No matter how much they may differ as to the necessity for changes in tariff schedules, they all believe that the policy of protection should be maintained. The history of our country justifies our adherence to that policy. The story of our wonderful progress under Republican administration is a familiar one. You know of the great increase in our national wealth. You do not need to be reminded of the amazing growth of our exports. Last year our exports were $1,491,744,695, the largest in our history. We have become the greatest manufacturing nation in the world, and last year our exports of manufactured goods were nearly $100,000,000 more than in the previous year. More than 5,000,000 people are engaged in this branch of industry. The lamented Secretary Hay told us a year ago that the value of manufactured goods was thirteen times as much as it was when the Republicans met at Jackson in 1854.

Republican conventions everywhere call attention, as well they may, to the magnificent results of protection from the beginning of the Government to the present time, and contrast them with the disaster which has resulted from the opposite policy whenever it has been put in practice. The Democratic party at its national convention in 1904 declared that it favored "a gradual reduction of the tariff," but influential members of that party (members of the House Committee on Ways and Means), who would be very active and influential in framing a new tariff bill in the event of Democratic success, have said on the floor of the House that protection was robbery, and that if they could have their way they would tear down every custom-house, "from turret to foundation stone," and that we must never lose sight of the ultimate goal—free trade. It is not strange that the American people at the last Presidential election declined in no uncertain way to follow leadership which would change the policy under which we have grown so strong. And the Republicans of Massachusetts very naturally reaffirmed their devotion to the principle of protection.

But they also recognized the fact, as declared by the national Republican convention at Chicago, that rates should be changed when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands the alteration of schedules. They also recognized the fact that the time at which revision of the tariff should be undertaken must be determined by the representatives of the party from all parts of our common country. The Republicans of Massachusetts do not ask their representatives to attempt to bring about tariff revision by making an alliance with representatives of the Democratic party, who do not agree with them as to the necessity of maintaining the protective principle. They wish tariff revision, but they recognize that it should come by the action of the representatives of their own party from all parts of our country.

Having recognized the facts that changes should be made in tariff schedules when the public interest demands them, and that the time for such changes must be determined by the representatives of their own party, the delegates at our convention approved the position taken by their Senators and Representatives in favor of present action and urged that they should continue to press upon their party associates in Congress from other States the wisdom of a consideration of the tariff for the purpose of revision and readjustment. I know that this declaration has been denounced by Democrats and by certain high priests of the stand-patters, who are perhaps moved by fear that some pet schedule may be jarred by revision, as a "straddle," but I respectfully submit that those who so characterize it must be perverse to the verge of hopelessness.

It is still true that there are none so blind as those who won't see or who do not want to see. Present action does not mean past action or future action. It means now—that now is the accepted time. The Republicans of Massachusetts have thus in most positive terms placed themselves on record as favoring an immediate revision and adjustment of tariff schedules.

The Republican party is not, never has been, and I trust never will become a "stand-pat" party. Its motto is not and never has been "Let well enough alone." It could not have accomplished its great work for our country and for humanity if it had been animated by any such milk-and-water sentiment as that. It does not stand pat. It is not content with the work it has already accomplished, but faces the future. New problems

are now pressing for solution—problems which must be solved aright if the welfare of our country is to be secure—and the Republican party should be ready and eager to attest to the work now awaiting it.

Henry L. Dawes, who represented Massachusetts in the House and the Senate for thirty-six consecutive years, and whose splendid devotion to the cause of protection can never be forgotten, has said:

It is a mistake to suppose that tariff legislation is a fixed science. There can be no tariff formulated that can last while all conditions on which it is based are changing.

I hold it to be the duty of a party responsible for a tariff law to see to it that when a duty is no longer needed for the protection of our industries, it be removed; when it has become so high as to be a bounty and thus an unnecessary tax upon the consumer, it be reduced. Protection is based upon the difference in the cost of production abroad and at home. No one should ask for more.

The Dingley law was enacted more than eight years ago. I have never heard anyone claim that it was perfect, even at the time of its enactment. Concessions had to be made. It was necessarily a compromise. In many particulars it was not, when finally enacted, as Mr. Dingley desired it to be. It was the best that could be done under all the circumstances, and has proved a wonderfully efficient law. It would, however, be amazing indeed if during the past eight years there had not been changes in conditions which call for some modification of our tariff schedules by way of revision and adjustment. It is not like the Republican party to shrink from an honest and thorough consideration of a subject because such consideration may be surrounded by difficulties. It is responsible for the the Dingley law, and is therefore responsible for any injustice which exists by reason of it. There should be no desire to escape from that conclusion. We have a large majority in the Senate and House of Representatives. Having the power, we should not hestitate to use it. Let us give to this subject honest and fearless consideration. When such consideration discloses the fact that a duty is no longer needed, let us remove it. This is simple justice. It will benefit all the people, and will, I believe, be responsive to the commercial needs of the country.

It was suggested at our State convention that a specific demand be made that hides, coal, iron ore, lumber, and wood pulp be placed on the free list. Personally, it seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that there are sound reasons for urging that these articles be placed on the free list. That is certainly so with respect to hides, coal, and iron ore. In November a delegation of boot and shoe and leather manufacturers called on President Roosevelt and urged upon him the necessity of a repeal of the duty on hides. The delegation numbered twenty-eight men, representing a majority of the leather, tanning, and boot and shoe industries of the United States, and a majority of them came from New York and the West. They claimed to speak for the manufacturers of $300,000,000 worth of shoes, that they employed over 100,000 workmen, and pay about $75,000,000 to wage-earners. They said that they were unanimous in asking for the repeal of the duty on hides, that this great industry is oppressed and burdened by a needless duty which prevents proper growth and expansion, both domestic and foreign. Attention was called to the fact that the cost of leather in the cheap, heavy shoes worn by the greatest number of our people is proportionately greater than in expensive and highly finished shoes. And so the spokesman for the delegation claimed that they were pleading not alone for those engaged in manufacturing, but also for the welfare of the people who wear shoes. About 240,000,000 pairs of shoes are made annually in the United States, and the difference in the price of leather here and where there is no duty on hides varies from 3 to 5 cents per pound, which means from 4 to 7 cents on the average factory cost. The price of hides has risen from 9 cents in 1897 to 15½ cents in 1905. As cattle are raised and slaughtered principally for beef, hides are a by-product, and it is doubtful if cattle raisers gain any benefit from the duty, as prices fluctuate, so far as the trust permits, in accord with the supply and demand for cattle for beef purposes.

It has been often insinuated that the manufacturers who were crying so loudly for the removal of the duty on hides were actuated solely by selfish purposes; that while they wished no duty on hides they would fight vigorously against any reduction of the duty on their manufactured product. The gentlemen who appeared before the President denied this and stated that they would willingly consent to a reasonable reduction of this duty.

Ex-Governor Douglas (a Democrat and one of the largest manufacturers of shoes in the world) closed his remarks by saying:

The duty on hides permits a charge of 15 per cent more for hides here than in foreign markets. In the boot and shoe industry we pay the highest wages on earth, but we have the cheapest labor, where efficiency and product are considered. Neither we manufacturers nor our employees are protected to any considerable extent by the duty of 25 per cent on boots and shoes. All we ask is a fair field and no favor, either in our own or in foreign markets. Take away the duties that prevent us from obtaining leather at the same prices paid by our foreign competitors and we will not only hold our own markets, with or without a duty on shoes, but we will invade foreign markets on an extensive scale. In so doing we will provide additional work at good wages to our boot and shoe workers. While the duty on hides bears heavily on our industry in every part of the country, now that Germany, Canada, and Mexico are discriminating against our shoes and are levying, or threatening to levy, much higher duties upon them, it will be even more difficult for us to hold our share of this industry, handicapped as we are. Unless the cost of materials can be reduced shoes must soon sell at higher prices.

Hon. Curtis Guild, jr., a Republican, who has just been elected governor of Massachusetts, supplemented the efforts of the delegation of manufacturers by a letter to the President, in which he said:

Here in Massachusetts the duty on hides is anathema. It is known that only 23 per cent of the hides and skins that come into the United States are subject to duty, and it seems perfectly illogical that calfskins, sheepskins, and goatskins should come in free as a by-product while a duty is assessed on the skins of full-grown cattle. There can be no question of the desire of the overwhelming majority of the people of this State for attention to such matters as this in the immediate revision of the tariff.

I know it is feared by some, probably many, that any serious consideration of tariff changes will bring demoralization to business. Many so-called "standpatters" freely admit that there are glaring errors in our present tariff law which demand attention. They say that they would favor correcting such errors if it could be done without a general tariff revision, but they argue that the country is now prosperous and that nothing ought to be done which might disturb present business conditions. I can not share that fear if action is taken by the friends of protection, by those absolutely pledged to maintain the principle of protection. If such changes made to right admitted wrongs can not be brought about without placing in peril our prosperity, then it seems to me such prosperity must be conceded to rest upon very unstable foundation and to be a growth of the mushroom variety.

History has a habit of repeating itself, and there is certainly reason to fear that if changes demanded in the interest of the people are not made the task of revision will be handed over to those who are opposed to the principle of protection and bent upon its destruction. We had that kind of revision not many years ago, and the humiliation and suffering which followed have not been forgotten. In four years the value of Massachusetts manufactures alone declined over $146,000,000, and the bank clearings of Boston fell off over four hundred millions in one year.

Tariff revision by the Democratic party meant mills running on short time or not at all and reduced wages. Remarkable business activity followed the passage of the Dingley bill. The people do not wish another Wilson-Gorman tariff. They have shown again and again by their votes that they distrust the party which was responsible for that bill.

Our orators have proclaimed that the tariff should be revised by its friends. We now have a large majority in the House and in the Senate. Having so large a majority, I hardly think we should admit our impotence to remedy any injustice for which we are responsible. If we deliberately close the door not only to action but to thorough investigation, we have none to blame but ourselves for the withdrawal of confidence which will surely follow. I can not believe the Republican party will shirk what seems so plain a duty.

And so our Republicans of Massachusetts have called for immediate action. They are protectionists and propose to remain such, but they do not believe in the sacredness of any tariff schedule. They have urged their Representatives to ask the cooperation of their party associates because they know that it is of the utmost importance that such action should be taken not by tariff wreckers, by those who would tear down our custom-houses, but by those who have always been true to the principle of protection.

The Committee on Ways and Means has heeded the prayer of the Filipinos. Will it not now give some attention to the petitions of our home folks? [Loud applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr, OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3—the Philippine tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then (at 5 o'clock p. m.), on motion of Mr. PAYNE, the House adjourned until Monday, January 8, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of State, requesting that Mr. John Barrett and Col. John J. Ockerson have leave to accept the Order of the Double Dragon of China—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Mora B. Fariss, administrator of estate of James P. Moore, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Susan R. Jones, administrator of estate of William Freeman, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of James M. Campbell against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Maria N. Swain, widow of Elisha R. Swain, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a statement of appointments, promotions, and changes in salaries paid from lump sums—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 10688) to erect a public building at Ishpeming, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10689) for the erection of a public building at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10690) to withhold from sale a portion of Fort Brady Military Reservation, at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10691) to erect a public building at Escanaba, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10692) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 10693) granting to the State of California 5 per cent of the net proceeds of the cash sales of public lands in said State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10694) for a public building at Santa Cruz, Cal., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 10695) to establish a light and fog-signal station on Southwest Ledge, entrance to New London Harbor, Connecticut—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10696) for the erection of a keeper's dwelling, to be attached to the light station at the Stonington Breakwater, Connecticut—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10697) providing for the issuance of patents for lands allotted to Indians under the Moses agreement of July 7, 1883—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 10698) to provide for celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Pacific Ocean by Vasco Nuñez Balboa by holding an international exhibition of arts, industries, manufactures, and the products of the soil, mine, forest, and sea, at the city of San Francisco, in the State of California—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 10699) to amend section 4386 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the transportation of animals—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 10700) to amend an act entitled "An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States," approved March 3, 1875, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 10701) providing for a United States judge for the northern district of Alabama—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 10702) to enable the United States to secure the exclusive use and possession of all lands within the present boundaries of the Fort Wingate Military Reservation, in the Territory of New Mexico, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10703) authorizing the extension of Monroe street NE.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 10704) to require all corporations engaged in commerce with the several States, with the Territories, and with foreign nations to secure a license from the General Government, and to impose a license fee for the same—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 10705) to increase rate of pension paid for gunshot wounds, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 10706) in respect to condemnation of land for public purposes in the Territories of the United States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10707) to provide for the improvement in breeding of horses for general-purpose uses, and to enable the United States to procure better remounts for the cavalry and artillery service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 10708) to provide for enlarging the public building at Davenport, Iowa—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 10709) providing for a light-house tender for the thirteenth light-house district—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10710) providing for a light-ship for Nantucket Shoals, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10711) providing for a light vessel for use off the mouth of Columbia River, Oregon—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 10712) to provide for the erection of a light-house on Independence Point, Chaumont Bay, New York—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOCKS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10713) authorizing the Jasper and Eastern Railway Company, its successors and assigns, to construct and operate a railroad bridge across the Sabine River, in the States of Texas and Louisiana—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10714) appropriating $500,000 to deepen the channel and improve the jetties at Sabine Pass, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10715) to establish an additional collection district in the State of Texas, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 10716) for the retirement of certain Government employees who rendered service in the military or naval establishments of the United States during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOCKS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10717) authorizing the Secretary of War to continue the excavating of the channel between the mouths of the Neches and Sabine rivers to Taylors Bayou, in Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 10718) increasing the pay of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service who served creditably with the regular or volunteer forces during the civil war—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 10719) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 65) fixing the pay of the commandant of the Puget Sound Navy-Yard, Wash.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) to authorize the President of the United States, in con-

junction with the State of Texas, to run and mark the boundary lines between the Indian Territory, the Territories of Oklahoma and New Mexico, and the State of Texas—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A resolution (H. Res. 125) asking the Attorney-General of the United States for information concerning certain railways—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A resolution (H. Res. 127) empowering the Doorkeeper of the House to employ a lady attendant in the ladies' reception room—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 10720) granting an increase of pension to J. F. Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10721) granting an increase of pension to Harriett J. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 10722) granting an increase of pension to William H. Flint—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10723) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10724) granting an increase of pension to David Bruce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10725) granting an increase of pension to Etta D. Conant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 10726) granting an increase of pension to James H. Handy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10727) granting an increase of pension to Aquella M. Hizar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10728) granting an increase of pension to George W. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10729) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Underhill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10730) granting a pension to Clarine J. Brinton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10731) for the relief of the widow and children of James W. Smith, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 10732) granting a pension to Sarah A. Nugent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10733) granting a pension to Anna Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10734) for the relief of the University of Florida—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 10735) granting a pension to Sophronia Gaunts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10736) granting a pension to Anna Blessing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10737) granting a pension to Amy Glines Marvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10738) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Prosser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10739) granting an increase of pension to N. Delmont McReynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10740) granting an increase of pension to Michael Bram—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10741) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10742) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Beckham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10743) granting an increase of pension to Hiram D. Herd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10744) granting an increase of pension to William Loucks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 10745) granting an increase of pension to Sandervain A. Ballou—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 10746) for the relief of Florence Lambert—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10747) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Lengle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 10748) granting a pension to John W. Munsell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10749) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10750) granting an increase of pension to Horatio Webster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10751) granting an increase of pension to George W. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10752) granting an increase of pension to Abraham W. Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 10753) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kellar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10754) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bennit—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10755) granting an increase of pension to Anna Flynn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 10756) granting an honorable discharge to Dennis Case—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 10757) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10758) granting an increase of pension to James M. Turley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 10759) granting a pension to Eliza Brawley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLACK: A bill (H. R. 10760) granting a pension to Libbie Merrill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 10761) to pay S. W. Peel for legal service out of Choctaw funds—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 10762) granting a pension to Letitia Bongartz—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10763) granting an increase of pension to Myron N. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 10764) granting a pension to Elizabeth Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 10765) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Whitson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 10766) granting a pension to Rachel L. Bartlett—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 10767) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Sisson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 10768) granting an increase of pension to William N. Sexton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 10769) granting a pension to Julia E. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10770) granting a pension to Helen P. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10771) granting a pension to John C. Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 10772) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Phillips—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10773) granting an increase of pension to George C. Rathbun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10774) granting an increase of pension to James D. Leach—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOAR: A bill (H. R. 10775) granting a pension to Ellen S. Cushman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 10776) granting a pension to James H. Gilley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10777) granting a pension to Commius Arnett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10778) granting a pension to Oliver Salmons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10779) granting an increase of pension to William H. Creek—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 10780) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles Lowe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10781) for the relief of the heirs of Madison Turner—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 10782) granting a pension to Peter Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10783) granting a pension to Andrew J. Pence—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10784) granting an increase of pension to John C. Poe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10785) granting a pension to Thomas J. Chambers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10786) granting a pension to Leander Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 10787) granting a pension to Hannah Dowd Vanderford—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10788) granting a pension to Charles W. Kester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10789) granting a pension to David Wilborn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10790) granting a pension to William Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10791) granting an increase of pension to Henry Gilbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLEPPER: A bill (H. R. 10792) granting a pension to William Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10793) granting an increase of pension to Moses C. Culver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 10794) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Schultz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10795) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10796) granting an increase of pension to John H. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10797) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Brugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 10798) for the relief of William B. Farrer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 10799) granting a pension to Adelaide B. Warwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 10800) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Oakes A. Ames—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10801) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Susan W. Farwell—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10802) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Matthew Luce—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10803) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of William Stackpole—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10804) granting an increase of pension to John H. Worley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10805) granting an increase of pension to Libbers Wisner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10806) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 10807) granting an increase of pension to Jacob J. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 10808) granting an increase of pension to Michael Kearns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 10809) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Linn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10810) for the relief of Patrick Curry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 10811) for the relief of Thomas B. Miller, heir of Milton R. Muzzy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10812) providing for the promotion of Chief Boatswain Patrick Deery, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 10813) for the relief of the heirs of S. H. Ayers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 10814) granting a pension to Eugene A. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 10815) to restore Lewis Carpenter Hamilton to the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10816) granting an increase of pension to August Bauer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 10817) granting an increase of pension to William J. Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 10818) granting a pension to George W. Creasey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 10819) granting an increase of pension to John Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 10820) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Worden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10821) granting an increase of pension to Richmond Booth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10822) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10823) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stratton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 10824) granting a pension to Mary Francis Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 10825) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Sarah E. Slocum—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 10826) granting a pension to Caroline Whipple Eddy, daughter of Ethan Whipple, a soldier and pensioner of the Revolutionary war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10827) granting a pension to Frank Crittenden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10828) granting a pension to Michael Lennon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 10829) for the relief of William B. West—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10830) granting an increase of pension to Dudley Portwood—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10831) granting an increase of pension to Levi C. Bishop—to the Committee on Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10262) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Shields—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10263) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Blevins—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10264) granting an increase of pension to Alexander R. Long—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10293) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Galbraith—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10303) granting a pension to John Brodie—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of National German-American Alliance, for reciprocity treaty with Germany—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 712, of Davenport, Iowa, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New Mexico Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, against the extension of Mormonism in the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of M. Fischler, against tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of commissioners of roads and revenues of Glynn County, Ga.; the Pilot's Association, the Board of Trade, and the Board of Pilot Commissioners of Brunswick, Ga., against bill H. R. 5281—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ACHESON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of J. F. Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of Joseph Fisher, urging immediate passage of the Penrose-Dalzell bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance, favoring a reciprocity treaty between Germany and the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Annie Rohr—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOWIE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William D. Newman—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Sherwood (Pa.) Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Allegheny, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance, favoring reciprocity between Germany and the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of S. L. Rogers and 27 others, of South Orrington, Me., for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of the Westinghouse Machine Company, against the tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. H. Jones and Joseph Fisher, of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring immediate passage of the Penrose and Dalzell bills for pensioning ex-prisoners of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Sherwood Council, No. 132, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Lincoln Avenue Woman's Home Missionary Society, of Pittsburg, Pa., against sale of liquor in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DARRAGH: Petition of R. M. Bulby et al., of Lake City, Mich., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Harding & Co. and merchants of Morley, Mecosta County, Mich., against passage of the Henry parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Petition of citizens of Wisconsin for repeal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Wisconsin, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Joshua S. Corder—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: Petition of the Hoche & Giesiler Piano Company, of Wheeling, W. Va., favoring passage of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Eliza Brawley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Cigar Makers' International Union of America, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of Fred Kernhof and the B. Eisile Company, of Minneapolis, Minn., against the Philippine tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce, against revision of the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Cigar Makers' International Union of America, against tariff reduction on cigars from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert M. Whitson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Petition of Nindee Council, Degree of Pocahontas, of Springfield, Mass., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the National German-American Alliance, for reciprocity between the United States and Germany—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Bellevue, Pa., against sale of liquor in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Bellevue, Pa., for prohibition in Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of the Indian Association of Norwich, Conn., favoring passage of the Lacey bill—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of the Carroll County Farmers' Institute, for removal of embargo on American products by Germany—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOAR: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ellen S. Cushman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James F. Calhoon—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES: Petition of New Haven Council, No. 75, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and citizens of Poca and Buffalo, W. Va., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: Paper to accompany bill for relief of C. A. Pearson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUNT: Petition of the National German-American Alliance, favoring reciprocity treaty between the United States and Germany—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLINE: Petition of the G. H. Bear Furniture Company, favoring consideration of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of citizens of Chaumont, N. Y., for a light-house on Independence Point—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of J. B. Van Petten—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York State, favoring a Federal judicial court in the Orient—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Arizona Anti-Joint Statehood League, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of William P. Morgan, pharmacist, Brooklyn, N. Y., for restoration of Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the United New York Sandy Hook Pilots' Association, against passage of bill H. R. 5281—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Long Island Railway Local No. 267, against passage of the Esch-Townsend bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Robert M. Williamson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MACON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. L. B. Jackson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Benedict Ellis—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John G. Harris, of Midway, Tex.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of A. B. Menard—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, favoring special agents for promoting American industry and trade abroad—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, favoring protection of the dried-fruit industry in any treaty that may be made with the German Empire—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, favoring a Federal judicial circuit court in the Orient—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, relative to the chemical proportion of sulphurous acid allowed on introduction of dried fruits into Germany—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, for proper recognition by Congress of the Milano Exposition—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of citizens of California, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of the Hoffman & Billings Manufacturing Company, of Milwaukee, Wis., against tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Herbert C. Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Nordyke & Marmon Company and the Eaglesfield Company, against tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jose Shabel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of Doe Run (Mo.) Lodge, No. 76, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Wood Finishers' Local Union No. 515, of Buffalo, N. Y., Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Humane Society, against any change in law governing transportation of live stock—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance, favoring the Army canteen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Bar Association, favoring a national bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Kate Lovett—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of D. J. Huss et al., J. H. Boughart et al., William E. Hill et al., G. M. Goodyear et al., Edward M. Hymes et al., P. E. Sutton et al., S. W. Perry et al., E. D. Smith et al., and William Dumames et al., a total of 199 farmers of Michigan, against passage of the Philippine tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens of Texas, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of the Woman's Club of Natick, Mass., for a national pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the Cigar Makers' Union of Dansville, N. Y., against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of Wyandotte Tribe, No. 95, Improved Order of Red Men, of Ireland, Ind., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *January 8, 1906.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

MENOMINEE (WIS.) INDIAN RESERVATION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, together with the draft of a bill authorizing the sale of certain blown-down and standing timber on the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AGREEMENTS WITH INDIANS IN SOUTH DAKOTA AND NORTH DAKOTA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs calling attention to the agreement with the Sioux Indians of the Rosebud Reservation, S. Dak., and the agreement with the Indians of the Devils Lake Reservation, N. Dak., and recommending that the shares of minor Indians retained in the Treasury shall draw interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting that Brig. Gen. Thomas H. Barry, United States Army, be authorized to accept a decoration of the Order of St. Stanislaus of the first class; that Col. John Van R. Hoff, Medical Department; Lieut. Col. Walter S. Schuyler, General Staff, and Maj. Montgomery M. Macomb, General Staff, United States Army, be authorized to accept a decoration of the Order of St. Anne of the second class; that Capt. Carl Reichman, Seventeenth Infantry, and Capt. Sydney Cloman, General Staff, United States Army, be authorized to accept a decoration of the Order of St. Stanislaus of the second class, conferred upon them by the Russian Government; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting that Capt. T. Bentley Mott, Artillery Corps, United States Army, be authorized to accept a decoration of the Legion of Honor conferred upon him by the President of the French Republic upon the completion of Captain Mott's tour of duty as military attaché to the American embassy at Paris; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting that Mr. John Barrett, American minister to Colombia, and Col. J. A. Ockerson, Commissioner on the Mississippi River Commission, be authorized to accept the letters patent and the decorations of the Order of the Double Dragon conferred upon them by the Chinese Government; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting that Rear-Admiral Charles D. Sigsbee, United States Navy; Capt. John M. Hawley, United States Navy; Commander Reginald F. Nicholson, United States Navy; Commander Alexander Sharp, United States Navy, and Lieut. Commander Harry George, United States Navy, be authorized to accept a decoration of the Legion of Honor conferred upon them by the French Government; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting that Brig. Gen. J. F. Bell, United States Army, be authorized to accept a decoration of Commander of the Order of the Legion of Honor, and that Capt. Grote Hutchenson, General Staff, United States Army, be authorized to accept a decoration of the Chevalier of the Order of the Legion of Honor conferred upon them by the French Government during the recent maneuvers of the French Army; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of John C. Boyd *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of the Pennsylvania Company for Insurance of Lives and Granting Annuities, executor of Henry Etting, deceased, *v.* The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CONSTRUCTION OF RAILROADS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 4th instant, a copy of the original invitation for proposals or bids for concessionary contracts for the construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of certain proposed railway lines in the Philippine Islands, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: I understand that some papers were sent in from the War Department this morning in regard to railroads in the Philippines and that they were referred with the usual order to print. If the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] has no objection, I should like to have them go to the committee without an order to print.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts that the papers from the Secretary of War go to the Committee on the Philippines without printing?

Mr. LODGE. I understand that course is agreeable to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. It is the report of the Secretary of War on railroads in the Philippines?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. CULBERSON. That course ought to be satisfactory.

Mr. LODGE. All right. I ask that the papers may go without printing.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the papers will be referred without printing.

JOURNAL OF LEGISLATURE OF PORTO RICO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of the journal of the house of delegates of the first session of the third legislative assembly of Porto Rico, January 9 to March 9, 1905; which, with the accompanying volume, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Attorney-General for the fiscal year 1905; which was ordered to lie on the table.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 99) to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company; and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Brunswick, Ga., remonstrating against the enact-

ment of legislation to remove discriminations against American sailing vessels in the coastwise trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the mayor and city council of Santa Fe, N. Mex., praying for the enactment of legislation donating to Santa Fe, Grant, and Pima counties, in that Territory, sufficient public nonmineral-bearing lands, the proceeds from the sale of which to be applied to the payment of all bonded indebtedness against these counties; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of Delaware Council, No. 4, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Muncie, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of Local Union No. 315, International Cigar Makers' Union, of St. Cloud, Minn., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WETMORE presented the petition of Capt. James H. Fish, of Greenport, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the Harbor of Refuge at the Delaware Breakwater; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Poultry Association of the State of Rhode Island, praying that increased appropriations be made for the maintenance of agricultural experiment stations; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Poultry Association of the State of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of legislation to place basic slag meal on the free list; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GAMBLE presented the petition of Mrs. Hiram Davidson and sundry other citizens of Rockford, S. Dak., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Lead, S. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of John J. Sharon and sundry other citizens of Elk Point, S. Dak., praying for the repeal of the duty on imported hides; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARTER presented a petition of the State Board of Sheep Commissioners of Montana, praying for a modification of the law relative to the transportation of live stock; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LONG presented a petition of 95 citizens of Miami County, Kans., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 553) for the relief of J. W. Patterson; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Old Orchard, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings and grounds; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Old Orchard, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a Sunday rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Old Orchard, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Dr. E. E. Shapleigh and 47 other citizens of Kittery, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Waterville, Me., praying for the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULTON presented a petition of the Historical Society of the State of Oregon, praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of a monument at Fort Clatsop, in that State, to the memory of Captains Lewis and Clark; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 241) granting a pension to Robert Sturgeon; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARNER presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 2510) granting a pension to Mattie H. Krekel; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLARK of Montana presented a petition of the State board of sheep commissioners of Montana, praying for a modification of the law relative to the transportation of live stock; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the State board of sheep commissioners of Montana, remonstrating against certain recommendations made by the Commissioner of the General Land Office in regard to the leasing of public lands for grazing purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SCOTT presented petitions of Fidelity Council, No. 182, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Central City; of Cumberland Council, No. 3, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New Cumberland; of Lincoln Council, No. 28, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wheeling; of John A. Logan Council, No. 95, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wheeling; of Capitol City Council, No. 221, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Charleston; of Elm Grove Council, No. 65, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Elm Grove; of Enterprise Council, No. 20, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Keyser, and of New Haven Council, No. 175, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New Haven, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration and for a revision of the law governing naturalization; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a memorial of Local Union No. 223, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Ottumwa, Iowa, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of the United Presbyterian Congregation of College Springs, Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Sioux City, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the Jews in Russia; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Gladbrook and Waterloo, Iowa, remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Muscatine, Iowa, praying for the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the memorial of Charles Raynard of the Isle of Pines, Cuba, remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Subdivision No. 643, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Ottumwa, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the employment of any man as a locomotive engineer who has not had three years' experience as a locomotive fireman; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of M. H. Talty and sundry other citizens of Oelwein, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Association of Knoxville, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a national college of commerce; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the German-American Alliance of Minnesota, praying for the ratification of a commercial treaty with the German Empire; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Aitkin, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made to aid in the construction of a canal from Waldeck, on the Mississippi River above Aitkin, to Pineknoll, a point below Aitkin, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of Cigar Makers' Local Union

No. 315, of St. Cloud, Minn., remonstrating against a reduction of the tariff on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Duluth, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made for the protection of the entrance to the Duluth-Superior Harbor; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PILES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washinton, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of desert-land claimants in that State, under entries made after January 1 and prior to June 24, 1903; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HOPKINS presented memorials of Local Union No. 297, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Canton; of sundry citizens of Sterling and Kewanee, and of Local Union No. 154, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Lincoln, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Western Springs, Chicago, Aurora, Ladd, and St. Charles, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent power companies from using Niagara Falls for commercial purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, Riverside, Mount Carroll, Potomac, Kinderhook, Compton, Moline, and Shumway, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the ratification of international reciprocity treaties; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Bar Association of the State of Illinois, praying for the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Bryan Hutchinson, of Joliet, Ill., and a petition of sundry citizens of Oak Park, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to investigate the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of A. E. Ziechme & Co.; of the Webster Manufacturing Company; of Truax, Greene & Co.; of the National Bank of the Republic; of the Griffin Wheel Company; of the Ayer & Lord Tie Company, all of Chicago, and of the Lumber and Fuel Company of Rockford, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation to reorganize the consular service of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of the Railway Employees' Twentieth Century Club, of Illinois; of the Business Men's Association of Springfield; of the Fox River Valley Manufacturers' Association, of Aurora, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Illinois Coal Operators' Association, of Springfield, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Urbana, Ill., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 1561, of Macomb; of Local Union No. 9087, of Kinmundy; of Local Union No. 8, of Champaign; of Local Union No. 10877, of Springfield; of Local Union No. 904, of Jacksonville; of Local Union No. 11159, of Rock Island, and of Local Union No. 10877, of Chicago, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Trout Hardware Company, of Chicago, Ill., remontrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GORMAN presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 2112) granting an increase of pension to John Heck; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 2125) for the relief of the heirs of William P. Elliot, deceased; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 2119) for the relief of Richard T. Gott, administrator of Thomas N. Gott, deceased; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SPOONER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Fond du Lac and Marshfield, Wis., remonstrating against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the board of agriculture of the State of Connecticut, praying that an appropriation be made for the suppression of the gypsy moth; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the United Gold Beaters' National Union of New York City, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the duty on gold leaf; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of John L. Beveridge and 100 other generals of the Volunteer Army of the rebellion, praying for the enactment of legislation to create a retired list for surviving generals; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the board of agriculture of the State of Connecticut, praying that increased appropriations be made for the maintenance of agricultural experiment stations; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Providence, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a national forest reserve in the White Mountains, of New Hampshire; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

COMPILATION OF NAVAL APPROPRIATION LAWS.

Mr. HALE. I present for reprinting a compilation of the annual naval appropriation laws. I ask that, with the additions, it may be printed, and that 800 extra copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it is a very important document and that it ought to be printed for the use of the Senate. I trust the Senator from Maine will modify his request. Of course the Committee on Naval Affairs, I concede, should have these extra copies, but I think the Senate should also have access to this important publication.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator from Iowa is right about that. Let there be an order to print 400 copies for the Committee on Naval Affairs and 800 copies for the Senate. That will cover it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine requests that 400 copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Naval Affairs and 800 copies for the use of the Senate, in addition to the usual number.

Mr. HALE. That is it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? There being no objection, the order was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the compilation of annual naval appropriation laws from 1883 to 1905, with information in tabular form relating to the vessels and personnel of the Navy, be printed, and that 1,200 additional copies, bound in cloth, be printed, 800 for the use of the Senate and 400 for the use of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

STATISTICS RELATING TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Senate Document No. 94, of the present session, being statistics relating to the public schools, has been completely exhausted. I ask that 1,000 additional copies be printed, 500 copies for the use of the Senate and 500 copies for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the order was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That Senate Document No. 94, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session, Statistics Relating to Public Schools, be reprinted as corrected, and that 1,000 additional copies be printed, 500 for the use of the Senate, and 500 for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1) to incorporate the American National Institute (Prix de Paris) at Paris, France, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1747) to authorize the Mobile Railway and Dock Company to construct and maintain a bridge or viaduct across the water between the end of Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2558) authorizing W. T. Clark to construct a bridge

across the Columbia River near the city of Wenatchee, Wash., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 327) granting an increase of pension to Walter Barney; and

A bill (S. 1505) granting an increase of pension to Uriah D. Barrett.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 202) granting an increase of pension to Allen Amburn;

A bill (S. 137) granting an increase of pension to Robert Wiper;

A bill (S. 777) granting an increase of pension to Byron Lent;

A bill (S. 1214) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Oleson; and

A bill (S. 471) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McLaughlin.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 974) granting an increase of pension to David L. Wright;

A bill (S. 944) granting an increase of pension to R. F. Catterson;

A bill (S. 1359) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Boss; and

A bill (S. 489) granting an increase of pension to Nelson B. Toole.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 144) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Briggs;

A bill (S. 204) granting an increase of pension to John F. Walter;

A bill (S. 205) granting an increase of pension to Francis Gee;

A bill (S. 149) granting an increase of pension to Cassius Lisk;

A bill (S. 150) granting an increase of pension to Lucius A. Lincoln;

A bill (S. 147) granting an increase of pension to Patrick McCue; and

A bill (S. 135) granting an increase of pension to Peter P. Chacey.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1164) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Bedell;

A bill (S. 184) granting an increase of pension to Lyman Marsh;

A bill (S. 1888) granting an increase of pension to George W. Patton;

A bill (S. 82) granting an increase of pension to Curtis A. Carpenter;

A bill (S. 1826) granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Paine;

A bill (S. 76) granting an increase of pension to Hartwell C. Keyes;

A bill (S. 574) granting an increase of pension to Lee H. Buckland;

A bill (S. 571) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Knight;

A bill (S. 708) granting an increase of pension to Maurice Downey;

A bill (S. 713) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim A. Gordon;

A bill (S. 15) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie E. Shehan;

A bill (S. 23) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Bradbury; and

A bill (S. 21) granting a pension to Mary G. Bright.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 182) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Smith;

A bill (S. 844) granting an increase of pension to James W. Ryan; and

A bill (S. 849) granting an increase of pension to Horatio Carter.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 783) granting an increase of pension to Moses H. Sawyer; and

A bill (S. 786) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Garvey.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 64) for the extension of Seventh street and Franklin street NE., and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2260) authorizing the extension of Meridian place NW.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1239) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. McGarvey; and

A bill (S. 1238) granting an increase of pension to John Christhoff.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1408) granting an increase of pension to Julia W. Estes; and

A bill (S. 1444) granting a pension to Dora H. Kuhns.

Mr. ALGER, from the Commitee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1872) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. White, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PILES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 530) granting an increase of pension to Sophia A. Knapp;

A bill (S. 195) granting an increase of pension to John Pieper;

A bill (S. 1269) granting an increase of pension to Charles Edwin Smith; and

A bill (S. 99) granting an increase of pension to Eugene P. Kingsley.

Mr. PILES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 532) granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Doty;

A bill (S. 85) granting an increase of pension to Edward Keaster; and

A bill (S. 988) granting a pension to Russell A. McKinley.

Mr. PILES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 194) granting an increase of pension to James L. Cowell, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 386) granting an increase of pension to Orange G. Jones, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1340) granting an increase of pension to John Leavitt;

A bill (S. 157) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie G. Reynolds; and

A bill (S. 168) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Davis.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1341) granting an increase of pension to Fred Preisinger;

A bill (S. 1342) granting an increase of pension to Morton M. Noah; and

A bill (S. 560) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Reed.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 559) granting an increase of pension to Seth M. Tucker, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GEARIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 627) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hiler, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1040) granting an increase of pension to James Sloan;

A bill (S. 217) granting an increase of pension to William C. Breckenridge;

A bill (S. 1431) granting an increase of pension to William W. Lane; and

A bill (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Allen J. Nash.

Mr. GEARIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1036) granting an increase of pension to William C. Beachey, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 525) granting an increase of pension to Michael Brady; and

A bill (S. 1310) granting an increase of pension to C. S. M. Hooton.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1201) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Preston; and

A bill (S. 113) granting an increase of pension to John D. McFadden.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 528) granting a pension to Robert M. McCormick;

A bill (S. 336) granting a pension to Abraham M. Cory; and

A bill (S. 2082) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth T. Carpenter.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1737) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Blanchard; and

A bill (S. 2143) granting an increase of pension to Angelina Hernandez.

Mr. PETTUS, from the Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2140) to authorize the Postmaster-General to dispose of useless papers in post-offices, reported it without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2669) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Ramsey;

A bill (S. 2670) granting an increase of pension to Marie J. Spicely; and

A bill (S. 2671) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Ricker (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 2672) to correct the military record of Henry T. Phillips; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PETTUS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2673) for the relief of Mrs. Caroline Rogers;

A bill (S. 2674) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Mary J. Collier, deceased;

A bill (S. 2675) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Fisher;

A bill (S. 2676) for the relief of the heirs of Charles L. King, deceased;

A bill (S. 2677) for the relief of Miss Fannie A. Price;

A bill (S. 2678) for the relief of the heirs of Levi Sugars, deceased;

A bill (S. 2679) for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. Ludwig;

A bill (S. 2680) for the relief of the heirs of Harry Fennell, deceased;

A bill (S. 2681) for the relief of the heirs of John Drain, deceased;

A bill (S. 2682) for the relief of Mrs. Mattie Drake Young;

A bill (S. 2683) for the relief of the heirs of John P. Moseley;

A bill (S. 2684) for the relief of the heirs of J. L. Burt, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2685) for the relief of the heirs of W. A. Rogers, deceased.

Mr. CULBERSON introduced a bill (S. 2686) to further and better regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and to amend existing laws thereon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FRYE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2687) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Lindsey;

A bill (S. 2688) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Roberts; and

A bill (S. 2689) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo M. Bartlett.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2690) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Malcolm Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2691) granting a pension to Martha M. A. Whitcomb;

A bill (S. 2692) granting an increase of pension to Ada P. McConnaughey; and

A bill (S. 2693) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Wise.

Mr. DOLLIVER introduced a bill (S. 2694) to correct the military record of Jacob L. Lynn; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2695) to correct the military record of Salmon A. Snow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2696) granting an increase of pension to O. J. Hopkins; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2697) making the anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 2698) granting a pension to Adolph Roensch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2699) for the relief of Robert F. Scott; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 2700) to improve the public building at Newport, R. I.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 2701) providing for the issuance of patents for lands allotted to Indians under the Moses agreement of July 7, 1883; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2702) granting an increase of pension to George W. Dightman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 2703) to establish a light-house and fog signal on Cape Hinchinbrook, Hinchinbrook Island, Prince William Sound, in the district of Alaska (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2704) to establish a light-house and fog signal on Ocean Cape, Yakutat Bay, in the district of Alaska.

A bill (S. 2705) to establish a light-house and fog signal on Cape Spencer, at the entrance to Cross Sound, in the district of Alaska; and

A bill (S. 2706) to establish a light-house and fog signal on Cape St. Elias, Kayak Island, Controller Bay, in the district of Alaska.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced a bill (S. 2707) for the relief of George M. Esterly; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2708) for the relief of B. Jackman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2709) granting a pension to

Judith A. Epps; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 2710) for the relief of claimants for desert lands in the State of Washington under desert-land entries made after January 1, 1902, and prior to June 24, 1903; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2711) for the relief of Isaac Gause; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2712) granting a pension to Mary Mahoney (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2713) granting an increase of pension to Lewis T. Penwell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2714) granting an increase of pension to William H. Lamasters; and

A bill (S. 2715) granting an increase of pension to Robert Bivans (with accompanying papers).

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 2716) granting a pension to Daniel J. Cooney; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2717) to refer to the Court of Claims the State war claims of the State of Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (S. 2718) for the relief of the Waukikum band of the Chinook Indians of the State of Washington;

A bill (S. 2719) for the relief of the Nuc Que Clah we Muck band of the Chinook Indians of the State of Oregon;

A bill (S. 2720) for the relief of the Chehalis tribe of Indians of the State of Washington; and

A bill (S. 2721) for the relief of the Wheelappa band of the Chinook Indians of the State of Washington.

Mr. KEAN introduced a bill (S. 2722) granting an increase of pension to Genevieve Ludlow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2723) for the relief of Mary A. Shufeldt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2724) for the relief of Delia B. Stuart, widow of John Stuart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 2725) granting an increase of pension to John Mather; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (H. R. 2726) granting an honorable discharge to Sylvester Munro; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 2727) to equalize the rank and pay of certain retired officers of the Marine Corps; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2728) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Carr (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2729) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Henry (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2730) granting an increase of pension to James P. Ford (with accompanying papers).

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 2731) for the relief of Susan S. Alexander, widow and executrix of George W. Alexander, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SMOOT introduced a bill (S. 2732) for the protection of wild animals in the Grand Canyon Forest Reserve; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and Protection of Game.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2733) granting an increase of pension to Charles Crismon (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2734) granting an increase of pension to John R. Conyngham (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2735) granting a pension to Marcelina S. Groff;

A bill (S. 2736) granting an increase of pension to James Williams (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2737) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Hains (with accompanying papers).

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 2738) for the relief of Capt. M. R. W. Grebe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2739) to correct the military record of Capt. Henry Inman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2740) for the relief of Joseph Disney; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2741) to enable the United States to secure the exclusive use and possession of all lands within the present boundaries of the Fort Wingate Military Reservation in the Territory of New Mexico; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 2742) for the relief of G. F. Tarbell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2743) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Morehead;

A bill (S. 2744) granting a pension to Robert Baldwin;

A bill (S. 2745 granting an increase of pension to Zerelda N. McCoy;

A bill (S. 2746) granting an increase of pension to Eli Newsom;

A bill (S. 2747) granting an increase of pension to Melvin A. Tenney;

A bill (S. 2748) granting an increase of pension to Joel R. Smith;

A bill (S. 2749) granting an increase of pension to John H. Brooks;

A bill (S. 2750) granting a pension to William P. Edson;

A bill (S. 2751) granting an increase of pension to Charles Carlisle;

A bill (S. 2752) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Moore; and

A bill (S. 2753) granting a pension to Delia M. Wilson.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced a bill (S. 2754) for the relief of John Holderby; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WARNER introduced a bill (S. 2755) for the relief of William Wilson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2756) for the relief of William B. Reich; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2757) for the relief of Henry Nicol; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2758) granting an increase of pension to William McCan;

A bill (S. 2759) granting an increase of pension to William B. Mitchell;

A bill (S. 2760) granting a pension to Eliza J. Glover;

A bill (S. 2761) granting an increase of pension to George W. King;

A bill (S. 2762) granting an increase of pension to Abram J. Bozarth;

A bill (S. 2763) granting an increase of pension to William Kelly;

A bill (S. 2764) granting an increase of pension to Archibald T. Stewart;

A bill (S. 2765) granting a pension to John Wier;

A bill (S. 2766) granting a pension to William H. Thomas; and

A bill (S. 2767) granting a pension to Sarah S. Etue.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 2768) for the relief of William H. H. Lee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BURKETT introduced a bill (S. 2769) to divide Nebraska into two judicial districts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced the following bills; which were

severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (S. 2770) for the erection of a keeper's dwelling to be attached to the light station at the Stonington Breakwater, Connecticut; and

A bill (S. 2771) to establish a light and fog-signal station on Southwest Ledge, entrance to New London Harbor, Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2772) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Niles;

A bill (S. 2773) granting an increase of pension to Eugene K. Comstock;

A bill (S. 2774) granting an increase of pension to John W. Gray; and

A bill (S. 2775) granting a pension to Charles J. Rider.

Mr. CLAY (for Mr. BERRY) introduced a bill (S. 2776) to define "options" and "futures," to make such contracts illegal, and to provide penalties for violation of the provisions of this act; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 2777) for the construction of a suitable vessel for the Revenue-Cutter Service for duty at Savannah, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HEYBURN introduced a bill (S. 2778) granting an increase of pension to John W. Langford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2779) granting an increase of pension to James J. Egan; and

A bill (S. 2780) granting an increase of pesnion to Daniel McCarter.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 2781) for the relief of Philip Loney; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (S. 2782) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes," approved February 8, 1887, and the acts amendatory thereto;

A bill (S. 2783) to repeal section 11 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1890, and for other purposes;"

A bill (S. 2784) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cancel trust patents of Louisa Phelix and Maria Louisa Rolfe;

A bill (S. 2785) to authorize the sale of down timber and hay on the ten sections of land in the former Chippewa of the Mississippi Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota, reserved from sale or settlement in accordance with the provisions of the act of January 14, 1889, as amended;

A bill (S. 2786) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to refund to purchasers of pine timber on ceded Indian lands sums paid in excess of the correct amounts due for timber cut;

A bill (S. 2787) to amend the act of Congress approved February 11, 1901, entitled "An act providing for allotments of lands in severalty to the Indians of the La Pointe or Bad River Reservation, in the State of Wisconsin;"

A bill (S. 2788) to enable the Indians on the La Pointe or Bad River Reservation to obtain title to the lots occupied by them in the village of Odanah, Wis., and to have said village surveyed, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 2789) for the establishment of town sites and for the sale of lots within the common lands of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians in Oklahoma.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 2790) granting an increase of pension to William J. Millett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2791) granting an increase of pension to John Lindt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to Committee on Pensions

Mr. DUBOIS introduced a bill (S. 2792) granting a pension to John W. Organ; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2793) granting an increase of pension to Elijah A. Chance;

A bill (S. 2794) granting an increase of pension to John H. Allison;

A bill (S. 2795) granting an increase of pension to John Albert;

A bill (S. 2796) granting an increase of pension to Simon Bournstine (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2797) granting an increase of pension to James Buggie;

A bill (S. 2798) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Coe; and

A bill (S. 2799) granting an increase of pension to Willis H. Watson.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced a bill (S. 2800) to regulate interstate traffic in adulterated or misbranded articles, and to permit the respective States and Territories to regulate the sale thereof within their respective boundaries; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 2801) to withhold from sale a portion of Fort Brady Military Reservation, at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FRAZIER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 2802) for the relief of the heirs of Hugh W. McGavock, deceased;

A bill (S. 2803) for the relief of the estate of Elijah Williams, deceased;

A bill (S. 2804) for the relief of the estate of Bryant Wheeler, deceased;

A bill (S. 2805) for the relief of the estate of John Moody, deceased;

A bill (S. 2806) for the relief of the estate of James F. Phillips, deceased;

A bill (S. 2807) for the relief of the estate of John Sanford, deceased;

A bill (S. 2808) for the relief of the estate of David Hurst, deceased;

A bill (S. 2809) for the relief of the heirs of Jesse Hollis, deceased;

A bill (S. 2810) for the relief of the estate of John Heathcock, deceased;

A bill (S. 2811) for the relief of W. J. Winsett;

A bill (S. 2812) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin F. Myers, deceased;

A bill (S. 2813) for the relief of S. R. McAlexander;

A bill (S. 2814) for the relief of John B. Warren;

A bill (S. 2815) for the relief of the estate of Hiram Howell, deceased;

A bill (S. 2816) for the relief of the estate of William Stidham, deceased;

A bill (S. 2817) for the relief of the estate of George W. Reeves, deceased;

A bill (S. 2818) for the relief of the estate of D. C. Wells, deceased;

A bill (S. 2819) for the relief of the estate of W. H. Neel, deceased;

A bill (S. 2820) for the relief of the heirs of James C. Anderson, deceased;

A bill (S. 2821) for the relief of the estate of Aulsey Dean, deceased;

A bill (S. 2822) for the relief of the estate of James Crews, deceased;

A bill (S. 2823) for the relief of the estate of Horace L. Bradley, deceased (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2824) for the relief of the estate of John North, deceased (with accompanying papers).

Mr. SCOTT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2825) granting an increase of pension to John M. Scott (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2826) granting a pension to John B. Garvey (with accompanying papers).

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 2827) to enlarge the trade and promote the sale of cotton products in foreign markets; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CARTER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2829) to regulate the granting of restraining orders in certain cases;

which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 2830) for the relief of the trustees of the Christian Church of Crab Orchard, Ky.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2831) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2832) granting a pension to Susan Pennington;

A bill (S. 2833) granting an increase of pension to George G. Hughes;

A bill (S. 2834) granting an increase of pension to David Bethurum (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2835) granting a pension to H. Rowan Saufley (with accompanying paper).

Mr. CLARK of Montana introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 17) to print the Fourth Annual Report of the United States Reclamation Service; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. MORGAN. I introduce a bill which I ask may be read at length and that it may lie on the table until to-morrow, when I will submit some remarks on it.

The bill (S. 2828) to provide for the regulation, by judicial authority, of the freight rates of railroad companies and other common carriers, and the preferential advantages granted by such common carriers to certain persons and places, to the wrong and injury of others, was read the first time by its title.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to have the bill read at length for the information of the Senate, but I will not take up the time of the Senate if I can have permission to have the bill printed in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be printed in full in the RECORD.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all railroad corporations or companies and all other corporations, companies, and persons engaged as common carriers in transporting, by land or water, freight or passengers among or between the States, or in or through the District of Columbia, are prohibited from demanding or receiving more than a reasonable compensation for such service, on their respective lines of transportation, or any part thereof on which they are so engaged, directly, or by agreement with any other corporation, company, or person; and they are likewise prohibited from giving unreasonable preferences in rates or charges for transportation services, or in the facilities of transportation, to any shipper or passenger, to or between any place or places on such routes or lines of transportation, to other shippers or passengers.

SEC. 2. The shipper or owner of any property, or any passenger on lines or routes of transportation, such as are mentioned or described in section 1 of this act, may sue such common carrier in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to the suit, for the recovery of such unreasonable charges for transportation, or for any damages sustained by the plaintiff in the suit, by reason of the giving unreasonable preferences in rates or facilities of transportation that are prohibited in the first section of this act; and in any suit brought under or in accordance with the provisions of said section the court shall entertain jurisdiction, without respect to the sum sought to be recovered therein, provided, the sum claimed by the plaintiff in the action shall be $50 or more.

SEC. 3. Appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States may be granted, or writs of error may issue from the Supreme Court of the United States for the review of a final judgment in any suit authorized in sections 1 and 2 of this act, on the application of any of the parties litigant, without reference to the amount of the judgment therein, rendered in a district court of the United States, and in such cases the district courts and the Supreme Court of the United States shall advance the same for trial or hearing over other civil causes on their dockets if, in the opinion of the court, the public interests are not injuriously affected by such order.

SEC. 4. If the plaintiff in a suit in the district court of the United States, instituted under or in accordance with this act, shall obtain judgment for a sum less than $50, the costs of such suit may be taxed equally between the parties, plaintiff, and defendant therein. If the recovery in such suit by the plaintiff shall be as much or a sum greater than $50, the entire costs shall be taxed against the defendant therein.

SEC. 5. Any citizen of a State may make complaint to the governor thereof, setting forth the facts which show a breach of the provisions of this act by any common carrier engaged in the business of transportation described in the first section thereof, and thereupon such governor, if he determines that it is proper and expedient for the people of the State that suit should be instituted, and is empowered by the laws of such State to institute suit for the determination of the questions and matters mentioned in the first section of this act, is hereby authorized institute and prosecute a suit against any of the common carriers referred to in this act, in the name of the State of which he is governor, in any court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof, for the recovery of any such demand or for the recovery of any damages that such citizen may be entitled to recover or that the people of such State or of any defined locality in such State have suffered through the unlawful conduct of such common carrier. Such sums as may be recovered in such suits in the name of the State are to be at the disposal of the legislature of such State. The State instituting such suit shall be regarded in all respects as the plaintiff in the action: *Provided,* That such a suit shall not be brought in any State in a district court of the United States for any judicial district of the United States within such State; but such suit in a district court of the United States may be instituted in any other State or district of which the defendants are citizens or in which any of them are liable to be sued in the district or any other courts of the United States.

SEC. 6. The service of process upon any director or officer of a corporation or company mentioned in the first section of this act at any place in which he is liable to be sued in any court of the United States shall be sufficient service as to such corporation or company and as to all the members thereof to compel their appearance, to abide by and perform its orders and the final judgment of the court when rendered.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act contained shall be construed as depriving any person who sues in his own right and name from instituting any suit under its provisions or any other suit, at law or in equity, in any State court or in any court of the United States against any common carrier.

SEC. 8. In all suits instituted under the provisions of this act or in accordance therewith against common carriers in the district courts of the United States the question of the reasonableness of rates or compensation demanded by or paid to a common carrier for the transportation of freights or passengers and the question of the reasonableness of any preference given by a common carrier to shippers of freights or of passengers over other shippers or passengers or to any place over any other place shall be considered as mixed questions of law and fact, to be determined and decided by a court and jury.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will lie on the table until to-morrow.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. ANKENY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1843) to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, entitled "An act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk war, Creek war, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole war,' approved July 27, 1892;" which was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $5,000 for the fencing, protection, and maintenance of the Government reservation at Nahant, Mass., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $3,410 for paving Massachusetts avenue from Sheridan circle to Decatur street, in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLAPP submitted the following amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

An amendment relative to the cancellation of the record of patent issued to Charlotte Nay taw me ge zhick, etc.;

An amendment authorizing Emma Saumty, Kiowa allottee No. 1025, to sell and convey 5 acres of her allotment;

An amendment proposing to appropriate $600,000 for constructing and completing irrigation systems to irrigate the allotted lands of the Uncompahgre and Uinta and White River Utes in Utah;

An amendment authorizing the sale of 20 acres of land in Oklahoma, the proceeds to be applied to the improvement of the Shawnee Indian Training School;

An amendment relative to the cancellation of the patent issued in the name of Margaret Bourassa, citizen Potawatomi allottee No. 1336, etc.;

An amendment relative to the cancellation of patents for allotments made to Thomas Bull, Sarah Bull, and Lillie Bull, Yankton Sioux allottees, etc.;

An amendment authorizing Jacob Doxtater and certain other Oneida Indian allottees to sell and convey their allotments; and

An amendment relative to the acceptance by the United States, at the maximum price of $1.25 per acre, of the tract of land within the old Cheyenne River Reservation, S. Dak., said tract being within that portion of the Great Sioux Reservation ceded by the agreement between the Sioux Nation and the United States approved March 2, 1889.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—EDWARD T. WHITE.

On motion of Mr. FULTON, it was

Ordered, That on the application of Edward T. White he is authorized to withdraw from the files of the Senate his certificate of discharge from the United States Army, contained in the papers accompanying Senate bill 2852, Fifty-eight Congress, second session, entitled "A bill granting a pension to Edward T. White," there having been no adverse report thereon.

MONETARY AGREEMENTS WITH PANAMA AND OTHER GOVERNMENTS.

Mr. BAILEY. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Texas will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate, That the Finance Committee of the Senate be instructed, and it is hereby instructed, to inquire—

1. Into all of the facts and circumstances concerning certain monetary and exchange agreements made by the Secretary of War with the Government of Panama and others, and to report such facts and circumstances to the Senate, together with their opinion as to the authority under which said agreements were made; and

2. Into all of the facts and circumstances under which certain bonds of the Panama Railway Company were recently sold, and report such facts and circumstances to the Senate, together with their opinion as to the authority for the sale of said bonds.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KITTREDGE. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution may go over for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under the objection of the Senator from South Dakota, the resolution will lie over.

NORWEGIAN STEAMER NICARAGUA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, as a case not acted upon by the Fifty-eighth Congress, a report from the Secretary of State, and accompanying papers, relating to the appeal for indemnity addressed to the equitable consideration of the Government of the United States by the owners of the Norwegian steamer *Nicaragua*.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 8, 1906.

SIVEWRIGHT, BACON & CO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State resubmitting the claim, which was not acted upon by the Fifty-eighth Congress, of Messrs. Sivewright, Bacon & Co. for damages sustained by their vessel, the British steamship *Eastry*, in consequence of collisions at Manila in June, 1901, with certain coal hulks belonging to this Government.

I renew the recommendation which I made to the Congress on January 19, 1903, that, as an act of equity and comity, provision be made for reimbursement to the firm of the money expended by it in making the repairs to the ship which the collisions rendered necessary.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 8, 1906.*

REPORT OF ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I inclose herewith the annual report of the Isthmian Canal Commission, the annual report of the Panama Railroad Company, and the Secretary of War's letter transmitting the same, together with certain papers.

The work on the Isthmus is being admirably done, and great progress has been made, especially during the last nine months. The plant is being made ready and the organization perfected. The first work to be done was the work of sanitation, the necessary preliminary to the work of actual construction; and this has been pushed forward with the utmost energy and means. In a short while I shall lay before you the recommendations of the Commission and of the board of consulting engineers as to the proper plan to be adopted for the canal itself, together with my own recommendations thereon. All the work so far has been done not only with the utmost expedition but in the most careful and thorough manner; and what has been accomplished gives us good reason to believe that the canal will be dug in a shorter time than had been anticipated and at an expenditure within the estimated amount. All our citizens have a right to congratulate themselves upon the high standard of efficiency and integrity which has been hitherto maintained by the representatives of the Government in doing this great work. If this high standard of efficiency and integrity can be maintained in the future at the same level which it has now reached, the construction of the Panama Canal will be one of the feats to which the people of this Republic will look back with the highest pride.

From time to time various publications have been made, and from time to time in the future various similar publications doubtless will be made, purporting to give an account of jobbery, or immorality, or inefficiency, or misery, as obtaining on the Isthmus. I have carefully examined into each of these accusations which seemed worthy of attention. In every instance the accusations have proved to be without foundation in any shape or form. They spring from several sources. Sometimes they take the shape of statements by irresponsible investigators of a sensational habit of mind incapable of observing or repeating with accuracy what they see and desirous of obtaining notoriety by widespread slander. More often they originate with or are given currency by individuals with a personal grievance. The sensation mongers, both those who stay at home and those who visit the Isthmus, may ground their accusations on false statements by some engineer, who, having applied for service on the Commission and been refused such service, now endeavors to discredit his successful competitors; or by some lessee or owner of real estate who has sought action or inaction by the Commission to increase the value of his lots and is bitter because the Commission can not be used for such purposes; or on the tales of disappointed bidders for contracts; or of officeholders who have proved incompetent or who have been suspected of corruption and dismissed or who have been overcome by panic and have fled from the Isthmus. Every specific charge relating to jobbery, to immorality, or to inefficiency, from whatever source it has come, has been immediately investigated, and in no single instance have the statements of these sensation mongers and the interested complainants behind them proved true. The only discredit inhering in these false accusations is to those who originate and give them currency, and who, to the extent of their abilities, thereby hamper and obstruct the completion of the great work in which both the honor and the interest of America are so deeply involved. It matters not whether those guilty of these false accusations utter them in mere wanton recklessness and folly or in a spirit of sinister malice to gratify some personal or political grudge.

Any attempt to cut down the salaries of the officials of the Isthmian Commission, or of their subordinates who are doing important work, would be ruinous from the standpoint of accomplishing the work effectively. To quote the words of one of the best observers on the Isthmus, "Demoralization of the service is certain if the reward for successful endeavor is a reduction of pay." We are undertaking in Panama a gigantic task—the largest piece of engineering ever done. The employment of the men engaged thereon is only temporary, and yet it will require the highest order of ability if it is to be done economically, honestly, and efficiently. To attempt to secure men to do this work on insufficient salaries would amount to putting a premium upon inefficiency and corruption. Men fit for the work will not undertake it unless they are well paid. In the end the men who do undertake it will be left to seek other employment with, as their chief reward, the reputations they achieve. Their work is infinitely more difficult than any private work, both because of the peculiar conditions of the tropical land in which it is laid and because it is impossible to free them from the peculiar limitations inseparably connected with Government employment; while it is unfortunately true that men engaged on public work, no matter how devoted and disinterested their services, must expect to be made the objects of misrepresentation and attack. At best, therefore, the positions are not attractive in proportion to their importance; and among the men fit to do the task only those with a genuine sense of public spirit and eager to do the great work for the work's sake can be obtained; and such men can not be kept if they are to be treated with niggardliness and parsimony in addition to the certainty that false accusations will continually be brought against them.

I repeat that the work on the Isthmus has been done and is being done admirably. The organization is good. The mistakes are extraordinarily few, and these few have been of practically no consequence. The zeal, intelligence, and efficient public service of the Isthmian Commission and its subordinates have been noteworthy. I court the fullest, most exhaustive, and most searching investigation of any act of theirs, and if any one of them is ever shown to have done wrong his punishment shall be exemplary. But I ask that they be decently paid, and that their hands be upheld as long as they act decently. On any other conditions we shall not be able to get men of the right type to do the work, and this means that on any other condition we shall insure, if not failure, at least delay, scandal, and inefficiency in the task of digging the giant canal.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 8, 1906.*

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I take it the usual order of the Senate will be followed on this occasion, and that the message and the accompanying documents will be printed and referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The message, with the accompanying documents, will be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals and printed, in the absence of objection.

Mr. GORMAN. I think, Mr. President, the country will be highly gratified at the very extraordinary statements which the President makes in regard to the great work of building the isthmian canal. It is true that the newspaper press, and possibly some individuals in both Houses of Congress, have found reason to criticise the very extraordinary orders that have been issued in the prosecution of the work which has been undertaken. The President has submitted one of the most remarkable messages, I think, which has ever been sent to Congress, giving a certificate of perfect purity and of great efficiency to all connected with that work. It is true that he invites the closest scrutiny by Congress into the conduct of his officials, and Congress ought, in justice to him as well as to the individuals whom he has employed, to order an investigation and to make it perfect and complete. I trust before the Senate proceeds many days it will so instruct the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

The President, however, goes one step beyond that. Before an investigation has been had and there has been an opportunity to look into the facts or to read the report of the Commission he indorses the high salaries that have been paid to the officials connected with the canal. Under what is known as the "Spooner Act," those salaries of the Commission have been fixed by the President himself. I have no doubt that in that matter he has been guided simply by a desire to produce the best results. I have no doubt that under the influences by which any President would be surrounded in like circumstances he has exercised his best judgment; but I do not think we can all agree with him that the salaries paid to some of the officials connected with that organization, who are performng mere clerical duties in the city of Washington, have not been extravagant. However, Mr. President, that is a matter, as the case now stands, for Congress to deal with; and it ought to deal with it in a broad and liberal way, without attempting to embarass the President of the United States in the construction of this great work. But it would seem to me that a blanket indorsement of all that has been done and his insistence that these great sala-

ries which have been paid shall be continued, will require careful consideration by Congress.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. GORMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. HALE. I thought the Senator was through. I will wait until he has completed his remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. GORMAN. The Congress of the United States placed the responsibility for the conduct of this work in the hands of the President, and gave him an appropriation to be used at his discretion, without estimates and without fixing the compensation of the officials, as is done in nearly all other instances in the conduct of governmental affairs. That was most unusual. I may say, Mr. President, it was a responsibility that ought not to have been placed upon the President. We have, however, since the trouble with Spain, grown into the habit of placing in the hands of executive officers millions of money to be expended without any accountability to Congress as to the details of the expenditure. This practice began while Mr. McKinley was President, Congress giving him $50,000,000 to be expended at his discretion. That was an emergency, it was said. I take it that was true; and yet we had emergencies prior to that time. We had the war with England, the war with Mexico, and our own internal troubles, far greater than the war with Spain, and yet no such action was taken in those days, because Congress had guarded carefully the purse strings of the nation. It then appropriated only upon estimates or upon specific statements as to the necessity for the expenditure of such appropriations. But this practice has been pursued as to other Departments of the Government until it has become substantially the rule in the Land Office, in the Post-Office Department, in the Agricultural Department, and in the War Department, almost without limit, to expend millions of dollars for material and the distribution to thousands of persons of salaries not known to Congress and not acted upon by Congress, until finally it has reached this great expenditure for the Panama Canal, estimated at $135,000,000 or $140,000,000, which we have placed in the hands of the President.

The President should not be sensitive if the representatives of the people in another branch and of the States in this branch shall determine—and wisely determine, as I think—to go back to the old rule, and the proper rule, of having estimates and determining governmental expenditures in detail. In the past that has been found the only method which will prevent extravagance in salaries and corruption in expenditures.

The condition relative to canal expenditures is not the fault of the President. It is the ill-advised action of Congress which has placed the President in this position, and which now, that the country has become aroused to inquiries as to the conduct of public officials, has made action necessary.

The President has met the case in that bold and manly fashion which seems to obtain with him as to all who are employed by his direction. Where he has been personally responsible for the employment of officials he finds nothing but good in their conduct. That is a manly characteristic; but I, for one, must be permitted to express the opinion that that is not the rule by which Governmental affairs should be carried on. No man living can tell what is to be the outcome in the expenditures for the construction of this canal across the isthmus; no man, so far as I know, has yet determined the character of the work, whether it shall be a canal that will cost $150,000,000 or one that shall cost $500,000,000. Therefore, with all due deference to the Executive, and with perfect faith in his desire to accomplish the result, and accomplish it by the best methods, I think he ought not to be sensitive to inquiry, and that inquiry perfect and complete ought to be made.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, in much that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] has said regarding the loose way of making appropriations that Congress has fallen into since the Spanish war, I agree. We are not yet out of the inflammatory influences of that war, and we have not yet got back to the old and better-fashioned way of making all appropriations in detail, upon estimates duly submitted, examined, and scrutinized by Congress, and reported in detail. I agree with the Senator in that. The sooner we return to the ancient way in this regard the better it will be in legislation for the Treasury and for the country.

In the little that I shall say now I will try to confine myself to the subject-matter presented by the message of the President.

The Spooner Act, Mr. President, deposited with the President enormous powers. It amplified the powers which the Executive has ordinarily exercised on important public measures; but it was done by Congress; it was discussed fully; it was framed by the distinguished and gifted Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], and, after having been prepared by him, was fully considered. At last in the emergency—that emergency being the mere building of the canal, which everybody recognized as a popular measure—this enormous lodgment of power in the President was assented to by Congress. Congress adjourned, leaving all this with the President. He had power to order work to be done, to make contracts, to make appointments, to fix salaries, and to do all the things that were essential to the carrying on of that great work. The language of the law framed by the Senator from Wisconsin is subject to no doubt. It was intended to be plenary, to commit to the President the authority that ordinarily would be exercised by Congress. For the time being the President has exercised that discretion. What else could he have done?

Now, in the early part of this session, to-day, what could the President do more than he has done? What is his plan as indicated by the message? The time has come when, Congress being in session, he commits back all of the extraordinary powers that have been committed to him to Congress for its action; he will no longer continue to or claim to fix these salaries, but he clearly has the right to express his opinion upon the rate of salaries and upon the men to whom the salaries have been paid. That is all he has done. He proposes, after receiving full reports from all the commissions that have been appointed, consulting engineers, including engineers from other countries, what? To go on and act? By no means; but to refer that to Congress, making such recommendation as he may think proper and fitting, but leaving it all to Congress.

Mr. President, everybody is fallible. Presidents make mistakes; Senators make mistakes; the world is full of mistakes; but the President has made no mistake here in committing this whole subject back to Congress, in giving up the enormous powers that have been lodged in him, and referring the subject-matter to Congress. I think the President and the country are to be congratulated at the moderation, the good sense, displayed by the President in realizinig that the time for the execution by him of the great powers lodged by the Spooner Act has passed and that Congress should consider this subject.

Mr. President, this being the policy of the President, sending it back to Congress and courting, to use his language, a full investigation, I hope there will be no delay on the part of the proper committee in taking up this great subject. The Committee on Interoceanic Canals, Mr. President, will find itself burdened day and night with the great labors thrown upon it by the President and by Congress in investigating and considering these great questions. They must take up the question of salaries. They must take up the question of progress and work as committed to the Commission through legislation, reported by them, if any is needed. They must take up the greatest question of all which will be committed to them by the President, or to us, and by us sent to them—deciding upon the type of canal. I do not envy the members of that committee in the work which they will have to do. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] is a member of the committee.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], one of the greatest lawyers and statesmen in the land, is a member of the committee. I hope he will give his time to the great questions to be considered by that committee, and that the committee will report, not delay and waiting and prolonging, because the people are impatient to know what is to be done, but the result of their conclusions.

On the question of salaries, I believe and think the committee will find that the President is right in what he indicates as his belief—that the large salaries attached to the important places, occupied by men who have upon their shoulders the responsibility of this work, are not too large. They are large compared with the ordinary scale of governmental salaries, but compared with the salaries which are paid by great corporations and great interests in the United States they are not unduly swollen.

But I hope the committee will early take into consideration all these subject-matters and report to the Senate as soon as may be, so that we may know for the future what are to be the conduct and the progress and the type of this great work. But certainly no man can complain that to-day the President has not turned the whole subject-matter over to Congress.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The message will be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals and ordered to be printed.

MESSENGER FOR THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. HEYBURN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger, to be paid from the contingent fund

of the Senate, at the rate of $1,440 per annum, until otherwise provided by law.

AFFAIRS OF MOROCCO.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I offer resolutions which I ask may now be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia submits resolutions which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas it has of late been announced in the public press both of Europe and the United States that for the purpose of considering certain grave questions relative to the commercial and political affairs of Morocco, and of reaching an agreement and determination thereof, the governments of the leading powers of Europe, including Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, Austria, and Spain, have agreed and arranged to hold in the near future, through delegates to be appointed by each of said Governments, a conference at Algeciras, in Spain, and that the Government of the United States has, by said European Governments been invited to participate through duly appointed delegates in the said conference; and

Whereas it is further announced in the public press that the President of the United States has, in compliance with said invitation, appointed delegates of the United States to and in said conference; and

Whereas the questions at issue relative to the affairs of Morocco, and the relation of European governments thereto, are reputed to be of such gravity, and the antagonistic demands of European governments to be so acute as to endanger the peace of Europe, as is evidenced by the publicly announced preparations for war in the dispositions of troops and fleets, and in the gathering of war material by several of said European powers, and as is also evidenced by press dispatches from the capitals of said powers, such as the following, which have been received and published in the newspapers of the United States, to wit:

"PARIS, *December 31.*

"Sensational papers here continue to publish lengthy telegrams from frontier towns reporting extraordinary activity of the military authorities. The evening edition of the Intransigeant to-day reproduces the alleged declaration of a superior Belgian staff officer concerning the military precautions Belgium is taking in order to preserve neutrality, and also a lengthy special dispatch showing the defensive strength of the main frontier points.

"Deputy Jaures reflects the pessimistic view of the socialistic element, writing in the Humanite that 'the antagonism in which France and Germany enter the Morocco conference causes a terrible uneasiness to weigh upon Europe, as the slightest untoward incident might unchain a catastrophe.' Most of the serious journals take a more conservative view, although all recognize the existence of widespread feelings of inquietude."

"LONDON, *January 6.*

"According to official information received in London from Berlin, Germany not only demands that all the powers shall participate in the execution of reforms in Morocco, but that the work of watching the frontier shall be divided among them, thus realizing the fears expressed by an official of the foreign office in an interview last Thursday that the German delegates might insist on regulations clashing with what France considers her special privileges—for instance, the policing of the frontier.

"If Germany persists in this attitude in the conference, it is believed a most serious situation will arise, as France is certain to resist, and Great Britain will support France. The British Government, while believing the conference will finally reach a satisfactory settlement, realizes that persistence by Germany in her demands will cause irritation which will require all the efforts of the delegates to remove, and in this it expects the support of the United States, Spain, and Italy."

"ROME, *January 6.*

"Interest here in the conference on Moroccan reforms is growing. This is due to the predominant position that Italy will assume because of the importance of her delegate, the Marquis Visconti Venosta, who, when he was Italian minister of foreign affairs, concluded an agreement with France by which Italy abandoned her claims on Morocco in favor of France. This agreement was completed later by Foreign Minister Prinetti, who pledged Italy's help to France in Morocco, receiving in exchange the help of France in Tripoli.

"At that time Germany had shown no interest in Morocco, while Italy considered herself free to so act, Morocco not being included in the agreement of the triple alliance concerning the equilibrium of the Mediterranean. Now Germany, it is said, maintains that any question, even if it were not contemplated by the triple alliance, comes within the terms of the treaty, and that if Germany is attacked by any other power the other two members of the triple alliance—Austria and Italy—are compelled to assist her with arms. Thus the situation of Italy in the conference is becoming more delicate, as the conference may lead to war, though the prospects at present point toward peace;" and

Whereas our only legitimate concern with Moroccan affairs relates to the very limited commerce between that country and our own and is in no matter connected with the grave political controversy which has been carried on for some time past between Germany on the one side and France and England on the other as to the future political control of Morocco, it having been the settled policy of this Government since its foundation to abstain from taking part in such political controversies between European nations: It is therefore

I. *Resolved by the Senate,* That the President be respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the Senate with copies of the following papers:

(*a*) Such invitation or invitations as were received by this Government to participate in said conference, and of the reply or the replies of this Government thereto;

(*b*) Of any protocol, agreement, or other paper setting forth the objects of said conference, and the subjects with which it is expected to deal;

(*c*) Of all instructions sent to the delegates designated to represent this Government at said conference, with the names of said delegates;

(*d*) Of any agreement fixing the time and place for the meeting of said conference.

II. *It is further resolved,* That the President be respectfully requested to inform the Senate whether under the terms of said invitation and the acceptance thereof, or under the instructions given to said delegates on the part of the United States, they are limited in their authority to a participation in the deliberations, judgments, and awards of said conference to questions concerning commercial and business matters in which the Government and people of the United States have an interest, either present or prospective; or whether the said delegates on the part of the United States have authority to participate in the deliberations, judgments, or awards of said conference relative to the political affairs of Morocco and her political relations to one or more of the said foreign governments, and to the respective rights and powers of any one or more of said foreign governments relative thereto.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the resolutions may go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under objection, the resolutions will lie over.

Mr. BACON. I did not ask for the present consideration of the resolutions. I refrained from doing so because of the fact that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] desires to address the Senate, and I did not wish to take up the time of the Senate to-day with any discussion upon the resolutions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolutions will lie over.

ATCHISON, TOPEKA AND SANTA FE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. LONG submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate copies of the correspondence between the President and the Attorney-General, the President and the Secretary of the Navy, and the Attorney-General and special counsel, Messrs. Harmon and Judson, relating to a departure from the published rates by the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company in the transportation of coal for the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, together with a copy of the opinion of Judge Philips in the contempt proceedings begun on account of said departure from published rates.

PERMANENT INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ALDRICH submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be requested to report to the Senate in detail the amount of all permanent indefinite appropriations and to report whether any reason exists why all provisions of law making such appropriations should not be repealed and such appropriations hereafter be made annually on estimates furnished by the various Departments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXISTING STATUS IN SANTO DOMINGO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution submitted by Mr. TILLMAN on the 4th instant was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public welfare, as to the existing status in Santo Domingo; whether or not President Morales carried his Government with him when he disappeared from the capital or whether he left it behind, and whether the American officers who have been in charge of the custom-houses are still performing that work; and, if so, under what arrangement and by what authority.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire merely to enter a motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I understand the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] desires to offer an amendment of a general character to the pending resolution, and that upon that amendment he wishes to address the Senate; and I do not desire to stand in his way a moment in that respect. I merely wish to enter the motion and to give notice that I shall object in the future to the discussion of treaties and of our foreign relations in the open Senate, unless the Senate previously decides in the proper way that the discussion shall be in the open Senate. I think haphazard discussion of foreign relations in the morning hour, and of treaties pending in the Senate or pending in committee, is something contrary to the spirit of our rules and is an unwise policy to adopt.

I merely desire to give that notice. I do not wish to interfere in the slightest with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, in reply to what the Senator from Massachusetts has just said, I wish to remark that I do not see how he can say or even think the Santo Domingo treaty is under discussion in connection with the pending resolution.

Mr. LODGE. I made no such suggestion.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator, if I understood him, and I was listening with both ears——

Mr. LODGE. I said I should object to treaties being discussed in open session unless the Senate, in the ordinary and proper way, ordered such discussion.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am not discussing the treaty at all, and do not propose to discuss it.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator brings that forward before anybody has accused him of doing it.

Mr. BACON. I wish to call the attention of the Senator

from Massachusetts to the fact that the President of the United States discussed the treaty in his message.

Mr. LODGE. It does not make the slightest difference what the President of the United States does. We settle our own rules.

Mr. BACON. And it was read in open Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. RAYNER. I offer an amendment in the way of a supplement to the resolution offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland proposes an amendment to the resolution of the Senator from South Carolina, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate the United States ought not to assume any liability for the payment of any indebtedness of the republics of Central or South America to European or other powers, and ought not to interfere with foreign governments asserting against these republics civil rights in accordance with the principles and procedure of international law unless such assertion amounts to an attempt to permanently occupy their territory or to change their forms of government or subvert their political institutions; and

Resolved further, That the United States ought not by war, or the threat or menace of war, to enforce the performance of contractual obligations entered into between its own citizens and any of these republics, but in such cases should limit its interposition toward obtaining relief for the claimants to the friendly offices of the ministers or diplomatic agents of the United States.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I presume it will not be inappropriate for me at this time to advance a few suggestions upon the subject-matter of the resolution that has just been read. It will be understood that in forwarding certain conclusions I have reached upon this subject I am only speaking for myself, and that I have no purpose and certainly no power to bind my party or any of my colleagues upon this floor to the acceptance of any views that I may now express.

We are to-day surging ahead with such velocity in the settlement of new questions in regard to our foreign policy with contiguous states that it seems to me it is well to have an interchange of opinion upon the open field of controversy in reference thereto, so that after consulting the compass and taking our bearings we may possibly formulate some steadfast line of conduct in connection therewith, or at least rescue some fundamental truths and principles from the confusion into which they have fallen.

The problems that we are now encountering in the administration of our foreign policy in this direction require mature thought and deliberation, and I plead with you at the outset, do not let us, because some trifling incident occurs of no significance, that does not affect our welfare or in the slightest degree menace our safety, lay down a code of principles and precedents that may be revised by our successors and repudiated and repealed by future generations.

It is not my intention in anything I may say to cast the slightest reflection upon the administration of the Department of State. While the questions at issue require a knowledge of constitutional and international jurisprudence, we all agree that the late lamented occupant of this portfolio upon the field of diplomacy was at least the peer of the brilliant line who preceded him and who have left the impress of their genius stamped upon the institutions of the Republic, and in so far as the President is concerned, feeling that he has been actuated by the best and highest impulses in the whole course of his administration and believing in his sincerity and integrity of purpose, no carping criticism shall come from me even in cases where he may have challenged precedent and strained authority to secure what, in his judgment, appeared to be a benefit and advantage to his country.

THE GENUINE MONROE DOCTRINE.

I would like it to be known that I subscribe to every sentiment of the Monroe doctrine; that is, the genuine doctrine, the old text and not the revised edition; the original document and not the counterfeit presentment. I stand by every utterance that it contains, but I reject the whole brood of heresies framed by modern paraphrasers and annotators, called the Monroe doctrine, but not a line of which ever sprang from the brain of the patriot whose name it bears.

The men who over three-quarters of a century ago rang a proclamation through the world that at that time convulsed the political fabric of continental Europe, would never, if living at this hour, admit the construction that is now placed upon it, and its founders and sponsors would never recognize it in its deformed and distorted shape. When a great invention in statesmanship dawns upon the world it seems proper that it should be associated with the name of its discoverer, and it ought not to be issued under a formula that no longer designates its ingredients and that has long since accomplished the purposes for which it was designed. When the Department of State issues a manifesto that is the product of its own genius it ought to be circulated under the name of its author, and in vindication of the memory of the dead and in defense of their rights I protest against the use of their names to any instrument that does not bear their signatures and to any doctrine that was never promulgated by their authority. As a usual thing, if a principle is right, it would concern me in a small degree whether it was fortified by tradition or had received the sanction of historic names. In this case the situation, however, is different, because we find that the President justifies his position upon the ground that he is merely enforcing a national policy, and that if we decline to act under existing emergencies it would be equivalent to abandoning a doctrine that is interwoven with our history and has become an integral part of our institutions. The charge is made that this new doctrine, which has been recently brought to our attention, is simply the old doctrine carried to its logical and inevitable conclusion in order to meet present conditions. This being the charge, it is absolutely essential in any discussion of this subject to find out whether this is the old doctrine or whether it is an entirely new one that has no connection with the old, and in order to ascertain this fact I would like for a moment to call to the witness stand the spirits of Jefferson, of Adams, and of Monroe and ask them whether they are innocent or guilty of the charge that the President has preferred against them. I call Adams because he was the real author of the declaration of 1823. The internal evidence of the message demonstrates this to be a fact, because in its first expression it deals with the question of our northwestern boundaries, a controversy that has been conducted by Adams and in connection with which he had employed almost the identical language contained in the message of President Monroe. Not only this, but Mr. Adams, narrating in his journal of December 6, 1845, a conversation with Mr. Bancroft, then in Mr. Polk's Cabinet, thus writes:

I said I approved entirely of Mr. Polk's repeated assertion of the principle first announced by President James Monroe, in a message to Congress, that the continents of North and South America were no longer to be considered as scenes for future European colonization. He said he had heard that this part of the message of Mr. Monroe had been inserted by him at my suggestion. I told him that was true; that I had been authorized by him to assert the principle in a letter of instruction to Mr. Rush, then Minister to England, and had written the paragraph in the very words inserted by Mr. Monroe in his message.

I would like to ask them this question: Was it ever contemplated that we should, under any circumstances, assume a protectorate, political or financial, over any of the Caribbean Islands or over any of the Latin-American Republics of Central or South America? Was not the motive that prompted the message one of self-interest to insure us against attack, and to enable us to hold the key to the situation in the event that any foreign power should attempt an invasion of American territory? I would like to ask Monroe: What did the message mean when it proclaimed—

It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness.

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interferred, and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Was it our purpose to proceed one step further than to announce that we would not permit foreign powers to subvert the governments of Central and South America and supplant them with monarchical institutions? Was not this the whole scope and the object of the proceeding? Was it ever intended that we should either interfere with the governments of the Republics themselves or prohibit foreign governments from asserting civil rights against them, accorded and universally recognized by the law of nations?

Now let us call Jefferson. Let me say a word about Jefferson. During the last campaign a leading advocate of the Republican party, in a vein of satire, in a brilliant address before the Republican convention, remarked that the Democratic party was spending the whole of its time in trying to find out what Thomas Jefferson would do if he were living. It could not, in

its leisure moments, devote its time to a better purpose. I would rather have the spirit of this dead pilot wafting over the ship of state than any living pilot that I know of at the helm. He may have been a doctrinaire, but it is just this kind of doctrinaires who have shattered the idols of superstition, broken the fetters of bondsmen and liberated the world of thought. When in his retirement at Monticello he wrote to President Monroe:

> The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation; this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us.

What was he talking about? No man living had at that time a deeper insight than he had into the profound significance of the causes that moved Monroe to sound an alarm that notified every tyrant on this earth that the Western Hemisphere was ablaze with the conflagration of liberty. He knew it meant one thing alone, nothing less and nothing more, and that was that a people once free upon this continent should never be enslaved again, and that no monarchy should ever be reared on this soil upon the ruins of republican institutions. He was thoroughly familiar with the jure divino autocracies of Europe and with their plans and expectations. He had been trained under the shadow of the Bastille. He was the mortal enemy of holy alliances and divine rights. He knew but one divine right, and that was the divine right of the people. In 1823 this old philosopher, from his knowledge of European conditions, understood the situation better than any man upon the American Continent. His faculties were growing stronger as his body became weaker. He was writing at this time upon every imaginable topic, philosophy, science, politics, literature, and religion, and thus surrounded when President Monroe solicited his opinion upon the suggestion of Mr. Canning, he sent the reply that has just been read. This is an old story, I know, in this Senate Chamber, but let me ask you what was this momentous question that Jefferson referred to? Was it a money question? Was it a financial question? Was he contemplating the probable bombardment of a Caribbean port to enforce the payment of a usurer's bond? Was his mind perplexed by a vision of a war conducted by bailiffs and constables and collectors in the interest of foreign pawnbrokers, whose weapons are pledges and debentures, and who, struggling with each other for preference and priorities in their insatiate chase for plunder, sweep down upon the pitiful revenues of these bankrupt and impoverished republics until they become prostrate supplicants at the exchequers of the world and are willing to yield their resources and concessions at any price or sacrifice that may be dictated in the gambling dens of the European stock market?

I am now trying to prove by the record, by the undisputed facts of history, by contemporaneous construction, the strongest evidence recognized by the canons of the law that the men who planted the seeds of the Monroe doctrine never contemplated that a despoiler's hand should enter the garden, take an alien weed, graft it on the parent stem and then claim that the harvest of this unholy wedlock is a natural growth that by organic process sprang from the virgin soil of the Republic. Let me once divest it of its nomenclature and I have gained the first point in this discussion. Then the new doctrine—call it what you will—must stand upon its own merits, not hallowed by prescription, and not infringing upon an ancient landmark.

THE PRESIDENT'S CONSTRUCTION OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Now, what is the principle of construction? I presume that the Monroe doctrine, though not within the international code, is subject to the same elementary rules of interpretation that govern any other instrument. What is the cardinal rule? You take the language and then if there is a doubt, you take the environment and surroundings, the res gestæ of the transaction, the occasion that called for it, the emergency that produced it, cessante ratione lex cessat, the instructions to our ministers abroad, and principally the object that was to be accomplished, and from them you gather the intention. What is the President's interpretation? Upon pages 2 and 3 of a message that he has lately sent to the Senate marked "Customs revenues of the Dominican Republic," and also marked "Confidential," but from which the injunction of secrecy has been removed, the President makes the following statement:

> Under the accepted law of nations foreign governments are within their right, if they choose to exercise it, when they actively intervene in support of the contractual claims of their subjects. * * *
>
> An aggrieved nation can without interfering with the Monroe doctrine take what action it sees fit in the adjustment of its dispute with American States, provided that action does not take the shape of interference with their form of government or of the despoilment of their territory under any disguise. But, short of this, when the question is one of a money claim, the only way which remains, finally, to collect it is a blockade, or bombardment, or the seizure of the custom-houses, and this means, as has been said above, what is in effect a possession, even though only a temporary possession of territory. The United States then becomes a party in interest, because under the Monroe doctrine it can not see any European power seize and permanently occupy the territory of one of these Republics; and yet such a seizure of territory, disguised or undisguised, may eventually offer the only way in which the power in question can collect any debts, unless there is interference on the part of the United States.

With the most profound respect and admiration for the President, both for the office and for the individual, I deferentially reject this startling interpretation. I want the curtain just to rise for a moment now, for I will presently analyze this statement in detail, but right now, though it is a thrice-told tale and volumes have been written upon it, I want to call the actors upon the stage with the scenery mounted and the play in full rehearsal and see whether it leaves the same impression upon the minds of this distinguished audience as it does upon the President.

We all know that following the downfall of Napoleon the rulers of Prussia, Russia, and Austria formed a conspiracy against human rights known as the "Holy Alliance." Instead of it being a "Holy Alliance" it was the unholiest plot ever conceived against the rights of humanity. It was succeeded in 1818 by the Congress of Aix la Chapelle. In 1820 it assembled at Laybach, in Styria, and again it met in Verona in 1822. At the last conference the following blasphemous declaration was made a part of the treaty:

> The high contracting parties, well convinced that the system of representative government is as incompatible with the monarchical principle as the maxim of the sovereignty of the people is opposed to the principle of divine right, engage in the most solemn manner to employ all their means and unite all their efforts to put an end to the system of representative government wherever it is known to exist in the states of Europe and to prevent it from being introduced into those states where it is not known.

Now Canning appears upon the scene, and, what is a strange incident in this proceeding, and one that is hardly ever adverted to, is that Canning, after the rejection of his proposal to the United States for a European congress to consider the affairs of Spanish America, announced that Great Britain would not permit any European intervention in Spanish America, and the French minister, Prince de Polignac, at that time disclaimed the slightest intention of interfering and acquiesced in the judgment of Mr. Canning, that the subversion of South America by Spain was no longer a subject of practical consideration. President Monroe's message appears a few months after this event, dated December 2, 1823. Take all these facts together, the cause that was operating, the danger that threatened the influence at work, the utterances of the message and the participants in the event, and I would like some Senator now upon this floor to select a single utterance from any of the agencies in this affair that jusitifies the President's construction. Where is there a word that we should either at the point of war deny to foreign powers the right to assert their just demands against these republics or become substantially responsible for the liquidation of their claims?

What part of the Monroe doctrine is it that withdraws these States entirely from the domain of international procedure and commands us to compel them to keep their faith with the nations of the world? We asserted then, as we do now, that we would not permit any new establishment of monarchical institutions upon the Western Hemisphere. Self-interest and self-protection were the main motives that we had at that time, and if we add to this the sentiment that we were then, as we are now, in sympathy with Republican forms of government wherever they exist, and then add to this the further fact that the territory being adjacent to us and a menace to us in the hands of a foreign power, that we did not propose to acquiesce in its encroachment by any European monarch, and that we would oppose any further colonization by foreign governments upon the shores of this continent and you have the whole of the Monroe doctrine from its inception to its completion, from its first to its latest utterance at the time it was promulgated.

THE PRESIDENT'S DOCTRINE NOT THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Now permit me to bring this doctrine quickly down to the present time, because it is absolutely necessary that this should be done in order to intelligently discuss the practical propositions involved.

Upon January 20, 1824, Henry Clay moved the following resolution, which was never acted upon in the Committee of the Whole in the House of Representatives:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the people of these States would not see, without serious disquietude, any forcible intervention by the allied powers of Europe in behalf of Spain to reduce to their former subjection those parts of the continent of America which have proclaimed and established for themselves, respectively, independent governments, and which have been solemnly recognized by the United States.

During the debate upon the Panama Congress in 1826 James Buchanan introduced and passed in the House of Representatives the following resolution:

In the opinion of the House the United States ought not to form any alliance with all or any of the South American republics, nor ought they become parties with them to any joint declaration for the purpose of preventing the interference of any of the European powers with their independence or form of government, or to any compact for the purpose of preventing colonization upon the continent of America, but that the people of the United States should be left free to act in any crisis in such manner as their feelings of friendship toward these republics or as their own honor and policy may at the time dictate.

On April 29, 1848, during the war with Mexico, President Polk transmitted to Congress the Yucatan message, and thereupon a bill was introduced in the Senate to enable the President to take temporary military occupation of Yucatan. Then followed the discussion in which Mr. Calhoun made one of the most effective arguments in his public career, concluding with the memorable words that he had simply discharged his duty to his country and to the Cabinet of which he was the only surviving member.

Then we come to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, to which I will not now refer, because the less said about it the better, *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*, and with the exception of the French intervention in Mexico, to which I shall presently make particular reference in another connection, it brings us to a brief consideration of the Venezuelan message of President Cleveland, sent to Congress on December 17, 1895. In the House of Representatives, and in an humble way on many other occasions, I was a firm adherent of the Administration of President Cleveland. Men sometimes are forgotton when they live. Posterity will remember him, and he will occupy a high and isolated place in the annals of the Republic. I regret to say that it was impossible for me to accept the views of the Administration in the Venezuelan boundary controversy. If the Monroe doctrine had not been appealed to and our intervention had been placed upon an entirely distinct ground and on behalf of Venezuela, and at her solicitation we had demanded as an international right that in order to avoid war between Great Britain and Venezuela that controversy should have been submitted to arbitration, it would have presented an entirely different aspect. I can not for a moment reconcile to any American precedent or to any principle of international law the proposition that in an honest dispute over a boundary line between a South American and a foreign state that we had a right to dictate the method of adjustment and by the menace of war compel submission to our terms, or that the Monroe doctrine ever contemplated such an interference upon our part.

When Mr. Bayard submitted to Lord Salisbury the dispatch of Mr. Olney, it was sent by Lord Salisbury to the ablest lawyers in the Kingdom and to the law officers of the Crown for their opinion. It was submitted on the 7th of August, 1895, and this investigation accounts for the fact that there was no communication sent from Lord Salisbury to the British minister in the United States until November 26, 1895. A statement that is peculiarly relevant to the present situation appears in this correspondence which I shall now cite, and I have emphasized the Venezuelan incident for this purpose, and I cite it because Lord Salisbury and the eminent jurists who had evidently prepared his answer seem to agree with Secretary Olney upon a proposition that comes right home to us with pointed force and irresistible conclusion upon this occasion, and comes to us in a discussion in which Secretary Olney had proceeded beyond the utmost limit of any of his predecessors in the assertion of our rights under the message of President Monroe. Listen to the statement of Secretary Olney, the most liberal constructionist upon the Monroe doctrine who has ever presided over the Department of State, and tell me whether it does not sustain every proposition for which I am contending:

The Monroe doctrine does not establish any general protectorate by the United States over other American States. It does not relieve any American state from its obligations, as fixed by international law, or prevent any European power directly interested from enforcing such obligations or from inflicting merited punishment for the breach of them. It does not contemplate any interference in the internal affairs of any American state. It does not justify any attempt on our part to change the established form of government, altering that form according to our own will and pleasure. The rule in question has but a single purpose and object. It is that no European power or combination of European powers shall forcibly deprive an American state of the right and power of self-government and of shaping for itself its own political fortunes and destinies.

In the answer from the British foreign office there was this striking passage, not a line or an assertion of which was ever contradicted or denied in any subsequent correspondence upon the subject:

Whatever may be the authority of the doctrine laid down by President Monroe, there is nothing in his language to show that he ever thought of claiming this novel prerogative for the United States. It is admitted that he did not seek to assert a protectorate over Mexico or the States of Central and South America. Such a claim would have imposed upon the United States the duty of answering for the conduct of these States, and consequently the responsibility of controlling them. His sagacious foresight would have led him energetically to deprecate the addition of so serious a burden to those which the rulers of the United States have to bear. It follows of necessity that if the Government of the United States will not control the conduct of these communities, neither can it undertake to protect them from the consequent attaching of any misconduct to which they may be guilty toward other nations. If they violate in any way the rights of another state or its subjects, it is not alleged that the Monroe doctrine will assure them the assistance of the United States in escaping from any reparation which they may be bound by international law to give. Mr. Olney expressly disclaims such an interference from the principles he lays down.

THE ROOSEVELT DOCTRINE.

I hope that I have now shown that the present doctrine is not the Monroe doctrine and that, therefore, it ought to have a new and proper name. We might call it the Dillingham doctrine, or, if the Senator from Alabama does not object, the Reader doctrine, or, what is better still, let us copyright it with a name that will surround it with proper dignity and command the respect of the nations of the world, and call it the Roosevelt doctrine.

It becomes necessary for us now to analyze this new doctrine of the President, to see whether we will adopt and make it a part of our international code. The President has encountered a complicated situation, and if his conception of it is correct he has applied the remedy with a master's hand. If he has made an accurate diagnosis, his treatment will undoubtedly eradicate the malady. I know a distinguished physician whose remedies are simply marvelous. There is only one trouble about the doctor, and that is he generally treats his patients for the wrong disease. He is eminently successful because his patients not being afflicted with the disease that his diagnosis points to, they invariably recover from it. What is the President's diagnosis of this case? It is based upon two propositions:

First. His first proposition is that the only way, except by actual war, that one nation can forcibly collect a money claim against another is by blockade, bombardment, or the seizure of its custom-houses, and under the accepted law of nations foreign governments are within their rights, if they choose to exercise it, when they actively intervene in support of the contractual claims of their subjects.

Second. His second proposition is that the United States then becomes a party in interest, so far as American states are concerned, because under the Monroe doctrine it could not see any European power seize and occupy the territory of any of these republics.

Upon the first proposition I respectfully deny that foreign nations are within their rights when they actively intervene in favor of the contractual claims of their subjects. With great deference to the President, this proposition is at war with the elementary principles of international law. There are some exceptions that sustain his statement in countries where anarchy and a failure to administer justice prevail, but with an exception in cases that are sui generis the rule is an inflexible and unbending one, precisely to the contrary tenor of what the President states it to be. In this country nearly every Secretary of State, including Madison, Adams, Clay, Webster, Calhoun, Marcy, Seward, and Blaine, have given the broad denial to suggestions of this character, so that until this new doctrine was promulgated it was considered a postulate and a fundamental maxim of international law that governments would not interfere in behalf of the contractual claims of their citizens, except through the channels of diplomacy and the proper presentation of the claims by their ministers. Of course, if the President is in error upon this point, which is the major premise of his argument, his conclusions fall to the ground, and, therefore, owing to its great importance I now present to you a line of precedents taken from the text writers that establish the true doctrine in this regard, and in doing so I desire to say that I am only referring to the principal ones, and that a volume could be filled with them if it became necessary to give the whole of them.

With regard to the contracts of an individual born in one country with the government of another, most especially when the individual contracting is domiciliated in the country with whose government he contracts and formed the contract voluntarily, for his own private emolument and without the privity of the nation under whose protection he has been born, he has no claim whatsoever to call upon the government of his nativity to espouse his claims, this Government having no right to compel that with which he voluntarily contracted to the performance of that contract. (Mr. John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State, to Mr. Salmon, April 29, 1823.)

The Government of the United States is not bound to interfere to secure the fulfillment of contracts made between their citizens and foreign governments, it being presumed that before entering into such contracts the disposition and ability of the foreign power to perform its obligations are examined, and the risk of failure taken into consideration. In cases of personal hardship and loss, however, like the present, the Department does not decline forwarding a statement of the grievance, with a recommendation of the claim, to the friendly offices of the minister of the United States. (Mr. Marcy, Secretary of State, to Mr. Fowler, July 17, 1856.)

The people who go to these regions (South America) and encounter great risks in the hope of great rewards must be regarded as taking all the circumstances into consideration, and can not with reason ask their Government to complain that they stand on a common footing with native subjects in respect to the alleged wants of an able, prompt, and conscientious judiciary. We can not undertake to supervise the arrangements of the whole world for litigation, because American citizens voluntarily expose themselves, to be concerned in their deficiencies. (Mr. Seward, Secretary of State, to Mr. Burton, April 28, 1866.)

Citizens of the United States who take up their abode in a foreign country and enter into contracts with the citizens or public authorities there are presumed to make their engagements in accordance with, and subject to, the laws of the country where the obligations imposed by the contract are to be fulfilled, and are ordinarily remitted to the remedies afforded by those laws for the redress of grievances resulting from breaches or nonfulfillment of such contracts.

Instances may sometimes occur in which there has been a denial or miscarriage of justice in the courts. In such cases the good offices of the Department may properly be invoked on behalf of the claimant. The claims now in question are not deemed to be of a character which calls for such interposition. (Mr. Fish, Secretary of State, to Mr. Wing, December 9, 1873.)

The claimants in this case stand in the relation of parties to a contract into which they voluntarily entered with the Government of Brazil against which they now seek indemnity for losses sustained, resulting, as it is said, from acts of that Government alleged to be in contravention of their contract. It is a well-established rule of this Government that in such cases the parties are remitted for the redress of injuries resulting from any breach or disregard of the contract to the laws of the country in which the agreement was entered into and where it is to be performed. This rule, so far as known, is one generally recognized by other civilized powers. (Mr. Fish, Secretary of State, to Mr. Pratt, July 17, 1875.)

This Government does not interfere diplomatically to enforce claims of actual citizens of the United States arising out of contracts voluntarily entered into by them. When a contract is made by them under such circumstances the person is expected to have considered the ability and the readiness of the other party to carry out the contract. In this case particularly such instructions could not be issued. (Mr. Fish, Secretary of State, to Mr. Swann, May 4, 1876.)

A breach of contract virtually entered into between a citizen of the United States and a foreign government with which this Government holds diplomatic relations, is not regarded as ground for official interference on behalf of the citizen. (Mr. Evarts, Secretary of State, to Mr. Thomas, September 12, 1878.)

In regard to claims of that character (contracts) it is a rule of universal acceptance and practice that the person thus voluntarily entering into a contract with the government of a foreign country or with the subjects or citizens of such foreign power, for any grievances he may have or losses he may suffer resulting from such contract, is remitted to the laws of the country with whose government or citizens the contract is entered into for redress. (Mr. Blaine, Secretary of State, to Mr. Logan, March 22, 1881.)

We must draw a careful and well-defined distinction between contracts and torts, not technical but nevertheless in international procedure differing from each other just as clearly as they do under the strictest rules of common-law pleading. We have and will exercise the right of intervention whenever a foreign government tortiously deprives an American citizen of his property, his liberty, or his life and declines to afford him proper redress therefor. This distinction has been so well taken by one of the most eminent men who has occupied the position of Secretary of State that it is well to quote his language in support of this proposition:

It has not been customary for this Department officially to interfere in behalf of citizens of the United States who may have entered into contracts with foreign governments, which the latter may not have fulfilled. The Department has usually limited its interposition to authorizing the proper diplomatic agent of the Government abroad to use his personal good offices toward obtaining relief for the claimant. The reason for this policy is that claims based on contract are supposed to stand upon a very different footing from those which arise from injuries to person and property committed by the authorities of any foreign government. (Mr. Fish, Secretary of State, to Mr. Bassett, June 27, 1870.)

By adopting a foreigner, under any form of naturalization, as a citizen, this Government does not undertake the patronage of a claim which he may have upon the country of his original allegiance or upon any other Government.

To admit that he can charge it with this burden would allow him to call upon a dozen Governments in succession, to each of which he might transfer his allegiance to urge his claim. Under such a rule the Government supposed to be indebted could never know when the discussion of a claim would cease. All Governments are, therefore, interested in resisting such pretensions. I infer from the memorials of Mr. Vigil and of the legislature of New Mexico that the claims to which you refer arose from contracts, expressed or implied, with the Mexican Government. Our long-settled policy and practice has been to decline the formal intervention of the Government, except in cases of wrong and injury to person and property, such as common law denominates torts and regards as inflicted by force, and not the results of voluntary engagements or contracts.

In cases founded upon contract the practice of this Government is to confine itself to allowing its minister to exert his friendly good offices in commending the claim to the equitable consideration of the debtor without committing his own Government to any ulterior proceedings.

PRECEDENTS AGAINST THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY.

It seems to me that the President is equally in error, if we are at all to be controlled by usage or precedent, in stating that the seizure of a custom-house and a blockade are equivalent to the seizure of territory within the meaning of the Monroe doctrine and that it is our duty to interfere in Central and South America if foreign governments attempt to enforce their rights by this method. In the first place, as I have attempted to show, strictly contractual claims will not be asserted by any such process, and foreign governments recognize this rule just as well as we do, the exceptions being where there is a discrimination of justice or where there is a condition of lawlessness and a failure to comply with the usages of civilized society. If the citizens of foreign governments are subjected to a tortious invasion of their rights with the connivance of any of the Republics of Central or South America, and after every effort made to obtain indemnity without avail, foreign governments proceed to place the revenues of the offending government under their control so as to obtain redress, I deny that there is any seizure of territory within the meaning of the Monroe doctrine to invoke our interference, and I will give you now three striking illustrations in which this very process was resorted to and in which we never asserted any right to intervene or ever made the claim that under the Monroe doctrine it was within our duty or province so to do.

The first incident is that of Mexico. The English claim originated in tort. Under the orders of Miramon a body of rioters had broken into the residence of the British legation, plundered its vaults, and had taken a large amount of money, the property of English citizens. The claim of France was also one for indemnity for wrongs committed by Mexico.

In this connection I direct your attention to an important communication sent by Secretary Seward on August 23, 1862, to Mr. Dayton, the American minister in Paris, which reads as follows:

This Government, relying on the explanations which have been made by France, regards the conflict as a war involving claims by France which Mexico has failed to adjust to the satisfaction of her adversary, and it avoids intervention between the belligerents.

Of course we know that these explanations were false, and that the Emperor Napoleon was then engaged in the treacherous attempt to place an Austrian archduke upon the Mexican throne. What I want to emphasize, however, is that the correspondence of Mr. Seward proves that there was no reference whatever to the Monroe doctrine, and no attempt to interfere with the proceedings that the European governments had undertaken to enforce their rights until within a brief period before the time that Maximilian landed at Vera Cruz. Not only this, but afterwards, and after the close of our civil war, Mr. Bigelow, our minister to France, who succeeded Mr. Dayton, absolutely agreed to recognize Maximilian upon the withdrawal of French troops from Mexican territory.

This incident establishes what I am contending for, and that is that the Monroe doctrine does not come into operation until there is an actual attempt upon the part of foreign governments to subvert republican institutions upon this hemisphere.

The next incident is one of extreme weight and consequence in this connection. The seizing of Venezuelan war vessels and the bombardment of Venezuelan ports by Great Britain and Germany have been cited by Mr. George F. Tucker, of the Boston bar, in his excellent treatise upon the Monroe doctrine, one of the most instructive and concise expositions upon the subject that I have ever read, as one of the first attempts in history to enforce commercial demands by virtual acts of war. Why did we not interefere in this case? This was an excellent opportunity to put the new doctrine into practical execution. We desisted because Great Britain and Germany both assured us that it was not their purpose to take permanent possession of Venezuelan territory. Under the new dispensation it was a casus belli, and it comes distinctly within the President's proclamation. Under the President's well-chosen terms it was a case in which the United States immediately became a party in interest, but our failure to interfere is demonstrative proof that we did not consider any attempt short of an attempt to subvert the autonomy of Venezuela as any breach of the Monroe doctrine or of any other doctrine incorporated in our diplomatic code.

The third episode is the strongest of the three. For an offense to her dignity England levied a fine of $75,000 upon Nicaragua. Upon failure to pay the fine British ships of war appeared at Corinto and armed forces took possession of the town. It was an unnecessary and unjustifiable proceeding upon the part of Great Britain, and here was an opportune occasion to summon the specter of Monroe to revisit the pale glimpses of the moon.

Frantic efforts were made to induce the State Department to act, but it stood by with grim and resolute silence and never sent a political economist or an auditor or an adjuster to apportion the revenues of Nicaragua, but permitted the emaciated Republics of Costa Rica, San Salvador, and Guatemala to subscribe a sufficient sum to liquidate the indebtedness. This was a defiant act upon the part of Great Britain, close to our own borders in the haunted churchyard of the Clayton-Bulwer apparition, but it never disturbed the tranquil slumbers of Adams and Monroe, and they never for a moment left their sepulchers to harrow up our souls or unfold the secrets of their prison house. I think that I have now established two propositions:

First. That the President is in error when he states that "we

are within our rights and other governments are within their rights when they actively intervene in support of the contractual claims of their citizens."

Second. That he is equally in error, if we are to be governed by precedent, when he states that "upon the seizure of a custom-house to enforce claims recognized by international law in South or Central America we become a party in interest under the Monroe doctrine, and must prevent this action upon the part of foreign governments."

THE NEW POLICY.

This brings us to a review of what this new doctrine really is, and it reveals a condition that will contribute largely to the entertainment of those who investigate it. We must realize that this new Monroe doctrine is strictly a financial doctrine. The tragic figures of Bolivar and Miranda and a hundred other heroes who swept up and down the Spanish Main have disappeared from view, and the Santo Domingo Improvement Company and the Westendorps, of Amsterdam, and Messrs, Bichoffscheim & Goldschmidt now appear upon the scene. Arma virumque cano is an epic dream. The theme is money, the legend is cash, and the foreign hordes who are advancing into the State Department are a syndicate of relentless mercenaries and money lenders who traffic in calamity, look upon national misfortunes as so much merchandise, and who for a venal profit would call a vendue and auction to the highest bidder the liberties of mankind.

Look at the situation for a moment and see whether I am exaggerating it. Let us take the Dominican complication. How did the Dominican indebtedness originate? Let me give you one item of it. I read from the thirty-first annual report of the Council of the Corporation of Foreign Bondholders, incorporated by an act of Parliament July, 1898:

1869.—Six per cent loan for £757,700. The Government of Santo Domingo entered into a contract with Mr. E. H. Hartmont, by which the latter agreed to provide a sum of £420,000 for the construction of roads and railways, of which £100,000 was to be retained by him as compensation, the nominal amount of the loan to be fixed by the contractor. The Government on its part undertook to pay, for the service of the interest and sinking fund, an annuity of £58,900 in half-yearly installments, for twenty-five years. Messrs. Peter Lawson & Co., acting for Mr. Hartmont, accordingly issued in London £757,700 in bonds secured upon a first charge on the customs duties of the ports of Santo Domingo and Puerto Plata, the guano royalties, and the revenues arising from the forests and mines of the province of Samana.

The bonds were redeemable in twenty-five years by a 1¾ per cent accumulative sinking fund. The issue price was 70 per cent, but at this price the loan received little support from the public, and was subsequently disposed of at rates ranging from 55 to 50 per cent to Messrs. Bichoffscheim & Goldschmidt and others, by whom they were later disposed of to the public. The Government only acknowledges receipt of £38,000. Mr. Hartmont, however, asserted that he tendered personally to the Government £211,110, but that it was not accepted owing to negotiations for annexation in progress at that time with the United States. Interest on this loan was paid for three years, but it was stated that these payments were made by the contractor and not by the Government.

What do you think of this? One hundred thousand pounds to Mr. Hartmont for negotiating the loan, the whole loan taken by Messrs. Bichoffscheim & Goldschmidt for 50 per cent, and Santo Domingo paid the sum of £38,000 out of the transaction, for which it gave its bonds for £750,700 and agreed to pay for interest and sinking fund £58,900 a year, £20,000 a year more than the whole amount of principal that it received, and this, shades of Monticello! is what Jefferson contemplated as the most momentous question that had agitated the Republic since the Declaration of Independence.

And this is the subject over which we are to have war. What a glorious war this will be! From Salamis to Trafalgar no such war was ever fought before. On the one side, Belgium's invincible armada, on the other, the converted scows and rowboats of the lamented Morales. Every war that has been waged either upon sea or land has always involved some principle. This will not only involve some principle, but it will involve a large amount of interest. The battle cry of the British navy has been "England expects every man to do his duty;" this battle cry shall be "Belgium expects every man to collect his money." The dying words of Lawrence were "Don't give up the ship, boys;" here the flag ship shall signal to the fleet, Don't give up your coupons, boys; and as the battle closes the valiant crew of brokers, bankers, underwriters, and promoters, paraphrasing the thrilling words of Perry, can flash a cable to the Westerndorps of Amsterdam: The revenue cutters and the custom-houses of Puerto Plata and Monte Christi have fallen; we have met the enemy and they are ours. Advance the bid on Dominican bonds.

While I am upon this branch of the subject let me refer to a statement lately made to the Baltimore Sun in a communication from its Washington correspondent that contains an interesting extract from the report of the corporation of foreign bondholders, which shows the effect that this new policy of the President has had upon the price of the securities of these American Republics, and which reads as follows, showing the rise in these investments since the beginning of this agitation. An appreciation of this sort would generally be a benefit, but in this case it is an absolute detriment, because it compels these governments to settle their obligations at a price far overreaching the speculative figures at which they were purchased. This table gives the prices of the bonds of eight of these countries at the end of September of each year:

Countries.	1901.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Colombia	14	24½	24	44
Costa Rica A bonds	16½	22	26	56
Costa Rica B bonds	15	19	19½	46
Guatemala	13	21	24	39¼
Honduras	5	4½	6	13
Nicaragua	57½	60½	59	79
Paragua	23	29	35	50
Uruguay	49½	58½	59½	72
Venezuela	26	32¼	42	51

I will tell you what I am willing to do. The Monroe doctrine is a Democratic doctrine, but I am perfectly willing to stand upon a Republican construction of it. You may search through every volume and pamphlet that have ever been written upon this subject and in no single one of them will you find a more concise and at the same time a more comprehensive definition of what the Monroe doctrine really is and what it was intended to be than you will in its exposition by Secretary Seward in the following language. I read from the instruction of Mr. Seward to Mr. Kilpatrick, our Chilean minister, in 1866:

The Government of the United States will "maintain and insist with all the decision and energy which are compatible with our existing neutrality that the republican system which is accepted by any one of those (South American) States shall not be wantonly assailed, and that it shall not be subverted as an end of a lawful war by European powers;" but beyond this position the United States Government will not go, nor will it consider itself hereby bound to take part in wars in which a South American republic may enter with a European sovereign when the object of the latter is not the establishment in place of a subverted republic of a monarchy under a European prince.

RECEIVERSHIP OVER FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

We have lately had an exposition of this doctrine, however, which proceeds a step further than any announcement that has ever been made upon this subject, and it comes from no less distinguished a source than the Secretary of War, as capable an adviser as the President could possibly select, and who, by reason of his integrity and intellectual power, has maintained the respect and confidence of his countrymen, regardless of party, in the commanding positions he has occupied in their service. Secretary Taft, in the frank and candid manner that generally characterizes his public utterances, in an addres lately delivered before the Republican convention of Ohio, speaking of our relations with Santo Domingo, says we are to take temporary possession of the island as receiver. I have looked carefully over the various provisions of the Constitution of the United States, and I find no clause that empowers this Government to act as a receiver for any other government. It might be supposed that through some inadvertence or error on the part of the printer it was omitted from the original proof sheet of the Constitution, but in examining the debates of the convention and the notes of Mr. Madison I am unable to discover that there was any discussion of this receivership matter in that body. This is a new project, therefore, and heralded by so high an authority it is worthy of consideration. The Secretary of War never makes a suggestion, even at a feast or a convention, that does not carry weight with, it, and we must not reject this proposition simply on account of the novelty of the conception. The Senator from Indiana, as I shall presently show, claims that we are a trustee for all the uncivilized nations of the earth, and now if you add to this that in the meantime we are to act as receivers for them you confer upon us a duty that is by no means a sinecure.

I would like to know who will act as receiver? It will evidently be impossible for Mr. Taft to perform these functions. As Secretary of War, upon frequent occasions ex officio Secretary of State, constructive governor-general of the Philippines, and, in the absence of the President, Acting President of the United States, I am quite sure that he has not the time to act as receiver for all the impecunious people on this earth. We will therefore evidently have to provide a new portfolio to be known as the "department of foreign receiverships" and a new secretary to be known as the "secretary of foreign bankruptcy." This official will, undoubtedly, have a sufficient amount of work to occupy his time, because there are a large number of people in the territory to be covered ready to go into the hands of a receiver, from Yucatan to Tierra del Fuego. The question

arises, Are these receiverships to be temporary or permanent? Take the receivership of Santo Domingo. Is it for the purpose of reorganization or liquidation? If for the former purpose, how long will it take to reorganize its finances, and, if it is permanent in character, who is ultimately to become its distributee? And then comes the serious question, Who are our clients in this controversy? In Santo Domingo we claim that the Government ought to be supported, because it is in favor of protecting American interests. In Venezuela American interests were with the revolutionists. Is this to be our policy—that we are to be allied with the party that is in favor of American interests? Is it not time, I appeal to you, to call a halt in this entire programme? Are we not trying to accomplish too much within a brief period? Are we not venturing beyond our limits as a world power and intruding officiously into affairs that do not possibly concern us?

I would also like to know under what clause of the Constitution we derive the right to act as receivers and take possession of the custom-houses of other countries. I would be obliged to some Senator upon this floor to select the provision that confers this authority upon the Executive. If this is an Executive function I shall be extremely grateful to anyone to point me to the article that so defines it. Make no mistake about this. We are now in possession of the custom-houses of Santo Domingo and collecting their revenues. Please give me the warrant and precept under which this process has been issued. If there is a statute for it, let me have it and I will ascertain whether there is any sanction for the enactment. If it is a custom, where and when has it ever been practiced or pursued? Is it not a fact that among all the interpreting decisions of the Supreme Court, among all the archives of the State Department, there is no precedent or example that justifies this assumption of authority? I am not fastidious or technical upon this point. I am not what you may call a strict constructionist of the Constitution, if by strict construction you mean that I would sacrifice its intention to its phraseology or its spirit to its letter. Give it now the broadest exposition that it can stand, the most liberal interpretation that it is capable of, treat it magnanimously, as the Supreme Court has done in its various revisions and translations, and I challenge you to find a single grant or franchise it contains that justifies this usurpation. I am not criticising the President now. If he has made a mistake, he has done so with a love for his country and a devotion to its people, and not for the purpose of personal aggrandizement, but, in all justice and fairness, has he not fallen into the gravest possible error in supposing that he has the right to execute a treaty before the treaty itself is ratified? It is childish to assert that the Senate is jealous of its rights or its prerogatives. That is not the point. The point I apprehend is that you, as the representatives of your States, will see to it with unabated vigilance that there is no intrusion by the Executive upon legislative functions and no encroachment upon constitutional limitations. I have no feeling, certainly no partisan feeling, upon this matter. Perhaps what has been done has been done for the best, but I want to avoid the precedent, because precedents live forever and bad precedents make good law. We are dealing now with a most important branch of our system.

This is the dead line of the Constitution, and the slightest trespass is fatal to the organic life of our Government. The limitation upon the Executive power is the keynote of the instrument, and when once you rend that cord in twain you destroy the delicate adjustment of the master's hand. It is the implied covenant that underlies the grant. It was the pillar of fire that led us through the stormy days of the state conventions to the shores of our deliverance. All the guaranties of the charter, habeas corpus, civil rights, the liberty of the press and religious freedom pale into insignificance before its light, and, if I am correct in the position I am assuming, I would like it once and forever understood that no treaty with foreign nations and that no compact, convention, or protocol in the nature of a treaty shall be performed and carried into practical effect, and no custom-house shall be seized, no revenues administered, no status quo established by any minister or military commander until the act of the agent is confirmed by the principal and the negotiations of the President are submitted to the only body under the Constitution that has the right to reject or ratify them.

THE CONDITION OF CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA.

Look for a moment at the situation of a number of the states that are involved in these controversies. Of course I am not speaking now of the states where order prevails and whose governments are stable and responsible. We know that they are in a condition of constant upheaval and are resting upon a political volcano. I will not dignify by the name of revolution the sedition and turmoil that since their liberation have raged within their borders. In some of them the public franchise is a mockery and a travesty upon republican institutions. In the city of Buenos Ayres, for instance, at the last election, with 800,000 population, 2,000 votes were cast, and they were largely the votes of persons who had been dead and buried for an indefinite period of time. In a number of instances their presidents are military dictators whose chief ambition seems to be to acquire as large a fortune as possible from the public funds before the time arrives for their assassination.

It will be utterly impossible for us to follow our citizens into these realms and inferentially become the ally of every rioter or usurper who regards the domain of his country as his private emolument and who is willing for a consideration to part with every concession upon its soil, with a full knowledge that they will be forfeited by the tyrant who succeeds him. Those who are in control are entirely justified when they announce to us that we have no right to interfere with them. There is a ruler now upon the republican throne of Venezuela, "half patriot, half brigand," who extended a hospitable invitation to the navies of France and the United States to bombard him, and while the whole world was smiling at the grotesqueness of his blustering pretensions, when you analyze the philosophy of the situation, he was unqualifiedly right. He proceeded to forfeit the concessions of our citizens, claiming that they were in league with his opponents. We demanded arbitration, and when he took refuge under the principle that the controversy was pending in the Venezuelan courts we answered him by saying, "You own your courts, and you can induce them to render any decision that you desire; we are therefore not bound by their judgment, and we shall bombard you if you do not submit to arbitration." Mr. President, we might as well admit that he is on the right side of this question and the law is with him. Corrupt or not, we know that these concessionaries must submit to the judgment of the courts that have jurisdiction over them. We can not bombard Venezuela because these tribunals have rendered an improper decision. Let us reverse positions for a moment. Here are hundreds of decisions flooding us every day in this country, from county, circuit, and municipal courts, and from district, appellate, and supreme tribunals. Suppose that every jury that rendered an improper verdict and every judge who pronounced an unsatisfactory decision were to be bombarded. Why, the land would reverberate with the roar of cannon and the firmament would be draped in fire.

THE FLAG DOES NOT FOLLOW A CONTRACT.

The President takes the ground that these States should pay their honest debts. That is a proper ground to take. If they repudiate them, says the President, we will intervene and compel them to fulfill their obligations. This was the purpose declared by him in one of the earlier communications made upon the subject, which at the time was profanely criticised as policing South America. The method of intervention that we were to resort to was the seizure of their custom-houses and a virtual assumption of suretyship for them, because it stands to reason that the moment we come into possession of their revenues we can never abandon their administration, but must continue their collection until the indebtness is liquidated. This makes us the guarantor of these claims. This will force them to be honest, says the President. I humbly take a position that is diametrically opposed to this doctrine. I say that such a policy on our part will deprive them of every motive for honesty and will close up for them every avenue of ambition. I would let them realize that we do not intend to stand sponsor for a dollar of their indebtedness and that, like every other people, they must perform the obligations of civilized society and that, if their property is rightfully seized upon their failure to do so, we do not intend to intervene unless there is an attempt to subvert their institutions. This is the only method by which you can inculcate proper lessons of national honor and good faith. Then whenever a rioter engages in a revolution he will understand that he can not seize a custom-house for his own emolument, because that is what a South American revolution generally means until he secures the claims of foreign creditors. There will be less revolution then, because when you take away the custom-house from a South American revolutionist you take away the inspiring motive that fans his patriotism into flame. I have the strongest friendship and the deepest sympathy for these people. Their ruling classes represent a spirited and chivalric race, and I cherish the fondest hopes for their future welfare. Let me take the liberty of telling them, however, in the places where these troubles occur that they will never emerge from bondage until they become a reliant and self-dependent people; that they will never take their place among the nations of the earth by surrendering their custom-houses into the hands of foreign constables and collectors; that they will never be recognized as factors in the world's progress until they grasp the

rudimentary principles of national honor, until they learn that there can be no fellowship or communion between liberty and corruption, and that a republic whose rulers are venal and whose assemblies are purchasable constitutes the most abject form of despotism, and though the bosoms of their people may pant with a love of liberty, though they may ostensibly exercise the privileges of freemen, their very suffrages are the emblems of servitude and they themselves are but bondsmen and slaves, "fancied freemen amid the clanking of their chains and imaginary monarchs beneath the infliction of their keepers."

WE MUST NOT INTERVENE UNLESS THERE IS A SUBVERSION OF POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS.

So far as I am concerned I am in favor of letting all the world understand what we mean by the Monroe doctrine. There ought to be no secret or mystery about it. Let me give you my definition, and I appeal to the historic evidence I have given in support of its accuracy:

First. We mean that no foreign power shall forcibly establish any monarchical government upon the face of the American continent.

Second. We mean that every republican form of government upon this hemisphere shall remain intact, subject alone to the free will of its own people.

Third. We do not and we can not mean that foreign governments within these limits shall not enforce their just demands against American nations.

Fourth. Once and forever we do not mean that we contemplate any protectorate over any other American nation.

Fifth. We can not possibly mean that when a foreign government in the enforcement of rights recognized by the law of nations subjects the revenues of one of these states to its control, it is our duty to intervene and become the guarantor of its obligations. What we do mean is that when the process reaches beyond that point and there is an attempt to subvert republican institutions, that then, under the Monroe doctrine, we will intervene and protect these states from aggression.

Sixth. We do not believe that the seizure of a custom-house, in order to obtain indemnity for a wrongful act, is a permanent invasion of territory or a subversion of republican institutions within the meaning of the Monroe doctrine, and that upon an attempt of this sort being made without any further encroachment it becomes our province to interfere by force and prevent it.

Seventh. And lastly, what is more important than all, we repudiate the doctrine that the flag follows a contract, and that we propose by war or by the menace or threat of war to enforce the performance of contractual obligations entered into by foreign governments with our own citizens.

If we abide by these maxims we will inculcate two lessons of imperishable value. In the first place, we will announce to these republics that they must pay their honest debts, that they have no right to repudiate their obligations, and that they can not involve this Government in their settlement or look to us to become the collectors and distributors of their revenue. In the second place, we will announce to our own citizens that when they enter upon transactions in these states that while we will protect their property and their liberty against wrongful invasion, so far as their contracts are concerned they are subject to the laws of the jurisdiction in which they are to be performed and that they shall not appeal to us to make good their profits, and by armed intervention insure the completion of their enterprises.

This is my ritual. This is the orthodox ritual. While I am not a devotee at the shrine of antiquity and am always willing to accept any new doctrine that may be an improvement upon the old, no matter how startling it may be, in this particular I stand by the ancient confession of faith and do not propose to become a proselyte from its altar. I believe that, however well intentioned the present purpose may be, that a financial protectorate over any of these republics will gradually lead to a political protectorate over them, and then by insidious process to annexation. Thus believing, I am unwilling to fashion the interpretation to the emergency, and standing upon a basic principle I do not propose that every zephyr that fans from the Caribbean shall sway and sweep me from the rock to which I am lashed. I do not believe that, looking at this subject calmly and practically, there is the slightest danger of any foreign government forcibly seizing the custom-houses of these states. The President's fears upon this subject will prove to be unfounded. He is generally apprehensive that we are continually in danger of war, and possessed of this belief he properly concludes that we ought to be continually making preparations for war in time of peace. I do not believe that any European or Asiatic power is anxious either to enter upon a conflict with us or with any state whose political autonomy they know that we will uphold and protect. Every government on this earth knows that we will not permit any of these republics to be subverted or deprived of their liberty or political rights. If such an attempt was made, there would be genuine war, but foreign powers have no designs of this sort and are not premeditating any such proceedings. They have sufficient troubles of their own without hazarding such a perilous undertaking. They all desire our good will and not our enmity. This whole issue is a dead issue; it has been buried so long that we ought not to drag it from its charnel house. I would suggest, with great respect, that whenever a council of adventurers and speculators notifies us that war ships are on their way to collect their debts, let us solemnly resolve that we will not become unduly agitated, but will exercise a proper degree of self-restraint and patience until the actual demonstration takes place.

A WORLD POWER.

I would like it understood that I am not opposed to this Government making proper efforts at all times through arbitrament or the intervention of its friendly offices to adjust and compromise controversies that other nations are engaged in. If this is what we mean by being a world power, I approve of it in the highest degree. Not only this, but I am in favor of advancing American interests and securing them the same rights and privileges that other nations possess in foreign lands. I have always thought the best way to accomplish this, however, was to open the highways of the ocean, so that our ports should be cleared for the commerce of mankind and so that the handiwork of the American mechanic and the fabric of the American mills could cross the sea and compete with the product of every country in every metropolis and emporium of the civilized world. Be this as it may, let it be understood that I would place no obstacle in our way as a world power, if we mean by this equal rights with every other people upon every avenue of trade and commerce and equal opportunities for American enterprise into whatever distant regions its thrift and industry may desire to venture. So far so good. But if we mean by becoming a world power that we are to take part in all the conflicts between other nations, that whenever a country is to be stolen we shall have an equal opportunity to participate in the plunder, that whenever the territory of a defenseless people is to be partitioned that we are to have a share of the booty, that whenever a national felony or deed of violence is to be committed that we are to have a hand in the pillage, that we are to have equal rights with all the other robbers who have heretofore purloined the fairest portions of the earth, that whenever a helpless State is unable to protect itself and other governments are ready to prey upon it that we must speed our battle ships to the feast and maneuver as a world power for an allotment of its possessions and a dividend of its liberties, if this is what we mean by a world power—and it looks to me as though this is what we do mean—then by whomsoever conceived and by whomsoever executed, regardless of the converts it leads to the altars of our institutions or the captives that it brings with gilded manacles into our realms, I denounce this whole crusade against human rights as a "policy that is at war with the providence of God and makes a mockery of religion's holiest offices."

CONFUSION BETWEEN THE POWER OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE POWER OF THE GOVERNMENT.

I am now about to conclude. In no sentiment that I have expressed have I been actuated by partisan motives. As much as I cherish the principles of my party, I could subordinate the whole of them when they conflict with the welfare of my country. The President and every officer under him to whom governmental policies have been committed have faithfully performed their functions, and they deserve all the commendation that has been accorded to them by the tribute of a united people. Every advance that we have made under their administration has with glowing emphasis, regardless of party lines, received the grateful recognition and acknowledgment of our countrymen. The whole danger that exists with us to-day is in attempting to accomplish too much and involving ourselves in cares and controversies that will only distract and complicate us. There must be a limit to our zeal and a boundary line to our aspirations. It is not necessary that every day shall dawn upon some new accomplishment.

Some years ago in this Hall the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], in an address replete with power and eloquence, gave expression to the following sentiment:

> We will not renounce our part in the mission of our race—trustee, under God, of the civilization of the world. And we will move forward to our work, not howling our regrets like slaves whipped to their burdens, but with gratitude for a task worthy of our strength, and thanksgiving to Almighty God that He has marked us as His chosen people, henceforth to lead in the regeneration of the world.

No member of this body is imbued with deeper religious convictions than I am, but I do not believe in this doctrine that we are trustees under God of the civilization of the world.

The Senator from Indiana will find no such decree as this enrolled in the chancery of heaven. When the time arrives, which I hope may be far distant, and he has passed through the eternal gates, he will search in vain for such a document as this among the archives of the celestial regions. If we are trustees, under what instrument do we hold? We are not a judicial trustee. We may, perhaps, be a constructive trustee, de son tort. One thing is sure, we are not a conventional trustee. Search the Constitution, the origin of the grant, and the Magna Charta of our title, and you fail to find in any one of its provisions a justification for the exercise of such an authority. It is just this unfortunate confusion between the power of the individual and the power of the Government that has cast upon us the onerous burdens that we now assume. This Government is not a foreign missionary society or an institution for the feeble-minded, and however commendable the efforts of individuals may be in this direction, this Government as a government has no such functions to perform. This is our whole trouble. You start from a false premise, and then you conclude that it is our duty as a trustee to march around the outposts of civilization, to patrol the waters of the world, and wherever we can find a feeble or degenerate race to claim them as our cestuis que trust, to appropriate their possessions and then, jure divino, as the chosen people of God, impose upon them our sovereignty. My heart goes out with thrilling love and sympathy for all those self-sacrificing souls who are spreading the solace and comforts of religion in foreign lands, who, courting danger and affliction, have gathered around the emblems of their faith the forsaken children of mankind, and upon every path of human suffering have ministered to the agonies of *despair; but* I can never acquiesce in the proposition that this is a governmental function, and that it is our duty to deprive a single race on earth, no matter how depraved and degenerate it may be, either in the interest of religion or civilization, of the slightest fragment of its possessions or the slightest vestige of its liberty.

I am with the slave in every darkened corner of the globe where he is struggling to be free, and I hope the day will come when every government that is built upon the bowed bodies of its subjects may disintegrate, and that upon its ruins republican institutions may arise. Let me say to you, however, Mr. President, as deeply as I love my country, with all the devotion I would lay upon her altars, with a fervid reverence for her flag wherever its colors greet the eye, I would rather see that flag lowered and trampled upon than used as a pirate's ensign and raised, not as an emblem of honor, but as an instrument of terror and oppression to the helpless and enfeebled races of mankind.

During the delivery of Mr. RAYNER'S speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The Senator from Maryland will suspend for a moment. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue for tonnage.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be laid aside until the Senator from Maryland completes his remarks.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I have some concern about the resolution that is at the head of what was submitted by the Senator from Maryland, and had expected to say a few words upon it. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will agree that the resolution, after the Senator from Maryland finishes, shall go over until such time as I may be able to call it up. I have to leave the city on an important mission and go to South Carolina, and there will not be any chance for me to get in to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that that course will be entirely agreeable to me personally.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to make a request to the Senate that the resolution shall lie on the table and be called up at a subsequent day. I dare say there will be other Senators who will wish to be heard.

Undoubtedly this interpretation, this eloquent indictment of the Roosevelt doctrine, I will call it, will not go unchallenged by our friends on the other side; and I wish to add a little additional reason why it should not go unchallenged. I hope that the request may be in the form which I present, that the resolution, upon the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, shall go over and may be called up at a subsequent day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the Chair will state the request of the Senator from New Hampshire to be that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside until the Senator from Maryland has concluded, and the Senator from South Carolina requests that the resolution may lie on the table.

Mr. TILLMAN. That it may go back on the table to be subject to call at any future day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That it lie on the table subject to the Senator's call at any future day.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

After the conclusion of Mr. RAYNER'S speech,

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business may be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, being Senate bill No. 529.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in his last memorable speech at Buffalo, proclaiming the need of broader markets and a greater foreign commerce, the late President McKinley thus outlined one of the indispensable methods by which that expanded foreign trade must be obtained:

> Then, too, we have inadequate steamship service. New lines of steamers have already been put in commission between the Pacific coast ports of the United States and those on the western coast of Mexico and South and Central America. These should be followed up with direct steamship lines between the eastern coast of the United States and South American ports. One of the needs of the times is direct commercial lines from our vast fields of production to the fields of consumption that we have but barely touched.
>
> Next in advantage to having the thing to sell is to have the convenience to carry it to the buyer. We must encourage our merchant marine. We must have more ships. They must be under the American flag, built and manned and owned by Americans. These will not only be profitable in a commercial sense, they will be messengers of peace and amity wherever they go.

Since that time President Roosevelt has on three different occasions called the attention of Congress to this matter. In his annual message of December 7, 1903, he recommended the appointment of a commission to investigate the subject of the merchant marine, with a view to appropriate legislation. Congress responded to that suggestion, and appointed a joint Commission of the two bodies, which Commission made an exhaustive investigation, their conclusions being embodied in two elaborate printed reports, and the bill now under consideration was also prepared by that Commission.

In his latest message to Congress, on the 5th day of December last, President Roosevelt said:

> To the spread of our trade in peace and the defense of our flag in war a great and prosperous merchant marine is indispensable. We should have ships of our own and seamen of our own to convey our goods to neutral markets, and in case of need to reenforce our battle line. It can not but be a source of regret and uneasiness to us that the lines of communication with our sister Republics of South America should be chiefly under foreign control. It is not a good thing that American merchants and manufacturers should have to send their goods and letters to South America via Europe if they wish security and dispatch. Even on the Pacific, where our ships have held their own better than on the Atlantic, our merchant flag is now threatened through the liberal aid bestowed by other governments on their own steam lines. I ask your earnest consideration of the report with which the Merchant Marine Commission has followed its long and careful inquiry.

The practical question now before us is, Will Congress heed the admonitions of Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt, or will it continue to neglect this most important industry until the remnant of our once prosperous merchant marine is driven from the seas?

To-day alone of all the nations ambitious for mercantile expansion the United States neglects its ocean shipping. Our coast fleets and our lake fleets, protected by ancient Federal statutes absolutely excluding foreign vessels from domestic traffic, are the most efficient, prosperous, and progressive in the world, as they are also incomparably the greatest in their aggregate tonnage. These domestic fleets are superb proof of American genius for the industry of water-borne transportation. Taking the coast and lake ships and the river boats together, we have a merchant navy of 5,335,000 tons, or six times the size of the poor, shrunken fleet of 888,000 tons registered for foreign commerce, which ought naturally to be now what it long was—by far the greater and richer portion of our whole mercantile marine instead of a starving and lessening fragment.

THE WORST RESULT OF OUR LACK OF SHIPS.

The decline of our ocean tonnage is a melancholy story. There is no need to rehearse it now. The Merchant Marine Commission in the whole course of its investigation sought to deal rather with the present and the future, and to regard the past

only for what light it could shed on the work in hand—the imperative task of rehabilitation. Sad as is the long decay of our deep-sea shipping—once the proudest in the world—the gradual disappearance of our shipyards, the bankruptcy of our ship merchants, the loss of our skilled mechanics and seamen, this, after all, though a calamity and a great one, is far less serious for the present, less portentous for the future, than the cramping and withering effect of our lack of American ships on the export trade of the United States. William McKinley's prophetic vision, in that final address of his to his fellow-countrymen, saw that without ships of our own to convey our goods to our customers we should be more and more hopelessly handicapped against our maritime competitors in the neutral markets of the world.

NO MERCHANT WOULD RISK IT.

To take a familiar but just illustration, What department store in any American city, engaged in a sharp contest for business, would dream of intrusting to a rival store the delivery of its goods to its customers? Is it not a fundamental principle of such keen competitive business—with which the rivalry of America and Europe in international commerce may not inaptly be compared—is it not the prime instinct of every successful merchant in such business to maintain an active and comprehensive delivery service of his own? Would any merchant conducting such a store sell or lay up his own wagons and neglect to provide others, even if his competitor offered to do the work more cheaply? It would be a poor judge of human nature, indeed, who would consent to such a proposition. His fellow merchants, partners, or assignees in the bankruptcy proceedings, that would certainly ensue, would have grave question of his sanity.

Yet the stupid merchant who turns his delivery service over to his rivals rather than be bothered with it himself has one conspicuous exemplar among the nations in the person of the United States. There are two other commercial nations of inferior rank which have also won an unenviable reputation for neglect of their delivery service—of their merchant shipping facilities. One of these two nations is China, the other is Russia. The fact speaks for itself with sufficient eloquence.

THE EXAMPLE OF OUR COMPETITORS.

But neither Russia nor China is the real rival of America. Our formidable competitors are the island kingdom of Great Britain and the two continental nations that front, the one on the North Sea, the other on the Bay of Biscay. What Great Britain, Germany, and France have done and are doing is of very live significance to the United States.

In the first place, all through the years when the world's ships were built of wood, and, service considered, built most cheaply in America, Great Britain rigidly denied registry to all vessels launched outside the United Kingdom. This was not altered to a so-called "free-ship" policy until it had become manifest that iron was destined to supplant wood as the material for ship construction, and that in constructing iron ships Great Britain had marked advantages over America. The free-ship legislation of Parliament, in 1849, was virtually nullified until 1854 by Lloyd's discriminations against American-built vessels. Here is one example of the historic British determination to have British commerce conveyed in British ships—a determination which, ever since Cromwell's time, had molded all the ingeniously and savagely protective navigation laws of the British Government.

EARLY BRITISH SUBSIDIES.

In 1840 the first regular line of British trans-Atlantic steamships—now the celebrated Cunard Line—was established, with an annual subsidy of several hundred thousand dollars. At that time, and for years before, the entire trans-Atlantic packet service in sail ships was conducted in American ships by American merchants. This packet service was the direct outgrowth of our own navigation laws, with their discriminating duties and tonnage dues, initiated in 1789 by Washington, Madison, and Jefferson. British competition with our packet lines, often attempted, had always proved impossible.

But in steam engines, and subsequently in iron hulls, Great Britain saw her opportunity, and was quick to improve it. Her subsidized steam line in turn began to drive our sailing packets off the ocean. The United States, under the initiative of President Polk and by vote of a Democratic Congress, met this attack by the offer of generous mail subsidies to American trans-Atlantic steam lines, of which the Collins line became the most famous and successful. The new American steamers were larger and faster than the Cunard ships, and soon possessed themselves of the lion's share of the trans-Atlantic commerce. Great Britain was now paying large sums of money for the transportation of her mails in exclusively British steamers, which were being regularly beaten by the Americans. This was maritime protectionism carried to an extreme, but on the ocean the British Government never wavered. Mr. Cobden, Mr. Gladstone, and the other statesmen who were now proclaiming on land the transcendent virtues of free trade nevertheless continued to vote lavish subsidies to the inferior Cunard ships that but for the subsidies would have been straightway driven off the passage.

Not only were these subsidies continued, but after a time they were very heavily increased, in a hope of securing improved speed. What the end of this rivalry would have been if the United States had held on can only be conjectured; but the unhappy feud between the North and South in Congress led to the canceling of the mail subsidies in 1858, at the very crisis of the contest between American and British shipowners. Not only the Collins but the other American companies were killed by this act, and for thirty years after 1861 the British flag retained undisputed mastery of the North Atlantic.

THE BRITISH PURPOSE.

That the British statesmen of 1840 to 1861 held President McKinley's view of the intimate relations of a country's ships to that country's commerce is demonstrated in this significant extract from the report of the parliamentary committee on contract packets in 1853:

> The objects which appear to have led to the formation of these contracts, and to the larger expenditures involved, were to afford us rapid, frequent, and punctual communication with distant ports which feed the main arteries of British commerce, and with the most important of our foreign possessions, to foster maritime enterprise and to encourage the production of a superior class of vessels, which would promote the convenience and wealth of the country in time of peace and assist in defending its shores against hostile aggression.

Indeed, British appreciation of the commercial maxim that "trade follows the flag" was so keen and thorough that a generous subsidy was granted for the creation of a British steamship line along the west coast of South America that touched at no British port whatever. Lindsay, the historian of British merchant shipping, says of the motives that prompted this significant action:

> The extension of British influence and British commerce was doubtless the chief inducement for supporting this communication between the Republics of New Grenada, Bolivia, Peru, and Chile, the nature and extent of that traffic rendering it necessary for the English to maintain mercantile establishments in the chief ports and towns of the western coast of the Pacific, and thus justifying the Government in incurring this expense. (W. S. Lindsay, History of Merchant Shipping, Vol. IV, p. 317.)

THE WORK OF AN AMERICAN.

This British steamship line in the Southern Pacific, thus started, is in existence to-day as the Pacific Steam Navigation Company. This company and the British "mercantile establishments" connected with it are an important, and probably the most potent, factor in the supremacy which Great Britain has held and now holds in Chile and the neighboring countries of South America. It is one of the ironies of fate that the actual founding of this powerful British steam line was the work of an American, a New England merchant, Mr. William Wheelwright, United States consul at Guayaquil, who first sought to interest his own Government in the project of an American steamship service on the west coast of South America; but he was rebuffed at Washington, and denied all help and encouragement. Not until then did he go to England. Parliament promptly granted the necessary subsidy, but required, of course, that the steamships not only should fly the British colors, but should be British-built—although Mr. Wheelwright was authorized to use the successful American model and arrangement.

Besides this British steamship line, that traversed a course where not one port was British, Parliament, by a generous subsidy of $1,200,000 yearly, created a British steam line to the West Indies, the Isthmus of Panama, Brazil, and Argentina. This was half a century ago; the Royal Mail service, with its business firmly established, has had its subsidy of late years reduced to about $400,000. So effective has been this British maritime protectionism that in the ports not only of Chile, but of Bolivia, Peru, Argentina, and Brazil the Stars and Stripes flying over an American merchant steamer are now never seen, while British commerce, which these subsidies were given to promote, far surpasses ours in every one of these Latin-American republics.

GERMANY'S STEAMSHIP LINES.

The one Old World nation which has made prodigious strides in foreign commerce of recent years, our ever vigilant and most formidable competitor, is the Empire of Germany, a thoroughly protectionist nation like our own. Until a quarter of a century ago, German sea power was absolutely insignificant. The Em-

pire had a small war navy and a small and not very prosperous or efficient merchant fleet. The chief German ships, both of war and of commerce, were British built. In 1881–82, when the Rhaetia and Rugia of 3,500 tons were launched for the Hamburg-American Company, not more than three or four small steamers of the deep-sea type had ever been constructed in German yards. A "free-ship" policy was in force, under which German shipowners bought nearly all of their ocean tonnage in England, Scotland, or America. But it is significant that under this "free-ship" policy, long and patiently tried, there had come no real growth in the German marine. German tonnage, like French tonnage under a similar trial of the "free-ship" policy, remained almost at a standstill. The Bureau Veritas records give Germany a merchant shipping of 1,098,000 tons in 1873, and of 1,277,000 tons in 1881. In Germany as in France, free ships, tested alone without national aid and encouragement, had utterly failed to bring any substantial increase in the commerce-creating power of the national marine.

In 1881, France, dismayed at the results of a "free-ship" policy, turned to subsidies and bounties in a belated and desperate effort to save her shipbuilding and navigation. The German statesmen at the same time resolved to do the same thing. Bismarck himself, then at the zenith of his fame and power, addressed an urgent memorial to the German Parliament, invoking attention to the French example, and also pointing to the splendid results to British trade and shipping that had followed the long-continued and generous British policy of subsidizing ocean mail lines to the chief markets of the world.

Bismarck argued that Germany was no longer merely an agricultural, but was becoming a manufacturing and commercial nation; that such a nation must inevitably seek new outlets for the surplus products of its industry; that it could never hope to gain a fair share of the world's commerce so long as it depended on the ships of its foreign rivals for the means of delivering its own merchandise to neutral customers. The great German statesman called upon the legislators to provide immediately national encouragement to German steamship lines, so that German manufacturers and merchants could have a fair chance to send their goods to foreign lands, without relying upon foreign steamships owned and run in the interests of their British or French competitors.

There were at that time long-established British and French steamship lines to Asia, Africa, and South America, with connections that enabled them to handle German merchandise. But the far-seeing Bismarck was not content with this. He knew that when German goods were landed at their foreign destination the British or French agents of the steamship companies that handled them were not interested in increasing German sales or advancing German trade, but were very much interested in promoting the commerce of their own countries. Under such circumstances, Bismarck argued, there could of course be no fair play for German goods, and no hope of a very large increase in the commerce of the Empire.

Germany in 1885 had, under its protective system, so developed its manufacturing resources that, like the United States in 1905, it found the need of a foreign outlet more and more imperative. Bismarck's plea for German ships to deliver German goods to foreign customers won from the Reichstag a law granting a mail subvention of 4,400,000 marks ($1,047,500) a year for fifteen years for a German steamship service to China, Japan, and Australia. That the chief motive of this subvention was to promote commerce rather than to secure swift auxiliary cruisers, or even to facilitate the mails, is shown by the fact that the required speed was only 11½ to 13 knots an hour. The service was undertaken by the North German Lloyd Steamship Company, of Bremen, and the first steamer sailed for the East in June, 1886.

Hitherto German shipowners, under a "free ship" policy, which discouraged German shipbuilding, had procured abroad most of their vessels—including all the largest and best of their ocean-going fleet. Now, however, there came a significant new departure. The German Government required that, in order to receive this mail subvention, the steamships performing the service should be built in German yards, by German workmen, and, as far as possible, of German materials. In other words, so far as this new German steamship fleet was concerned, the free ship policy that had been tried and proved disappointing, was abandoned.

THE GAIN OF GERMAN TRADE.

When the mail subvention was granted and the new German steamships put to sea the Empire had very little trade with Australasia and the Orient. This distant commerce had long been regarded as a British or a French monopoly, and the pioneer German liners went out with almost empty holds. Without Government aid the new steamship service never could have been started, or, if started, it could not have lived a year. Indeed, the total receipts of the German East India service were 7,920,000 marks for 1887, exclusive of the subvention of 4,400,000 marks, while the expenses were 12,823,000 marks—so that the service almost showed a deficit, even with the Government assistance. But year after year there came a gradual improvement. Cargoes and passengers both increased until eventually the service was on a profitable basis.

The important fact, however, is not that the steamship company finally earned dividends, but that this mail subvention of 4,400,000 marks a year, creating a new line of German steamers, finally brought a greatly increased commerce to the German people.

In 1888, two years after the East India service started, the exports of merchandise by these German ships were in quantity 27,369 tons, and in value 33,190,000 marks. By 1896 these exports had increased to 89,148 tons, valued at 74,433,000 marks. A mail subvention of 4,400,000 marks a year had brought an increased export trade of more than 50,000,000 marks to the German Empire, and this was only the beginning of German expansion in the markets of the Orient.

ANOTHER GERMAN SUCCESS.

So successful did the East India mail subvention prove, in expanding German commerce with China, Japan, and Australia, that in 1890 the Reichstag granted another subvention to create a German steam line to East Africa. There was no pretense that this was necessary for postal purposes, for the German mails were conveyed rapidly to African ports by long-established British and French steamers, which were also available to carry German merchandise. The subvention was offered frankly to increase German trade and German influence.

The East Africa service was a shorter route, and at first only small vessels were required. The subvention therefore was set at 900,000 marks ($214,000) a year, and the ships employed were smaller and less powerful than the ordinary coast craft of the United States. But they went out direct from Germany—there was no transshipment of freight; they bore the German flag; they were officered and manned by loyal Teuton sailors, and the agents of the steamship company in the East African ports were German merchants, with everything at stake in increasing the sales of German merchandise. As a natural result, German commerce with East Africa grew so rapidly that the German steamship receipts from freight and passengers advanced from 453,000 marks, or only a little more than twice the subvention in 1892, to 1,476,000 marks, or seven times the subvention in 1898.

This swift and great expansion of German trade, under the impulse of generous mail subventions to German steamships, offers a significant contrast with our own stand-still commerce in those South American countries where all the ocean-going ships fly European flags and are controlled by European interests.

Experience with the mail subvention as a means of fostering German commerce so thoroughly satisfied the German Government and people that in 1898 and 1899 the Reichstag directed the renewal of both the Asiatic and the African mail contracts for another fifteen-year period—increasing the former compensation from 4,400,000 to 5,590,000 marks, and the latter from 900,000 to 1,350,000 marks, and requiring at the same time an improved and extended service. But no "greyhound" speed was exacted of these German steamers. The moderate rate of about 13 knots on the Asiatic and from 10½ to 12 knots on the African line was regarded as sufficient for German commercial purposes.

STILL OTHER GERMAN AIDS.

These imperial mail subventions are by no means the only method by which the German Government encourages shipping in order to expand German commerce. Shipyard materials are hauled at a nominal figure on the German State railways—a virtual bounty on shipbuilding. These State railways also transport at a very low rate merchandise intended for export by German steamers. British merchants complain that this German railway policy is throwing more and more of the Far Eastern carrying trade into German ships, to the severe injury of London and Hull and Plymouth and Liverpool. Moreover, all the mighty influence of the Imperial Government is constantly exerted to applaud and honor all those who are connected with the building up of German shipping and the expansion of German commerce—an agency which, says Consul-General Mason at Berlin, "in a country like this where royal favor is so potent and eagerly sought for is an important element of success."

Not until Germany began to own and build her own ships to carry her own trade did she begin to be considered as a serious factor in the commerce of the world. Her wonderful maritime

expansion has made her mercantile expansion possible. The clear vision of the great Bismarck first recognized that his country must have ships in order to have commerce, and that to have ships meant increased prosperity not only for the seaport towns, but for every manufacturing village or agricultural district producing anything that could be sold abroad. German merchant tonnage that under a "free-ship" policy, without State aid, increased only from 1,098,000 in 1873 to 1,277,000 in 1881, has, with State aid, grown to 3,393,000 in 1904, and German commerce has expanded in almost like proportion.

FRANCE DRIVEN TO SUBSIDY.

France, like Germany, long and patiently tried the "free-ship" policy for the ostensible benefit of her shipping and commerce. She adopted this policy in 1866. In 1872–73, dismayed by the results of "free ships," France resorted for a short time to discriminating duties, but was forced to abandon them because of the threatened retaliation of other nations, the United States included. "Free ships" were then renewed. In 1870 France had a merchant tonnage of 1,072,000; in 1881, after a long experiment with "free ships," French tonnage had fallen to 914,000, while French shipbuilding, overwhelmed by British competition, was so nearly dead that it was a difficult problem to keep up the construction of the navy.

After this illuminating experience the French Government, in 1881, offered an elaborate system of bounties for shipbuilding and subsidies for navigation, applying to the entire ocean-going merchant fleet of France. The system was experimental. It was successful from the first in encouraging French navigation—the proportion of long-voyage traffic under the French flag increasing from 28 per cent in 1880 to 39 per cent in 1890. Outside of the postal lines, France in 1881 had only two lines of ocean steamships. But by 1890, under the effect of the navigation subsidies, France had five lines to Brazil and Argentina (the United States now has not one), three lines to New York, three to Senegal, and two to the west coast of Africa, and one line each to Cochin China, Chile, Madagascar, New Orleans, the West Indies, Mexico, and the Isthmus of Panama. At first the effect on French shipbuilding was disappointing, and an excessive subsidy to sail craft led to an abnormal increase of French sail tonnage at the expense of steam. However, in successive revisions of the French subsidy law these defects, that had provoked severe criticism, were amended, until of recent years there has been a large and reasonably steady growth in the entire French marine. French steam tonnage, which was 805,000 (gross) in 1890, had gained to 1,266,000 in 1904, while French sail tonnage had increased from 298,000 (net) to 494,000.

FOREIGN METHODS AND OUR OWN.

The real backbone of the French merchant marine is composed of the two great ocean mail companies, the Compagnie Générale Transatlantique and the Messageries Maritimes, the latter giving French merchants postal and freight communication with the Orient. Each of these two great companies has long received mail subventions of from $1,500,000 to $2,000,000 a year, and that their influence in building up French trade has been potent is demonstrated by the fact that Bismarck pointed to the French lines especially as proof that Germany must follow the French example or give up all hope of securing a fair share of the commerce of the world.

Germany now pays an annual subvention of $1,330,000 to the North German Lloyd for a steamship service to China, Japan, and Australia. Great Britain pays $1,600,000 to the Peninsular and Oriental for a steamship service to the Orient. France, as has been said, gives to each of her two great companies a mail subvention of from $1,500,000 to $2,000,000 a year. The United States in the fiscal year 1904 paid in mail subventions to all the lines under the American flag (including $690,000 to the American line to Europe) only $1,375,000, or but a little more than the German Pacific line received, and much less than Great Britain and France gave to a single one of their great steamship companies.

THE COST OF OUR NEGLECT.

It is manifest that this niggardly policy on the part of the United States not only discourages American shipowning and shipbuilding, but—far more important—hampers the efforts of American manufacturers, farmers, and merchants to gain their rightful share of the world's commerce. These great ocean mail lines of the powers of Europe all run direct from their own ports to the ports of the other continents. These powers spend no subsidies on lines from the United States. The European ships that engage in American trade with South America, Africa, and the Orient are as a rule poor, slow, inefficient, uneconomical craft—the cast-off "tramps" of European services. They are owned and managed by foreign companies, whose first concern is for the welfare of their own nation and for the profit of their main lines of communication. As the president of the British Peninsular and Oriental, in a recent address boasted:

> Our policy is that of a British company which is keenly alive to British interests, and I believe in this respect we represent the general feeling of the shipowners of the country.

European shipowners are frankly working to keep their own country's trade as great, and the trade of the United States as small, as possible. To leave to men like these the ocean transportation service of America is, to quote Thomas Jefferson, a "strange speculation," which, if long continued, would mark the United States as a simpleton among the nations.

FOR BROAD NATIONAL INTERESTS.

The plea of the Merchant Marine Commission, indorsed by the Committee on Commerce of this body, is not primarily for the shipowners or shipbuilders, or even for the seamen of this country, though all of these three classes deserve at least as much consideration as is granted by our national laws to any other industrious and patriotic body of American citizens. The need of a large, active and prosperous merchant fleet is primarily to increase our commerce, next to promote the national defense, and last of all to encourage shipbuilding and navigation. To deny adequate consideration to the merchant marine is to cheat the western or southern farmer of one of the surest hopes of an increased market for the products of his industry. It is to cheat the merchant and manufacturer of an indispensable ally in their fight for trade with their powerful European competitors.

Britain, France, and Germany all make generous provision by national subvention for conveying not only their mails but their merchandise under their national flags to the distant neutral markets in which they and we are contending for the commercial mastery. Even the smaller powers—Spain, Italy, Austria, Portugal, and last, but not least, Japan—do the same thing. The United States alone leaves its merchants, manufacturers, and farmers at the edge of the ocean to get their goods over seas as best they may—by some accident of trade or the grace of their foreign rivals. If we lag in the world's markets, if we fall behind even in the Philippines, our own possessions, if we see Germany striding ahead of us in the Orient, and all Europe grasping South America by commercial bonds stronger than the Monroe Doctrine, the fault is our own, and in our own hands lies the remedy.

"IF FOREIGNERS WILL DO THIS WORK FOR US MORE CHEAPLY THAN WE CAN DO IT OURSELVES, WHY NOT LET THEM?"

One of the most frequent and plausible objections urged to a policy of national encouragement to the merchant marine is found in this question, "If foreigners will do this work for us more cheaply than we can do it ourselves, why not let them?" Critically examined, however, it is nothing but the fundamental free-trade argument in the most extreme form in which it is possible to state it. Many years ago this very same plausible argument was familiar in another field—"If England, France, and other countries can make our cotton and woolen fabrics, our tools, and our iron more cheaply than we can, why not let them do so—why not let Europe be the workshop and America the farm?" Of course Europe enthusiastically favored this idea; and Washington, Hamilton, Madison, and other far-seeing statesmen who framed in 1789 our first tariff law "for the encouragement and protection of manufactures" had considerable difficulty in convincing their countrymen of the fallacy of this adroit plea, which foreign interests now exploit in turn against the encouragement of American shipping.

If the argument were admitted as a sound one, that if foreigners will do or make anything for us more cheaply than our own people, they ought to be permitted to do so, then the entire protective system of the United States is rooted in a delusion, and ought to be abandoned, root and branch. To admit that this argument is sound is to admit the whole free-trade contention, pure and simple.

APPLY THIS TO THE FARMERS.

This adroit argument of those who are opposed to national aid for American shipping depends for its force very largely on the class of men before whom it is used, or the latitude or longitude in which it is promulgated. To say, "If foreigners can do our ocean carrying more cheaply than we can, why not let them do it?" sounds very persuasive to the farmer of either Massachusetts or Minnesota, who is not himself particularly interested in shipbuilding or shipowning. But put this same argument in another form to the Massachusetts farmer: "If the Canadians can supply eggs and butter and hay and potatoes more cheaply than you can, why not tear down the tariff wall and let them do so?" or to the Minnesota farmer: "If Manitoba can raise wheat for the American market more cheaply than you can, why not repeal the protective duty of 25 cents per

bushel and let Manitoba raise our wheat while you sell out and go to work for somebody else?"—the public man who propounded this question in either Massachusetts or Minnesota would find himself a quick candidate for retirement.

Yet, if the farmers, East and West, expect and demand national encouragement for their industry through the Department of Agriculture, through irrigation, and in many ways, as well as through the tariff, why should not the shipowner and the seaman in the deep-sea trade have some encouragement also? Why should protection be applied to the one class, and free trade to the other? Where is the equity of taking an immigrant fresh from Germany or Scandinavia, setting him on a western farm, irrigated at the national expense, and giving this same immigrant generous protection on his cereals or his fruits, while all protection is denied to an American-born shipowner or seaman whose ancestors fought under Paul Jones, or Decatur, or Hull, or who himself fought under Farragut, or Porter, or Dewey, or Sampson, or Schley?

If protection is wise and right for the one, why is it not wise and right for the other?

BUILT UNDER PROTECTION.

The American shipowner or seaman is compelled to build and equip his ship in a protected country, to pay protected wages, and to buy protected materials—for, though steel and other things for ships for the deep sea as distinguished from the coast trade are on the free list, nobody dares to avail himself of the privilege so long as there is no encouragement or protection in the deep-sea business. The wages on the ship after she is built are fixed, generally, by the protected wages prevailing in America. Moreover, many foreign ships in our own commerce receive subsidies or bounties, and nearly all are protected and encouraged, if not in this, in some other more subtle but effective way by their own governments.

In the face of all this, to accept the free-trade argument for the shipowner and seaman alone, and to say to them, "Here, if the foreigners can do your trade of ocean carrying more cheaply than you can, we'll let them do so—you can sell out and go to work for somebody else" is an injustice so harsh that the farmers, East, South, and West, need only to understand it to reject it at once and forever. If, in addition to the natural advantage of the cheap and fertile lands of Manitoba, the Canadian government gave a bounty of 25 cents a bushel on all the wheat there produced, it is easy to foresee what would soon become of the wheat raisers of the Dakotas and Minnesota. Yet, if the argument is a sound one that whatever foreigners can, by subsidy or otherwise, do more cheaply than we can, they ought to be allowed to do it, who will gainsay the shipowner or seaman who declares: "Here I am, unprotected in my ocean trade. Why should the farmer be protected? If Canada can raise cheaper wheat for New York and New England, pull down the tariff and let her do so. What right have you to deny protection to me, and at the same time forbid me to go with my ship for my wheat to British Columbia if I can get it cheaper there, or to Nova Scotia for my potatoes, or to Argentina for my beef, or wool, or hides?"

And what answer is there, truly? Is protection justifiable that protects some only, and not all?

CHEAPER IN THE LONG RUN.

Moreover, it is worth considering whether, even if it is true that foreigners can now do our ocean carrying more cheaply than we, it would be true some years hence if this our one unprotected industry were adequately and firmly protected and encouraged. Many, many years ago, when this same plea that the foreigners could do the work more cheaply than we could was being used against the efforts of Washington and his colleagues to develop American manufactures, it was also true that foreigners—the English—could, and were doing, our ocean carrying trade more cheaply. In 1789 the American merchant fleet in overseas commerce registered only 123,000 tons, and all but 23 per cent of our own imports and exports were conveyed by foreigners. There were those then, as there are now, who, for self-interest or other reasons, insisted that if the English could carry our goods more cheaply they ought to be permitted to continue to do so, regardless of its effect not only on American ship building and owning, but on the national defence. However, Washington, Adams, Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, and the other great men of the Government took another and a broader view, and in their protective legislation included our shipowners, seamen, and fishermen—the fishermen by direct bounties, the others by the requirement that goods imported in American ships should come in at a lower rate of duty, and that their tonnage taxes should be less than were charged to their foreign competitors. This policy proved splendidly successful.

In 1789, as has been said, our registered merchant fleet consisted of only 123,000 tons, conveying 23 per cent of our commerce. In 1800 our merchant shipping had risen to 667,000 tons, conveying 89 per cent of our commerce, which, meanwhile, had very heavily increased. In 1810 our registered shipping stood at 981,000 tons, or actually 100,000 tons greater than our registered fleet of 1904.

THE LESSON OF EXPERIENCE.

Washington and his associates believed that in the course of time American ships, protected and encouraged, would be enabled to carry our goods even more cheaply than foreigners, and this confidence was perfectly justified by the result. American wages on shipboard and in the shipyards were higher as a rule than foreign wages, though the difference was not so great as now. American timber was cheaper than English, though not cheaper than north European timber, yet the materials, then as now, were a minor factor in the cost of ship construction. As the shipping business throve under national protection in the years from 1789 to 1830 and onward, American ships, built in great numbers, the product of a firm, thoroughly organized, and prosperous industry, gradually became the cheapest, because the most efficient carriers in the world. It was a common remark that an American vessel, managed by a sagacious, enterprising merchant and hard driven by skillful, well-paid officers and crew, could make four or five voyages while an English or Dutch vessel was making three. So well and so cheaply did American ships convey commerce that in the heyday of the Atlantic packets, before 1840, every packet line between our ports and Europe flew the United States flag—in eloquent contrast to present conditions, when only one of the scores of trans-Atlantic steam lines is American.

Washington's faith, therefore, that with proper encouragement his own country's ships and seamen would be doing our carrying trade and doing it more cheaply, was abundantly justified long before the first subsidized Cunard steamship crossed the ocean, in 1840. Meanwhile, the system of ship-protection by discriminating duty and tonnage dues had been steadily reduced as our shipping grew and prospered, though this system was not entirely abandoned against Britain, our chief competitor, until 1849. At that time, it was believed that American maritime supremacy was thoroughly established. In 1855 we had a registered tonnage of 2,348,000, which conveyed 75 per cent of our foreign commerce besides much of that of other nations. But for the change from wood to iron and from steam to sail, the application of generous steamship subsidies, first by England and then by continental Europe, and the outbreak of our Civil War, the United States, with its unrivalled native aptitude for the sea, would undoubtedly have remained a great ocean carrier. But these unforeseen events undid the work which Washington and his fellow-statesmen had so wisely initiated.

However, our national experience from 1789 to 1860 proved that adequate protection to American shipping meant in the long run not only as cheap but cheaper ocean carrying than foreign nations were providing. The presumption, therefore, is a reasonable one, that though foreigners may now carry our goods more cheaply than we can, just as they did in 1789, yet American shipping, properly encouraged and strengthened, will before very long be able to do the work more cheaply as well as more efficiently than the foreigners.

THE EXAMPLE OF THE GREAT LAKES.

This reasonable presumption is fortified by a striking development which has occurred in recent years on the Great Lakes of America. Here, by the joint operation of National laws and natural causes, American shipowners have been given not mere protection and encouragement but absolute monopoly. Our coastwise statutes forbid foreign ships to convey either freight or passengers from one American port to another, and most of the Great Lakes' commerce is American in origin and destination. Moreover, only relatively small vessels, inadequate for the present carrying of bulk cargoes, can pass from the ocean into the Lakes via the St. Lawrence canals. Practically the whole evolution of Lake traffic has, therefore, been worked out by Americans, with foreign competition excluded. The result is exceedingly important and instructive. In 1886 it cost 3.68 cents a bushel to carry wheat from Chicago to Buffalo, and 62 cents a ton to carry coal from Buffalo to Duluth. In 1904 that had been reduced to 1.32 and 34 cents, respectively. Nowhere in the world is water transporation now so cheap, work considered, as on the Great Lakes, and nowhere has there been such a steady and marked reduction in the cost of the service.

JUST A FAIR CHANCE.

What is true of the steady reduction of cost in the lake trade is true also of the coastwise trade of the Atlantic and Pacific, from which the competition of foreign vessels is altogether ex-

cluded. National aid to the deep-sea carrying trade of the United States does not mean a monopoly for American ships; it means simply the putting of American ships on an equality, to start with, with foreign ships, trusting to the ingenuity and enterprise of our people and their native genius for the sea to work constantly toward an ever-decreasing cost of ocean transportation and an ever-increasing efficiency. But a century of economic experience proves beyond dispute that the Government must help its own people to begin—that in not one industry exposed to international competition and controlled at first by foreigners has America been able to make any headway whatsoever without some national assistance and encouragement. In many such industries it is now indisputable that after a reasonable time our own people have managed to do the work as cheaply as, or more cheaply, than the foreigners.

OF TRUE NATIONAL BENEFIT.

In such instances, of course, all or most of the money previously sent abroad for the products of an industry is now retained in the United States, furnishing a new market for American materials and labor. It is estimated that the annual cost of transporting the imports and exports, the mails and the passengers in the over-seas trade of this country is about $200,000,000, nine-tenths of which goes to the ships of foreign nations. If even so much as one-half of this immense yearly expenditure could be transferred to our own ships and seamen, the number of those ships and seamen would have to be multiplied five-fold—benefiting directly not only the shipbuilding and shipowning States, but all the States that furnish the timber, steel, and other materials entering into ship construction, and creating an important new market for the product of American farms. The lumbermen of Michigan, Wisconsin, Georgia, Florida, and the Carolinas, the iron miners of Wisconsin and Minnesota, and the coal miners of Pennsylvania, Illinois, Maryland, West Virginia, and Alabama would have more work and more wages if the great ships that convey our deep-sea commerce were built of American material, wrought together in American yards. The real "raw material" of a ship is the tree in the forest or the ore in the ground. At least 99 per cent of the total cost of that ship represents employment given to labor in the mines, the forests, the lumber mills, and the steel mills or foundries, as well as in the coast town where all these things are assembled in the finished vessel.

The free-trade argument involved in the plausible question, "If foreigners can build and sail our ships more cheaply, why not let them do so?" ignores these considerations altogether.

NEEDED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.

But there is still another consideration, and, perhaps, the most significant of all, which makes it wise for the United States to have an ocean shipping of its own—the need of ships and seamen for the national defense. This proposition is as true to-day as it was in 1794, when Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State, wrote in behalf of the new national policy of aiding and encouraging the merchant marine. Jefferson said:

> To force shipbuilding is to establish shipyards, is to form magazines, to multiply useful hands, to produce artists and workmen of every kind, who may be found at once for the peaceful speculations of commerce and the terrible wants of war. * * * For a navigating people to purchase its marine afloat would be a strange speculation, as the marine would always be dependent on the merchants furnishing them. Placing, as a reserve, with a foreign nation or in a foreign shipyard the carpenters, blacksmiths, calkers, sailmakers, and the vessels of a nation would be a singular commercial combination. We must, therefore, build them for ourselves.

In Jefferson's time ships of war and of commerce were of wood. Their construction was relatively simple, and the means to build them were not difficult to improvise. But now, when all ships of war, as well as all large ships of commerce, are of steel, of huge size and weight, equipped with elaborate machinery, a nation which neglects its own shipyards to "purchase its marine afloat" engages in a "strange speculation" indeed, far more hazardous than it would have been in the eighteenth century. To construct and furnish a shipyard now requires not several months but several years. One of the newer yards of this country—not the largest, but an excellent one—represented in its buildings and machinery an investment, before it had built a single ship, of seven or eight million dollars.

NO SHIPYARDS, NO ARMOR CLADS.

One after another, of recent years, nearly all of the great shipyards of the United States capable of building first-class armor clads have gone into bankruptcy or escaped bankruptcy only by radical reorganization. This effectually disposes of the assertion, so familiar once on the part of objectors to national aid to the merchant marine, that American shipbuilders were already making inordinate profits. It is an important fact, which must be remembered, that shipyards possessing the heavy and costly machinery requisite for the construction of steel ships of the line can not be developed and maintained alone by the demands of the coastwise trade, whose vessels as a rule are of moderate power and dimensions. Nor are there enough new battle ships at any time in hand to keep busy and prosperous the number of large shipyards that would be required to meet the shock of a serious and protracted naval war.

If the United States persists in its present policy of neglecting its deep-sea shipping it will not be long before the shipbuilding facilities of the country will have shrunk to what the coast trade can support, and in that case, if great battle ships are to be built in America at all, they must be constructed at the naval stations, with the very much increased cost which characterizes every such attempt to turn a private business or industry over to the Government. At present there is only one naval station in the country which has the means to build a first-rate war vessel. Our entire battle line, with one exception (the *Connecticut*—the *Texas* is a second-class vessel), has been launched by the great private shipyards, which will almost certainly vanish if our deep-sea fleet disappears. With these yards, of course, will go their superb staffs of highly trained engineers and their intelligent and experienced workmen. The value of such a national asset as these skillful men are, in time of need, is something which does not need to be argued in any other country but America.

When foreign steamship managers, therefore, urge so plausibly, "If we can do your ocean carrying more cheaply than you yourselves, why not let us do so?" they understand perfectly well that so long as America has no ocean ships of her own her coasts, as well as her commerce, are exposed to foreign aggression. Two of the foreign steamship managers who have been exploiting this plea of "cheapness" most persistently took some of their fastest and best steamships out of their New York service and sold them to Spain as cruisers and commerce destroyers in her war with the United States.

WAR SHIPS NOT TO BE BOUGHT OFFHAND.

In that war the United States found how delusive was one argument which had been used against national aid to our ocean shipping and shipbuilding, as well as against the proper increase of our Navy—that in case of need ships could be bought abroad. With the great emergency fund of $50,000,000 available, and with naval officers and diplomatic agents scouring the docks and arsenals of Europe, our Government was able to find and purchase only a few insignificant craft—two small cruisers, one gunboat, and one torpedo boat. Of these, only one cruiser and the gunboat could be delivered before the actual outbreak of the war, adding almost nothing to the actual fighting power of the United States. The war was won by fighting ships built in American shipyards.

Before the war, the Navy and War Departments did, however, manage to purchase an inadequate number of foreign steamers for transports, colliers, and supply ships—indispensable auxiliaries which ought easily to have been supplied from our own merchant marine if the deep-sea fleet had been in any way sufficient, even for a hundred days' conflict with a fifth-rate power. Of course, these foreign vessels so hastily bought were, as a rule, unfit for the required service. In many cases they were secured only by a sharp straining of the neutrality laws, and in most cases the ships had to be laid up idle in an hour of imperative need because their foreign officers and crews refused to risk their lives for a flag they did not love, in a war in which they had no interest.

MEN AS WELL AS SHIPS.

And this brings up forcibly another important consideration—that if we allow foreigners to do all our ocean carrying, we shall find ourselves without seamen as well as without ships in the shock of a sudden emergency. American officers and sailors have so shrunk in numbers with the decline of our ocean tonnage that the United States Navy has long been without the material for an efficient seagoing reserve, which England, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan have steadily regarded as of the very first importance. Admiral Sampson declared, just after the war with Spain, that in that little three months' affair the United States had exhausted its maritime resources—that we had put afloat all our available, trained officers and men in our first fighting line, and that if a single disaster had compelled us to man another fleet we could not possibly have done it, even if the ships had been forthcoming. Admiral Sampson pointed to this as vivid and conclusive demonstration of the naval need of a great merchant marine.

Foreigners, with their cheap wages and subsidies, may be willing and eager to convey our commerce in peace, but they will not fight our battles and defend our coasts in war. Indeed, as we learned in 1898, they will be likely to be found siding with our enemies, if they are not our enemies themselves.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL.

In the bill under consideration two distinct forms of aid and encouragement for our ocean shipping and ocean commerce are provided, an analysis of which I will undertake to make. One is in the form of new mail subventions to ten specified lines to be established (as set forth in sections 5 and 6), running, three of them, from the Atlantic coast to Brazil, Argentina, and South Africa, respectively; four from ports of the Gulf of Mexico to Brazil, Central America, and the Isthmus of Panama, Cuba, and Mexico, respectively, and three from the Pacific coast—one to Japan, China, and the Philippines, via Hawaii; one to Japan, China, and the Philippines direct, and one to Mexico, Central America, and the Isthmus of Panama. For these ten steamship lines—most of them entirely new services—a maximum compensation of $2,665,000 is proposed, distributed, $1,050,000 to the three Atlantic lines, $475,000 to the four Gulf of Mexico lines, and $1,140,000 to the three lines on the Pacific Ocean.

Besides these ten subventions it is proposed to add $250,000 to the present subvention of $757,000, payable under the postal aid law of 1891 to the American Line of 20-knot mail steamers from New York to Plymouth, Cherbourg, and Southampton, and $217,000 to the $283,000 now paid under the act of 1891 to the Oceanic Line of mail steamers from San Franciso to New Zealand and Australia.

THE MAIL SUBVENTIONS.

The policy of subventions to regular lines of American steamers carrying the ocean mails under contracts is not a new one in the United States. Sixty years ago President Polk recommended and Congress granted liberal subventions, similar to those now proposed, for American steamship lines to Europe, the West Indies, and the Isthmus of Panama. Some of the most earnest advocates of those subventions at that time were Senators from the Southern section of this country, and though the policy was abandoned in the bitter political struggle that preceded the civil war, it was reestablished on a moderate scale in the postal-aid law of 1891, the most important contract under this law—that for our present trans-Atlantic service—having been arranged under the Administration of President Cleveland.

For these mail subventions, therefore, there are excellent precedents in both the legislative and executive policies of the United States Government. So far as these postal payments are concerned, the present bill involves no new departure from the established practice of the nation, no departure, indeed, from the established practice of the world, for every maritime power, without exception, grants liberal subventions to lines of steamships flying its own flag in order to secure the prompt and regular delivery of mails, merchandise, and passengers on the chief routes of its ocean commerce, and to encourage the maintenance of swift and powerful vessels and skilled officers and seamen as auxiliaries to the fighting fleet in time of war.

NAVAL AUXILIARIES.

The acts of Congress, under President Polk and his successors, granting mail subventions, required that the steamships receiving those subventions should be built on plans approved by the Navy Department. That is the provision also of the postal aid law of 1891, the general terms of which, tested by several years of experience, are made applicable in the present bill. But this bill goes further, in providing that there shall be a naval reserve of officers and men as well as ships ready for the national service. This force of sea militia or naval volunteers is authorized in the very first section of the bill, and annual retainers for the enrolled officers and men, after the practice of the chief naval powers, are provided according to their grade and value. All steamships receiving mail subventions under the terms of this bill are required to carry in their crews a certain increasing proportion of men who are naval volunteers, this being made a condition of the contract.

With the two exceptions already described, the mail subventions offered in the present bill do not apply to any of the routes on which American steamers are now receiving subventions under contracts authorized by the postal aid law of 1891. The proposition is supplementary to that law, and in no sense a substitute for it. With these two exceptions, the present purpose is to secure the establishment of American steamship lines carrying the United States mails, under contract on routes where the act of 1891 has failed to do this, and to open communication with foreign markets with which American merchants now have inadequate communication. The new mail subventions on these 10 routes do not contemplate the building of any very fast steamers of the "greyhound" class, which are confined, as a rule, to the passenger service between the United States and Europe. The highest speed required on any of the new routes in this bill is 16 knots, the lowest 12 knots, yet this speed, while moderate, is somewhat superior to that of the foreign vessels now engaged in similar trades. It guarantees improved dispatch for the United States mails, and yet is easily obtainable by modern ships having a very great capacity for merchandise.

Such mail steamers, it is true, will not be swift enough for the service as scouts and lookouts, described by Admiral Dewey in his valuable report on the merchant marine as auxiliary to the Navy in war. But these vessels will be swift enough for service as fast transports, ammunition ships, colliers, supply ships, etc.—auxiliary vessels which, as Admiral Dewey shows, are also indispensable to the efficiency of our regular war fleets.

THE TWO INCREASED SUBVENTIONS.

There should be an especial word of explanation for the increases proposed by the bill in the compensation of two existing mail contract lines. These exceptions to the general principle of offering no increased pay to lines already receiving Government aid are justified by the peculiar conditions of the two cases. As the report of the Merchant Marine Commission says:

In the first place, the American line to Australasia operates in Pacific waters, where the cost of fuel, labor, etc., is considerably greater than at Atlantic ports. Secondly, the line is required to maintain a very high speed. Furthermore, the ships of the company employ exclusively white crews, instead of the Asiatics utilized by many other Pacific companies. This American line to Australasia not only performs the best service, but now receives the lowest compensation of all lines running to Australasian points. This service is so regular and swift that great numbers of Australasian men of business, even when bound to Europe, are brought en route to the United States, and thereby become regular purchasers of American merchandise. The very heavy increase of our exports to British Australasia, from $12,674,000 in 1896 to $27,401,000 in 1904, is due unquestionably in a great degree to the extraordinary efficiency and regularity of the ill-paid American steamship service out of San Francisco.

The increase provided for in the present bill is $217,000 a year, which, added to the $283,000 now paid, will bring the compensation to the American line up approximately to the compensation paid European steamship companies, and will a little more than restore the original rates of the postal-aid law of 1891, which were cut down to the serious crippling of that measure when the bill passed the House of Representatives.

It is announced authoritatively that unless the subvention to the line to Australasia is increased as proposed, the service, which has been losing heavily every year, will have to be abandoned. In that case our increased Australian trade would inevitably go in large part to other countries, involving a loss of millions of dollars a year to American producers. The Merchant Marine Commission believes that it would be recreant to its duty if it did not provide for the continuance of an American steamship line which has fought so bravely against such heavy odds and has achieved such notable work in the expansion of American commerce.

THE ONE AMERICAN LINE TO EUROPE.

Of the proposed increase of $250,000 to the American Line to Europe the report of the Commission says:

The only other proposed increase in the compensation of the existing contract mail routes is the addition of $250,000 to the maximum of $757,000, now payable under the postal-aid law of 1891 to the 20-knot American line from New York to Plymouth, Cherbourg, and Southampton. This line of four steamers—St. Paul, St. Louis, New York, and Philadelphia—meets the fiercest competition of the State-aided corporations of Europe, soon to be intensified by the new subvention of $1,100,000 granted to the Cunard Company by the British Government on terms so liberal as to make it equivalent to $1,500,000 a year. One possible object of this new British subvention is to drive the Stars and Stripes off the mail routes of the North Atlantic, and it is a very unusual American who would counsel nonresistance to this aggressive purpose of our chief mercantile and maritime competitor.

There are a few faster ships under foreign flags on the North Atlantic than the four American liners, but the American company is the only one which is able or is compelled to perform a full 20-knot service throughout the entire year. It is the habit of foreign companies to lay up their best steamers during boisterous winter months, when passenger traffic is lightest and least profitable, and the voyage is roughest and most expensive, but the four great American steamers, notably good heavy-weather ships, go constantly to and fro, giving to the United States in point of regularity and reliability throughout the entire twelve months the very best Atlantic mail service. This is required by the severe terms of the postal-aid law of 1891, and it deserves adequate recognition by the Government. The proposed addition of $250,000 will approximately restore the original rate of compensation of the law of 1891.

Moreover, it must be remembered that these four American liners are the fastest ocean-going steamers that fly the Star and Stripes, and that they were especially designed for the service as auxiliary cruisers, which they performed so brilliantly in the war with Spain. To allow these historic ships to be forced off the sea would be a national humiliation.

"DELIVERY-WAGON" SHIPS.

In connection with the shipping bill which was before the Senate three or four years ago, there arose, especially from the western and southern sections of the country, a very earnest insistence on the value of what might perhaps be termed the "delivery-wagon" type of ship, the general cargo carrier, or the steam or sail "tramp," especially adapted to the transportation of cotton, wheat, and other bulky articles that make up more than one-half of our exports to foreign lands. This demand was repeated and reiterated at all of the hearings of the Merchant Marine Commission, north, south, east, and west, and has been borne carefully in mind in the framing of the present measure.

Section 2 of the bill provides especially for those "delivery

wagon" ships, which may be of modest size and cost, inferior in speed to the regular mail lines, and still indispensable agencies of ocean trade, going hither and thither, wherever freights are to be secured and new markets won, the humble, restless pioneers of commerce. To all of those vessels, steam or sail, section 2 offers a subvention of $5 per gross ton if engaged for a full year in foreign trade, and of smaller sums for shorter periods. This subvention, which is intended to equalize cost of construction, wages, and maintenance between our own and similar foreign craft, is conditional upon the employment in the crew of a certain proportion of naval volunteers, and the vessels accepting it must carry the mails when required free of charge, must be kept seaworthy and effective, must make all ordinary repairs in the United States, and must be held ready to be taken by the Government in time of need. The subvention is payable under a contract for one year at a time, renewable from year to year, but paid in no case to a given vessel for a longer period than ten years.

THE PHILIPPINE AMENDMENT.

In section 2 is embodied an important provision postponing the application of the coastwise principle to our trade with the Philippines from July 1, 1906, when existing law would cause this to take effect, until 1909, as urged by the Secretary of War and recommended by the President.

Economic conditions in the Philippines are said to be such as to make it inadvisable at this time to reserve to American vessels the long-voyage carrying trade between the islands and the United States, as has already been done in the case of Hawaii and Porto Rico. But to continue to hold our Philippine commerce open to foreign ships, and to take no steps to encourage American vessels to enter it, would be to leave our lines of communication with Manila and our other East India military stations and commercial ports in the control of foreign powers, our rivals in trade, and possible enemies in war. This would be so manifestly contrary to the public interest, and contrary to the practice of all other governments possessing such remote dependencies, that a special subvention of 30 per cent above the regular rates, or $6.50 per gross ton per year, is offered in the bill to all American vessels that bring Philippine products to the United States, or convey American products to the Philippines. The voyage to or from the Philippines is so long, and, especially by the Suez route, where high canal dues must be paid, is so expensive, that it seemed to your committee that an extra encouragement ought to be provided for American vessels to participate more largely than they do now in the carrying of our Philippine commerce. The result of the competition of American vessels, aided by this especial subvention, with the foreign vessels now engaged in the trade, will inevitably be to assure favorable freight rates and improved facilities for the trade between the Philippines and the United States on both the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards.

IMPORTANCE OF CARGO CARRIERS.

Such a subvention as is proposed in section 2, to what are primarily cargo vessels, steam or sail, not operating in regular lines under mail contracts, is altogether new to the maritime practice of the United States. The nearest precedent is to be found in the payment for many years after 1792 of bounties to the ships and men of the deep-sea fisheries; these bounties being at first ostensibly in compensation for a rebate of the salt duties. The chief motive of these bounties was a desire to foster the fisheries as a naval reserve, a plan which proved thoroughly successful. In the present bill the vessels and men of the deep-sea fisheries are included on the same terms as the cargo carriers and their seamen, thus restoring an encouragement which the fisheries had enjoyed for seventy years prior to the civil war.

While, therefore, a subvention to cargo carriers and their officers and men undeniably lacks the exact authoritative precedent of the mail subventions in our national history, yet in a general way this subvention also is justifiable on the ground of national defense and the extension of national commerce, and is unquestionably very earnestly demanded by public sentiment. Any measure for the relief of our merchant shipping and the encouragement of our export trade which stops short with the regular mail lines is manifestly incomplete and fails to meet the requirements of our commerce and the reasonable expectations of our people.

OUR BULKY EXPORTS.

Nor is it an adequate reply that several of the chief maritime powers of the world—notably Great Britain and Germany—reserve their national subventions entirely to the relatively fast and expensive steamships of their mail lines and give their general cargo vessels no direct encouragement whatever, for these cargo vessels are indirectly in many ways the beneficiaries of national legislation.

Details of a policy adapted to Great Britain and Germany are not necessarily adaptable to America. Unlike those older nations, the United States is a great exporter of agricultural staples, like raw cotton, breadstuffs, and provisions, which are far more bulky in proportion to their value than are manufactured goods, and can not stand the cost of high-speed transportation. For the especial carrying of these important products the United States requires a large fleet of economical "tramps," or "delivery-wagon" ships. Manifestly the Merchant Marine Commission was deeply impressed with the importance of encouraging the construction of such a fleet, and the subvention of $5 per gross ton to cargo carriers, provided for in section 2 of the present bill, certainly does not lack justification in the hard facts of our commercial needs, and in a fair consideration for the all-important agricultural interests of the West and South, whose need of a foreign market is so urgent.

SOME FOREIGN EXAMPLES.

Moreover, while Great Britain and Germany give no direct subventions to cargo vessels, other maritime nations, notably France, Italy, Austria, and Japan, do pay liberal bounties on both the construction of this class of ships and their navigation. France has increased her tonnage from 1,113,000 in 1893 to 1,760,000 in 1904–5; Italy, from 860,000 to 1,259,000; Austria, from 304,000 to 574,000, and Japan, from 148,000 to 830,000. Norway, with 1,742,000 tons in 1893–94 and 1,779,000 tons in 1904–5, though she gives no premium on the navigation of these "tramps" does grant bounties on their building. Thus, the policy outlined in section 2, while new to American legislation, can find abundant examples in the general practice of the maritime world.

It must not be thought that because cargo vessels are relatively slow they have no military value and no place as naval auxiliaries in war. Of course a slow ship is just as effective as a fast ship in the training of officers and seamen, and, indeed, in this the sail ship is best of all. But, taking a leaf out of our own actual experience in the war with Spain, the records show that of the scores of steamers purchased or chartered as transports, colliers, or supply ships, the great majority were of a speed of from 10 to 12 knots, and very few of a speed as high as 15 knots. Economical carrying ships have their legitimate place in war no less than in commerce.

INCREASE OF TONNAGE TAXES.

The United States is the most liberal nation in the world in its expenditures for river and harbor improvements, light-houses and buoys, and a life-saving service. To these objects the Government gave from 1888 to 1905 the enormous sum of $359,518,885. At the same time almost no protection and encouragement were given to American shipping in the foreign trade, so that a very large part of this $359,518,885 was virtually a subsidy to foreign shipowners, who convey about 90 per cent of our overseas commerce and who, from 1888 to 1905, returned only $11,234,106 in tonnage taxes to the Government.

The tonnage taxes of the United States are lower, in some cases very much lower, than those of the principal maritime nations of the world. Great Britain collects in tonnage taxes considerably more than the entire cost of her light-house establishment. On the other hand, the United States, in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, collected $856,204 in tonnage taxes, while the cost of the light-house and buoy service was $3,686,000. It is not proposed to go as far as Great Britain and to defray from tonnage taxes the entire expense of lighting and buoying the coast, but in section 8 of the bill the tonnage taxes are increased from the present figure of 6 cents a ton on all vessels, American and foreign, arriving from distant foreign ports, to 16 cents a ton, and from 3 cents to 8 cents a ton on all vessels arriving from foreign ports that belong geographically to the North American system. Moreover, the number of arrivals for which the tonnage taxes are imposed is increased from five in a year to ten in a year for any given vessel.

These increased tonnage taxes proposed in the bill fall on all ships, American and foreign alike, engaged in overseas commerce. But, after a British precedent, a rebate of 80 per cent of the duties is made to American vessels carrying boys as apprentices and training young seamen for the merchant service and the naval reserve.

ESTIMATED REVENUE.

Of the income to be produced by the proposed new tonnage taxes the final report of the Merchant Marine Commission says:

The report of the Commission last year estimated that these increased tonnage taxes would furnish a total revenue of $3,025,529, based on the tonnage taxes of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, from which should be deducted tonnage taxes under existing law amounting to

$885,841 and rebates to American vessels carrying apprentices of $210,320, leaving a net increase of revenue of $1,929,368.

The probable increase, based on the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, has since been computed in the same way by the Commissioner of Navigation, showing that for that year the bill involves a net increase in tonnage taxes of very close to $1,900,000. That amount, thus verified, may therefore be accepted as a safe measure of the additional revenue provided for in the bill. This increase, it should be further noted, accrues from the beginning of the coming fiscal year, from July 1, 1906, to June 30, 1907, and within that period will have brought into the Treasury an additional revenue of $1,900,000.

ESTIMATED COST OF THIS BILL.

Now, as to the important question of the expenditures involved in this measure for the upbuilding of the American merchant marine. I am gratified to note that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of this body [Mr. ALLISON] is honoring me with his attention. I know that if no other Senator should ask about the cost of this proposed legislation the Senator from Iowa would surely do so before the discussion was closed. Therefore I propose, Mr. President, to be entirely frank and to give as nearly as it is possible to give the cost to the Treasury of the United States for the ten years during which it is proposed that these subventions shall continue if this bill shall be enacted into law precisely as it is written.

Of course it may be taken for granted that the probable cost of the proposed legislation will be wildly exaggerated by its adversaries, most vociferous and most reckless among whom are the agents of the foreign steamship companies that now monopolize nine-tenths of the ocean carrying of the United States and drain out of our country every year, in freight, mail, and passenger receipts, nearly if not quite $200,000,000. The conjectures which such men as these will make of the cost to the country of restoring our merchant fleet will be limited only by the audacity of their imaginations and their trust in the credulity of the American people.

Anticipating that this will be the chief line of the foreign and domestic attack upon the shipping bill, the Merchant Marine Commission caused an especially careful estimate to be made of the expenditures under the several sections of this measure. It is believed that if these estimates err at all it is in every case on the side of liberality, and that if the actual cost of the proposed legislation is found to depart from the estimates either way it will prove to be over rather than under calculated.

A NET GAIN THE FIRST YEAR.

Bearing this in mind, there is now submitted the estimates of the probable expenditures under this bill set forth in the report of the Commission as follows:

The practical result of the proposed bill in the first year of its operation will manifestly be to increase the revenue of the Government. The estimate of the Commission for this first year is as follows:

Net increase of revenue from tonnage		$1,900,000
Expenditures:		
A. Naval volunteer retainers	$150,000	
B. General subventions to cargo vessels		
C. New mail subventions	666,250	
D. Increased subventions to two existing mail lines	467,000	
		1,283,250
Net gain to the Treasury		616,750

Naval volunteer retainers of $150,000 would provide for a force of 3,000 officers and men, and as this naval-reserve idea is entirely new both to the merchant marine and to the Navy Department, which controls it, it is not probable that more than 3,000 volunteers could be enrolled in the first year.

By the terms of the bill the general subventions to vessels at the rate of $5 per gross ton for twelve months' service in the foreign trade or deep-sea fisheries are not payable, though earned the first year, until "after July 1, 1907," so that there will be no expenditure whatever on this account in the fiscal year preceding.

A year ago the Commission estimated that not more than one-fourth, or $666,250, of the maximum subventions of $2,665,000 for the 10 new mail routes could be expended in the first year under this bill, because most of the steamships requisite for such service do not now exist in the American merchant marine and would have to be constructed in American shipyards. There has been no change in the bill or in current ocean shipbuilding that would alter this conservative calculation.

The increase in the subventions to two existing mail lines now performing contract service under the postal-aid law of 1891 is a new feature of the bill this year. These subventions would probably become payable in the first year of the bill, and therefore are fully allowed for at their maximum of $467,000 in the present estimate. But it should be noted that this particular expenditure remains the same, without increasing in succeeding years.

NET COST THE SECOND YEAR.

For the second year under the proposed bill the Commission presents this estimate of total revenue and expenditures:

Expenditures:		
A. Naval volunteer retainers		$300,000
B. General subventions to cargo vessels		1,250,000
C. Mail subventions to new lines		1,500,000
D. Increased subventions to two existing mail lines		467,000
		3,517,000
Net increase of revenue from tonnage		1,850,000
Net cost to the Treasury		1,667,000

The naval volunteer force might possibly be doubled from 3,000 to 6,000 officers and men of the merchant service in this second year of the bill, thus doubling the total retainers, as above estimated.

The general subventions to cargo carriers and deep-sea fishing vessels become payable this second year. These subventions, it should be remembered, are not bounties outright, but are conditioned on the terms of rigid contracts with the Government to perform certain services. It is difficult to forecast how many of these contracts would be undertaken by shipowners, but there is a good basis for an estimate in a careful analysis by the Commissioner of Navigation of the actual voyages of American vessels in foreign commerce in the calendar year 1904. If all of these vessels had fulfilled the contract requirements of the proposed bill, they would have earned somewhat less than $1,000,000 in general subventions. In other words, $1,000,000, under the terms of this bill, would pay subventions to all American ships, steamers suitable for new mail lines included, now engaged in over-seas carrying. This deliberate, exact analysis of a year's actual voyages by the Commissioner of Navigation is proof that the original estimate of the cost of the general subventions in last year's report of the Commission was altogether too high. Allowing that the subventions will immediately increase by 25 per cent the participation of existing American vessels in our ocean-carrying trade, the present estimate of $1,250,000 would seem to be sufficiently liberal.

The deep-sea fishing fleet of the United States is now a small one—about 50,000 tons—and can not be a very important factor in estimating these subventions. For convenience it will be included in this estimate among the cargo carriers. Its vessels are in service for widely varying periods in a year.

By the second year, under this bill, it is believed that enough new mail steamers will have been constructed to put into operation enough of the new mail service to require an expenditure of $1,500,000.

The expenditure for increased subventions to two existing lines—$467,000—reaches its maximum the first year, and does not increase thereafter.

The net increase in the revenue from tonnage would probably be lessened by an increase in the number of foreign voyages of American ships which, after the British practice, receive a rebate of a portion of the tonnage dues for carrying apprentices and training seamen. This explains the decrease from $1,900,000 in the first year of the bill to $1,850,000 in the second.

THE THIRD YEAR.

In the third year, under the proposed bill, from July 1, 1908, to June 30, 1909, the mail subventions to the 10 new lines will probably reach their maximum of $2,665,000 through the building of more ships and the full establishment of these services, and the general subventions to cargo vessels will increase by the building of new tonnage to the extent of $500,000. There will naturally be a further gain in the number of naval volunteers and the amount of their retainers. The estimated cost of the bill the third year is as follows:

Expenditures:	
A. Naval volunteer retainers	$400,000
B. General subventions to cargo vessels	1,750,000
C. Mail subventions to new lines	2,665,000
D. Increased subventions to two existing mail lines	467,000
	5,282,000
Net increase of revenue from tonnage	1,750,000
Net cost to the Treasury	3,532,000

COMPENSATING FOR THE SUBVENTIONS.

If the net increase of revenue from tonnage provided for in this bill is to be considered as an offset to the general subventions to cargo vessels, it will be discovered that the increased revenue for the first three years under this bill, or a total of $5,500,000, more than compensates for the aggregate subventions earned by the cargo ships in three years and paid in four, or $5,250,000.

This view of the situation is rendered all the more logical and equitable by the fact, referred to in last year's report of the Commission, that the maximum cost of all the 10 new ocean mail lines, or $2,665,000 a year, is very nearly balanced by the apparent net profit now derived by the United States from its ocean mail service.

Our Government is the only one in the world which year after year has insisted on retaining this profit from its ocean mails, and the policy has been a severe discrimination against the merchant shipping interests of the United States. Great Britain has pursued a radically different course, devoting not only its entire annual ocean mail income, but several million dollars besides, to the subsidizing of lines of British steamships. As the Commission said in its report last year—

There will be general agreement that at least this apparent profit on the ocean mail service of the United States ought to be turned back to the encouragement of our ocean mail lines, and that is exactly what is contemplated in the mail-subvention clause of the proposed legislation. In fact, the annual—not the accumulated—profit from our ocean mail service is hereafter to be devoted to the upbuilding of American steamship communication with distant markets. Great Britain goes beyond this, and applies to this purpose two or three millions more annually. The United States can at least afford to utilize in this way the full amount of its ocean mail net income.

As this net income is steadily increasing it is probable that by 1909, when all the new mail services provided for in this bill may be in operation, the profit from our ocean mail service will be not $2,579,000, as in 1904, but $3,000,000 or more, and enough to compensate for not only the $2,665,000 required for the 10 new mail routes of this bill, but, besides, the increased subventions of $467,000 to two existing lines, or the total ocean mail expenditure of $3,132,000.

THE FOURTH YEAR.

The expenditure on mail lines, new and old, will have reached its maximum in the year from July 1, 1908, to June 30, 1909, and will increase no further under the terms of the proposed bill. Moreover, in the next or fourth year the enrollment of naval volunteers, if it has reached 10,000 officers and men, with total retainers of $500,000, will presumably have exhausted the available material in the American merchant marine, for Great Britain, with a merchant marine much larger than ours will be in 1909 and a regular naval personnel three times as numerous as ours, has a naval reserve, after years of effort, of 33,500.

Therefore the only increased expenditure under this bill beyond the fourth year, from July 1, 1909, to June 30, 1910, will be the general

subventions to cargo vessels. The estimate of the cost of this bill in the fourth year is as follows:

Expenditures:	
A. Naval volunteer retainers	$500,000
B. General subventions to cargo vessels	2,250,000
C. Mail subventions to new lines	2,665,000
D. Increased subventions to two existing mail lines	467,000
	5,882,000
Net increase of revenue from tonnage	1,600,000
Net cost to the Treasury	4,282,000

AFTER THE FIFTH YEAR.

After this point—the fifth year, from July 1, 1910, to June 30, 1911—the only feature of the proposed bill which will make any increased draft upon the Treasury will be that required to aid the active and useful "tramps," or freighting ships, to fight their way into the world's commerce, and the amount of the subventions will depend upon the need of the cotton planters of the South, the ranchmen and farmers of the West and Southwest, and the manufacturers of the entire country for new tonnage to make new markets for the products of their industry.

HALF A MILLION A YEAR.

A reasonable estimate, however, is that these general subventions to the hard-working cargo ships, the democracy of the ocean, will continue to increase on the average by about $500,000 a year, representing a net annual gain in the tonnage of the American ocean fleet of about one hundred and fifty thousand, some vessels earning subventions for six months, some for nine months, some for the full twelve months. One hundred and fifty thousand tons of new shipping would represent 40 or 50 steamers or sail vessels, and such a net gain as this every year would be a satisfactory result of the general subvention feature of the proposed bill.

For it must be remembered that in order to make a net increase of 150,000 tons very much more than this amount of new shipping would have to be constructed to cover the inevitable waste of storm and wreck and the wearing out of the older tonnage. What this would mean to American shipyards, to the men who work in them, and to the lumbermen, miners, and farmers who furnish the materials away back at the forests, mines, and fields may be conjectured from the fact that last year only 20,000 tons of shipping for over-seas trade—all in one giant vessel—were completed in the United States, and that at the present time only four foreign-going ocean steamers, altogether of about 30,000 tons, are being constructed. All four, it is worthy of note, belong to one of our four or five mail lines now subsidized, and two of these ships are building to replace steamers purchased by the War Department.

GRADUALLY LESSENING AID.

It is stipulated in the bill proposed by the Commission that "no vessel shall receive a subvention under the provisions of section 2 of this act for a longer period than ten years." As to these general subventions to cargo ships, it is the frank belief of the Commission that after a reasonable period they can probably be lessened in amount, having served their purpose of increasing the volume, and thereby reducing the cost of American ship construction and of developing the whole shipping trade to high economic efficiency. For it is a historic fact that the older American merchant marine was built up from 1789 onward under a policy of national aid of some kind or degree, and that its best friends insisted that it would have gone on prospering after that aid was withdrawn but for the radical change from sails to steam and the tremendous advantage given to Great Britain by her immediate and persistent application of subsidies to ocean commerce.

A GREAT NEW TONNAGE.

A net annual addition of 150,000 tons of shipping to the American ocean fleet for ten years would mean a new tonnage of 1,500,000 registered for over-seas carrying. We have now about 900,000 tons so registered; but only about one-half of this is regularly employed. It is probable that 500,000 tons of American shipping, much of it growing old and uneconomical, would actually represent all our tonnage seriously engaged in over-seas voyages. One of the first things that shipowners would do under the stimulus of national encouragement would be to replace their old vessels with others, new, economical, and efficient, and qualified to receive subventions for ten years to come. Moreover, the mail subventions to the ten new regular lines would add from 200,000 to 300,000 tons of high-class steam tonnage to the naval reserve.

COST THE TENTH YEAR.

An increase of $500,000 a year in the general subventions to cargo vessels, together with a gradual lessening of the increased revenue from tonnage, due to the larger participation of American vessels in our ocean trade, would bring the estimated total cost of this bill, in its tenth year, from July 1, 1915, to June 30, 1916, to approximately the following figures:

Expenditures:	
A. Naval volunteer retainers	$500,000
B. General subventions to cargo vessels	5,250,000
C. Mail subventions to new lines	2,665,000
D. Increased subventions to two existing mail lines	467,000
	8,882,000
Net increase of revenue from tonnage	1,200,000
Net cost to the Treasury	7,682,000

These estimates show, Mr. President, that for the first year the increased revenues coming from increased tonnage dues will put into the Treasury $616,750 and take nothing out; at the end of the second year the cost to the Treasury will be $1,667,000, at the end of the third year the cost will be $3,532,000, and the fourth year $4,282,000. The cost increases, Mr. President, slightly year by year from the end of the fourth year until the tenth year, when the cost of the tenth year will be $7,682,000, making an aggregate expenditure, provided the bill shall be enacted as it is written and provided the increased tonnage taxes shall be allowed to remain, a little in excess of $40,000,000 for the ten years.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, if I do not interrupt the Senator from New Hampshire, I should like to inquire if the amount of the increased tonnage tax is estimated after the rebate of 80 per cent is allowed to American ships?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator a question for the purpose of showing what we do for other interests.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. GALLINGER. With pleasure.

Mr. HALE. The Senator shows very clearly that in the aggregate about $40,000,000 will be expended for this great interest.

Mr. PERKINS. For ten years.

Mr. HALE. For ten years. Now, does the Senator from New Hampshire remember just what the amount is that is set aside for the one item, for which we all voted, for irrigation in the West?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that is problematical; I think no Senator can answer that question definitely, as it depends upon the income from the sale of the public lands in the arid and semiarid States.

Mr. HALE. It is not less than $30,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Probably not less than ten times that amount ultimately. Certain States are to receive the revenues from the sale of the public lands, as I have stated.

Mr. LODGE. They have received $30,000,000 from the sale of public lands.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes, they have approximately that amount in the Treasury now. Perhaps more.

Mr. LODGE. Thirty million dollars.

Mr. GALLINGER. And the probability is that the aggregate will be ten times that amount before it ends.

Mr. HALE. I call attention to that to show how little is proposed by the pending bill for this great interest compared with what we have done for other interests.

Mr. SCOTT. I am informed that the amount for the coming year will be nearly $60,000,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very likely. There are now $30,000,000 in the Treasury credited to certain States, and of course that is going to increase as the lands are sold.

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER (reading):

Right here it may be said that Great Britain and her colonies next year will expend, including the new Cunard subsidy, between $6,000,000 and $7,000,000 on the encouragement of imperial shipping and commerce; that France will spend about $8,000,000, and that nations like Italy and Japan, with less than half our population and far feebler resources, will spend between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000.

Here is one side of the balance sheet—an expenditure for the development of American shipping and American commerce beginning with nothing and rising gradually to $7,682,000—an average of $4,625,625 a year—an amount less than our chief competitors are now paying, and very much less in proportion to our ability to pay and our power to take advantage of new maritime and commercial opportunities.

WHAT THE BILL GAINS FOR THE NATION.

Now, let us look at the other side and consider what the bill will create for and give to the American people:

1. A force of 10,000 naval volunteers—American officers and men of the merchant marine trained to the naval service and holding the same relation to the Regular Navy held toward the Regular Army by the present militia and National Guard.

Right at this point I want to say that the Navy Department is extremely anxious to have this naval reserve created, having had a bill here last year for that purpose. The Department gives warm support to the proposition embodied in this bill, saying that it is very desirable legislation.

2. A new fleet of from 200,000 to 300,000 tons of steel mail steamships, the naval reserve of fast transports, ammunition ships, supply ships, colliers, repair and hospital ships, dispatch vessels, etc., described in the accompanying report of Admiral Dewey, as essential to the efficiency of our fighting fleet in war.

3. A net addition to our cargo (and fishery) tonnage of 1,500,000 tons, increasing fourfold the actual ocean shipping of the United States, and giving us, exclusive of our distinctive lake and coastwise vessels, a merchant marine much larger than the entire merchant fleet of France or Norway, nearly twice that of Italy, and fully twice that of Japan. Such a new merchant tonnage would enable the United States to carry under its own flag not 10 per cent, as now, of its own imports and exports, but 30 or 40 per cent, earning for our own country, instead of $20,000,000, from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000 a year in freight and passenger receipts.

4. Finally, the creation of ten regular new or strengthened American steamship lines to South America, Central America, Africa, and Asia, supplemented by a large and active fleet of "tramp" or cargo vessels, inevitably opening new markets for many thousands of additional bales of American cotton and thousands of tons of grain, flour, provisions, and manufactured goods—a total amount of increased trade and increased employment for the whole American people impossible to state now in specific figures, but certainly fiftyfold or a hundredfold the entire cost of the national subventions.

Mr. President, I ought to have said that forty-odd million dollars to be expended under this bill for the ten years during which the subvention is to run presupposes that every one of the new lines named in the bill shall be established and in full operation. It may be that they will not all be established. If

so, then the cost to the national Treasury will be less than the sum I have named.

TRANSPORTATION VITAL TO TRADE.

The United States has now reached a parting of the ways on this great question. Congress by its action on this proposed measure has very largely the power to determine whether we shall move on in the path which William McKinley would have taken and which President Roosevelt advocates, and add to our immense home market new markets over seas, or whether we shall rest content with our present halfway commercial growth and hereafter depend for such scant increase as we may get on the grace of the shipowners of other and rival nations. There may be those of us who think that we already have trade enough and ships enough, and that we ought to be satisfied to stand still where we are, incidentally ceasing to build any more ships of war, and to leave to our competitors in Europe and to ambitious and aggressive Japan the mastery of those neutral markets from which in a few years we shall be as surely and finally excluded by the enterprise of our rivals as if a wall were built against our trade around the coasts of South America, Asia, Africa, and Australia.

That may be the temper of the American people, but I do not believe it. I know it is not the temper of the people of New England, or of New York, or of Pennsylvania, or of Virginia, or the Carolinas, or of the great States fronting the Mexican Gulf, or of the Commonwealths of the Pacific Ocean. I do not believe that it is the temper of the States of the Mississippi Valley and the Middle West, whose fields and factories produce a very large proportion of our entire exports, and must have increased markets for the maintenance of their prosperity.

Mr. President, since I commenced these remarks I have received information to the effect that the Board of Trade of Brunswick, Ga., has indorsed the bill that I am advocating. What is true of that great commercial organization is true of scores of organizations throughout the country, north and south, their action being found in an appendix to the last report made by the Merchant Marine Commission.

Two great cities of the Mississippi Valley region are and long have been rivals for the trade of that rich and populous valley and the great West beyond. They not only vie with each other in offering goods at favorable prices and of excellent quality, but they have done their utmost to surpass each other in offering facilities for transportation.

If one or the other of these two great cities, Chicago and St. Louis, were to have a fast and regular express and freight service to all parts of the West and Southwest and the other was dependent on stage coaches or the prairie schooners of bygone years, the latter city might offer just as good merchandise at just as favorable rates as its competitor, and yet, because of the lack of the vital element of transportation facilities, it would cut as sorry a figure in those neutral markets as the United States now cuts, for example, in the markets of South America.

We are to-day dependent, as has time and time again been pointed out by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, our American ministers, consuls, and others, upon facilities for reaching the South American markets, which bear about the same relation to the subsidized steamship lines of Europe as stage coaches would bear to the swift and regular service of the trunk-line railroads.

Just as the railroad lines which now thread our West and Southwest could not be constructed at first without national or other aid, because of the enormous expense of the initial undertaking, so these great European steamship lines to South America and the other continents were brought into being at first by mail subsidies or other forms of national assistance. The establishment of these great European steamship lines offering favorable facilities to European exporters as compared with our own, makes it still more difficult, and, indeed, impossible for private American enterprise to gain access to those distant neutral markets without some kind of national encouragement. All the American representatives in South America who have declared that we could never get an adequate foothold there without ships of our own have also declared that it was inevitable that these steamship lines could not be operated at first without a loss, and that they would have to be assisted, as their European rivals are assisted, by some measure of generous national legislation.

That this is manifest is proved by the experience of the two lines of steamers which American capital is now operating between our Pacific seaports and the Orient. These enterprises are controlled by experienced and capable managers. They have wrought a great expansion of American trade. But they have never paid a dividend to their owners without national aid, and it is inevitable that unless such aid is soon forthcoming these services, which have proved of such immense value to the farmers of the West and the manufacturers of the entire country, will have to be abandoned, unless, indeed, they pass under foreign flags and are sustained by foreign and rival governments for their own purposes.

OUR ONE NATIONAL FAILURE.

We have paltered with and postponed this question of American ocean trade for forty years. We have seen our shipping and our seamen vanish, and shipyard after shipyard that would have been a glory and a pride to any other nation topple into bankruptcy. We have seen other nations grasping the trade opportunities that should have been our own. Successful in all else, we have retired, baffled and disheartened, from the high seas. It must be acknowledged, and it may as well be frankly acknowledged here and now, that the steady decline of our ocean shipping since 1861 marks the one great and humiliating failure of the Republican party.

But the Republican party has failed here because here alone it has not been true to Republican principles. It has protected everything else which felt the pressure of foreign competition, but it has left unprotected that one industry which feels foreign competition most directly and keenly of all. In the light of forty years of neglect it is little short of a miracle that we should have any ocean ships whatever, any shipowners, any officers, any seamen.

Fortunately, there are still a few left. There is a nucleus of skill and experience on which to build. But if we wait a few years more even this remnant of our shipping will have departed, save for the few lines which are now sustained by their mail pay under the act of 1891.

This bill, proposed by the Merchant Marine Commission and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Commerce, represents the results of more than a year of conscientious investigation by Senators and Representatives of both political parties. On the need of an American shipping to expand American commerce they are absolutely agreed, and they are agreed also on the advisability of the majority of the definite propositions in the present measure. So close a union between men of opposing parties on this question has never been reached before. Such is the measure which I have had the honor of presenting and now have the honor of advocating before the Senate. In summing up the case for the proposed legislation, I beg to quote from the report of the Commission:

> A new merchant fleet in over-seas commerce of 2,000,000 tons would give the United States the same high rank in merchant shipping which it now holds through its great and powerful Navy. This Navy is now costing $100,000,000 a year, and it is grandly worth it. Nobody who wants the merchant marine built up would have the Navy cut down. The great men of the Navy are powerful champions of the merchant marine. Every strong friend of the merchant marine is a strong friend of the Navy also. The foe of one is apt to be the foe of both. But the Merchant Marine Commission would urge with all earnestness that a great nation, expending $100,0.0,000 a year upon its Navy, can justifiably devote from one to seven millions a year to the encouragement of its merchant shipping, and that the nation which is preparing to build the isthmian canal must stir betimes to build its own ships if it would have its flag borne through the great waterway on something else than yachts and men-of-war.
>
> Unless the American people begin now, at once, to give some heed to their neglected merchant shipping, they are likely to realize when their canal is completed that they have spent three hundred millions of American money to subsidize the ships and the trade of foreign governments.

Mr. President, the last speech that Mr. Blaine made in this body was on the 27th day of January, 1881. It was on the occasion of a famous debate between Mr. Blaine and the late Senator Beck, of Kentucky, on a resolution offered by Mr. Beck in favor of free ships. Mr. Blaine eloquently combated the proposition that this country should be dependent upon Great Britain for a merchant marine, and in the course of his argument said:

> It is a fact equally remarkable that for the past twenty-five years, or make it only for the past twenty years, from the beginning of the war to this hour, the Congress of the United States has not done one solitary thing to uphold the navigation interests of the United States. Decay has been observed going on steadily from year to year. The great march forward of our commercial rival of old has been witnessed and everywhere recognized, and the representatives of the people of the United States have sat in their two houses of legislation as dumb as though they could not speak, and have not offered a single remedy or a single aid. * * *
>
> During these years in which Congress has not stepped forward to do one thing for the foreign commerce of this country, for all that vast external transportation whose importance the Senator from Kentucky has not exaggerated, but has strongly depicted, the same Congress has passed ninety-two acts in aid of internal transportation by rail; has given 200,000,000 acres of the public lands, worth to-day a thousand million dollars in money, and has added $70,000,000 in cash, and yet, I repeat, it has extended the aid of scarcely a single dollar to build up our foreign commerce.

From that day to this nothing has been done for American shipping except the enactment of the inadequate Postal Aid Law of 1891, and we are now practically in the situation that

Mr. Blaine so earnestly inveighed against—dependence upon foreign nations in the matter of over-seas transportation. It is to rescue this country from the deplorable condition that to-day exists that this bill is offered to the Congress. It does not go as far as I would wish, but its enactment will do something toward reviving the shipping interests of our country, and in a measure rehabilitating the American merchant marine, a result which all patriotic Americans desire to see accomplished.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ANKENY. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to withhold his motion for a few moments that I may ask for the consideration of the bill (S. 2558) authorizing W. T. Clark to construct a bridge across the Columbia River near the city of Wenatchee, Wash.

Mr. LODGE. I will yield to the request of the Senator from Washington if the bill does not involve debate.

Mr. ANKENY. I am sure the bill will not lead to discussion.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, section 1, to strike out all of line 3, as follows:

That William T. Clark and his assigns be, and they are hereby—

And insert—

That the Washington Bridge Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Washington, its successors and assigns, be, and it is hereby—

So as to make the section read:

That the Washington Bridge Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Washington, its successors and assigns, be, and it is hereby, authorized and empowered to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto over and across the Columbia River at a point at or near Wenatchee, in the county of Chelan, State of Washington, for the purposes hereinafter set forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, section 2, line 13, after the word "said," to strike out "William T. Clark, or his assigns" and insert "bridge company, or its assigns;" so as to read:

SEC. 2. That any bridge constructed under the authority of this act shall be built and located under and subject to such regulations for the security of the navigation of said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe, and to secure such object said bridge company, or its assigns, shall submit to the Secretary of War for his examination and approval, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, section 2, line 8, after the word "said," to strike out "William T. Clark or his assigns, at his or their expense" and insert "bridge company or its assigns, at its or their expense;" so as to read:

And any changes in said bridge required by the Secretary of War at any time shall be made promptly by the said bridge company or its assigns, at its or their expense.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, section 2, line 13, after the word "company," to insert "or its assigns;" so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That if the bridge herein authorized be built as a drawbridge, the draw shall be opened promptly upon reasonable signal for the passage of boats; and whatever kind of a bridge is built the said company or its assigns shall maintain thereon, from sunset to sunrise, such lights or other signals as the Light-House Board shall prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, section 3, line 21, after the word "said," to strike out "William T. Clark and his assigns" and insert "bridge company or its assigns;" and in line 25, before the word "assigns," to strike out "he or his" and insert "the said company or its;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That said bridge shall be constructed to provide for the passage of wagons, carriages, automobiles, and vehicles of all kinds, street and suburban car lines, animals and foot passengers, and to provide for telegraph and telephone lines, and two pipe lines to convey water to the east side of the river for irrigation, power, and domestic use; and the said bridge company or its assigns shall have the right to charge, collect, and receive therefor such reasonable rates of toll and under such reasonable rules and regulations for the use of said bridge as the said company or its assigns may prescribe from time to time, subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, section 5, line 18, after the word "within," to strike out "one year" and insert "two years;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized is not commenced within two years and completed within three years from the date hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Washington Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Columbia River near the city of Wenatchee, Wash."

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I renew my motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After six minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 9, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 8, 1906.

PENSION AGENT.

Albert O. Marsh, of Indiana, whose term will expire January 13, 1906, to be pension agent at Indianapolis, Ind. (Reappointment.)

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Merris C. Barrow, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Douglas, Wyo., his term having expired December 18, 1905. (Reappointment.)

Eugene B. Mather, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Buffalo, Wyo., his term having expired December 19, 1905. (Reappointment.)

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Frederick W. Daniels, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Buffalo, Wyo., his term having expired December 19, 1905. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

To be lieutenants.

Ensign Bayard T. Bulmer to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, having completed three years' service in his present grade.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Bayard T. Bulmer to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Lieut. Sumner E. W. Kittelle, promoted.

To be ensigns.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of February, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Charles Belknap, jr.
Fred H. Poteet.
Webb R. Raudenbush.
Butler Y. Rhodes.
Charles E. Smith.

To be surgeons.

P. A. Surg. John E. Page to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 20th day of April, 1904, vice Surg. Will F. Arnold, retired.

P. A. Surg. William H. Bell to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 20th day of May, 1905, vice Surg. Hatton N. T. Harris, deceased.

To be passed assistant surgeons.

Asst. Surg. Earle M. Brown to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 8th day of May, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

Asst. Surg. John F. Murphy to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 18th day of May, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

Asst. Surg. Morton W. Baker to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 10th day of July, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

Asst. Surg. James H. Holloway to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 26th day of September, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

To be chief gunner.

Gunner Charles B. Babson to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 27th day of April, 1904, having completed six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the "Navy personnel act," approved March 3, 1899, as amended by the act of April 27, 1904.

To be chief carpenter.

Carpenter Joseph M. Simms to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1905, upon the completion of six

years' service, in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the "Navy personnel act," approved March 3, 1899, as amended by the act of April 27, 1904.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Edwin Lee Jones, a citizen of the Territory of New Mexico, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 6th day of January, 1906, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Artillery Corps.

Second Lieut. Alden F. Brewster, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from November 6, 1905, vice Moore, detailed in Signal Corps.

Second Lieut. John A. Berry, Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from December 20, 1905, vice Stopford, promoted.

Signal Corps.

First Lieut. Alfred T. Clifton, Signal Corps, to be captain from January 2, 1906, vice Rickard, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of December, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Logan Tucker, a citizen of Illinois.

Charles C. McReynolds, a noncommissioned officer of the Marine Corps.

John E. Semmes, a citizen of Maryland.

Charles F. B. Price, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

John P. Clum to be postmaster at Fairbanks, in the Territory of Alaska. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

ARKANSAS.

Edward W. Burruss to be postmaster at Holly Grove, in the county of Monroe and State of Arkansas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

CALIFORNIA.

James F. Scott to be postmaster at Ione, in the county of Amador and State of California, in place of William A. Bennetts, resigned.

CONNECTICUT.

George D. Carey to be postmaster at Sound Beach, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

GEORGIA.

Lena Brimberry to be postmaster at Camilla, in the county of Mitchell and State of Georgia, in place of Thomas W. Brimberry, deceased.

IDAHO.

John F. Cook, jr., to be postmaster at Bonners Ferry, in the county of Kootenai and State of Idaho. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

ILLINOIS.

Robert N. Chapman to be postmaster at Charleston, in the county of Coles and State of Illinois, in place of Robert N. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1905.

Frank C. Davidson to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Dewitt and State of Illinois, in place of Frank C. Davidson. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1905.

Walter W. Lindley to be postmaster at Urbana, in the county of Champaign and State of Illinois, in place of Walter W. Lindley. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1905.

John J. Reeve to be postmaster at Jacksonville, in the county of Morgan and State of Illinois, in place of Edmund C. Kreider, deceased.

Ozias Riley to be postmaster at Champaign, in the county of Champaign and State of Illinois, in place of Ozias Riley. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1905.

Joseph C. Weir to be postmaster at Rantoul, in the county of Champaign and State of Illinois, in place of Joseph C. Weir. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1905.

INDIANA.

Samuel S. Heath to be postmaster at Lebanon, in the county of Boone and State of Indiana, in place of Ellis G. Darnell, removed.

IOWA.

William S. Browning to be postmaster at Winfield, in the county of Henry and State of Iowa, in place of William S. Browning. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1905.

Marion Bruce to be postmaster at Rolfe, in the county of Pocahontas and State of Iowa, in place of Marion Bruce. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1905.

Frank D. Carr, to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of Van Buren and State of Iowa, in place of William Goodin, removed.

Harry McNamara to be postmaster at Tipton, in the county of Cedar, and State of Iowa, in place of Harry L. Brotherlin. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1905.

Charles M. Stevens to be postmaster at Williams, in the county of Hamilton and State of Iowa, in place of Charles M. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1905.

Francis Trunkey to be postmaster at Elma, in the county of Howard and State of Iowa, in place of Francis Trunkey. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1905.

KANSAS.

James M. Goff to be postmaster at Walnut, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

LOUISIANA.

William C. Price to be postmaster at Homer, in the parish of Claiborne and State of Louisiana, in place of Frankie McFarland, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Henry Converse to be postmaster at Rutland, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts, in place of Henry Converse. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

MICHIGAN.

Frank E. Nellis to be postmaster at Mount Clemens, in the county of Macomb and State of Michigan, in place of Edward G. Folsom. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

MISSOURI.

Frank M. Deggendorf to be postmaster at Potosi, in the county of Washington and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

NEW YORK.

J. D. Denison to be postmaster at Greene, in the county of Chenango and State of New York, in place of Henry F. Whittenhall. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1904.

Ellsworth Sweet to be postmaster at Waterloo, in the county of Seneca and State of New York, in place of Ellsworth Sweet. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

Dayton H. Whipple to be postmaster at Altamont, in the county of Albany and State of New York. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Benjamin G. Bradley to be postmaster at Gastonia, in the county of Gaston and State of North Carolina, in place of Claudius D. Holland, removed.

Rufus R. Harris to be postmaster at Louisburg, in the county of Franklin and State of North Carolina, in place of Mattie E. Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1904.

Alvin S. Willis to be postmaster at Morehead City, in the county of Carteret and State of North Carolina. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

OHIO.

Glenn H. Salkeld to be postmaster at Perry, in the county of Lake and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

OREGON.

Ephraim Miller to be postmaster at Lakeview, in the county of Lake and State of Oregon, in place of Dick J. Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Jacob R. Evans to be postmaster at Nanticoke, in the county of Luzerne and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Samuel Powell. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

Howard B. Frankenberry to be postmaster at Point Marion, in the county of Fayette and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

Elmer S. Hull to be postmaster at Montgomery, in the county of Lycoming and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Harry K. Frontz, removed.

Samuel Sparr to be postmaster at Williamsburg, in the county of Blair and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Levi Sparr, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Elizabeth A. S. Mixon to be postmaster at Barnwell, in the county of Barnwell and State of South Carolina, in place of Elizabeth A. S. Mixon. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1906.

VIRGINIA.

Clinton W. Hoge to be postmaster at Gate City, in the county of Scott and State of Virginia. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

John B. Kimberly to be postmaster at Fortress Monroe, in

the county of Elizabeth City and State of Virginia, in place of John B. Kimberly. Incumbent's commission expires January 21, 1906.

WISCONSIN.

Royden J. Coon to be postmaster at Plainfield, in the county of Waushara and State of Wisconsin, in place of Ira P. Coon, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 8, 1906.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Arthur H. Swain, of California, to be receiver of public moneys at Visalia, Cal.

POSTMASTERS.

DELAWARE.

John A. Jolls to be postmaster at Middletown, in the county of Newcastle and State of Delaware.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Frank P. Goss to be postmaster at Hyannis, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts.

George W. Jones to be postmaster at Falmouth, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts.

William A. Murphy to be postmaster at Amesbury, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts.

NEW YORK.

Orley W. Closson to be postmaster at Schuylersville, in the county of Saratoga and State of New York.

John T. Davis to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Herkimer and State of New York.

Emmett B. Hawkins to be postmaster at Huntington, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York.

William H. Hill to be postmaster at Lestershire, in the county of Broome and State of New York.

George W. Hitchcock to be postmaster at Ripley, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York.

David C. Inglis to be postmaster at Spring Valley, in the county of Rockland and State of New York.

William G. Laidlaw to be postmaster at Ellicottville, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York.

Seth T. Lyman to be postmaster at Pelham, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

John McNally to be postmaster at Ossining, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Vine M. Seagers to be postmaster at Endicott, in the county of Broome and State of New York.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Harry L. Johnson to be postmaster at Laceyville, in the county of Wyoming and State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *January 8, 1906.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 6, 1906, was read and approved.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

FISH WHARF, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4459) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations respecting the rights and privileges of the fish wharf, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to make such regulations as they may deem proper for the sale of the rights and privileges of the fish wharf in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin what this bill is about. I could not hear very well.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who reported the bill and who will explain it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the bill just reported was prepared by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and has been favorably reported by the committee without amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Was it the unanimous report of the full committee?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Briefly, what does it do?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Briefly this: In 1865 the board of aldermen of the District of Columbia passed an ordinance providing for the sale of the privilege and regulating the fish wharf within the District of Columbia in which there is this provision:

Provided, That no wharf or dock shall be deemed eligible to be selected for said purpose unless situated at some point on the north side of the Potomac River between Eleventh street and Fourteenth street west and that no rights shall accrue to the highest bidder as aforesaid unless he be the proprietor or occupant of a suitable wharf or dock within the limits above prescribed.

Now, it so happens that just one individual was provided with a suitable wharf or dock and that he has been the only bidder for this privilege within all these years. The Commissioners regard it as a very valuable privilege, and in order to make regulations so that the District will receive a larger revenue from the sale of this privilege this bill is proposed. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. FINLEY. Do I understand the gentleman that this party has a monopoly?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; an absolute monopoly as the matter now stands. He makes a certain bid every year. There is a provision for the advertising for bids, and on the day on which the bids are let this man is the only bidder, because under the provisions of the old law he is the only person eligible to the privilege. Now, the Commissioners want to make regulations that will enable the District to realize more revenue from this privilege.

Mr. FINLEY. And the purpose of this bill is to break up that monopoly?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The purpose of this bill is to break up that monopoly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my colleague on that committee the following amendment to that bill:

Provided, That no letting or selling of such rights or privileges shall be for a longer time than one year.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is the provision of the old law, and I accept the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to say this is a unanimous report from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall make no objection, then.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding: "*Provided*, That no letting or sale of such rights or privileges shall be for a longer term than one year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL WEARING OF BADGES OR INSIGNIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 58.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the same.

The Clerk read the bill as proposed to be amended, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 58) to prevent the unlawful wearing of the badge or insignia of the Grand Army of the Republic or other soldier organizations.

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever, in the District of Columbia, not being a member of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, of the Grand Army of the Republic, of the Sons of Veterans, of the Woman's Relief Corps, of the Union Veteran's Union, of the Union Veteran Legion, of the United Spanish War Veterans, and not entitled under the rules of the order to wear the same, willfully wears or uses the insignia, distinctive ribbon, or badge of membership, rosette, or button thereof, or who uses or wears the same to obtain aid or assistance thereby, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $20 or by imprisonment for not more than thirty days, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

ABATEMENT OF NUISANCES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 4461.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4461) to provide for the abatement of nuisances in the District of Columbia by the Commissioners of said District, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the owner of any real property in the District of Columbia shall fail or refuse, after the service of reasonable notice in the manner hereinafter provided, to correct any condition which exists on or has arisen from such property in violation of law or of any regulation made by authority of law, with the correction of which condition said owner is by law or by said regulation chargeable, or to show cause, sufficient in the judgment of the Commissioners of said District, why he should not be required to correct such condition, then, and in that instance, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, and they are hereby authorized to, cause such condition to be corrected; assess the cost of correcting such condition and all expenses incident thereto (including the cost of publication, if any, hereinafter provided for) as a tax against the property on which such condition existed or from which such condition arose, as the case may be; and carry such tax on the regular tax rolls of said District, and collect such tax in the same manner as general taxes in said District are collected: *Provided,* That the correction of any condition aforesaid by said Commissioners under authority of this section shall not relieve the owner of the property on which such condition existed, or from which such condition arose, from criminal prosecution and punishment for having caused or allowed such unlawful condition to arise or for having failed or refused to correct the same.

SEC. 2. That for the purpose of carrying into effect section 1 of this act the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and all other persons, including contractors and employees of contractors acting under their authority or by their direction, be, and they are hereby, authorized to enter upon and into any lands and tenements in said District, during all reasonable hours, to inspect the same and to do whatever may be necessary to correct, in a good and workmanlike manner, any condition that exists on or has arisen from such lands or tenements in violation of law or of any regulation made by authority of law, with the correction of which condition the owner of said lands or tenements is by law or such regulation chargeable. Any person who shall hinder, interfere with, or prevent any inspection or work authorized by this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding $100 or by imprisonment for a period not exceeding three months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 3. That for the purposes of this act any notice required by law or by any regulation aforesaid to be served shall be deemed to have been served (a) if delivered to the person to be notified or if left at the usual residence or place of business of the person to be notified with a person of suitable age and discretion then resident therein, or (b) if no such residence or place of business can be found in said District by reasonable search if left with any person of suitable age and discretion employed therein at the office of any agent of the person to be notified, which agent has any authority or duty with reference to the land or tenement to which said notice relates, or (c) if no such office can be found in said District by reasonable search if forwarded by registered mail to the last known address of the person to be notified and not returned to the post-office authorities, or (d) if no address be known or can by reasonable diligence be ascertained or if any notice forwarded as authorized by the preceding clause of this section be returned by the post-office authorities if published on three consecutive days in a daily newspaper published in the District of Columbia, or (e) if by reason of an outstanding unrecorded transfer of title the name of the owner in fact can not be ascertained beyond a reasonable doubt, if served on the owner of record in the manner hereinbefore in this section provided. Any notice required by law or by any regulation aforesaid to be served on a corporation shall for the purposes of this act be deemed to have been served on any such corporation if served on the president, secretary, treasurer, general manager, or any principal officer of such corporation in the manner hereinbefore provided for the service of notices on natural persons holding property in their own right, and, if required to be served on any foreign corporation, if served on any agent of such corporation personally or if left with any person of suitable age and discretion residing at the usual residence or employed at the place of business of such agent in the District of Columbia. Every notice aforesaid shall be in writing or printing or partly in writing and partly in printing; shall be addressed by name to the person to be notified; shall describe with certainty the character and location of the unlawful condition to be corrected, and shall allow a reasonable time to be specified in said notice within which the person notified may correct such unlawful condition or show cause why he should not be required to do so.

SEC. 4. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

SEALER AND ASSISTANT SEALER OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 4463.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4463) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved March 2, 1895, entitled "An act for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. That the sealer of weights and measures shall give bond to the District of Columbia in the penalty of $5,000, with two sureties or with the guaranty of a bonding company, to be approved by the Commissioners, conditioned on the faithful discharge of the duties of his office, and shall take and subscribe on oath or affirmation before the Commissioners that he will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of his office, which bond or guaranty and oath shall be deposited with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

REPORT UPON THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE ANACOSTIA RIVER FLATS.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask the present consideration of the bill S. 71.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin calls up Senate bill No. 71, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 71) requiring the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare a report upon the improvement of the Anacostia River flats.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to submit to Congress a report upon the improvement of the so-called flats of the Anacostia River from its mouth to the District line, with recommendations and estimates of cost.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if this bill has been reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. SULZER. Unanimously?

Mr. BABCOCK. Unanimously.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to inquire what the purpose of this bill is?

Mr. BABCOCK. The purpose of the bill is to get the facts and figures which the Commissioners have in their possession in reference to the cost of improving the Anacostia flats, if it is ever done. It involves no expense whatever.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why could not that be done by a simple resolution of inquiry?

Mr. BABCOCK. Well, it is presented to the House in this way by the Senate. It has passed the Senate, and the easiest and quickest way to get the information is to pass it here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the passage of this bill call for any appropriation?

Mr. BABCOCK. No appropriation; no extra expense attendant upon it at all.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My purpose of inquiry is this: Does the passage of this bill put any improvement upon a footing that would entitle an appropriation to be made on an appropriation bill without further legislation?

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to hear the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I desire to know whether, if this bill be passed, that hereafter it would be in order to make appropriations for this purpose upon appropriation bills without further legislation?

Mr. BABCOCK. This would not affect the right of the Appropriation Committee one way or another in the matter. It simply places before Congress this information, that is all; and I would say to the gentleman that, so far as the Committee on the District of Columbia is concerned, there is no intention, I believe, to bring in any proposition before this House calling for the appropriation of money.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Why does this come in the form of an act instead of a joint or concurrent resolution?

Mr. BABCOCK. I think the gentleman will have to propound that question at the other end of the Capitol, as this is a Senate bill.

Mr. MANN. As it is not possible for me to propound that question at the other end of the Capitol, and probably never will be, I am compelled to rely upon the gentleman from Wisconsin, whom I wish might be translated to the other end of the Capitol, where he properly belongs.

Now, I understand a simple resolution can call for this information; I do not see the object of an act of Congress calling for it.

Mr. BABCOCK. I think the resolution would have been ample; a joint resolution from either House.

Mr. MANN. Is it not the purpose always to permit the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to put this in the river and harbor bill—a perfectly legitimate purpose, I suppose?

Mr. BABCOCK. I have no knowledge or information on that subject at all.

Mr. MANN. Would not an appropriation for this improvement come through the River and Harbor Committee, or the authorization of it?

Mr. BABCOCK. I think that the appropriations within the District have been made by the Appropriations Committee in the House in the past.

Mr. MANN. Is this an improvement of the Anacostia River, or an improvement of adjoining land?

Mr. BABCOCK. This is the old question of the reclamation of the Anacostia Flats.

Mr. MANN. Who owns that land?

Mr. BABCOCK. The Government, I assume.

Mr. MANN. The only method of reclamation is by improving the river, is it not?

Mr. BABCOCK. It would be similar to the work that was done here opposite the wharf where the island was made by reclamation into a Government park. I suppose this work, if ever done, would be similar to that. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that the committee has no pride in the form of this bill. If he thinks there is anything wrong, we better turn it down. The committee thought it a simple matter, and believed Congress should have the information.

Mr. MANN. It seems that the House may properly inquire for information without the gentleman thinking that it is a reflection upon his committee, which we have no thought of doing.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Commissioners have this information in their possession or if a new investigation is required.

Mr. BABCOCK. I understood that the information is practically ready.

Mr. SULZER. Let me ask the gentleman how much is it going to cost the Government to get this information?

Mr. BABCOCK. It is all practically prepared, and I understand there will be no expense whatever.

Mr. SULZER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin whether, if the Commissioners decided to make any further investigation, it would not require some appropriation from Congress in the future?

Mr. BABCOCK. I think it would. I do not think they have any money available to make any further investigation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And would not the passage of this bill make a provision for appropriation upon the District of Columbia appropriation bill?

Mr. BABCOCK. The information that the committee has is that the Commissioners have the facts and figures practically ready to submit to Congress now without any additional investigation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But that would not preclude the Commissioners asking for the information—to make further investigation under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. BABCOCK. I do not understand that there is any further investigation necessary that will involve any expense. This simply authorizes or directs them to make a report to Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask the gentleman to yield me two or three minutes on this question. I will move to recommit or lay it on the table.

Mr. MANN. Before the gentleman from Wisconsin yields to the gentleman from New York, will the gentleman pardon me for making a suggestion to him with reference to it? Under the rules of the House an appropriation for a public work in progress is in order. Now, if this information is obtained by a resolution, it is not a public work in progress; but if we pass an act of Congress requiring the Commissioners to submit to Congress an estimate of the cost—query: Will it not be called a public work in progress and thereupon appropriation become in order? There can be no other purpose for putting this in the form of an act of Congress, it seems to me. I think the gentleman ought to be willing to amend it, so that instead of being an act of Congress it will be a concurrent resolution.

Mr. BABCOCK. The committee has no particular interest in the form of the measure. We simply think this information is desirable. I am perfectly willing that an amendment may be made making this a joint resolution instead of an act, if the gentleman thinks it would be any better.

Mr. MANN. It ought to be a concurrent resolution, I fully agree with the gentleman. I have no doubt whatever, and I take the same views as the gentleman from New York has taken and others have taken.

Mr. BABCOCK. Does the gentleman desire time?

Mr. MANN. I would like to offer an amendment at the proper time changing it from an act to a concurrent resolution.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be laid aside temporarily to give gentlemen time to prepare an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF KALORAMA ROAD.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill H. R. 130 in the House as in Committee of the Whole, under the five-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the consideration of the bill 130, and that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 130) authorizing the extension of Kalorama road NW.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed, within thirty days after the passage of this act, to institute in the supreme court of the District of Columbia sitting as a district court, by petition, particularly describing the lands to be taken, proceedings to condemn the land necessary for the extension of Kalorama road from Eighteenth street to Champlain street with a width of 50 feet.

SEC. 2. That of the amount found to be due and awarded as damages for and in respect of the land condemned for extension of Kalorama road as herein provided, such amount thereof shall be assessed by the jury hereinafter provided for as benefits, and to the extent of such benefits, against those pieces or parcels of land on each side of said road as extended, and also on any or all pieces or parcels of land which will be benefited by the opening of said road as said jury may find said pieces or parcels of land will be benefited; in and determining the amounts to be assessed against said pieces or parcels of land the jury shall take into consideration the respective situations of such pieces or parcels of land and the benefits they may severally receive from the extension of said street as aforesaid: *Provided*, That if the aggregate amount of the benefits to be assessed, as determined by said jury pursuant to the provisions hereof, is less than one-half of the amount of the damages awarded for and in respect of the land condemned, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, in their discretion, reject the award and assessment of said jury, and all proceedings hereunder shall be null and void.

SEC. 3. That the said court shall cause public notice of not less than ten days to be given of the filing of said proceedings by advertisement in such manner as the court shall prescribe, which notice shall warn all persons having any interest in the proceedings to attend court at a day to be named in said notice and to continue in attendance until the court shall have made its final order ratifying and confirming the award of damages and assessment of benefits of the jury; and in addition to such public notice said court, whenever in its judgment it is practicable to do so, may cause a copy of said notice to be served by the marshal of the District of Columbia, or his deputies, upon such owners of the land to be condemned as may be found by said marshal or his deputies within the District of Columbia.

SEC. 4. That after the return of the marshal and the filing of proof of publication of the notice provided for in the preceding section, said court shall cause a jury of seven judicious, disinterested men, not related to any person interested in the proceedings, and not in the service or employment of the District of Columbia or of the United States, to be summoned by the marshal of the District of Columbia, to which jurors said court shall administer an oath or affirmation that they are not interested in any manner in the land to be condemned nor are in any way related to the parties interested therein, and that they will without favor or partiality, to the best of their judgment, assess the damages each owner of land taken may sustain by reason of the extension of said road and the condemnation of lands for the purpose of such extension and assess the benefits resulting therefrom, as hereinbefore provided. The court before accepting the jury shall hear any objections that may be made to any member thereof, and shall have full power to decide upon all such objections and to excuse any juror or cause any vacancy in the jury when impaneled to be filled; and after said jury shall have been organized and shall have viewed the premises, said jury shall proceed, in the presence of the court, if the court shall so direct, or otherwise, as the court may direct, to hear and receive such evidence as may be offered or submitted on behalf of the District of Columbia, and by any person or persons having any interest in the proceedings for the extension of said avenue. When the hearing is concluded the jury, or a majority of them, shall return to said court, in writing, its verdict of the amount to be found due and payable as damages sustained by reason of the extension of said road under the provisions thereof and of the pieces or parcels of land benefited by such extension and the amount of the assessment for such benefits against the same.

SEC. 5. That if the use of a part only of any piece or parcel of ground shall be condemned, the jury in determining its value shall not take into consideration any benefits that may accrue to the remainder thereof from the extension of said road or highway, but such benefits shall be considered in determining what assessment shall be made on or against such part of such piece or parcel of land as may not be taken as hereinbefore provided.

SEC. 6. That the court shall have power to hear and determine any objections which may be filed to said verdict or award, and to set aside and vacate the same, in whole or in part, when satisfied that it is unjust or unreasonable, and in such event a new jury shall be summoned, who shall proceed to assess the damages or benefits, as the case may be, in respect of the land as to which the verdict may be vacated, as in the case of the first jury: *Provided*, That if vacated in part the residue of the verdict and award as to the land condemned or assessed shall not be affected thereby: *And provided further*, That the exceptions or objections to the verdict and award shall be filed within thirty days after the return of such verdict and award.

SEC. 7. That when the verdict of said jury shall have been finally ratified and confirmed by the court, as herein provided, the amounts of money awarded and adjudged to be payable for lands taken under the provisions hereof shall be paid to the owners of said land by the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia from moneys advanced to him by the Secretary of the Treasury upon requisitions of the Commissioners of said District, as provided by law; and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of said judgments and awards is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 8. That when confirmed by the court the several assessments herein provided to be made shall severally be a lien upon the land assessed, and shall be collected as special improvement taxes in the District of Columbia, and shall be payable in five equal annual installments, with interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum from and after sixty days after the confirmation of the verdict and award. In all cases of payments the accounting officers shall take into account the assessment for benefits and the award for damages and shall pay only such part of said award in respect of any lot as may be in excess of the assessment for benefits against the part of such lot not taken, and there shall be credited on said assessment the amount of said award not in excess of said assessment. The said court may allow amendments in form or substance in any petition, process, record, or proceeding, or in the description of property proposed to be taken, or

of property assessed for benefits, whenever such amendments will not interfere with the substantial rights of the parties interested.

SEC. 9. That each juror shall receive as compensation the sum of $5 per day for his services during the time he shall be actually engaged in such services under the provisions hereof.

SEC. 10. That the sum of $300 is hereby appropriated, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, to provide the necessary funds for the costs and expenses of the condemnation proceedings taken pursuant hereto.

SEC. 11. That no appeal by any interested party from the decision of the supreme court of the District of Columbia confirming the assessment or assessments of benefits or damages herein provided for nor any other proceeding at law or in equity by such party against the confirmation of such assessment or assessments shall delay or prevent the payment of award to others in respect to the property condemned nor delay or prevent the taking of any of said property sought to be condemned nor the extension of such road: *Provided, however,* That upon the final determination of said appeal or other proceeding at law or in equity the amount found to be due and payable as damages sustained by reason of the extension of said road under the provisions hereof shall be paid as hereinbefore provided.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, there is a principle involved in this bill of such importance that I think it better be considered in the Committee of the Whole. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 130 and also the bill H. R. 127.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 130 and also the bill H. R. 127.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. DENBY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering two bills, the first of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 130) authorizing the extension of Kalorama road northwest.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with, as it has just been read to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, in reference to the bill——

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will have order, so that we can hear. We have not been able to hear anything this morning.

Mr. BABCOCK. If it is in order, I will ask for the reading of the bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further debate, the Chair will order the bill to be read under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I think there is an important question involved in this bill to which the House ought to pay some attention. As I understand it, oftentimes there are some gentlemen who live and own lands in the vicinity of this city who desire to enhance the value of those lands from acreage property to that which is sold by the foot. In other words, they want streets and alleys to subdivide their lands, and they want the government of the city to compensate them for these streets and alleys, that when established are to give greater, much greater, value to their lands. They propose to do it on what they call an exceedingly fair basis; that they shall pay a portion of the cost that their lands will be enhanced by the action that is proposed of subdivision. Under some circumstances that might be well, and I might be willing to say that that would be fair; but under the methods that are pursued in this city that kind of procedure never is fair. I think we have a right to say that we distrust all these appraisements that are made in the city of Washington in cases where the Government proposes to take land for public uses. The Government is always outraged by these performances. Let me cite you an instance, Mr. Chairman. A block southeast from where we now stand was recently acquired by the Government by appraisement by the method that is proposed to be followed, substantially, by this bill. These lands cost the Government of the United States more than three times the sum that they had been appraised at for taxation purposes. We are told whenever it is proposed to increase the taxes of the property owners of the District that they pay excessive taxation; that their lands are unduly valued; that uniformly they sustain a valuation fully equal to two-thirds of the sum that they would sell for in the market.

Now, for the purposes of this argument I am going to assume that that may be true, and that it would have been right under the circumstances of which I speak that the Government should have paid a third more than the appraised value of these lands; yet it was compelled to pay three times the value of these lands—three times, sir!

The same experience was had when the block northeast of the Capitol was secured to the Government. Again we had to pay more than three times the assessed value. So it is with all the property that the Government acquires through this method of appraisement when the appraisements are made by the real-estate ring of the city of Washington. [Applause.] And I think a halt ought to be called in that method of making appraisement and compensation. I am opposed to using the Government of the United States or the District of Columbia for the purpose of further exploiting the lands in the suburbs of this city. We have gone to the extreme in that respect.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. BABCOCK. I desire to correct the gentleman in one statement. This is not in the suburbs, but it lies in a thickly populated part of the city between Florida avenue and the crest of the hill.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. BABCOCK. There is no acre property adjoining or anywhere near it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, the principle that I have tried to discuss is the same. You will find it in this bill, as you find it in all these other propositions.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am very glad to hear what the gentleman says about this matter. Can he tell me now whether the Government appealed from this oppressive appraisement and was relieved from having to pay three times the value; and if not, why not?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know whether the Government has the right of appeal or where the appeal would lie. I presume that in this, as in all matters of condemnation, there is the possibility of appeal—that is, that parties would have their right to challenge the appraisement in the courts appointing the appraisers. But I think you will find——

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Of course the landowners can appeal; but has the Government the right to appeal or to refuse to pay this award?

Mr. HEPBURN. I will not say whether it has the right of appeal or not, but I certainly agree with the gentleman that there ought to be some power of review. Possibly it would be impracticable. I do not know whether you could accomplish anything by it. I remember reading some of the proof in the case of the condemnation of Rock Creek Park, and I was astonished to find that there were men in the city of Washington who, under the solemnity of an oath, would fix a valuation of $35,000 an acre for lands that were far away from the limits of this city.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. It is not an unusual thing for the landowner to appeal, and I do not see any reason why the Government, that has to pay for the land, should not have the right of appeal.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think you are certainly right. I doubt whether under circumstances like these the Government ought to pay for the streets and alleys when the lands are subdivided and made a part of the city, as would be the case should this bill pass. There is an astonishing and extraordinary augmentation of values always in cases of this kind, and I think that we ought to assume that the necessary land should be given when this great value is added to the property.

I do not know the particulars of this special case, and therefore I do not choose to discuss them, but I want to speak against the principle. I want to speak against the principle that is involved in enlarging the streets and alleys of the city of Washington as long as those that we now have are in the condition that they are. There is not a continuous mile of street in the city of Washington where there is to-day a respectable driveway. We talk about the beauties of the Capital, we talk about the expenditure of millions to make it the most beautiful city in the country; and yet, if you will drive over any of the highways of this city, you will find they are in a lamentable condition. I have to pass daily over a street right here in our vicinity—East Capitol street. It is in such a condition, I suppose from

the scandalously faulty first construction or first surfacing, that it seems to one as he rides that he is passing over one of the old-fashioned army corduroy roads. The surface is cracked from one end to the other, the cracks extending from the center to the curb. Every 5 or 6 or 10 feet you come to the jar and jolt that results from that uniformity of defect.

Another street over which I frequently ride—B street NE.—has two blocks where I think there is not to be found a single square rod in which the asphaltum surface has not disappeared in places, leaving a jolting hole that entirely destroys the pleasure or the convenience of a drive. This street has been in that condition for months and months, and I understand the reason to be that there is no money available for the purpose of putting in proper and passable condition the streets that we have. When I say passable condition I do not mean that you can not pick your way over those streets, but I mean that they are not in passable condition, as the highways of the great Capital of the United States ought to be. And yet here they stand reaching out for more streets, more highways, more places in which to spend money that they say they do not have. I think there ought to be a halt called on all movements that look to the securement of greater extension of highways until those we have are brought somewhere nearly into the decent condition that the streets of the great Capital should be in. [Applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Committee of the Whole House to what I deem a radical defect in this legislation, in any event. I by no means hesitate to indorse the position taken by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], but I want to call attention to the very peculiar condition that is proposed in the proceeding by which these condemnations are to take place. In the first place, the verdict is to be rendered by a majority of the jury, thereby making it very much easier of obtainment than if the entire jury should be compelled to join. And I may say that my observation and experience, which has been pretty lengthy, is that in matters of condemnation it is not very difficult to get one-half of the jury with the most inflated idea of the value of the premises sought to be condemned. In the first place, I call the attention of the committee to this fact, that there is no provision in the bill for an appeal, although I think it probable that under the general statutes there may be an appeal provided for somewhere that would carry this case to some other court on appeal, and there is a possible inference in the bill itself that that is the idea of whoever concocted the very adroit scheme of this measure.

The provision of the bill is that the condemnation shall be in the supreme court of the District of Columbia and that the court shall have the power to hear exceptions to the manner of procedure, just as in any other court of original jurisdiction the court that is to confirm or set aside the verdict of the jury has a right to hear exceptions to the report; but at the end of that time there is no provision for any appeal to another court or tribunal, although I say it is possible that there may be under same general statute.

But here is the provision which I condemn and which ought not to be permitted for one moment:

SEC. 11. That no appeal by any interested party from the decision of the supreme court of the District of Columbia confirming the assessment or assessments of benefits or damages herein provided for nor any other proceeding at law or in equity by such party against the confirmation of such assessment or assessments shall delay or prevent the payment of award to others in respect to the property condemned nor delay or prevent the taking of any of said property sought to be condemned nor the extension of such road: *Provided, however*, That upon the final determination of said appeal or other proceeding at law or in equity the amount found to be due and payable as damages sustained by reason of the extension of said road under the provisions hereof shall be paid as hereinbefore provided.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman inform the committee whether or not there is a provision for any officer, district attorney, or prosecuting attorney, or any legal representative of the Government, to appear to represent the Government in these condemnation proceedings?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not find any provision of that character in this bill. I do not know what the general statutes may provide in that regard.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. All that is provided is that it shall have a jury, bring in the witnesses, and that five of the jurors may bring in a verdict, and that ends it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; and they get $5 apiece a day for doing it. Now, Mr. Chairman, what I want to get at is this: That in any proceeding anywhere for the condemnation of real estate, if an appeal is taken from the finding and judgment of the court below, the proceeding is suspended until the final hearing of the court and the judgment becomes a finality. I think this legislation is dangerous legislation, and it is made entirely too easy to extend the benefits of the treasury of the District of Columbia out into the improvement of these lands. I do not care whether they are just outside of Florida avenue or where they are. The whole principle of the bill is vicious, and it ought not to pass.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time in my experience as a Member of this House that we have had our attention sharply challenged to this kind of lawless imposition upon the Government rights in reference to eminent-domain proceedings. I remember, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman who is now the Speaker of this House said, with reference, I believe, to some asylum where condemnation proceedings were about to be had, that it was impossible to get an honest eminent-domain proceeding held in the District of Columbia.

He has been here for about forty years. This morning we hear the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], a man who is familiar with the District of Columbia, make the appalling statement that in building the offices for the Senate and the offices for the House the Government has been held up and made to pay three times the assessed value of the property. We hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who is as well acquainted with the geography of this District and this legislation, I dare say, as any man in the District, and yet we do not hear a single solitary suggestion from the distinguished gentleman who reports this bill to the House. Ah, the outrageous oppression that has been visited on the Government, cited by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]! It is time to call a halt. This is no man's State. It is not mine; it is not yours. We are the city council for the District of Columbia. With such testimony as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] has cited here, we should do one of two things—we should defeat this bill or provide that there shall be an appeal if the Government authorities think there should be one, and that there shall be counsel present to represent the District in these cases, to look after the interest of the District. Why, I have never heard in my life of such a stupendous proposition as this in eminent-domain cases. The city that I have the honor to represent, Nashville, the city attorney, with marked ability and great energy, represents the mayor and the city council in these cases.

Why, I remember the condemning of Fort Negley, where my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] and my friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] were about forty years ago. They did not, however, make a speech at that time, as they were very busy otherwise. The city condemned that whole hill for a reservoir; and, by the way, a neighbor of President Harrison built the reservoir. We had a great lawsuit about the value of this land, and the city of Nashville was not only represented by Judge Anderson, one of her best lawyers, but, if I mistake not, we employed additional counsel, and the matter was settled in the supreme court of the State.

Mr. SIMS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this bill ought to be defeated?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Nobody has explained it. It has not been read.

Mr. SIMS. Why, it has been read twice.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Oh, I mean in the hearing of the House. The first reading of the bill was waived.

Mr. SIMS. Read by paragraphs.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I venture to say there are not five men in this House who know what is in this bill.

Mr. SIMS. Is the gentleman one of them?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Are you?

Mr. SIMS. No; I know all about it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman who reports this bill has not explained it.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman not think it would be a good idea for somebody who does know something about it to explain it?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am, as usual, groping in darkness, simply because the chairman of the committee who brings in this bill has not explained it to the House; yet his duty is to explain it.

Mr. SIMS. But he explained it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Oh, explained it. But there are not five men in this House, unless they sat around the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK], who heard a word of this bill. I sat here and listened and tried my best to hear it.

Mr. SIMS. I would like to inform the gentleman now that not a cent of this comes out of the Government.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I don't care; it is wrong anyway.

Mr. SIMS. Wrong to pay people for their property?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. No; but the principle upon which this bill is based.

Mr. SIMS. Well, what is the principle?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. There is nobody to represent the Government.

Mr. SIMS. But the Government is not interested.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. If my friend knows so much about it, why doesn't he explain it? He knows that I hang upon his words; he knows that I have great confidence in him.

Mr. BABCOCK. I can explain it in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Wait a moment. I am talking to my friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]. Now, if the gentleman from Tennessee will explain this bill and tell me the Government of the United States has not got any money invested in it and is not liable, that the people of the United States are not liable in the least degree, and that the square thing will be done, and if the Government has any rights in it there will be the right of appeal, and that the other party will have the right of appeal, and that we will have some lawyer there to represent the Government, if the Government is interested, then I think it would be a fairly good bill.

Now, how is this bill in these matters?

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Just a moment. Will my colleague explain that?

Mr. SIMS. Why, certainly; but as a courtesy to the chairman of the committee, who has been accused of not explaining it, I think he ought to have an opportunity to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am not yet through with this matter.

Mr. BABCOCK. I want to explain to the gentleman from Tennessee why the chairman of the committee had not explained the bill.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well——

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, the reason ought to be perfectly apparent and plain that I have not had an opportunity to get the floor.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Who has not?

Mr. BABCOCK. The chairman of the committee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Wait a minute; did the gentleman not have a right to the floor when he reported the bill, and he sat down and the gentleman from Iowa got up and made his usual Gatling-gun speech at this bill and shot about forty holes through it, and then the gentleman from Ohio got up and fired a few rifle shots and then turned the fragments over to me? Now, if you can hold up your hands and show that this bill ought to be passed, I will yield the floor and let the gentleman explain the bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. I simply want to answer the gentleman's question as to why it has not been explained. Now, when the Gatling gun's fire started at the bill through courtesy I immediately sat down to listen to what the gentleman had to say.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I thought the gentleman scared the gentleman from Wisconsin off and——

Mr. BABCOCK. Then the gentleman from Ohio came up on the firing line, and I thought I could secure no opportunity for recognition, and then the gentleman from Tennessee came to the front——

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Tennessee always comes to the front when she thinks a square deal is needed and ought to be had. Now, I will yield the floor if the gentleman will explain this bill. Will the gentleman explain it?

Mr. BABCOCK. I did intend to do so.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then I yield the floor. I reserve my time if I have any left, because I want to be heard, too.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take the floor or borrow any part of the gentleman's time. I desire to be recognized in my own right. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the House, this bill is an exact duplicate, word for word, of a large number of bills which have been passed by this House. There is absolutely nothing new in it except the description of the property. It provides, first, that this little piece of ground, which connects Eighteenth street with Champlain avenue, a distance of some 200 feet, shall be opened. Why? For the use and benefit of the general public. There is no acreage property there; there is no real estate interest there. It is desired by the officials and by the government of the District of Columbia to accommodate the people who live on Champlain avenue and in that section.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, do not interrupt me, please. Now, Champlain avenue runs from Florida avenue, at the foot of the hill, clear up to the top of the hill, a distance of over 2,000 feet. There is no highway between the two streets by which the people can reach the street-car lines; that is, the Capital Traction Company line and Chevy Chase line where it runs out Eighteenth street and out over the bridge across Rock Creek. Now, this is the reason that has necessitated the enactment of this legislation. Now, how are you going to pay for it? In the first place, we proceed under the law. A jury is appointed which assesses benefits and damages. Under the provisions of the bill 50 per cent must be assessed as benefits, which are to be paid by the property owners, and 50 per cent is to be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, but not a penny out of the United States Treasury. Now, the estimated cost of this improvement is $6,000.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he leaves that very important proposition?

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. My colleague says that the Government of the United States is in no way liable for the expense attending this matter. We make a little appropriation of three or four thousand dollars to pay the expenses. Now, you say the money paid the damaged owners is paid out of the District treasury.

Mr. BABCOCK. Out of the District revenues.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How do those revenues get into the District treasury?

Mr. BABCOCK. From taxation in the District of Columbia only; not a cent from the Government. The gentleman must understand no moneys can be taken out of either the District or the United States treasuries without an act of this body—not a dollar.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman think we ought to protect that treasury as well as the Treasury of the United States? Is there any lawyer going to represent the District treasury down before this court?

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, the District of Columbia is represented by able attorneys.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. In this kind of procedure?

Mr. BABCOCK. In this kind of procedure; yes, sir.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Who are the gentlemen? What are their names?

Mr. BABCOCK. I can not give the gentleman all of the names. Mr. Duvall, who recently passed away, was one of the attorneys for years, and Mr. Sinclair is in charge of matters of this kind.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. There is not a word said in the bill about any attorney representing the city.

Mr. BABCOCK. No, sir; the attorney for the District of Columbia or some of his assistants represent the District of Columbia in all legal matters.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman object to an amendment?

Mr. BABCOCK. I object to any amendment of that kind to the bill.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Requiring an attorney to represent the District of Columbia?

Mr. BABCOCK. That is already provided for under the law, my dear sir.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What objection has the gentleman to putting it in here literally?

Mr. BABCOCK. The objection, I think, is this, Mr. Chairman. If the gentleman will listen to me for five minutes, I think he will understand it thoroughly. I want to explain how this form of a law came to be brought about. Numerous street-opening acts in the past have been attacked by property owners or those interested, and some acts were, I understand, set aside by the courts of the District of Columbia. The attorney for the District at that time, Mr. Duvall, and three Members of this House, two of them here at present and members of the Committee on the Judiciary, and one the chairman of that great committee, together with a very distinguished gentleman on the minority side of the House, Mr. COWHERD, of Missouri, formed a subcommittee of three, which was appointed by the District Committee to draft this very form of legislation.

That was some years ago. All the street-opening bills reported to the House then and since that time have been drawn in this form, word for word. They have gone before the courts of the District, they have been upheld, and every clause in this form of bill has been acted upon. One of the difficulties that the Commissioners experienced in street-opening cases was this—and I say this in reply to the criticism of the gentleman from Ohio—often when a man is dissatisfied with the decision or with the amount awarded him he could go in and stop the opening of a street a mile long indefinitely and hold up all the other property on that street, causing an immense amount of damage to individual owners. Congress has provided there shall be no stay, but he has a right to file exceptions to the award.

He can not under the present law or under the provisions of this bill stop the opening of a street.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. I have read the bill, and I think that provision is entirely right, but there are some other matters that I wish to ask the gentleman about. What will be the cost of improvements after the condemnation proceedings are had?

Mr. BABCOCK. It will be very trifling. This is a very level strip of ground, almost on grade from one street to the other.

Mr. FINLEY. Will that include paving and the extension of water mains?

Mr. BABCOCK. Nothing in the way of sewerage or water, I think, but it will ultimately require paving and grading. The extension will take two lots now vacant.

Mr. FINLEY. About what will that cost?

Mr. BABCOCK. This committee does not deal with that, and I could hardly give an intelligent estimate; but the cost will be trifling. I should say perhaps the street would be 200 feet long and about 50 feet wide.

Mr. FINLEY. My reason for asking the gentleman is simply that this is the beginning of a project, and I think that the House ought to know what will be the ultimate cost of the improvement should we go into it—whether it will be reasonable or not; but if the gentleman does not know that, of course he can not answer it.

Mr. BABCOCK. There are gentlemen on this floor who could answer the question as to what it would cost to grade a street 200 feet long and 50 feet wide.

Mr. FINLEY. That is grading and paving?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman tell me this? I find here, on page 4, lines 9 and 10, the following:

> When the hearing is concluded, the jury, or a majority of them, shall return to said court, in writing, its verdict of the amount to be found due—

and so forth. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman this: Is that not an unusual proposition—I do not mean here in the District of Columbia, but generally speaking—as to verdicts of juries?

Why the necessity for taking away unanimity in the conclusion of the jury and giving a majority verdict of a jury in a case like this? I would like to have some explanation of that.

Mr. BABCOCK. Well, I will say that this form of bill is the outgrowth of years and years of experience in the District of Columbia, and that the greater part of it has been drafted by the best legal minds and approved by the courts. Now, I am not a lawyer, and do not propose to get into any discussion of any legal questions involved.

Mr. FINLEY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I do not think my question involves a legal discussion, but as I understand all other verdicts here in the District of Columbia require unanimity on the part of the jury, and this permits a majority. Now, does the gentleman know whether or not this provision for a verdict of a majority of the jury applies to any other procedure in the District of Columbia than land-condemnation proceedings?

Mr. BABCOCK. I do not think it does apply to any except condemnation proceedings.

Mr. FINLEY. Then the gentleman knows of no reason why it should apply to this, except the practice and custom has grown up in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BABCOCK. Well, it is a practice that has been found to be necessary, and found to be efficient; and I do not think there has ever been a person appearing before the committee with any criticism as to the legal machinery of this form of bill. All concede that it has protected the rights of the District and of the property owners.

Mr. FINLEY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will call his attention to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa this morning, who spoke of some very exorbitant verdicts that were rendered by juries operating under this provision of permitting a verdict by a majority.

Mr. BABCOCK. I do not think he was speaking of the opening of streets. I think he referred only to the ground taken for the site of an office building for the Senate, in which he stated the verdict was three times what it should have been. That will appeal to every gentleman of the House as not being, perhaps, an unusual thing in cases where the Government condemns ground for sites for public buildings.

Mr. FINLEY. In my half-dozen years here in the House I have heard the charge frequently made that the verdicts of juries in assessment cases were exorbitant.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will permit me, I will say that it was shown at the time of the condemnation of the property across the river for a lunatic asylum that the only salvation of the District in the matter of condemnation was to require a verdict of the entire jury and not permit five or six men to get on a jury and join together to charge the Government more.

Mr. FINLEY. I am obliged to the gentleman from Ohio for his statement.

Mr. BABCOCK. In answer to that proposition, the gentleman is talking about an entirely different subject. That was a real-estate proposition, a speculative proposition. This is something demanded for the public, and for the public convenience. This proposed street extension does not relate to a speculative property, but is simply for the convenience of the people who live in that neighborhood and of the general public.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why, Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing above all other things in the development of the District of Columbia that is speculative—and everybody knows it—it is the taking out of the pockets of the people of this District and of the country the money to open streets out in the country to develop and enhance the value of the outlying property there. The only public interest that grows up is after the speculator has despoiled the Treasury of the country.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this proposed extension is not out in the country; it is hardly beyond the confines of Florida avenue—only about a thousand feet beyond that.

Mr. FINLEY. Would the gentleman have any objection to an amendment striking out this provision for a majority verdict on the part of the jury?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes, I would; because this provision has been found to work satisfactorily, and under it I do not think there is a single case of injustice that has been done either to the District or to the property owners. If there were I would be glad to yield for an amendment. But before the gentleman offers an amendment I desire to say that this form of law was prepared by three of the ablest lawyers in this body; that it has been used satisfactorily for years, and that a large number of bills identical in form with the one now under consideration have passed the House without debate or amendment. It has also been before the court several times, and its provisions were upheld. Before any amendment should be offered to that law its effect should certainly be very carefully considered.

Mr. FINLEY. This is not a general law of the District of Columbia affecting the general law of verdicts of juries, but simply applies to these procedures for the condemnation of lands, and we would not be amending any general law to require a unanimous verdict.

Mr. BABCOCK. Does the gentleman forget that this method has been in operation for years and years?

Mr. FINLEY. And during every year the attention of the House is called in the debates and statements made and figures given as to the exorbitant prices that have been obtained in this way, and numerous instances have been shown where it has not worked out to the best interests of the people of the District of Columbia or the Treasury; and that is what I have in mind, and what I wish to protect.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, just a word. If my friend from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] has a suit pending in one of the courts of the District of Columbia to recover the value of a horse and buggy, he must have the verdict of twelve men before he can get his money, although only twenty-five or fifty dollars may be involved; but when it comes to a question of taking the people's money and handing it over for the purposes for which we have enacted, you can get a majortiy of a jury to find a verdict. I say that is unfair.

Mr. FINLEY. A majority of seven men can do what otherwise requires twelve men.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Exactly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will permit a question, I should like to ask one. I find that section 2 provides—

> That of the amount found to be due and awarded as damages for and in respect of the land condemned for extension of Kalorama road as herein provided, such amount thereof shall be assessed by the jury hereinafter provided for as benefits, and to the extent of such benefits, against those pieces or parcels of land on each side of said road as extended.

Section 5 provides—

> That if the use of a part only of any piece or parcel of ground shall be condemned, the jury in determining its value shall not take into consideration any benefits that may accrue to the remainder thereof—

What is the meaning of that?

Mr. PALMER. Read the rest of the section.

Mr. HEPBURN. Why hold out the idea that there is to be——

Mr. BABCOCK. Read it all.

Mr. HEPBURN (reading)—

that may accrue to the remainder thereof from the extension of said road or highway, but such benefits shall be considered in determining what assessment shall be made on or against such part of such piece or parcel of land as may not be taken as hereinbefore provided.

Mr. BABCOCK. That answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. HEPBURN. No, it does not answer the gentleman's question. I want to know why you want that particular verbal juggling in there. Why should not these lands be considered just as the others are? Why do you make a special provision with regard to them, unless it be for the purpose of confusing and clouding the question that is to be submitted?

Mr. BABCOCK. Well, now——

Mr. HEPBURN. There is another question I should like to ask the gentleman. Why is it that he is so solicitous for the interest of these people who are on the opposite side of one of these parallel streets that is now cut off from access to the railroad by the location of this long strip of territory that he says intervenes, and that now compels these people to go around the end of it in order to get to the cars?

When they bought that property upon the opposite side of this long intervening strip of ground, did they not know of that situation and did they not get the benefit of it in the lower prices that they paid because of the inconvenience? And having selected that place, and being willing to submit themselves to the inconvenience for the sake of the compensation they had in the lower price, is it fair for them to come in now and say that the Government must wipe out this inconvenience and place their property in the condition of higher value that it would have been in when they bought their lands if this work had been completed at that time?

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Clerk to read the letter of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting this bill. That will answer many of the questions which have been asked by gentlemen.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE COMMISSIONERS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, November 21, 1905.

DEAR SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to forward herewith draft of bill to authorize the extension of Kalorama road NW. from Eighteenth street to Champlain avenue, with request for its enactment.

A map is inclosed, showing in red the land necessary to be condemned for the extension, the estimated cost of which is $6,000. The alley shown on the plat was recently condemned under the provisions of a general law authorizing such condemnation, and the entire cost of opening same, together with the expense of the proceedings, was assessed on property benefited. It is only necessary now, in order to get the 50 feet proposed by the bill, to condemn a strip of land about 30 feet wide at one end and 34 feet at the other. The opening of this street is of extreme importance for the reason that in the long block between Eighteenth street and Champlain avenue and extending from *Florida* avenue to Columbia road, a distance of about 2,000 feet, there is no means of access from east to west, so that those living to the east are cut off from convenient aecess to the street-car connection to the west. This section of the District is rapidly building up, several houses having been built in the immediate vicinity of the proposed extension within the last year, and unless the land is condemned in a short time it will probably be built upon, which would of course increase the cost if it is determined to open such a street at a future date.

The bill proposes that not less than one-half of the amount awarded as damages should be assessed against the abutting property, the other half to be borne by general taxation. The reason for this provision in this case is that the alley having already been condemned, and the cost assessed entirely on abutting property, and the street being a convenient means of access to the general public as well as to those immediately adjacent, the Commissioners believe that it is only just and equitable that the general public should bear a portion of the expense of opening this street.

Very respectfully, HENRY B. F. MACFARLAND,
President Board of Commissioners District of Columbia.

Hon. J. W. BABCOCK,
Chairman Committee on the District of Columbia,
House of Representatives.

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will ask for the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the floor for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I should like to have the opportunity to say a word before the chairman of the committee closes debate.

Mr. BABCOCK. I yielded to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asked to be recognized and the gentleman from Wisconsin yielded.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, the letter of the Commissioners has thrown some additional light upon this subject, to the extent of showing that there is a general statute under which this condemnation can be had, as I assume, from the fact that it tells us that an alleyway that will form a part of this highway has already been condemned under the general statute.

Mr. BABCOCK. If the gentleman will permit me, I will explain that in just a word. The last Congress passed an act authorizing the Commissioners to open minor streets and alleys, and they have opened an alley there 20 feet wide. This is an addition of 30 feet in width, making a 50-foot street. They have no authority under the general statute for making it more than 20 feet wide.

Mr. HEPBURN. I understand the gentleman to say there is authority for opening minor streets and alleys?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Is there a limit given to these streets?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Now, another point I want to make. In the opening of this inferior highway that would not be so beneficial—we have a right to assume—to the owners of this property, a mere alley, in order to have that convenience the property owners were compelled to meet with the entire expense. Now, when we propose to open a street that will have a frontage of more than 400 feet, making more valuable lots, why should we limit their contribution to one-half of this expense? In the expense of establishing the alley, where the benefit would be inconsiderable, they must pay all; here, where the special benefits are large, where there will be a frontage of 400 feet, they are to bear only one-half of the expense. Is there equity or justice in that?

Mr. BABCOCK. There is equity and justice because it is a great public benefit.

Mr. HEPBURN. A public benefit! It is a public benefit to those persons who bought their lots on the side of this parallel street that is cut off now from the free and easy access to the street railway, these gentlemen who have had the benefit of this isolated position that they selected for the lesser price, we assume, that they paid for their lots. Having had that, they now propose that the Government shall pay for these improvements that would place their property in a position that it would be in when it is no longer subject to this disability that resulted in the depreciated price that they were the beneficiaries of. A great public benefit! Does it extend, will this contemplated street extend, back to create a great thoroughfare? Surely not. It simply takes a piece of property that lies in front of property of a few persons who will be the beneficiaries for an alleged public use.

Mr. BABCOCK. It does extend the benefits to the public.

Mr. HEPBURN. If it were a part or would form a part of a great thoroughfare, that would be one thing; but after you get this street, if they want the benefit of a public thoroughfare, the gentleman will come here compelling the people who travel in that vicinity to traverse this road whether they want to or not, or whether it will be a convenience or otherwise. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe in this kind of legislation. I do not want any more streets about the city of Washington until we have better streets. I do not want the duty imposed on the Commissioners of surfacing vast areas of the country here in the District until they can properly surface those streets that we now have jurisdiction over, and which they ought in some way to make passable and comfortable.

Mr. BABCOCK. I now yield to my colleague on the committee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the criticism that has been made on the extension of streets cut through unimproved country being paid out of revenues for the District, and asphalted, and improvement made, etc., I feel as strongly against that as does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. Perhaps something of that sort has been done in the past; I do not know. But because something of that sort has been done that was wrong, should this House stand here and refuse to make needed improvements simply on that account? There is a street-car line running up and down Eighteenth street that brings hundreds and thousands of people to the city and back to the country, or to that portion through which the cars run.

Kalorama avenue comes along at right angles and intersects Eighteenth street, so that the people living on Eighteenth street have Kalorama avenue to come down. The people in Champlain avenue, which runs parallel with Eighteenth street, have no way of getting out of it without going away round the end of the block, and it makes it almost inaccessible. Here is a small piece of property—if gentlemen can see these red lines on the map that I hold up—there is a small portion between Eighteenth and Champlain avenue, 34 feet at one end and 30 at the other. If purchased now, while it is vacant, it will open Kalo-

rama avenue down to Champlain avenue so that people can come through to this street car line without going around out of the way. Now, after that property, which is now vacant, is built upon, the necessity for opening this street will be greater in the future than it is now, and after it is opened it will cost three or four times as much as it will now. To condemn that property now will cost $6,000. This bill provides that one-half shall come out of the property owners and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia. Gentlemen will remember that no part of that is provided by the United States Government. The people of the District of Columbia are benefited as well as those who happen to own this vacant piece of property. Now, gentlemen will notice that lots are laid off fronting Champlain avenue and Eighteenth street. Consequently, the improvement to this vacant property here when this is taken off will not equal what it would if these vacant properties abutted on a great street like this street car line occupies. Consequently, it is inequitable to take from the owners of these two vacant pieces, who had already furnished the 20-foot alleyway, the entire cost of opening that street that they have no particular interest in. The owner of this lot fronts on Eighteenth street, and the owner of that block on the east side fronts Champlain. Therefore, they can not possibly be benefited individually and personally as much as the public who want to go through to Champlain, and the public on Champlain and east, in order to go through to this street car line. I have never seen in the District of Columbia a street-opening proposition that had more equity in proportion to the cost than this has.

As to the general condemnation laws of the District, I am not here to defend or commend them. It is only up to the committee as to what we are going to do with this identical bill. Are you going to refuse a large number of people a needed convenience because the law may have been, in some instances in the past, abused? Now, it is true that when this street is opened, or these condemnation proceedings take place and dedication is authorized, then the city will improve by asphalting or otherwise, and that expense comes out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and also out of the half paid by the Government, as I understand it. Therefore, to that extent, the General Treasury is indirectly interested in such improvements as they may make in the way of paving hereafter. But that is done and has to be authorized or paid for by separate authorization, and so far as this bill goes, we do not provide how it shall be improved, whether the street shall be asphalted or paved in some other way. We simply authorize the opening of a street which is as much needed as I can conceive could possibly be anywhere in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What has been the observation of the gentleman, who is now on the District Committee, with reference to the oppressive prices that the Government, either the District of Columbia or the United States, has had to pay in these condemnation proceedings?

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman have reference to condemnation proceedings by the Government for public buildings?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; or any other public concern. We will say a public building.

Mr. SIMS. These streets here are paid for by the city and not by the Government.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I understand. That is indirectly the Government of the United States.

Mr. SIMS. No; we do not directly or indirectly contribute to it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The revenues come out of the District of Columbia to pay for these street improvements. What has been the gentleman's observation with reference to, say, land for public buildings?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I never have had an opportunity to observe but one instance and that was the case of the condemnation of the property on which the office building for the House is being built.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What has been the gentleman's observation?

Mr. SIMS. I never have bought or sold any property in Washington. I never priced it, but from the price paid in the case referred to I thought those people got in a commercial way every cent that they ought to have had and perhaps more. But there is something to consider besides the mere market value of the property when you go in and take a man's home from him and deprive him of it and put him in the way of being compelled to hunt up another place and make the best bargain he can for it. There is something in the nature of damages in such a case outside of the commercial value. He may easily get a great deal less than he would have been willing to take for it, whether in the nature of a home or a homestead.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman know whether any appeals were taken in these cases?

Mr. SIMS. Yes; I think there were many appeals taken.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. By whom?

Mr. SIMS. Well, exceptions to the report, which are in the nature of an appeal.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. By whom?

Mr. SIMS. The property owners.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Was any lawyer there, any United States district attorney, or any law official, representing the District of Columbia—representing the Government or District of Columbia—in making these condemnations?

Mr. SIMS. Well, the District of Columbia had no interest in it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I put my proposition both ways.

Mr. SIMS. And the property owners were the only ones interested——

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Was there any United States district attorney there?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I do not know just how the proceedings were taken—whether the Attorney-General of the United States or an assistant district attorney or an attorney of the United States was present. I do not know how the interests of the Government were protected in detail, but I know they were protected.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Protected how?

Mr. SIMS. Why, that the Government was properly represented.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. BABCOCK. I want to say in connection with that that an attorney is detailed by the Commissioners specifically to look after street openings—Mr. Sinclair. I understand the Appropriations Committee appropriates especially for his salary and he is detailed.

Mr. SIMS. He is the assistant district attorney, but the gentleman from Tennessee was asking about this office building. Now, I want to ask you if you can see any objection whatever to this bill?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I want to say to my colleague that the main trouble is because the bill was not explained at first. Then the second trouble is that there is a general objection to the bill because of the general nature of it. It does not seem to guard the interests of the public, whether it is the District of Columbia or the Government of the United States, as thoroughly as it should. For instance, it provides seven jurors. Now, I understand they can condemn land possibly without any jury, but then that is not fair, that is not just.

Mr. SIMS. Does my colleague recognize the necessity for that improvement?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Oh, I do not know anything about real estate in Washington.

Mr. SIMS. Do you not recognize the necessity of it, as explained to you?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I confess to my friend I am a little bit prejudiced against it because it is out on the edge of town. I have seen so much of paving and asphalting and guttering out on the edge of my beautiful city, which you love as well as myself, while our streets in the very heart of the city were in holes, so I confess I am somewhat prejudiced in this case.

Mr. SIMS. There is no use getting away from this question.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am showing you——

Mr. SIMS. Eighteenth street is highly improved, Champlain avenue is improved and Kalorama is improved, and there is this little connection in the heart of a thickly settled portion of this city on Washington Heights. It is not in the suburbs; it is not out of the town, but it is in a place where property is as high in value almost as any part of Washington City.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. You mean high in value?

Mr. SIMS. Yes, sir; and the trouble is that——

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do you think this work ought to be done by seven jurors—this work of condemnation?

Mr. SIMS. I think, as to condemnation proceedings, they ought to proceed in the interest of the public as rapidly as possible.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, that does not answer the question.

Mr. SIMS. I do not propose to wait now and change the general law in order to get this bill passed.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. You say specifically in the bill seven jurors, and that five can make a report and condemn a man's property. You can try with seven and decide with five.

Mr. SIMS. It seems, Mr. Chairman, neither the owners of

the property nor the public nor the District of Columbia have in any way objected to this, and only those have objected——

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They have no representative in the House, and we are, as I said a while ago, the common council of the city of Washington. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] protested against this form; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] protested, and I am trying my best to do it myself.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, this matter was considered by the committee. Not a mortal man in the District of Columbia offered one objection to it or made any criticism whatever, and it is highly recommended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Who ever heard of it while it was being considered by the committee? What did you know about it? Who had heard there was such a bill pending?

Mr. SIMS. It was introduced like any other bill introduced into this House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. How many witnesses appeared before the committee?

Mr. SIMS. There was not one.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Exactly like the process by which we got protection for the poor street-car drivers. The committee came in and reported a bill which did not compel the street railroads to protect the motormen, and said that none had appeared before the committee. I made an investigation, and found they were afraid to appear before the committee for fear they would lose their jobs.

I asked a number myself and took their names. That is why they did not appear before the committee. It seems there were no persons who appeared before the committee in this matter.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Does the gentleman think anybody was afraid to appear?

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman think that the property owners were afraid to appear?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The property owners ought to have a chance to appear here.

Mr. SIMS. Suppose they do not know about it?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I can suggest to the gentleman how.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. They know that the bills are pending, and if they do not like them they can appear before the committee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Have any of them appeared?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. No.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then how does the gentleman know?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. It is a simple procedure that has been going on for a long while.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then why reenact it? Why reenact a proceeding here and leave out the proposed amendment—the gentleman even refused to agree to an amendment to the bill providing for a city attorney to represent the District of Columbia there—why do you reenact the old law and leave out a provision about a city representative being required to represent the District of Columbia?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I assume that one of the attorneys connected with the District government is always here, one especially detailed.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Not a single man in this debate has said that there is a single representative to represent the District of Columbia or the United States in any of these proceedings.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. If my brother will pardon me, I will say that if I were going to prepare that law to practice under in Michigan I would have provided for twelve jurors.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why would the gentleman have twelve jurors?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Because that is our practice there. They are entirely satisfied to have a majority here.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I think the House is convinced by this time that the opposition to this bill it not specific, but general, and I can not see any use in wasting more time of the committee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I would like to waste a little more time in looking out for the hereafter.

Mr. SIMS. I decline to waste any more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] is recognized.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] will give me a little more time. I want to be heard for a few moments. I will be brief.

Mr. BABCOCK. I will yield to the gentleman in a minute. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield to me then?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. All right.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] now.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, if the House will indulge me for just a few moments I would like to say a few words not only concerning this bill, but concerning other measures of a similar character which have passed heretofore, and some which will probably be urged for passage during the present session of Congress. The bill now under discussion is almost identical with those that have previously passed the Congress. I hold in my hand a bill (H. R. 17585) introduced during the third session of the Fifty-eighth Congress by the present chairman of the committee [Mr. BABCOCK]. It is a bill authorizing the extension of Rhode Island avenue NE. The provisions of that bill, although it never became a law, are almost identical with the provisions of the present bill under discussion. As the chairman said, the bill now under discussion is the bill that received the greatest favor, at least during the last session of Congress. I will read, on the subject of expense, section 10 of the bill, previously introduced at the third session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, as follows:

> That the sum of $300 is hereby appropriated to provide the necessary funds for the costs and expenses of the condemnation proceedings taken pursuant hereto, one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

That, as I am informed, is the character of the bills that have passed this Congress for years and years previous to the Fifty-eighth Congress. In other words, that the Government of the United States was to pay one-half of the expense of the condemnation proceedings for the opening of any new street or roads within the District of Columbia.

During the last session some members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I was then a member, but of which I am not at the present time, objected to that portion of the bill, and it was changed to read as follows:

> That the sum of $300 is hereby appropriated, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, to provide the necessary funds for the costs and expenses of the condemnation proceedings taken pursuant hereto.

You will notice from the reading of the bill that the costs and expenses are taken out of the revenues of the District of Columbia instead of half out of the revenues of the United States and half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes, sir.

Mr. BABCOCK. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, it has been the policy of Congress for years, one that has been fought out and decided on this floor before Congress was honored by the presence of the gentleman from Minnesota, that in all street-opening matters the entire expense should be borne by the District or city property, and that the bill the gentleman is reading from is such as was sent to me officially, all of them containing a clause that one-half of the expense be paid by the General Government.

Now, if the bill that has been reported by the committee has that provision it was a clerical error. The clerk of the committee informs me that all street-opening acts are in accordance with the policy of this House and committee—that is, that the entire expense should be borne by the District of Columbia.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Then, Mr. Chairman, my information is wrong. Still, I do not doubt, I do not like to doubt the chairman's word; but my information, positive and direct, upon the subject is that that was the way until the Fifty-eighth Congress, when the form of the bill was changed, so that the property owners should pay a portion and the District the other portion. But my information is, and I shall still believe that to be correct until proof is presented to me, that previous to the Fifty-seventh or Fifty-eighth Congress all bills that passed this House were to the effect that the Government of the United States should pay one-half of the condemnation proceedings on any land in the District of Columbia. Mr. Chairman, where do you get information about the District from if you can not get it from the chairman of the committee? I go to the Committee on the District of Columbia itself, where the information was given to me, because I objected to the proposition saying that where a man's land was benefited he should not receive damages at the expenses of the Government. An agitation was then had, and this new form of bill gotten up. I was one of the subcommittee that reported it to the committee.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I understood you to say the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The District of Columbia Com-

mittee. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the meaning of these lines are which I read from section 10:

That the sum of $300 is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

It has been my understanding heretofore that the revenues of the District of Columbia were made up of taxes collected by direct taxation and an amount equal to the estimated revenues of the District was placed there by the Government of the United States. If I am wrong about that I certainly desire to be corrected.

Mr. BABCOCK. If the gentleman will look at the report submitted to Congress, he will find that these specific amounts are paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and not out of the Government Treasury.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman tell me what constitutes the revenues of the District?

Mr. BABCOCK. Moneys raised from licenses and taxes on real and personal property in the District. The annual supply bill is handled by the Committee on Appropriations. When they bring in District of Columbia appropriation bills they appropriate for current expenses of the District government, to be paid one-half out of the United States Treasury and one-half out of the District of Columbia revenues, or to be paid entirely out of the District revenues, in some instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am seeking information, and when I do that I generally go to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia on all matters pertaining to the District, because his greater experience enables him to answer all questions. But my understanding is that there are but two sources of raising revenue to supply the District government, one by taxes and licenses in the District proper, the other, an equal amount which the Government of the United States added, which put together constituted the revenues of the District of Columbia for all purposes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill up for consideration, while I do not approve of some features of it, still I wish to say that it is the least offensive of any street-opening bill that I have seen during three sessions of Congress. It is the least offensive in this regard, that the public is more benefited by the provisions of this bill in proportion to the length of the street that is opened than by any other bill for a street of equal length. Usually these bills extend for blocks—I believe sometimes half a mile—and into territory that is not very well built up. Hence, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] says, it certainly savors of real-estate speculation rather than the public benefit.

The bill under consideration I am familiar with, at least partially. It was introduced in the third session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, but never got out of committee. I wish to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], who says he personally went over the route, what length of territory is proposed to be opened?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. The gentleman from Tennessee does not appear to be here, but the chairman has passed over the ground, and I have no doubt that he can give you the information.

Mr. BABCOCK. Two hundred feet.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is the length of the street?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes; 200 feet.

Mr. HEPBURN. What is the other length of it?

Mr. BABCOCK. The block is about half a mile long; it is something like 2,000 feet.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. This bill is less offensive than any bill of its nature that I have ever seen, because it is apparent from this—I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] has made it plain—that the public generally will be benefited and to a greater extent than is usually the case in street-extension bills.

Mr. Chairman, there is a provision in every one of these bills that no property except that fronting upon the street, and only a small portion of that, shall be assessed for benefits. Ordinarily, under all condemnation laws in the different States with which I am familiar the property benefited by the location of a public ditch or highway, whether it absolutely touches it or not, usually has to share in the burden of taxation. That is one objection to this form of bill, but in this particular case the distance is so small that I think we ought not to quibble simply for the purpose of defeating it.

Mr. Chairman, a proceeding is provided in this bill, and I think it is universal in proceedings of this kind in this District, that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall institute proceedings in the supreme court of the District for the purposes of this condemnation; that a notice shall be published for a certain length of time; that upon the expiration of that time, upon proof of due publication and notice, the court shall direct the marshal to subpœna a jury of seven men to hear, try, and determine the matters in issue in this condemnation. After receiving evidence they assess the benefits and the damages. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa, and I have heretofore contended that the two methods employed, namely, in assessing only a part of the benefits at one time, which is in the nature of a juggle, and another matter which I am about to refer to, should be corrected. I have repeatedly attempted to get that done, but unsuccessfully, and I am glad that the gentleman has referred to the matter.

Mr. Chairman, after the verdict of the jury is rendered—and a majority of the seven jurors may find a verdict—what then happens? There follows a very peculiar proceeding, in my judgment. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, in their discretion, reject the award and assessment of said jury and all proceedings thereunder shall be null and void. In other words, if the verdict of that jury does not suit the Commissioners, who are not a court, but laymen—if it does not suit the Commissioners they may in their discretion set it aside. Therefore, this verdict of the jury is a farce. You might as well submit it to the Commissioners of the District without the trouble and expense of impaneling a jury at $5 per day. When the proper time comes I propose to move to strike out of line 16 the words "may in their discretion" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "shall;" so that it will read "shall reject the award and assessment of said jury."

If the law is to remain as written here, I should like to inquire what is the necessity for the verdict of a jury. In all orderly proceedings in court, after the trial of a case the judge, upon proper case made, on an application for a new trial, may set aside the verdict for various reasons: First, because it is contrary to the evidence; second, that it is contrary to law; but under this peculiar jugglery of words—I get that expression from the gentleman from Iowa, and I am much obliged to him for it—they have a farce of a trial by jury, a verdict which may be rendered by four out of seven men, and then the Commissioners may, in their discretion, set it aside if it does not suit them. There is no appeal from that. The only appeal provided is a technical appeal upon questions of law alone, where objection is made. You can not review the facts except by submission to another similar jury. It is wholly within the discretion of the District Commissioners, and that ought to be remedied.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Does not this procedure seem to be quite satisfactory to the people here?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman from Michigan has asked me a pertinent question. I will say that while a member of the District Committee I have never heard anybody object to it. I do not know whether they know of the proceeding or not, but I can say to the gentleman for his information that a very reliable gentleman on the outside, one who is not a Member of Congress, informed me very recently that it was only a favored few who got street extensions in the District of Columbia, and that other portions which had no influence could never get any.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I want to ask my brother if he was not a member of that committee during the last Congress?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; I was a member of that committee, and I objected to 90 per cent of all these street extensions, and you laid over several of them because I did object.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Do you know of anybody during the Fifty-eighth Congress who wanted to be heard before that committee upon street-opening cases who did not have an opportunity?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I never heard of anybody asking to be heard.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. You never did?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Never on these matters.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have been listening to this colloquy and I am anxious to find out where in the world this committee gets so much information and reports so many extensions if no one comes before the committee to ask for them.

Mr. BABCOCK. I can answer that question, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Minnesota will allow me.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BABCOCK. The property owners always appear before the Commissioners of the District, sitting as a board of commissioners, and the Commissioners make a report to the Committee on the District of Columbia, which report is considered final unless some of the interested parties request a hearing. If no request is made, the committee takes it for granted that no one wishes to be heard further.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am obliged to the gentleman

from Tennessee for asking the question, and to the chairman of the committee for answering it, because, as I said, I never knew of a property owner to appear before the committee and object to any of these street extensions when I was a member of the committee. I now ascertain that the Commissioners sit somewhere in the District, get up hearings unbeknown to Congress, the residents appear before them, and then the Commissioners report the result to the District Committee.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Why should Congress be bothered with these hearings? Why is not that a proper action?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Why should not the District of Columbia be governed like other cities?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. There is no reason why, if a property owner desires, he should not go before the District Committee and be heard in person if he wishes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Is there anything in the bill or report which shows that the property owner or anybody did appear before the committee or Commissioners?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. No. Did the gentleman ever see a bill in a State legislature that showed who appeared before the committees at the preliminary hearings?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnsota. Oh, no.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Then there is no reason why this bill should show it, and there is no reason why any property holder who wishes should not, either by himself or by his attorney, appear before the District Committee if he so desires.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this simply carries out my view, and I am glad that I am getting the information now that this city is run almost directly by three Commissioners and not by the citizens or by Congress. It now appears here that the ipse dixit of these Commissioners is sufficient for the committee to report upon and for Congress to act. That is the way it appears at the present time; that is the way I thought it was when I was on the committee, but I never obtained the information before.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman find any provision in the bill for the District of Columbia to appeal from this proceeding?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do not.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And yet the revenues of the District of Columbia are trenched upon to pay a part of these expenses.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It would seem so.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And yet they have no appeal from the condemnation proceedings.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, as I say, I am not particularly objecting to this bill except upon principle. But, Mr. Chairman, there is another question that I do object to, and have strenuously objected to ever since I have had the honor to be a Member of Congress. I do not think, however, that this discussion will result in much good in that direction, but it seems to me that it is a question that Congress ought some time in the future to take in hand and deal with as it should be. The question is this: I know of no municipality, no city or government in the United States, where property is taken and condemned for street purposes, or where the streets, after having been located and laid out, are ordered to be paved with brick or with asphalt, or where there is a sewer laid in front of it, that the property itself does not at least carry a large proportion of the expense for that improvement per front foot. If there is any government or municipality in the United States that is not charged with that burden to some extent, if there is a Member on the floor that knows of such a city, I would like to have it made known.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is the way that all cities are governed in this respect. I know of no reason why now in this city the property owner who has property that is improved many fold by the location of a street in front of it, or by having it asphalted, or by the putting down of a sewer whereby it is enhanced in value—I know of no reason why that property should not be held to pay a part of the expense.

Now, take this particular bill. If it is passed, the District Commissioners will, under the law, open this street or they will order it to be opened, and next year, or possibly during this session, you will find before this House an item in the general appropriation bill appropriating money for the District of Columbia—a sum from ten to twenty thousand dollars—for the purpose of asphalting or paving this particular street. Who pays that expense? The United States pays one-half of it and the District of Columbia pays the other half, and the owners of the lots and property do not pay a dollar. That, to my mind, is the worst possible principle that is involved in the street extension and the improvements in the city of Washington. This city is the only place of which I have any knowledge on earth where property that is largely benefited many times its present value does not contribute anything toward paving the streets in front of it. Millions of dollars of this Government have gone to pave streets out in various portions of this District upon the plea of the public good, that simply, in my judgment, was for the purpose of enhancing the value of real estate owners who own large tracts of land in the vicinity.

That is the principle that I war against; that is the principle that I object to—extending a street six, eight, or ten blocks out into almost unimproved territory, knowing that in the near future Congress will be called upon through its Appropriation Committee to appropriate hundreds of thousands of dollars for asphalting and paving that street. That is my main objection to the system here. These condemnation proceedings, while they have stood the test of the courts, would not be endured for one moment in any municipality in the United States outside of the District of Columbia.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a small bill and, as I have said in the beginning, the least objectionable of any bill that I have seen emanating from the District of Columbia Committee. Therefore, I myself shall vote for this bill, but reserve the right hereafter to express my opinion and vote the other way when I think that it is a real estate transaction instead of one for the public good.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this debate has already taken up so much time that I shall not undertake to discuss this bill fully, and shall only make a few suggestions that I utter for the purpose not so much of amending this present bill as that the committee may think along the lines I suggest in the future. One of the propositions that is fundamentally erroneous in this bill and absolutely wrong is this: That they charge up benefits in common to the abutting owner. They should charge the abutting owner with a special benefit. The abutting owner has already paid for a good highway when he pays his taxes. For instance, I own a lot, I pay taxes, and the city comes along and builds a highway in front of that lot without hurting the grade at all, without hurting me whatever. I have already paid for that in paying my taxes to the city government; but if it comes along and there is a big sink hole in front of my property, and they cover that up and make the highway perfectly safe, why, I would say that possibly might be a special benefit; or if the house were so situated that you could not get down to the road, and they made some adjustment in making the street which I have already paid for in my taxes, by which I can get in and out of my house, why, that would be a special benefit. But where, as it seems to me is suggested in this bill throughout, you simply come in and make a street in front of A B's house, and then charge him up with the benefit of making that street in front of his house, when he has already paid for making that street when he has paid his taxes, that makes him pay twice for it. Now, that is a precedent that is not just; it is not good law; it is bad policy; and yet it is throughout this whole bill. The words "special benefit" are not alluded to or taken into consideration in this bill; and for the future edification of the distinguished committee that reports this bill I shall refer them to a very noted case decided a number of years ago in my own State, the case of Woodfolk *v.* Railroad, where that exact question came up.

There they undertook to build a railroad in front of a man's house and cut off his property and paid him for it in benefits. His house was near the battlefield that my distinguished friends from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] and Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] helped to make a number of years ago at Nashville. It destroyed his property and the railroad tried to pay him off in benefits. They appealed the case, and Judge Carruthers, one of our great jurists, for the whole supreme court, said you can not pay him in benefits in common, you must pay him in money; if you specially benefit him then charge him up with that, but you can not take his land and pay him in benefits. In short, do not charge him taxes to build the street and when you build it burden him with benefits growing out of making a good street in front of his house. He paid his taxes to get that kind of street. This bill burdens the abutting owner with benefits in common and taxes, too, to get what his taxes entitle him to have. Lewis on Eminent Domain, and other authorities, cite this Woodfold case as a leading authority on this point.

Now, there is no right of appeal in this bill that I can find, and I called on my distinguished friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOON] to look through the bill, and he can not find any appeal. On the contrary, you will find at the end of the bill a provision that blocks or rather prevents an appeal. I believe that is the way my friend from Pennsylvania construes it.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania. I have not read the bill through.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. None of us have had a chance to

do that. These bills are heaped in on us just like taking a pitchfork and throwing hay off a wagon. No chance to know. No chance to study. This bill was reported on January 4th—this in the 8th.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman if he has read section 11 of the bill, that contemplates appeal as a matter of course and provides that such appeals shall not delay the proceedings?

Mr. GAINES of Tennesseee. That is what I said just now.

Mr. FINLEY. Then, as I take it, the right of appeal is not taken away by the bill. It is recognized here in section 11 that there is a right of appeal.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, it is very doubtful. You have some doubt about it, and I am satisfied my friend on my right has some doubt, and I have doubt. Gentlemen, unless you give the right of appeal on the merits of the case injustice may be done. In some States no appeal is allowed; they let the twelve jurors settle the matter, and whatever they adjudge, why, that practically settles it. Now, there is no provision here for an appeal on the merits. Some one has suggested there is possibly a technical appeal on questions of law or errors of law. There are seven jurors to sit here. They do not know anything about the law, and the chances are they will exclude testimony that ought to be included, and unless you have an attorney there to represent the District of Columbia the District of Columbia will be prejudiced, and unless the abutting owners have their lawyers there they will be prejudiced. You turn the suits over to seven jurors and let five of them settle that without giving any right of appeal to a jury of twelve men, which they ought to have, when you undertake to take any man's property away from him, whether he lives in a log cabin or in a mansion. That is the moral law. Whether we have any Constitution or not, whether we have any statutes or not, the moral law, upon which all our laws are built, says a man is entitled to just compensation.

I remember reading away back in some Turkish history where they wanted to build a sewer, I believe. All the people gave the right of way except one man, and he did not give it possibly because he was a poor man. He said, "No, that is my property, and I can not give it away;" and the ruler of that country called his lawmaking body together and appropriated just compensation for him and took the land. That was in a heathen country where there was no constitution, and that is the law of this country, and the courts here uphold it. Here, gentlemen, you are fixing to take the people's property, yet there is not a word appearing here that a single, solitary man has been before this committee and asked for this proposed law—not one. It developed in the course of a colloquy here that somebody had come before the District of Columbia Commissioners here. How many Commissioners were present? One, a minority, or a majority? Is that a board of condemnation? It certainly can be a board of recommendation. There may be no objection to this bill further than pointed out, and what I have said may not be tenable, as I have not had a chance to investigate, it being a long bill, etc., but this thing of going along here and making laws for the District of Columbia because A B down town has seen the committee or because the Commissioners recommend it, without giving the people of this District a chance to be heard before the committee is wrong.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Let me tell this and then I will yield.

I want again, Mr. Chairman, to allude to this street-car matter. I do not know whether my friend from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] was here or not, but the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] was here and he reported the bill. They said the reason why they did not give a covering out in front to protect the street-car driver, or motorman, was because they did not have room to get the street cars in the street-car shed if a vestibule was put on the car. They had room enough for the poor fellow out in the graveyard, but they did not have room enough in the street-car shed for a vestibuled car. It was contended that these poor street-car fellows did not want this vestibule because they did not come up here and appear before the committee. As I say, I felt sorry for these poor people, and I got on every car I could and asked the motorman if he was in favor of these vestibules. Why, all said, "Of course we are." I said, "You are?" "Yes." Then I asked, "Why did you not go before the committee?" They said, "We dared not go because we were afraid we would lose our jobs." I think that was so in every case. I took a little book in my pocket, and took the names down of the men. Now, here we are opening this street. My colleague [Mr. SIMS] says it is all right. My friend over here [Mr. DAVIS] says it is a little bit of a thing; better let it go this time; but how do you know, gentlemen, that you are not outraging some poor little Turk out on that street, who does not know the way even to the House, like the driver who brought me up here this morning. Now, that is true. If he was in Tennessee he would vote the Republican ticket.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I would like to ask the gentleman why he claims that these people have not the right to be heard, when they have the right to appear before three Commissioners of this District, who are able gentlemen, and if they do not get a fair hearing there, they can appear before the District Committee. I have been a member of the latter committee for two or three Congresses, and I have yet to know the time when the humblest citizen in this District did not have the fullest right to be heard before that committee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will tell the gentleman. The men on that committee do not give them a chance. You do it so quickly. You are fine business men, and you draw up bills one day and report them here the next day.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. The gentleman is drawing on his fertile imagination just now.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do not mean to reflect upon the committee. I am talking about the swiftness with which the gentlemen resolve themselves into a mayor and common council for this District. The people hardly know how to legislate in this place. They leave it all to us. It is not the business of the Commissioners to see that legislation of this sort is passed without giving the people that are to be benefited or damaged a chance to be heard by the committee that draws the bill that takes their little home and turns them out into the street.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK]?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BABCOCK. I desire to say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], Mr. Chairman, that no request for a hearing before the District Committee has ever been ignored, or no bill has ever been reported by that committee as long as there was a request there for hearing from the humblest citizen of the District.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have not any doubt but that the gentlemen would hear the humblest citizen in this District, Mr. Chairman, but as a matter of fact neither the humble nor the exalted have been before the committee in this case.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Is not that the best proof that they are satisfied—the fact that they have not appeared before the committee?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Take the street-car case. Afterwards we raised a row here in the House about turning the people out to the ravages of that horrible snow. I remember it was several feet deep. I saw those poor men with frozen hands and unprotected. We raised a row here in the House and that bill was taken back to the committee. They heard the people, and we got the vestibuled cars.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. The gentleman does not think that is a parallel case to this, does he—the case of a man working for a corporation?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. It is a worse case with those poor fellows who do not have where to lay their heads, possibly.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman tell us who is going to be injured in this District if they appear before the committee and let their wants be known?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why do you not give them the chance in here when the time comes?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. They know when the District Committee meets.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman is recommending a bill here to require some sort of a court for the property owners when they proceed to take their property, and yet there is not a single bit of testimony here that a single abutting owner, a single citizen, has come to the committee and asked the committee to enact this bill or this particular kind of a bill.

Mr. SIMS. In this kind of a case, where the Commissioners have recommended and where there is no objection filed by anybody, will the gentleman please tell us who he would send for to interrogate?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. My colleague from Tennessee has not given the people a chance. He has admitted that not a single man has been before the District Committee. How does he know that they want this particular bill? How does he know that they want any bill?

Mr. SIMS. I deny emphatically that the dear people have not had a day in court.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How does the gentleman know? Has he been out to see these men?

Mr. SIMS. The bill was introduced. It was published and printed, and every man that wanted it could get a copy of it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman has to send his speeches to his constituents, and they are printed. I hope he will send some of his speeches to his people, and to mine too.

Mr. SIMS. My constituents seem to get along better without my speeches than they do with them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this committee is accused of not giving the people a chance.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. It is hoped that you are going to do so.

Mr. SIMS. What will we do? Sit down and write each one a letter?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Who asked the committee to introduce this bill?

Mr. SIMS. The Commissioners.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How does the gentleman know that? The Commissioners said it, but I want the people to say it.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman makes a pretty serious charge when he says that the committee has denied the people the right to be heard.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have not said that.

Mr. SIMS. I know the gentleman will not say it, because it is not a fact. We endeavor to give everybody in this District an opportunity, because they do not enjoy the benefit of having a Member on this floor to represent them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do you personally know that the abutting owners know that this bill has been introduced?

Mr. SIMS. I did not ask any of them if they did and never will be foolish enough to ask them such a question. I will not presume that the abutting owners do not know when a public bill has been introduced, has passed through the committee where hearings have been had on it, that they do not know it. I have not found any man that is interested that did not seem to know it and know the justice and equity of it. I think the gentleman is not entirely serious when he says that the committee were engaged in a star-chamber proceeding.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I did not say that.

Mr. SIMS. I have heard the people of the District of Columbia until I am worn out hearing them. Still I say that no man shall be denied a hearing so long as I am on the committee if I can prevent it. We hear them in our committee, at our private residences; they come to us through letter and by organization, and I have never heard anywhere that a hearing has been denied them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do not believe that my colleague would do the slightest injustice to anybody, but the trouble is that when the gentleman gets down to the District Committee his information ceases. He says the Commissioners have asked for it; but I asked him who asked the Commissioners, and he says he does not know. I asked him if he had been out at this place and seen any of the people who are interested in this, and it appears there is not a single man who has been over the locality or knows anything about it.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken when he says that nobody has been out on the part of the committee. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] was over the ground.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I asked my colleague if he had been out there to see these people.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. He did not go to the people.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How do you know he has been out there?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Because I heard him say so.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will ask my colleague and friend again if he has ever been out there and located the premises?

Mr. SIMS. I have been out there and passed over this property. I have not located any premises, because there are no premises. I looked over the ground where Kalorama avenue comes into Eighteenth street and where this extension will be. In all candor, I have never seen a proposition for opening a street better than this one.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Did you see any of the people who owned this property?

Mr. SIMS. I did not.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do you know any member of this committee who saw the property owners?

Mr. SIMS. I did not go and ask them.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That is a great plea for a great Congress, legislating for a people who are stripped of the right of suffrage as these people are. Think of me undertaking to introduce a bill in the common council of Nashville (for we are the common council of Washington) chaining my people's hands and they not knowing a word about it.

Why, Mr. Chairman, bills are not introduced, as a rule, unless somebody comes and asks that it be done, and there is not a single individual, as the record shows, who has asked for the passage of this law. That is the point of the criticism I am making.

Mr. BABCOCK. Just one moment there. I want to explain to the gentleman from Tennessee that the demand is universal with the people living in that neighborhood, and I believe that they would not impose on the Commissioners or the committee or think for a moment they would permit that to be done.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Are the people living along this road asking for this?

Mr. BABCOCK. There are no people living on this road. It is people living adjacent to it—the people in the neighborhood.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me a question?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman know how many owners there are of this property through which this extension will go?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that he has had every chance I have had of getting information about this.

Mr. FINLEY. I am sure of that.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. So far as has been shown, there is not a single owner of this property that has ever asked for the passage of this law, and the only authority for it is the request of the Commissioners. They are not here. The bill has been presented here without the consent of one of the abutting owners, and yet here is a bill that comes in without any right of appeal, providing a jury of seven, and that five men may pass upon questions of eminent domain in this District in a manner that has been denounced by the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Ohio in a manner that makes us all shudder and feel that we should be more careful than we have been in the past.

Mr. FINLEY. This is an old field, a piece of unimproved property, and this is for speculative purposes, I suppose, is it not?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do not know whether it is for a speculative purpose or not. That is what I am trying to find out, who wants this law. No abutting owner has asked for it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that the gentleman from Wisconsin ought to amend this bill and give the District of Columbia the right of appeal, giving the abutting owner the right to appeal, and say it literally, otherwise the court may rule that none is allowed. Let him go to the higher tribunals, where there are twelve jurors and where the court can look somewhat after the troubles which the gentlemen from Ohio and from Iowa alluded to this morning. But it does not do that.

Another thing. I asked the gentleman if he would not accept an amendment directing that the attorney for the District of Columbia be required to be present and represent the District and protect its rights in this matter.

When I asked my colleague [Mr. SIMS] if he knew of any district attorney or legal officer representing the Government of the United States or the District of Columbia who appeared in our condemnation proceedings he said he had not heard of any. I have not heard of any. Gentlemen, are we going on in this slipshod way, picking up seven men off the street, making them jurors and letting them collect the testimony? That is the provision of the law as I understand it, that these seven men are to gather up the testimony.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. The gentleman makes the statement that he does not know of anyone who appears to represent the District. I am reliably informed that in all these proceedings there is an attorney whose special duty it is to represent the District.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What makes me weary about the matter, and more or less distressed as a public official, is that the gentleman from Wisconsin refuses to allow his bill to be amended so as to compel that attorney to be there.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. It would seem to be a novel proceeding to write into the law a provision that this attorney should do his duty, when there is no reason to doubt that he does his duty.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Do you think it is a novel proceeding to compel an officer to do his duty?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Oh, no; but the gentleman assumes that he is not doing his duty without any evidence to support that assumption.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. You say this whole thing is a

reenactment of the law to a large extent. Why do you not reenact the part of the law compelling the legal adviser of the District to appear and represent the District?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. If we had any reason to suppose that he was not doing his duty there might be some reason for such an amendment, but there is no evidence of anything of that sort.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What harm can possibly be done by putting it right into the statutes? My dear sir, let us make the law plain. Let us not leave these statutes open to construction. Why, the Supreme Court reports show that on the antitrust act of 1890 and on the railroad cases the judges stood five to four each time, from the very first case down to the merger case. It was simply because that great statute is open to construction. Why not say literally what we mean?

Mr. PALMER. I suppose the reason why the committee do not favor any such amendment is because they presume that the District Commissioners and other officers representing the District have common sense.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That may be true, Mr. Chairman, and yet people of common sense sometimes do not know their duty, and if they know it they do not do it. I have been trying to find out whether the practice is for this legal adviser of the District of Columbia to be present. I have tried all the morning to find out, and there has been nobody who has opened his mouth and said either voluntarily or in reply to my inquiry that the district attorney has ever appeared in one of these cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill by sections for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That of the amount found to be due and awarded as damages for and in respect of the land condemned for extension of Kalorama road as herein provided such amount thereof shall be assessed by the jury hereinafter provided for as benefits, and to the extent of such benefits, against those pieces or parcels of land on each side of said road as extended, and also on any or all pieces or parcels of land which will be benefited by the opening of said road as said jury may find said pieces or parcels of land will be benefited; and in determining the amounts to be assessed against said pieces or parcels of land the jury shall take into consideration the respective situations of such pieces or parcels of land and the benefits they may severally receive from the extension of said street as aforesaid: *Provided*, That if the aggregate amount of the benefits to be assessed, as determined by said jury pursuant to the provisions hereof, is less than one-half of the amount of the damages awarded for and in respect of the land condemned, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, in their discretion, reject the award and assessment of said jury, and all proceedings hereunder shall be null and void.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend line 14, on page 2, by striking out the word "one-half," and in line 16 by striking out the words "may, in their discretion," and inserting in lieu thereof the word "shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 14, strike out "one-half of;" in line 16 strike out "may, in their discretion," and insert in lieu thereof "shall."

Mr. HEPBURN. So that the section will read—I ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That if the aggregate amount of the benefits to be assessed, as determined by said jury pursuant to the provisions hereof, is less than the amount of the damages awarded for and in respect of the land condemned, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall reject the award and assessment of said jury, and all proceedings hereunder shall be null and void.

Mr. HEPBURN. I want this in such shape that the gentlemen who want this road shall pay for it. That will effect it.

Mr. BABCOCK. This would defeat the very intention of this act—to strike out the word "one-half" in line 14. I ask that the question be divided. There is no great objection to striking out the words "may, in their discretion," and inserting the word "shall." That language is used to give the Commissioners a little latitude. Supposing the jury assessed benefits of 45 per cent or 48 per cent or 49 per cent, then they would have to reject it and go through with the whole proceeding again, under the amendment of the gentleman. That is the only objection I have to that. But if you strike out the word "one-half," you defeat the very object of the bill, which is to have the property benefited pay one-half and the District pay one-half of the amount found for damages.

Mr. HEPBURN. That is just what I want, to test the sense of this House with regard to this class of improvements. I am fully convinced that where improvements of this kind are to be made, those who are to be the beneficiaries should pay for the improvements. There is no reason why the Government should pay any portion of it. Everybody who has given any attention to this debate, or who is familiar with the topography and geography of the country out there, knows that this is a benefit to a very few people.

There is no general benefit that would result to the people of the District by the construction of this highway. It is to a few, largely those who are owners of this strip of territory, and in addition to them there are a few in the immediate vicinity that will have their property enhanced in value and convenience promoted. Now, these people I am perfectly willing should have this convenience and should have this addition to their value, but I want them to pay for it.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be divided, as suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the Clerk will read the first portion of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, strike out the words "one-half of."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to this amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEPBURN) there were—ayes 52, noes 43.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BABCOCK and Mr. HEPBURN.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 61.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second section of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 16, on page 2, strike out the words "pay in their discretion" and insert in lieu thereof the word "shall."

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to that.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 4. That after the return of the marshal and the filing of proof of publication of the notice provided for in the preceding section, said court shall cause a jury of seven judicious, disinterested men, not related to any person interested in the proceedings, and not in the service or employment of the District of Columbia or of the United States, to be summoned by the marshal of the District of Columbia, to which jurors said court shall administer an oath or affirmation that they are not interested in any manner in the land to be condemned nor are in any way related to the parties interested therein, and that they will, without favor or partiality, to the best of their judgment, assess the damages each owner of land taken may sustain by reason of the extension of said road and the condemnation of lands for the purpose of such extension and assess the benefits resulting therefrom, as hereinbefore provided. The court before accepting the jury shall hear any objections that may be made to any member thereof, and shall have full power to decide upon all such objections and to excuse any juror or cause any vacancy in the jury when impaneled to be filled; and after said jury shall have been organized and shall have viewed the premises, said jury shall proceed, in the presence of the court, if the court shall so direct, or otherwise, as the court may direct, to hear and receive such evidence as may be offered or submitted on behalf of the District of Columbia, and by any person or persons having any interest in the proceedings for the extension of said avenue. When the hearing is concluded the jury, or a majority of them, shall return to said court, in writing, its verdict of the amount to be found due and payable as damages sustained by reason of the extension of said road under the provisions thereof and of the pieces or parcels of land benefited by such extension and the amount of the assessment for such benefits against the same.

Mr. WEBBER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the words, in lines 9 and 10, "or a majority of them" be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, in lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "or a majority of them;" so that it will read "when the hearing is concluded the jury shall return to said court," etc.

Mr. WEBBER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that a foot of land should be taken from any person without first the intervention of the jury, and, secondly, not by a majority, but by the unanimous vote of the jury. That is in the spirit of all institutions. It is the law, I think, practically throughout the whole country, and it is right as a principle not to take one foot of land away from a freeholder in the District of Columbia without the verdict of every man impaneled upon the jury.

As a principle, I am against anything that will rob any citizen of this Republic of that constitutional right. It is a constitutional right, whether it is found in the letter of the Constitution of the United States or not. It is the unwritten law of our institutions from the formation of the Government.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio increase the jury from seven to twelve?

Mr. WEBBER. No; it leaves it at seven.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, some of the Mem-

bers here will remember that in the codification of the Alaskan laws the committee reported a provision fixing their trial jury at six. Mr. Moody, now Attorney-General, and myself protested and secured an amendment fixing it at twelve. The Senate must have changed this back to six, and it was enacted, although I was informed the Senate made no "material" changes in the House bill. The next I heard of it the Supreme Court of the United States, last session in a criminal case, held this law was void, and that the defendant was entitled to be tried by twelve jurors, no more, no less.

Now, in this kind of a proceeding—eminent domain—we can provide for seven jurors. But, gentlemen, if you keep trenching on the old common law, abandoning the old-fashioned principles, as my friend from Ohio says, after a while we will be like the old darky was who had a very dissolute daughter. Every time the negroes had a religious meeting in the nighborhood she would "get religion," and in the course of a few weeks she would backslide. She became a chronic backslider. One day, in passing the negro chapel, I heard the "sisters" shout that "Mary Jane has got religion." I rode on home, pushed my sack of meal off my pony, and went to the bottom of the hill to water my horse, and there I saw "old Aunt Mary" washing clothes. I said: "I have some good news for you, Aunt Mary." She said, "What is it, my son; what is it? God knows I am always glad to hear something good." I said, "Mary Jane has got religion." She said, "Has she?" And I said "Yes." She said, "How do you know?" I said, "I heard them say so a while ago as I came along by the church." "Yes," she says, "she keeps gittin' religion and gittin' religion and blacksliding and er blacksliding, and after a while she will get right back in *hell, whare she ought* to be." [Laughter.]

Now, gentlemen, if we keep on evading the Constitution, discrediting its principles, crushing its spirit, after a while we will have no Constitution and we will be back exactly where we ought to be, and have to fight for its reestablishment. A jury at common law and as written in the Constitution "means twelve jurors, no more, no less," says the Supreme Court. I am unalterably opposed to seven jurors. After a while, only a while, we will be "taking" property and life everywhere without any jury. There is a mysterious strength and sacredness about a jury of twelve; "no more, no less." Do not trifle with this sacred byword of home and liberty. If you can do thus in a plain highway case you can have seven jurors in a plain little log-cabin case, or a mansard case, or any other civic case. Start the ball rolling from the top of the hill and it will go on to the bottom.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. What constitution does the gentleman refer to whereby the people of the District of Columbia are entitled to get a jury of twelve?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I will not undertake to discuss the proposition at this late hour in the day. I will refer the gentleman to the Callan case and the Thompson case, from the District of Columbia, and to the recent Alaskan case, where he will find more law on the subject than I can tell him in the time I ought to take on this floor just now.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I believe if this amendment, offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEBBER], is agreed to, and I think it ought to be, the bill will be perfect in that respect. I quite appreciate what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] has said about the decision of the Supreme Court, but this is a special procedure, created by a special statute, and my object in having the entire verdict of the seven men grows out of the fact that here is a proceeding to take another man's property, and the marshal of the District may pick the jurymen without any limitation whatever. He can go out and pick up seven men anywhere, and I think we ought to have the verdict of the seven men—the entire jury. I do not think the objection made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] is applicable in a case of this character. It might be like an order in partition, which the court may send to three men. It might be like any order of appraisement in a dead man's estate, where the court can select any number that it sees fit, and in this case we provide for seven men. The only question is whether we will compel the verdict of the seven men or divide it up so that a majority of three and a half men or four men to three may render a verdict. I think if this amendment is agreed to the bill will be in that particular entirely satisfactory.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] misunderstood me. I did not say, and I do not contend, that we can not create a jury of seven in this special proceeding, and especially where we allow an appeal and trial by a jury of twelve.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Then I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Possibly I was not as clear on that point as I should have been, but I do say that we ought to stop having juries of less than twelve. Twelve is the common-law jury. It is the law of history and safety. It has protected us in our lives and liberties for more than a century and far beyond that. Yet you come in with this, your new-fangled way, your quick way, your short way, and abandon those old precious principles. To me this is distressing. If there is any virtue in twelve, there must be less virtue in seven, and if we have lived safely in these matters with juries of twelve men, why should we at this day abandon the common-law jury of twelve? Of course I know the courts hold we can do this, but I think it is reprehensible and dangerous, and especially so when Congress sanctions it.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] that in a city like this there is a great deal of this sort of proceeding going on from time to time, and it so happens often that rich men buy property and hold it for speculative purposes. If it is possible for a man to be corrupted, when you require a unanimous verdict of the jury, all the property owner has to do is to have one juror hold out for what the property owner thinks he ought to get, and then possibly by holding and preventing a verdict from time to time the property enhances in value and the necessities of the case are such that he will get two or three times what it is worth, whereas in a majority verdict you are more likely to bring in what is a more reasonable verdict.

Mr. SULZER. Is it not a fact that the Government can take condemnation proceedings to acquire title to this property?

Mr. SIMS. But it is not a Government proceeding.

Mr. SULZER. Is it not begun under that provision of the Constitution, the right of eminent domain?

Mr. SIMS. This is for the city and the District of Columbia.

Mr. SULZER. It can be done in the same way. If it is too much, the Government can resort to condemnation proceedings.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What I reprehend is cutting down the jury from twelve to seven.

Mr. SULZER. And the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And then going a step further and allowing four out of seven to pass judgment on the citizens' property. It is a bad precedent. Now, there you have four men instead of twelve to take my house from me, whereas if some one maliciously takes my life you try the man who assaults me with a jury of twelve.

There is not much difference when you take a man's home away from his wife and little children—there is not much difference between that and going along and taking his life. They are sacred; home, life, and liberty go along together.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Are we operating under the five-minute rule? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. We are working under the five-minute rule, and the five minutes of the gentleman from Tennessee expired as he closed his remarks.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in reference to this jury. Time and experience in a great many cases have proven that this form of law—the one you are discussing now—has worked in all respects equitably and justly not only to the District but to property owners, and I desire to say that if you require the unanimous verdict of a jury you put the power in the hands of one man to hang the verdict. If, for instance, a verdict should be equitably $6,000, one man on that jury can say, "You must make this $10,000 or I will not sign;" and to my mind it will work out an injustice—an injustice to the District, an injustice to those who are paying for these street-opening cases, and I want to state further, gentlemen, that it will be a dangerous precedent to adopt this amendment. Now you are acting and you are abiding by a majority vote. This is not a case of a trial before a court at law for murder or for a crime, but it is a question as to the valuation of property to be taken for public uses, and I tell you, gentlemen, it is a dangerous amendment. I confidently believe, if you adopt the amendment, the result will be to stop all street-opening cases in the District of Columbia or the Commissioners will have to come back to Congress with the statement that it is not safe and it is impossible for them to go ahead with any further improvements of this character.

Mr. WEBBER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. WEBBER. Do you know of any State in the Union where a jury of less than twelve is authorized in condemning property?

Mr. GROSVENOR. And that by unanimous verdict. Every State in the Union.

Mr. WEBBER. And that by unanimous verdict.

Mr. BABCOCK. I will say that this action, as I understand

it, is not a law proceeding under eminent domain to take property, but this is a special proceeding, the operation of which has been demonstrated by experience of many years in the District of Columbia to be the best and most equitable method in the condemnation of land in street-extension cases.

Mr. WEBBER. That does not answer the question. Do you know what State?

Mr. BABCOCK. I want to state further to the gentleman that in many cases the court appoints commissioners of three or five, as the case may be, to assess damages and report to the court.

Mr. WEBBER. I will ask the gentleman what State——

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Michigan is one.

Mr. BABCOCK. The court has to approve the verdict before it goes into effect, and I say to the gentleman from Ohio that in my judgment this would be a dangerous amendment, and would operate directly in opposition to what he intends it should.

Mr. WEBBER. If I understand, Mr. Chairman, the point the gentleman makes is this, that some of these jurors may be corrupted and therefore proceedings blocked. Am I right?

Mr. BABCOCK. I stated that one man could hang the other six.

Mr. WEBBER. You said, if I understood you corerctly, more than that.

Mr. BABCOCK. This provides for a jury of seven and a majority controls the verdict, and that verdict is rendered to the court and the court has to approve it before it goes into effect. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his amendment, because I consider it a very serious question.

Mr. WEBBER. Mr. Chairman, I can not see it that way. The chairman of the committee says it is a very serious question, and to that I accede. It is an exceedingly serious question, if things are in that condition in the District of Columbia where proceedings are liable to be blocked because of corruption.

Mr. BABCOCK. I never mentioned the word "corruption," Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WEBBER. Well, the record will show. I do not want to misquote the gentleman at all, but I know that throughout the States of the Union—there may be some exceptions, but practically all of them—it is understood by all present that a jury of twelve and all of the twelve are required to take one foot of land from anybody, and I think this is a very dangerous precedent. It may have been the practive heretofore to allow a proceeding of that character, but for one I protest and register my vote against this. I can not see it in any other way, and I still insist upon the amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin express astonishment at an amendment of this character.

Why, this matter of requiring a unity of action on the part of jurors is as old as our civilization. It comes down from Magna Charta; it is a part of our judicial system that every man regards as the one particular jewel in the crown of our civilization. The requiring of this unanimity of action is not new, but the experience of centuries acquiesces in its wisdom and justice. Why should we make an exception here? This is not a trivial matter. Under this proceeding that is now contemplated there may be a sum of eight or nine thousand dollars involved, a sum that the people of this District may be contending for in order to secure their rights. Why should we not observe that procedure that all of these centuries have determined to be wise and just?

I want to make still another amendment to this section and to strike out the words, when the time comes, "if the court shall so direct, or otherwise as the court may direct," and compel this proceeding to be had in the presence of the court. I want to give all the dignity possible to the adjudication of this question, that involves eight or nine thousand dollars to the people of this District. It is an important suit. If you can not take from a man his property to the amount of $20 without giving him the benefit of a jury in the presence of a court, presided over by a court with all the power possible to give respect and dignity to that proceeding, ought we here, in the interest of the stockjobbers in real estate in this District, to waive all that and allow a man to be despoiled, as he may be, under this proceeding? I think it ought to have all of the dignity with which we can surround it. And, more than that, I want this section further amended so that all that testimony that may be offered may not necessarily be received. These gentlemen have so worded this section that whatever testimony is offered, without regard to any of the questions usually involved in the procurement of testimony, shall be received. Note what the language is:

Said jury shall proceed in the presence of the court if the court shall so direct, or otherwise as the court may direct, to hear and "receive" such evidence as may be offered or submitted.

That is what the testimony must be. Whether it is competent or incompetent, whether it is relevant or irrelevant, whether it clouds the issue or whether it makes it clearer, it has all got to be "received" under the peculiar wording of this bill. Why should that language be in there? If this is to be a fair proceeding, if it is to have some relation to the dignity of ordinary proceedings in court, why should the judge have the power to send the jury off into some dark room and then compel them there to receive any testimony that anyone, no matter what his cupidity may be, no matter what his interest may be, no matter how vile he may be, may wish to offer. I confess that in all the experience that I have had with statutes, with questions that have been submitted to Congress, I have never yet seen one that compelled the jury to "receive" that testimony which any interested or any person might see fit to force upon its attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated. In the first place, this procedure seems to be entirely satisfactory to the people living in the District, where this practice has been followed for the last six or seven years. And I have yet to learn that any proceeding of this kind, either upon the part of any property owner or any attorney acting for a property owner, is not entirely satisfactory.

Now, as to the contention of the gentleman that it ought to be in the presence of the court, I will say that this proceeding is in the nature of a proceeding held before commissioners of estates. In that case the testimony is not taken before the court. Neither has the verdict to be unanimous. For instance, here is an estate in which a party has a claim, for example, $50,000 against the estate. In Michigan when there is no doubt as to what commissioners will do the attorneys, in selecting the number of commissioners, usually select two, simply for the purpose of saving expense, but where there is likely to be a contest they select three, and a majority of the three determine what the verdict shall be. That is precisely what is done in this case, and I earnestly hope that this amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEBBER].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Division! Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 41; noes 43.

Mr. WEBBER. Tellers!

The question was taken on ordering tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused. The noes have it, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in lines 4 and 5 on page 4, the words "if the court shall so direct, or otherwise, as the court may direct."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "if the court shall so direct, or otherwise, as the court may direct."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, just a word in reference to that. That is on old practice here of the court, and this is taking away one of the rights and privileges of the court, which, I think, it will hardly be good judgment to do. I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HEPBURN. It is not a prerogative of the court. We can authorize a court, if we see fit, not to perform this duty; otherwise it will be the duty of the court to perform it. I think that there is no reason why a matter involving an amount of money that this case may involve should not receive the attention of a justice of the court. There is no hardship to anybody, and it certainly will have a good effect to have a judge there to determine interlocutory questions that may arise during the presentation of the proof. I think it is a wise thing to have this adjudication and that it shall be under the surveillance and in the presence of and with the aid of a competent judge.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will prevail. While, as I said a few moments ago, this is a small matter compared with many others, and while there is but five or six thousand dollars involved in the opening of this little street of 200 feet, yet within the memory of many Members of Congress bills of this kind have previously been before Congress where it extended a distance of a quarter or half a mile, where many thousands were involved. Therefore it seems to me that a court would not waste its time in sitting and hearing the matters in controversy, especially where the pro-

posed law simply orders and directs that the evidence of every person shall be received without any judge or judicial officers sitting there to determine upon the competency of this evidence. It is more in the nature of a marshal's or commissioner's court, without any judge presiding, as to the rules of evidence. Evidence of an illegal character, contrary to law, may be admitted without the presence of a court, where hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property are passed upon. The court should at least pass upon the competency of the evidence received and would then be in better position to determine the legal questions which might arise. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the right of a jury in the appraisement of the value of property taken under the right of eminent domain, in the original proceeding, does not exist in any considerable number of States of the Union. Almost universally the practice is that commissioners or appraisers are appointed by the court, in some jurisdictions three, and some five, as the court may direct. In some States the number is provided by statute. The object is to have appraisers or commissioners in the first instance to appraise the property to be taken. In nearly all jurisdictions the right of appeal lies to a court, where the whole question may be gone over de nova, testimony offered upon the one side and upon the other, in the presence of a court, before twelve jurors, where the rights of the contending parties may be fully adjudicated under the direction of the court. So that, in this instance, it is unfortunate that this bill calls these appraisers or commissioners "jurors" instead of commissioners or appraisers, as is usual in many of the States of the Union.

The people whose property is condemned under the provisions of this bill are not deprived of the right of a trial by jury. Under section 11 of the bill an appeal by an interested party may be taken, and there lies the right of a trial by jury.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I beg the gentleman's pardon; that is exactly what it does do—to deny a trial by jury.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think that the right of a trial is given here. Under the common law there is a right to trial by jury. If there is not in the bill, there should be, and an amendment of that kind should be offered.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If you do that I will withdraw my objection to the bill.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. It is the practice now.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It can not be the practice under this bill. It is artfully drawn to prevent a trial or a possibility of a trial by jury.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am informed that that is the practice in the District.

Mr. GROSVENOR. There is no trial by jury to be had under this bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If it is not the practice in the District of Columbia now, in all cases of appeal from awards by appraisers, I say that it ought to be, and I understand that it is.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will read the upper part of page 5, he will find what the procedure is in case the court sets aside the verdict. It will simply be a repetition of what has been had already—another jury.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But the question now before the committee is that of the right of a jury of twelve before a court in the original appraisement. I think there is no question that this amendment should be voted down and that the practice followed in other jurisdictions should be followed here. Then if this bill does not already permit an appeal, and if it is not the practice within this District to give that right, I favor giving it, so that the question shall be tried de novo on such appeal before a court and jury.

Mr. PALMER. That is expensive for the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, before that amendment is voted on I want to say just a word in reference to this. It seems that a wrong impression has been conveyed here. That is, that there is a denial of the right of appeal after this verdict has been rendered. There is nothing of the kind. Cases have been held over and over again, where parties dissatisfied with the amount of a verdict have gone into court and had a trial before a jury, the same as they would in a case of any other claim. Now, what does this do? This is enacted to provide that no appeal shall estop the opening of the street or prevent others from receiving their awards.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. You mean to cut the head off and give the remedy afterwards?

Mr. BABCOCK. It does not prevent anyone from going into court and establishng his rights.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman had read his own bill, I am inclined to think he would not have made the statement with which he last astonished the House.

Mr. BABCOCK. The gentleman has read the bill a great many times.

Mr. HEPBURN. Let me read section 6:

That the court shall have power to hear and determine any objections which may be filed to said verdict or award, and to set aside and vacate the same, in whole or in part, when satisfied that it is unjust or unreasonable, and in such event a new jury shall be summoned, who shall proceed to assess the damages or benefits, as the case may be, in respect of the land as to which the verdict may be vacated, as in the case of the first jury.

In other words, when the court wishes to set aside this proceeding, then it may enter such an order that there shall be a repetition of the same thing. That is the remedy; that is the appeal; that is the possibility of getting a common-law jury, and that is the only one.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is the remedy when the court sets aside the verdict of the jury——

Mr. GROSVENOR. It goes right back to another jury.

Mr. BABCOCK. The proceedings have to be gone over again.

Mr. HEPBURN. When a case is heard in court before a judge and jury it is tried according to the common law. There everything is open and aboveboard. There the witnesses who appear are subjected to cross-examination. Interlocutory questions are raised and decided by a competent court. There a man has some of the benefits of being heard and of having his day in court before he is deprived of constitutional rights. Here it is not so. This may be a matter of comparatively little importance in this case; but the gentleman from Wisconsin astounded us a little while ago by assuring us that this provision was a reprint of the general form that they use in all these matters of a similar character here in this District.

Mr. BABCOCK. It is a copy.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then if it is a copy it is time for the House of Representatives to set its seal of condemnation upon that class of procedure. It may be inconsequential here. It may be of vast importance in the next case, where gentlemen will reproduce the same procedure in the name of justice.

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa would read the first line of section 11 of the bill he would see what this is intended for.

That no appeal by any interested party—

Now, what does that do?

That no appeal by any interested party from the decision of the supreme court of the District of Columbia confirming the assessment or assessments of benefits or damages herein provided for nor any other proceeding at law or in equity by such party against the confirmation of such assessment or assessments shall delay or prevent the payment of award to others in respect to the property condemned nor delay or prevent the taking of any of said property sought to be condemned nor the extension of such road.

In other words, that no appeal by any interested party shall delay or prevent the payment of awards to others. That is all. The very language of the bill itself shows the right of appeal under the law, and not only that, but case after case has been conducted in the District of Columbia where appeals have been taken. This simply provides that where perhaps fifty persons are given awards that the appeal of one or two of them shall not estop the others from receiving their money. That is all it does.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia tell the House what the practice is on appeal from a decision of the court?

Mr. BABCOCK. I prefer not to get into a legal discussion, because while I know what the practice is I am not a lawyer and I do not want to attempt to describe in legal terms the details of the procedure to be taken.

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to know whether such a bill would raise questions of fact as well as law or whether it would simply review the law.

Mr. BABCOCK. I can not answer the gentleman.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the House will possess themselves of this bill and give to it a very brief attention they will discover by the argument of the gentleman himself, repeated over and over again, that there is no possible avenue by which the owner of real estate sought to be condemned in this way can ever have a trial by jury. The gentleman has repeatedly—although I do not think he quite understood the force and effect of what he was saying—said that this was a special proceeding, a term which lawyers pretty well understand the meaning of; that it was of its own character a proceeding to condemn land, and that it was not of a character that could command the authorization of a common-law jury, but was a commission; and finally our friends have planted themselves on that ground.

Mr. BABCOCK. That is in the condemnation proceedings.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman does not understand the question at all. Now, this bill—and I ask the attention of every intelligent man—contains all the law there is on the subject of condemnation of this particular kind of land.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if there is an eminent domain law in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I presume so. If there is, they ought to proceed under it, and there would be no necessity for this. That is what I have been claiming all the time. But, assuming that there is or is not, I assert—and no lawyer will contradict me—that all the rights and all the remedies that the owner of real estate has is given to him by this bill that I hold in my hand if it should become a law.

Now, what is there of it? The gentleman says that because in section 11 the words used are, "No appeal by interested parties shall" do so and so, that that carries a provision for an appeal. Why, that is far from it. The appeal contemplated there is an appeal provided for in the form of exceptions to the ruling of the court in setting aside the finding of the commission.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to worry any further with this bill. It is ill formed and absolutely defective in every particular. If there is a necessity for this legislation, this committee ought to take this bill back and examine it, and then come here with a perfected bill, when we can readily pass it. But this bill is defectve and ought not to be passed, and the House will make a great mistake if it should permit this bill to become a law.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the amendment read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 4, after the word "court," strike out "if the court shall so direct, or otherwise as the court may direct."

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, there is no more reason why this procedure should be in the presence of the court than there is that the commissioners should sit in the presence of the probate judge. It is not the practice to do that, nor when a circuit judge sits as a probate judge. When you and I come to die and have an estate to settle, the commissioners who are appointed will not sit in the presence of the court unless there is some special reason for it, but they will sit by themselves, and it will be in the power and discretion of the probate judge to say whether or not it is necessary for him to be present when the jury or commission is proceeding with its work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEPBURN), there were—ayes 55, noes 39.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 6 on page 4, the words "and receive."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 6, strike out the words "and receive."

Mr. BABCOCK. There is no objection to that, Mr. Chairman.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, in line 9, page 4, by inserting, after the word "avenue," the words "the evidence so presented shall be preserved as a record of the court."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after the word "avenue," in line 9, page 4, the words "the evidence so presented shall be preserved as a record of the court."

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to that amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That if the use of a part only of any piece or parcel of ground shall be condemned, the jury in determining its value shall not take into consideration any benefits that may accrue to the remainder thereof from the extension of said road or highway, but such benefits shall be considered in determining what assessment shall be made on or against such part of such piece or parcel of land as may not be taken as hereinbefore provided.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK], to kindly explain the necessity for this section. Why should not those parts that are immediately adjacent or abutting to these lands stand just as the others do? Why should there be this fifth section at all?

Mr. BABCOCK. Well, there have been numerous instances where parts of property have been taken that practically destroyed the value of the portion not taken, as compared with pieces that have not been touched at all, and this provision has been deemed necessary on the part of the Commissioners, who have recommended and approved of that section in these bills.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Is not that an innovation on the common-law practice?

Mr. BABCOCK. No, I do not think that it is. It reads "but such benefits shall be considered in determining what assessment shall be made on or against such part of such piece or parcel of land as may not be taken as hereinbefore provided."

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, why should not the advantages be set off against the disadvantages and the results certified? That is the usual course.

Mr. BABCOCK. I think the last three lines do that.

Mr. PALMER. No; I do not think the last three lines fix it at all. Now, the usual, ordinary legal method is to set off the advantages against the disadvantages, and if the advantages exceed the disadvantages the landowner is given a verdict in accordance therewith, and if the damages exceed the advantages he gets a verdict for that amount. I can see no reason why this peculiar method should be adopted. It practically comes to the same thing, but it only tends to confuse and make not clear that which ought to be clear.

Mr. Chairman, I move that this section be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out section 5.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any objection to that. I do not think the section is vitally important.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 11. That no appeal by any interested party from the decision of the supreme court of the District of Columbia confirming the assessment or assessments of benefits or damages herein provided for nor any other proceeding at law or in equity by such party against the confirmation of such assessment or assessments shall delay or prevent the payment of award to others in respect to the property condemned, nor delay or prevent the taking of any of said property sought to be condemned nor the extension of such road: *Provided, however,* That upon the final determination of said appeal or other proceeding at law or in equity the amount found to be due and payable as damages sustained by reason of the extension of said road under the provisions hereof shall be paid as hereinbefore provided.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I move the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 8, after the word "condemned," strike out the words "nor delay or prevent the taking of any of said property sought to be condemned nor the extension of such roads;" and at the end of line 14 add the following: "*Provided further,* That in all cases of appeal the same shall not operate to suspend the proceedings in said case as to the property covered unless a sufficient bond shall be given by said appellant in form and for the sum and upon such conditions as may be ordered by the court from which said appeal is taken."

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Very well.

Mr. BABCOCK. As to whether this amendment would, in effect, delay the opening of a street in case one party should appeal from a decision and commence suit to have it set aside?

Mr. GROSVENOR. If his property was necessary to the opening of the street it certainly would.

Mr. Chairman, this proposition looks to conform to the law of the United States, the constitutional provision that private property shall not be taken for public use except by due process of law. As long as a man has a right to insist that his property has not been taken by due process of law he ought to have the right to hold on to his property. This provision is that if he wants to appeal, if he is given the right of appeal—and the gentleman says he is, though I do not know where it is myself—if he will give a bond to indemnify the public for any damages they may sustain by reason of his appeal in ascertaining his rights he may hold on to his property until his rights are adjudicated. That, I think, is a fair provision and I have offered it in perfect good faith.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I think that amendment is all right, so far as this bill is concerned; but this provision in the bill was intended to operate in such cases as Sixteenth street and Fourteenth street, where there were a great many parties in interest and where one party has been the cause of holding the matter for a period of at least two years in a case where forty or fifty other interests were involved, where they could not mortgage or sell or dispose of their property nor borrow money on it nor have a loan renewed, and which has worked a great hardship to those in interest. That was the intention of this provision. However, it will not affect the purpose of this bill, and I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I think it had better go in. It certainly recognizes a fundamental principle of our holding of property in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, with a favorable report to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DENBY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 130) authorizing an extension of Kalorama road NW., and had directed him to report said bill, with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, as a case not acted upon by the Fifty-eighth Congress, a report from the Secretary of State and accompanying papers relating to the appeal for indemnity addressed to the equitable consideration of the Government of the United States by the owners of the Norwegian steamer *Nicaragua*.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 8, 1906.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President; which was read, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State resubmitting the claim, which was not acted upon by the Fifty-eighth Congress, of Messrs. Sivewright, Bacon & Co. for damages sustained by their vessel, the British steamship *Eastry*, in consequence of collisions at Manila in June, 1901, with certain coal hulks belonging to this Government.

I renew the recommendation which I made to the Congress on January 19, 1903, that, as an act of equity and comity, provision be made for reimbursement to the firm of the money expended by it in making the repairs to the ship which the collisions rendered necessary.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 8, 1906.*

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President; which was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the resolution of the House of Representatives of December 16, 1905, requesting the President "to cause to be prepared as soon as may be practicable and to communicate to the House information as to the number of clerks and other civil employees in the classified service, male or female, in each of the Executive Departments of the Government and in the Government Printing Office and under the Smithsonian Institution, and in the aggregate, in the city of Washington who have reached the age of 70 years or more," I transmit herewith reports from the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney-General, the Postmaster-General, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, the Public Printer, the Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Civil Service Commission, giving the information requested in said resolution.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 8, 1906.*

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I inclose herewith the annual report of the Isthmian Canal Commission, the annual report of the Panama Railroad Company, and the Secretary of War's letter transmitting the same, together with certain papers.

The work on the Isthmus is being admirably done, and great progress has been made, especially during the last nine months. The plant is being made ready and the organization perfected. The first work to be done was the work of sanitation, the necessary preliminary to the work of actual construction; and this has been pushed forward with the utmost energy and means. In a short while I shall lay before you the recommendations of the Commission and of the board of consulting engineers as to the proper plan to be adopted for the canal itself, together with my own recommendations thereon. All the work so far has been done not only with the utmost expedition, but in the most careful and thorough manner; and what has been accomplished gives us good reason to believe that the canal will be dug in a shorter time than had been anticipated and at an expenditure within the estimated amount. All our citizens have a right to congratulate themselves upon the high standard of efficiency and integrity which has been hitherto maintained by the representatives of the Government in doing this great work. If this high standard of efficiency and integrity can be maintained in the future at the same level which it has now reached, the construction of the Panama Canal will be one of the feats to which the people of this Republic will look back with the highest pride.

From time to time various publications have been made, and from time to time in the future various similar publications doubtless will be made, purporting to give an account of jobbery, or immorality, or inefficiency, or misery, as obtaining on the Isthmus. I have carefully examined into each of these accusations which seemed worthy of attention. In every instance the accusations have proved to be without foundation in any shape or form. They spring from several sources. Sometimes they take the shape of statements by irresponsible investigators of a sensational habit of mind, incapable of observing or repeating with accuracy what they see, and desirous of obtaining notoriety by widespread slander. More often they originate with, or are given currency by, individuals with a personal grievance. The sensation mongers, both those who stay at home and those who visit the Isthmus, may ground their accusations on false statements by some engineer, who, having applied for service on the Commission and been refused such service, now endeavors to discredit his successful competitors, or by some lessee or owner of real estate who has sought action or inaction by the Commission to increase the value of his lots, and is bitter because the Commission can not be used for such purposes; or on the tales of disappointed bidders for contracts; or of office holders who have proved incompetent or who have been suspected of corruption and dismissed, or who have been overcome by panic and have fled from the Isthmus. Every specific charge relating to jobbery, to immorality, or to inefficiency, from whatever source it has come, has been immediately investigated, and in no single instance have the statements of these sensation mongers and the interested complainants behind them proved true. The only discredit inhering in these false accusations is to those who originate and give them currency, and who, to the extent of their abilities, thereby hamper and obstruct the completion of the great work in which both the honor and the interest of America are so deeply involved. It matters not whether those guilty of these false accusations utter them in mere wanton recklessness and folly, or in a spirit of sinister malice to gratify some personal or political grudge.

Any attempt to cut down the salaries of the officials of the Isthmian Commission, or of their subordinates who are doing important work, would be ruinous from the standpoint of accomplishing the work effectively. To quote the words of one of the best observers on the Isthmus, "Demoralization of the service is certain if the reward for successful endeavor is a reduction of pay." We are undertaking in Panama a gigantic task—the largest piece of engineering ever done. The employment of the men engaged thereon is only temporary, and yet it will require the highest order of ability if it is to be done economically, honestly, and efficiently. To attempt to secure men to do this work on insufficient salaries would amount to putting a premium upon inefficiency and corruption. Men fit for the work will not undertake it unless they are well paid. In the end the men who do undertake it will be left to seek other employment with as their chief reward the reputations they achieve. Their work is infinitely more difficult than any private work, both because of the peculiar conditions of the tropical land in which it is laid, and because it is impossible to free them from the peculiar limitations inseparably connected with Government employment; while it is unfortunately true that men engaged on public work, no matter how devoted and disinterested their services, must expect to be made the objects of misrepresentation and attack. At best, therefore, the positions are not attractive in proportion to their importance; and among the men fit to do the task, only those with a genuine sense of public spirit to do the great work for the work's sake can be obtained; and such men can not be kept if they are to be treated with niggardliness and parsimony, in addition to the certainty that false accusations will continually be brought against them.

I repeat that the work on the Isthmus has been done and is being done admirably. The organization is good. The mistakes are extraordinarily few, and these few have been of practically no consequence. The zeal, intelligence, and efficient public service of the Isthmian Commission and its subordinates have been noteworthy. I court the fullest, most exhaustive, and most searching investigation of any act of theirs, and if any of them is ever shown to have done wrong his punishment shall be exemplary. But I ask that they be decently paid, and that their hands be upheld as long as they act decently. On any other conditions we shall not be able to get men of the right type to do the work; and this means that on any other condition we shall insure, if not failure, at least delay, scandal, and inefficiency in the task of digging the giant canal.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 8, 1906.*

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 99. An act to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GRAHAM, for four days, on account of sickness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. JONES of Washington was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of German M. Rouse, Fifty-eighth Congress, first session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Does not the report of the Committee of the Whole House recently made have precedence that would enable us to conclude that business now, if it is practicable? There are many gentlemen who would like to dispose of that at this time.

The SPEAKER. In answer to the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that this is District day, and there is unfinished business before the House. If the House does not conclude consideration of it to-day, it will go over until the next District day.

Mr. HEPBURN. I am assuming that my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is about to move to adjourn. I hope he will withhold the motion.

Mr. PAYNE. I was about to move to go into Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEPBURN. Let us conclude this matter now.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman call for the regular order.

Mr. HEPBURN. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH] desires a vote for each amendment separately, does he not?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I was about to say to the House I had stepped out of the Chamber, and just before I did so I was informed by the chairman of the committee [Mr. BABCOCK] that this was on the Calendar as unfinished business, and he did not desire to take it up to-day.

Mr. HEPBURN. If there is any expressed wish about the matter I do not desire to interfere with it.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. In the absence of the chairman and under those circumstances I would not like to take it up.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3—the Philippine tariff bill.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, no doubt the Members of the House were astonished last Saturday at the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LAWRENCE] in favor of tariff revision. I believe that they will recover from their astonishment somewhat when they learn the respective positions upon this question of the Republican voters of Massachusetts and the Republican leaders. The former are tired of paying tribute to the trusts and are clamoring loudly for relief for their industries. The Republican leaders are reducing the pressure upon themselves by making only such concessions as they are forced to while standing pat as much as they dare to. They did make a declaration in their platform last year, with the usual qualifications, that seemed something like a statement in favor of tariff revision at some future time not yet definitely ascertained. That declaration was appropriately characterized by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] as "a straddle and a bluff." They made that statement after the Democrats had elected a governor by a plurality of 35,000 votes in a State that is normally Republican by 60,000 votes.

This year they elected their candidate for governor by nominating an exceptionally popular man, who believes in low tariffs, by the small majority of 22,000, while the Republican candidate for lieutenant-governor, who was a high protectionist, was able, by means of stooping considerably and opportunely, to barely escape defeat by the small plurality of less than 2,000 votes.

Mr. TIRRELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a question, I will ask him if he will state to this House what the Republican majority is in the house of representatives in Massachusetts and the Republican majority in the senate of Massachusetts and the gains in Republican senators made in the city of Boston alone?

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to answer any question that will contribute even a little to the elucidation of the subject that we are considering, but I can not discover a connection between the increase in the number of senators from the city of Boston and the tariff question. I will say for the information of the gentleman, concerning his question of the increase of Republican senators and representatives throughout the State, that the Republican party has so gerrymandered the State of Massachusetts that they have an overwhelming majority in the legislature that does not at all represent the proportions of the two political parties. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TIRRELL. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Massachusetts when that gerrymander occurred, and if the same division of districts has not been in force in Massachusetts for the last ten years and a new reapportionment is to be made this year on that account?

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Chairman, I must decline to answer that question, not out of any discourtesy to the gentleman, but because I am unable to see that it has the slightest relation to the subject in hand, and as I believe this House would like to rise at 5 o'clock and my speech will take until that time, I must decline to yield to any question that does not throw some light, at least a small ray, upon the subject which we are considering.

So you see, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Massachusetts, regardless of party, are practically united in favor of tariff revision. The intensity of that feeling is not adequately expressed in Republican platforms or Republican speeches. The tariff-revision sentiment has gone beyond the control of the Republican leaders of Massachusetts; and it is certain that the crow which the Republican party ate in their last convention is not their final experience with that unsavory dish. They will be compelled to eat more and more of it each year until they go the full length of the Democratic demand for honest tariff revision, not in the interest of its friends, the swollen trusts, but in the interest of the millions of consumers in this land. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

And as it is often argued by the Republicans of Massachusetts that we can not have free raw materials because of the alleged position of some members of my party in the Southern States, I am glad to be able to state, after consultation with many of them, that they are ready to vote for a bill for free hides if we will also support a bill that will give them free boots and shoes and a substantial reduction of the tariff upon products of leather. So, now, Mr. Speaker, that you have a better understanding of the tariff sentiment in Massachusetts, I trust that you will not be too severe upon my colleagues during their transition from the high-protection caterpillar state of political development to the low-tariff butterfly condition. [Laughter.] They are in an awkward dilemma, for upon one hand the people of Massachusetts are goading them to insurrection, while upon the other hand the Speaker of the House frowns sternly upon such unruly conduct. As political navigators they are doing their level best to steer the party boat clear of the Scylla of the Speaker's censure and the Charybdis of an indignant constituency. [Applause and laughter an the Democratic side.] Theirs is truly an embarrassing position, and you should commiserate rather than condemn them. They are really victims of circumstances over which they have no control. If, Mr. Speaker, you are moved toward harsh measures for these recalcitrants, I trust you will remember that "the quality of mercy is not strained; it droppeth as the gentle dew from heaven." And when you remember that, I know that you will forgive them. If you do not, Mr. Speaker, then, as an upright judge, you are bound to take into consideration their previous good conduct, for, you know, they have been good on the whole since the Dingley bill passed.

Beyond the silent introduction of a few free-hide bills by Members from shoemaking districts and a few free-coal bills during the excitement of the coal srike, which conduct may reasonably be excused upon the ground of pardonable local interest, they have been truly loyal to those great pillars of the Republican party, the beef trust, the steel trust, the coal trust, the lumber trust, and all the other trusts. [Applause and laughter.] And do not forget, Mr. Speaker, that they will come around all right again, provided the Republican party carries the next election by a substantial majority. So do not cut them off their committees, do not cut down their appropriaions for rivers and harbors and public buildings. Deal with them kindly. Treat them as lost sheep.

Just let them alone and they'll come home,
Wagging their tails behind them.

[Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence, I will discuss briefly the pending bill. Democrats should welcome the opportunity of discussing this measure, for it affords them a chance to declare their positions upon two important questions—our governmental relations to the Philippine Islands and the question of tariff reform. The minority report states clearly the Democratic position upon both of these questions. We believe that our governmental relations to the Philippine Islands violate both the Constitution of the United States and the genius of American institutions. Therefore, we favor a severance of those relations at the earliest possible moment, because we are convinced that while we retain the islands they will afford a standing argument for a larger Navy and for increased expenditures generally. Furthermore, it will leave upon us the stain of the sin of maintaining control of a people who aspire to be free men. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Democratic position in favor of free trade with the Philippine Islands is also in harmony with the Federal Constitution, which declares that all imposts, excises, and duties shall be uniform throughout the United States. If, however, the substitute bill offered by the minority fails to pass, then I will

gladly vote for the pending bill, believing that the Democratic party ought to embrace every opportunity for tariff reform that is presented.

Now, I admit that a system is not a wise one which would include all the men of a country in a single enterprise. If instead of depending largely upon agriculture as we do we depended solely upon it, some great blight of nature might bring calamity to us, even as the failure of the potato crop brought famine upon Ireland. Therefore it is well that our industries are diversified and that our manufactures have grown to their present great dimensions. Although our abundant supplies of coal, iron, lumber, copper, silver, and gold would have made us successful in manufacturing without the aid of a tariff at all, still no one will quarrel now with the policy of those statesmen who in the early days laid small taxes for the encouragement of American manufactures. Yet the singular result of that small beginning is that while the manufacturers of this country have grown immensely wealthy, the taxes upon competing products have constantly increased. Still stranger is the fact that although these taxes had their origin in the patriotic desire to possess those articles in time of war which were needed for its prosecution, they have operated to enable American manufacturers to sell their products more cheaply to foreigners than to American citizens. Now, we have a country that is marvelously wealthy, wonderfully developed, and filled with a people of high intelligence.

There is no longer any need for the maintenance of a system of high protection. Its friends admit that many duties are too high that ought in justice to be lowered, but the reason they advance for noninterference with the existing schedules is that if one item is discussed then the entire schedules must be considered, and that it is better, therefore, to forego a consideration of any schedule rather than endanger the whole system.

Now, while this may furnish a sufficient motive for selfishly interested manufacturers, and those who represent them in Congress, it is not a good reason to give for nonaction to the American public. So other plausible pretexts had to be urged. A familiar one is that the Government should encourage diversity of occupations. A sufficient answer is that the Almighty provided for that when He gave us our broad acres of fertile lands, our vast stores of mineral wealth, our great forests, our mighty rivers and lakes, placed us between two great oceans, gave us our position in the temperate zone, and peopled our land with ambitious, intelligent, and industrious men. I am aware that credit to the Almighty for this beneficence is denied by the Republican party [laughter], and that they assert all our prosperity is due to the tariff, but I will not, at this late hour, go into a profitless discussion of the relative merits of these two sources of prosperity, for I believe that political necessities have made at least a portion of my audience somewhat biased. [Laughter.]

Another familiar argument is that the tariff is necessary in order to protect labor. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that American labor is sufficiently progressive to prosper without Government aid, but there is no need of debating that proposition now. If we accept the Republican ground for the continuance of the tariff schedules—namely, their desire to protect labor—an examination of the law will fail to disclose any justification for it. If they sought the protection of labor alone, then the rates would be only high enough to equalize the labor cost of articles produced in the United States and competing articles produced abroad. But an examination of the schedules will disclose that many articles are protected by tariff rates which exceed the entire labor cost of production. There is a bill pending in this Congress, introduced by the minority leader, which provides that no rate of duty shall exceed by 100 per cent the price of the foreign competing article. And yet I venture to predict that the Republican party, which bases its noninterference with the schedules upon its alleged desire to "protect" American labor, will not pay the slightest attention to this bill. But, Mr. Chairman, we have seen this "protection to labor" theory dealt a severe if not a mortal blow by one of its own friends. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, discussed the Philippine tariff bill for nearly four hours last Thursday, and I state confidently that he proved that American labor needs no protection. He anticipated the arguments of his Republican friends, who represent the sugar and tobacco interests affected by this bill, by declaring that the Filipino could not compete successfully with the American farmer. I cheerfully pay him the compliment of stating that he proved his case abundantly. He showed to us that the Filipino who is paid only a few cents a day, who frequently goes without shoes, without a hat, and without a coat, and sometimes without other unmentionable articles of his dress, is no match whatever in competition with the highly paid American farm laborer.

Now, here we have a demonstration by one of the gentlemen who has steadily opposed tariff reduction; by the gentleman who, in point of fact, as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, sits effectively upon the lid of tariff discussion, that American labor need fear nothing in competition with Filipino labor.

Now, those who adopt his reasoning will see that it follows from this demonstration that we need not fear competition from the labor of Canada, Mexico, South America, or Europe, because the scale of wages is much higher in each of these countries than it is in the Philippine Islands. Therefore, we must conclude that the Republican cry of "pauper labor," which has become so familiar to us in political campaigns, has been raised for the sole purpose of frightening the American workman into supporting the policy of high protection and voting the Republican ticket.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. WEEKS. As to whether the gentleman himself thinks that American labor needs no protection.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think that American labor needs no protection from such labor as has been mentioned in the case of the Philippine Islands, or from a great deal of the labor of the world. I think that the American farm laborers and mechanics are abundantly able to take care of themselves. I know we must have a tariff, because we must have revenues, and in imposing duties upon articles to raise a revenue we must afford incidental protection. I say that any tariff which will raise sufficient revenue under our existing system to run this Government will yield sufficient protection to American labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Then, as I understand it, in levying this tariff the gentleman would levy it with reference to revenue, regardless absolutely of protection?

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if it were the beginning of this country I would so levy the taxes. If we had an opportunity of providing another system, I would answer "Yes," but there is no need of making an affirmative answer at this late day. I believe it would be entirely proper for any party in power in levying tariffs to take into consideration American labor if it could be shown, and clearly shown, that there was any necessity for the protection of American labor.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. But the gentleman contends that there is no such evidence at this time.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will follow my speech he will find out exactly how far I go in this particular, and as we are near adjournment I will thank him if he will not interrupt at this stage. Later on I will be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I understood the gentleman to invite interruptions if they were pertinent to his remarks.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I stand on that ground now. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe no more significant admission has been made on the floor of this House in the last twenty years than that of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the great tariff-making committee of the United States, for just as soon as it is discovered that there is either no need for protecting American labor by tariff schedules or need only of levying slight duties for its protection and that the tariff duties are levied for the purpose of enriching the manufacturers of this country then the people of this land will rise up and drive from power the party that perpetuates such a system.

We always contended as Democrats that the labor which was paid $1 per day was not necessarily cheaper than that which was paid $2 a day, for we argued that if the $2 a day labor actually produced four times as much as the $1 per day labor, then the $1 a day labor was actually twice as dear to its employer as the $2 a day labor. So I do not criticise the statements of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for I find they are based upon sound economic principles, which have long been recognized and acted upon by the Democratic party. Now that tariff reduction has begun for the benefit of the Filipinos, however, why should not we continue the benefits of tariff reduction

in order to help American citizens. Surely, if there is no fear of the cheaply paid labor of the Philippine Islands, there is no fear of the competition of the labor of the Canadian wheat raiser, the coal and iron miner, and the lumberman? Why not, therefore, give us a 75 per cent reduction of the rates upon coal, iron ore, lumber, wood pulp, fish, wheat, and other farm products that we get from Canada? You can confer no greater boon upon the people of the United States than to give them cheap food and clothing. Instead of depending for increases of wages upon the fear or whim of individual manufacturers, which increases would inevitably be unequal, the very moment you reduce the cost of food and clothing, that moment you increase the prosperity of labor by increasing the purchasing power of the wages of labor. On the other hand, the very moment that by tariff enactment you increase the cost of food and clothing, that moment you decrease the prosperity of labor by curtailing the purchasing power of the wages of labor. Now, why should we not put the Canadians, who are our brothers in blood, in speech, in customs, and institutions, upon terms of equality with the Filipinos, who are unlike us in all these respects, who are thousands of miles distant from us and who came to us solely as the accidental result of war? Why not go further and adopt reciprocal relations with France. The senior Senator from Massachusetts based his objection to the French reciprocal treaty, as I remember it, upon the ground that French jewelry might compete injuriously with the cheap jewelry manufactured at Attleboro, Mass. Now, in order to protect that interest of comparatively slight importance we sacrificed a market which, according to Hon. W. A. Harris, of the National Live Stock Association of the United States, would be worth $40,000,000 annually to the farmers of this country.

Why not go further and adopt reciprocal tariff relations with Germany and with South America? The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] asked the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] the other day what would a great food-consuming nation like Germany do without the food stuffs of the United States, and he indicated by his manner that he was confident that the retaliatory tariff which will be adopted by Germany in March will speedily be abandoned in order to admit at lower rates of duty American farm products. But I tell the gentleman that he would not be so serene in his conclusions if he had examined the history of recent meat exportations from the United States to Germany. If he did, that examination would disclose to him that since these discriminatory meat-inspection laws have been in force the prices of hogs, oxen, calves, and lambs have increased marvelously, and that as a consequence the importation of them from the United States has fallen off tremendously. He would find that hogs which sold at wholesale in 1900 for 9 cents a pound sold in 1904 for 14 cents a pound; that fat oxen which sold for 11 cents sold in 1904 for 15 cents; that calves which sold for 14 cents sold in 1904 for 18 cents, and that lambs which sold for 11 cents sold in 1904 for 14 cents; and he will find that in 1898 we sold to the Germans twenty times more pork, fifty times more hams and shoulders, and fourteen times more bacon than we did in 1904. Now, then, Mr. Chairman, this does not indicate that the Germans had to buy our beef and pork and lambs from us, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio, in the light of that experience, why will they be compelled to buy their breadstuffs from us when the retaliatory tariff goes into operation?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I presume the gentleman does not want me to reply at this particular time, but with his leave I will answer that question at a later date.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I will be very glad to give the gentleman the unlimited time he will require to answer that question. Now, Mr. Chairman, the United States is not the sole producer of cattle, corn, and wheat. There are other sources of supply that are available to the Germans. The Argentine Republic is raising a choice quality of cattle. They have built packing houses, and they are shipping dressed meat to the markets of Europe in competition with us to-day. The Argentine Republic has a great field for the raising of wheat, and they have begun to raise sheep also upon an extensive scale. When the people in the Argentine Republic learn that they are to be permitted to trade upon preferential terms under the favored-nation clause of the German tariff, their raising of those articles will be stimulated by the prospect of a larger and a more stable market, and they will compete with us more injuriously than they are doing now. Furthermore, Canada is prepared to become the great wheat field of the world. She will raise an immense quantity of wheat in the next few years, and she will undertake to compete with us for the markets of Europe. Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Roumania raise wheat upon a large scale, and the farm products of these countries will come into competition with ours. There are other sources of supply available to the Germans, and I believe that these people will loyally support the policy of their Government, which is to compel the favorable introduction into the United States of German articles of export. The Germans, I believe, will be willing to curtail their supply, both of bread and meat, when they find the increased prices of the American products compel them to economize. That reduced consumption follows increased prices is the history of the whole world. Now, I trust that the Members of this House will not rush the country heedlessly into a tariff war with Germany or any other country, for if they consult the pages of history they will learn that tariff wars are always unprofitable. That idea can be best illustrated, perhaps, by the story of the two dogs that were contending so furiously for a bone that they did not observe a third dog who came along and seized the bone and made off with it. France enjoyed friendly commercial relations with Italy, but the protectionists of both countries forced the governments to abandon friendly relations and enter upon a tariff war.

A short experience convinced them that it was unprofitable for both countries, for while they were contending neutral nations came in and took possession of their markets. Therefore, as sensible people, they adopted reciprocal relations as speedily as possible. The same is true of the tariff wars between France and Switzerland and France and Russia. In the event of a tariff war between Germany and the United States undoubtedly both countries would suffer tremendously, and no interest would suffer so much as the agricultural interests of the United States. They would find a very profitable source for their exports cut off, and it would be extremely difficult to dispose of this new surplus upon terms favorable to themselves. Now, perhaps, some good may result from this scheme of things, for the American farmer may awaken to a sense of the inequalities of the Dingley tariff, and drive out the party that perpetuates that system.

What do the farmers receive from the tariff? They get no more for their cattle now than they got in 1897, when the duty of 15 per cent was placed upon hides, yet that duty has increased the cost to them of the shoes they wear and the harness they place upon their horses. The tariff has not increased the price of the wheat and the corn which they export, for the prices are fixed in the great free-trade market of Liverpool and are based upon the visible supply of these commodities and the probable demand for them. Yet that tariff has increased to them the cost of farming machinery, of agricultural implements, of supplies, of materials that enter into their farm buildings and their dwellings, while the excessive cost of steel rails has imposed an additional handicap upon them by increasing the cost of the transportation of their products to the markets. Surely there is no one in the United States who ought to complain more loudly of the abuses of the present tariff than the long-suffering American farmer.

Now, I will conclude this discussion, Mr. Chairman, in a few moments. I have noticed in this debate a tendency to regard the excess of exports over imports as the best evidence of our national prosperity, and, of course, that excess is attributed to the operation of the Dingley tariff. The Republican party is resourceful in expedients. It is ingenious in framing plausible excuses. In the years when the Republican tariff failed to cause an excess of exports over imports—when, in fact, our imports, year after year, exceeded our exports—we never heard this present-day theory that the prosperity of the nation was based upon the excess of the exports over imports. It was not until the last few years, when our exports exceeded our imports, that this new theory was devised as a pretext for continuing the existing schedules.

Now, that theory can be sound only upon the assumption that every time we sell we make gains, while every time we buy we suffer loss. That theory disregards the fundamental principle that all commerce is barter, and that money balances are merely the instrumentalities which close the aggregate of commercial transactions.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] pointed with pride to the fact that our exports this year were $1,491,744,000, while our imports were $1,117,512,000. He triumphantly referred to this excess of $374,232,000 as a vindication of the policy of protection and as the sole criterion of our national prosperity. Now, suppose, Mr. Chairman, that we sold $187,000,000 less and bought $187,000,000 more, so that our exports and imports would exactly balance, would the gentleman from Iowa state then that our national prosperity had departed? Why, if the people of the United States instead of having in their pockets, or in the pockets of a few of them, rather, the three hundred and seventy-four millions represented by the excess of exports,

had in their possession $374,000,000 worth of foreign articles which they needed and which promoted their comfort and happiness, would they not be quite as well off as they are now?

Why, the excess of exports over imports is only a drop in the bucket compared with the total of our commercial transactions. This year the value of the products of the farms of the United States was $6,415,000, of our manufactories $16,000,000,000, of our minerals $1,289,000,000. The excess of exports was only 6 per cent of the total value of the agricultural products, only 2½ per cent of the total value of manufactures, and only 1½ per cent of the total value of our factories, farms, and mines, leaving out of the calculation entirely the value of the products of our fisheries and our forests.

No, it is not the excess of our exports that gauges our national prosperity, but the great volume of commercial transactions that are absolutely unrestricted by tariffs in the forty-five States and four Territories of this Union. [Loud applause.]

Some idea of the immensity of these internal transactions may be gained from the statements that we have now 211,000 miles of railroad, and that the net earnings of the railroads of the United States were $639,000,000 last year. Out of the total value of our farm products we exported only 12 per cent last year and had 88 per cent left for domestic uses. Out of the total value of our manufactures and our mines only 4 per cent were exported and 96 per cent were left at home for domestic consumption.

No, Mr. Chairman, it is the great system of free trade throughout the whole domain of the United States which has built up the prosperity of this nation. I trust that that system will be extended so that it will include Canada on the north of us and Mexico upon the south. I trust that it will be extended still further to embrace the whole American continent, so that standing together, with the cry of "America for the Americans," we will confidently face the outside world. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3 and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a schedule of claims allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of W. R. Henson, administrator of estate of John Henson, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for temporary barracks—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for certain contingent expenses of the consular service—to the Committee on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Postmaster-General submitting reasons for certain changes in estimates as to salaries, etc.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Attorney-General, transmitting a report of the expenditures of the Department and the use of the contingent fund—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Postmaster-General submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with a copy of a communication from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, a draft of a bill to ratify an agreement with the Indians of the Colville Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1972) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Gillon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 27); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7408) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Price, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 28); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2800) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Manahan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 29); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3368) granting an increase of pension to William McNair, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 30); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1868) granting an increase of pension to Perry Egge, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 31); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7662) granting an increase of pension to Barney Schultz, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 32); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1789) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Shade, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 31); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1810) granting an increase of pension to James E. Post, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 34); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6186) granting an increase of pension to William Harvey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 35); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7952) granting an increase of pension to Detrick Nortrup, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 36); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1505) granting a pension to William Birmingham, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 37); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8550) granting an increase of pension to John Bierer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 38); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8403) granting an increase of pension to James L. Rector, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 39); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 520) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Stern, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 40); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid

Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1752) granting an increase of pension to Hugh N. Lokerson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 41); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7230) granting an increase of pension to John M. Wells, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 42); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1971) granting an increase of pension to Melville A. Smith, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 43); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6446) granting an increase of pension to Silas N. Bradshaw, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 44); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1330) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hildreth, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 45); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6113) granting an increase of pension to Moses Schoonmaker, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 46); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7888) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Sutherlin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 47); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4991) granting an increase of pension to William R. Glisan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 48); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6191) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Bachman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 49); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7423) granting a pension to Rachel Dailey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 50); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7509) granting an increase of pension to John N. Stone, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 51); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5653) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Wells, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 52); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6172) granting an increase of pension to Abraham K. Van Tine, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 53); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5208) granting a pension to Susan J. Rounds, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 54); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7735) granting an increase of pension to James Hartzel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 55); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3758) granting an increase of pension to George Nulton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 56); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4643) granting an increase of pension to Orlena F. Seaver, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 57); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3428) granting an increase of pension to S. E. Chamberlain, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 58); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1381) granting an increase of pension to David H. Quigg, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 59); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1074) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Bean, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 60); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6917) granting an increase of pension to Edmund R. Strang, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 61); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1511) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius A. Hallenbeck, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 62); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4223) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Schultz, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 63); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 749) granting an increase of pension to Elkanah M. Wynn, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 64); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1199) granting a pension to Lydia A. Jewell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 65); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1288) granting an increase of pension to S. D. Platt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 66); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8071) granting a pension to Mary Mitchell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 67); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1339) granting an increase of pension to James Kelley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 68); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5631) granting an increase of pension to Leonard F. Simmons, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 69); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4682) granting an increase of pension to James Whiteman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 70); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3010) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Meadows, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 71); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3573) granting a pension to John V. Sanders, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 72); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2770) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Plumpton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 73); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2435) granting an increase of pension to Hilia Ann Connor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 74); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2735) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Foster, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 75); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1772) granting an increase of pension to James C. Plybon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 76); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1960) granting an increase of pension to Conrad Laukenman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 77); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1548) granting an increase of pension to Emma Leviness, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 78); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2012) granting an increase of pension to William Wilson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 79); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1361) granting an increase of pension to Camillus B. Leftwich, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 80); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1378) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Hobart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 81); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9659) granting an increase of pension to Abraham V. Smith, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 82); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3006) granting an increase of pension to William H. Crites, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 83); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6120) granting a pension to Harriet M. Smithers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 84); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6447) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Davenport, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 85); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2990) granting a pension to Felix G. Walker, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 86); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1073) granting an increase of pension to William J. Castlow, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 87); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 10832) for the current deposit of public moneys, for the issue and circulation of national-bank notes, and for the gradual conversion of the United States notes into gold certificates—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10833) to amend section 5200 of the United States Revised Statutes, in relation to bank loans—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10834) for the erection of a public building at Cynthiana, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10835) to amend an act providing when plaintiff may sue as a poor person, and when counsel shall be assigned by the court, as passed July 20, 1892—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10836) extending the provisions of an act of June 27, 1890, to the Kentucky State Militia and the Provisional Kentucky Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 10837) fixing the compensation of the customs inspectors at the ports of Boston, New York, and Chicago—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 10838) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in the northern district of California—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10839) for the relief of claimants for desert lands in the State of Washington, under desert-land entries made after January 1, 1902, and prior to June 24, 1903—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 10840) to provide for the investigation of controversies affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 10841) authorizing the construction of dams across Spring River and Grand River, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 10842) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept a yawl—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 10843) authorizing the extension of Kenyon street NW.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10844) to create retrenchment commission, to reorganize Departments, to abolish unnecessary bureaus, to reduce salaries and expenses, to reform pension list, to regulate our system of internal improvements, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 10845) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 10846) providing that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall declare and publish a uniform classification of freight—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 10847) to treat the findings of the Court of Claims in certain cases as judgments, and to provide for the payment of the same—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10848) authorizing the President to negotiate commercial treaties with foreign countries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 10849) to increase pay of mail carriers on rural free-delivery routes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 10850) to prohibit aliens from fishing in the waters of Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 10851) to aid in the erection of a statue of Commodore John D. Sloat, United States Navy, at Monterey, Cal.—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10852) to divide the State of California into three judicial districts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10853) to prohibit gambling in the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE (by request): A bill (H. R. 10854) to confer jurisdiction, legal and equitable, upon the Court of Claims in the matter of the claims of certain Shawnee Indians to be enrolled as Cherokees, under treaty of July 19, 1866, agreement of June 7, 1869, the act of October 1, 1890, and decrees of the courts thereunder, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 10856) to provide for the erection of a post-office and custom-house at Richford, Vt.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 10857) to establish a uniform rule of naturalization throughout the United States of America—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 10858) to establish a naval militia and define its relations to the General Government—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 10859) authorizing a public building at Kinston, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10860) to prevent removals from State courts into courts of the United States by nonresident corporations—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10861) to limit removal from State courts into courts of the United States in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A resolution (H. Res. 129) for the investigation of the recent violent expulsion of an American mother from the White House offices and grounds—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A resolution (H. Res 130) ordering the Public Printer to print 500 additional copies of maps to accompany House Document No. 263, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A resolution (H. Res. 131) directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to transmit to the House certain information—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A resolution (H. Res. 132) inquiring as to delays in deliveries of materials and armor for use in construction of the United States ship *Connecticut*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 133) inquiring as to changes and cost thereof of the United States ship *Louisiana*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHALL: A resolution (H. Res. 134) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 10855—to the Committee on Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SOUTHALL: A bill (H. R. 10855) for the relief of Charles A. Miner—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 10862) granting a pension to Mary E. McCracken—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10863) granting an increase of pension to James Pomeroy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10864) granting an increase of pension to J. P. Kleckner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10865) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10866) granting an increase of pension to William Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10867) granting an increase of pension to Henry Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 10868) granting a pension to Alice Bosworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 10869) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Thomas Parr—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10870) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Andrew Jackson Oatman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDRUS: A bill (H. R. 10871) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Julia A. Shaw—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BANNON: A bill (H. R. 10872) granting an increase of pension to Abram J. Hill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 10873) granting a pension to Margaret Shea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A bill (H. R. 10874) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Pfahl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10875) granting an increase of pension to Amos B. Horton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10876) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10877) granting an increase of pension to Howell B. Treat—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10878) granting a pension to George F. Center—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10879) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Myres—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 10880) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah F. Hanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 10881) granting a pension to Jerry Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10882) granting a pension to Frederick Wulff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10883) granting an increase of pension to William Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 10884) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Libby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10885) granting a pension to Henrietta R. Young—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 10886) granting an increase of pension to Martha S. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 10887) granting a pension to Isaiah Crouch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 10888) granting a pension to Burton Walters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10889) granting a pension to William H. Garrison—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10890) granting a pension to Effie J. Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10891) granting a pension to James J. Sim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10892) granting a pension to Philene Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10893) granting an increase of pension to James K. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10894) granting an increase of pension to William J. Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10895) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Griffith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10896) granting an increase of pension to Polly Ann Napper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10897) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Deems—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10898) granting an increase of pension to Shadrack Waters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10899) granting an increase of pension to James M. Alderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10900) granting an increase of pension to Arthur R. Dreppard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10901) granting an increase of pension to John W. Marcum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10902) granting an increase of pension to James Holderby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10903) granting an increase of pension to Lovell E. Cropper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10904) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Richard Dove—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10905) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William Ridge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10906) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph F. Bryan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10907) granting an increase of pension to John N. Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARRAGH: A bill (H. R. 10908) to correct the military record of Andrew J. Drake—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10909) to correct the military record of Joseph Van Valkenburgh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10910) to correct the military record of Henry W. Knapp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10911) to correct the military record of Richard Foster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10912) granting an honorable discharge to James M. Rogers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10913) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Joseph B. Riley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 10914) granting an increase of pension to John Hamilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10915) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Foreman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 10916) granting an increase

of pension to Charles H. Shreeves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 10917) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNWELL: A bill (H. R. 10918) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Webster Josselyn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 10919) granting a pension to Abbie G. Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 10920) granting a pension to Mary Edna Cammeron—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 10921) for the relief of Joel Glover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 10922) granting an increase of pension to John McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10923) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Rockwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER. A bill (H. R. 10924) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Sizer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT of California. A bill (H. R. 10925) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Dennis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10926) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 10927) for the relief of F. A. R. Scott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10928) for the relief of the estate of David Pangle, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10929) for the relief of the estate of John North, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 10930) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Wareham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 10931) granting a pension to Ellen M. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10932) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Keinborts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10933) granting a pension to Lillian P. Beaudin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10934) granting a pension to Josephine D. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10935) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. J. L. Boone—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10936) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Matthew Totten—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10937) granting a pension to Henry W. Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 10938) granting an increase of pension to David C. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10939) granting an increase of pension to John T. Gingrich—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 10940) granting an increase of pension to James S. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10941) granting an increase of pension to French L. Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10942) granting an increase of pension to Jessie Raynor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 10943) for the relief of W. J. Winsett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10944) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Tullahoma, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10945) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Lewis M. Maney, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 10946) granting a pension to Miller C. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 10947) granting a pension to Belle V. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10948) granting an increase of pension to James F. Wheeler—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 10949) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Moloughney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10950) granting a pension to Charles Anderson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 10951) to promote and retire Maj. John W. Dillenback, retired—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 10952) for the relief of W. C. Waldrop, administrator of the estate of Millington Waldrop, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10953) for the relief of the legal representatives of William A. Henderson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10954) granting an increase of pension to Letitia D. Watkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 10955) for the relief of the heirs of Lawrence M. Spann—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 10956) to correct the military record of William E. Morris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10957) granting a pension to Horatio Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10958) granting an increase of pension to Levi Dodson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 10959) granting a pension to George H. Bryner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 10960) for the relief of Charles Cox—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10961) granting a pension to Nancy Taylor—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10962) for the relief of Isaac Easterly—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 10963) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel G. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10964) granting a pension to Angeline W. Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 10965) granting an increase of pension to Mortimer F. Sperry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 10966) granting a pension to Christian Schmidt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10967) granting a pension to George Larson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 10968) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, at Waverly, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10969) granting an increase of pension to C. G. Tucker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 10970) for the relief of the estate of David Ledwith—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10971) for the relief of the estate of George W. Reeves, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10972) for the relief of S. K. McAlexander—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10973) for the relief of John B. Warren—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10974) for the relief of the estate of Hiram Howell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10975) for the relief of the estate of William Stidham, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10976) for the relief of the Overton Hotel Company, of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10977) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin D. Gates, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10978) for the relief of the estate of D. C. Wells, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10979) for the relief of the estate of James Crews, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10980) for the relief of the estate of Ausley Dean, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10981) for the relief of the heirs of James C. Anderson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10982) for the relief of the estate of W. H. Neel, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 10983) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel W. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 10984) granting an increase of pension to John Wilkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 10985) granting a pension to Emma C. Fenno—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 10986) granting an increase of pension to James Cupps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 10987) for the relief of George W. Stamps—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10988) granting a pension to Jane Barr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10989) granting a pension to John S. Barr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10990) granting a pension to B. F. Zell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10991) granting an increase of pension to Peter Lapoleon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10992) granting an increase of pension to S. E. Bish—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10993) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10994) granting an increase of pension to John A. Hetrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10995) granting an increase of pension to Robert Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10996) to correct the military record of Mark G. Harris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 10997) granting a pension to Clara Belle Barr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10998) granting a pension to Helen G. Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10999) granting a pension to Elizabeth R. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 11000) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 11001) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Beaufort, Carteret County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 11002) granting an increase of pension to Jay Badgley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 11003) granting an increase of pension to James E. Reilly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELBORN: A bill (H. R. 11004) to correct the military record of John M. King—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11005) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Langston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11006) for the relief of the First Baptist Church, of Springfield, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COCKS: A bill (H. R. 11007) granting an increase of pension to John Vogler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11008) authorizing the Secretary of War to adjust the claim of the Merritt & Chapman Wrecking Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11009) authorizing the Secretary of War to adjust the claim of the Merritt & Chapman Wrecking Company, and making an appropriation to satisfy such claim of $1,800, or so much thereof as may be necessary—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 11010) to correct the record of Martin Lunsford and grant him a pension—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 11011) for the relief of the estate of Esidore Cohn, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11012) for the relief of the estate of Richard A. Bynum—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11013) for the relief of Henry Tull, heir at law and distributee of the late John Tull—to the Committee on War Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1885) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Van Petten—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9490) granting an increase of pension to William W. Fergusen—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4666) granting an increase of pension to David A. Carpenter—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10756) granting an honorable discharge to Dennis Case—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Shorthorn Cattle Breeders' Association, favoring a commercial treaty with Germany and other European nations favorable to the products of American farms and ranches—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of citizens of Medway, Pa., favoring rsetriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Tobacco Growers' Association against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of the Cutler Desk Company and others, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the Baxter Molding Company, of St. Louis, Mo., for favorable consideration of bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Frank Z. Curry—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Georgia and Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 471, of Macon, Ga., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOUTELL: Petition of retail grocers and tea dealers of Chicago, against a tax on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Civic Federation of Chicago, against careless naturalization customs—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Daniel Covington—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Current Events Club, of Westchester, Pa., against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Derrickson Company, of Chester, Pa., for repeal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill (H. R. 5274) granting an increase of pension to William T. Brannan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Anderson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPRON: Protest of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, against the repeal of the anti-canteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Current Topics Club of Newport, R. I., indorsing the model child-labor law—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CASSEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry P. Will—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John N. Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph R. Boger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Elijah Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Grindstone Council, No. 689, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Nancy Rose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of General McClellan Council and Hoboken Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Petition of Jacob Gallatin and 61 others, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of the German Veteran Society of Davenport, Iowa, against spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Clinton (Iowa) Retail Grocers' Association, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles H. Shreeves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Nathan Foreman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of 170 union cigar workers of Davenport, Iowa, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Cigar Makers' International Union of America, against reduction of the Philippine tariff on tobacco and cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Electa E. Brooks—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York State, for a Federal judicial circuit court in the Orient—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the American members of the Educational Association of China, for free admission of Chinese students to America—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of the Minnesota Good Roads Association, favoring Federal aid—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOSS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Manufacturers and Shippers' Association of Rockford, Ill., favoring power of Interstate Commerce Commission over railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas J. Sizer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 6228) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan H. Terrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Paper to accompany bill for relief of S. Weldy—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John North, of Jefferson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James R. Moore, of Knox County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of S. Long, administrator of estate of Nicholas H. Long—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Josephine D. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, asking that the United States participate in the Milan Exposition—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of N. A. Beake et al., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Bar Association of Northern California, for additional district judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry W. Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Matthew Totten—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Lorenzo Boone—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Miller & Lux (Incorporated) et al., for a modification of the interstate-commerce law relative to live stock—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Lillian P. Beaudin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Daniel Kienborts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ellen M. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: Petition of the United Presbyterian Presbytery, of Keokuk, Iowa, for prohibition in Oklahoma and Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of G. W. Woolley & Son, for repeal of the tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Unity Council, No. 11, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Southington, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Connecticut State board of agriculture, favoring bill H. R. 345—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Connecticut State board of agriculture, favoring a law for the suppression of the gypsy moth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Lexington Lodge, No. 72, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of New Britain, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of citizens of the Fourth Nebraska Congressional district, favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of Jacob C. Herndon, of Rutherford County, Tenn., praying reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Anthony Wayne Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Newark, N. J., and Washington Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, urging restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of James A. Moore, Frank Dabney, and H. K. Owens, for a special act of Congress for relief of desert-land claimants in the State of Washington under entries made after January 1 and prior to June 24, 1903—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Bell V. Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of citizens of Superior, Wis., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY: Petition of the Commercial Club of Omaha, the National Home Trade Society, the Wright & Wilhelmy Company, the C. W. Hull Company, the United States Supply Company, Cartan & Jeffery, E. H. Sprague, the Lee Broom and Duster Company, J. R. Lehmer, C. B. Shackleford, and the Bradford-Kennedy Company, favoring two classes of mail only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KLINE: Petition of New Tripoli Grand Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of citizens of Oklahoma, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Melitta Long—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William J. Willis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Wright—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Isaac Sewell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Isaac Sewell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Celia A. E. Joiner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Hartwell Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James W. Williamson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah E. Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Dillard M. Young—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Simpson Gunn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Rice—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John B. Henderson, executor of the estate of William A. Henderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Isaac P. Small—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of W. C. Waldrop, administrator of the estate of Millington Waldrop—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: Petition of Fort Sumter Lodge, No. 223, Brotherhood of Railroad Conductors of America—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany bill (H. R. 8122) for a public building in Sumter, S. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: Petition of the Connecticut State board of agriculture, favoring bills H. R. 285, 286, and 345, appropriating $250,000 for suppression of the gypsy and brown-tail moths—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of citizens of North Dakota, for drainage of land in Cass and other counties—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Bolivar Shield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Broughton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of E. R. Chaltin, of Meigs County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOORE: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Mortimer F. Sperrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of W. C. Chamberlin and 54 others, David C. Pierce and 55 others, C. P. Kern and 64 others, C. A. Coler and 40 others, and E. D. Miller and 796 others, citizens of Ohio, against the Philippine tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of H. Stern, jr., a wholesale dry goods firm of Milwaukee, favoring two classes of mail only—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Cumberland Presbyterian Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of S. H. Lawson, with paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Thomas J. Lawson, late of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of H. H. Cromwell, with paper to accompany bill for relief of the estate of W. F. Cromwell, late of Wayne County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of C. G. Tucker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina: Petition of citizens of North Carolina for a law prohibiting catching fish in the Atlantic Ocean below the mouth of the inlet into which the waters of the Cape Fear River flow—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John A. Moon—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Mrs. L. E. Coopwood, R. V. Taylor, Sallie J. Valentine, A. P. Young, and John H. Gray, deceased, all of Fayette County, Tenn., asking reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of J. Levi Roush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary A. Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Dison Ramsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Levi Kegg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph J. Mishler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James F. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of John L. Beveridge and 100 others, for creation of a Volunteer Army retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the American Chamber of Commerce of Paris, favoring a commercial treaty of reciprocity between the United States and Germany—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 60,000 Americans in Alaska, for representation in Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance, for a reciprocity treaty between the United States and Germany—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Petition of the Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union, for the creation of the position of foreman of presswork in the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas J. Stevens—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: Petition of Sergeant Wyant, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Bellevue Lodge, No. 214, Knights of Pythias, of Delance, Pa.; O. C. Fritchman et al., Knights of Pythias Lodge No. 185, and citizens of Sykesville, Pa., and Mahoning Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SOUTHALL: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 10855) for relief of Charles A. Miner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the State board of agriculture of Connecticut, favoring bill (H. R. 345) to extend experiment stations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the State board of agriculture of Connecticut, for bills H. R. 285 and 286, for extermination of gypsy moth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the International Silver Company, of Meriden, Conn., favoring bill H. R. 7079—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of the Methodist Church of South Beaufort, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Good—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of John Zimmerman et al., against putting tea and coffee on the dutiable list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *January 9, 1906.*

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

AGREEMENT WITH INDIANS OF COLVILLE RESERVATION, WASH.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, together with the draft of a bill to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Indians of the Colville Reservation, in the State of Washington, concluded by United States Indian Inspector James McLaughlin, under date of December 1, 1905, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 58) to prevent the unlawful wearing of the badge or insignia of the Grand Army of the Republic or other soldier organizations;

A bill (H. R. 4459) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations respecting the rights and privileges of the fish wharf;

A bill (H. R. 4461) to provide for the abatement of nuisances in the District of Columbia by the Commissioners of said District, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 4463) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

VISITORS TO WEST POINT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed Mr. SCOTT and Mr. BLACKBURN members of the Board of Visitors on the part of the Senate to attend the next annual examination of cadets at the Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., under the requirements of section 1327 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented petitions of the annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Deming, N. Mex.; of sundry citizens of the State of California, and of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of West Philadelphia, Pa., and a petition of sundry citizens of Blanchard, Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pitcairn, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Arizona Miners' Association, of Phoenix, Ariz., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing joint statehood with New Mexico; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a petition of Burnside Council, No. 26, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Chester, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented petitions of Lincoln Council, No. 4, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Windsor; of General Stark Council, No. 35, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Springfield, and of Minnehaha Council, No. 5, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Springfield, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SMOOT presented a petition of Local Union No. 1370, Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Bingham Canyon, Utah, and a petition of Cigar Makers' International Union No. 224, of Salt Lake City, Utah, praying for the enactment of legis-

lation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WARNER presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 567) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to make an examination of certain claims of the State of Missouri; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a petition of the Black Hills Mining Men's Association, of South Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation for the establishment of mining experiment stations and to promote the mineral resources of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 986) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Doan; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 315) granting an increase of pension to George Pike, jr.; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented papers to accompany the bill (S. 985) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Smith; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Watertown, Minn., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Minnesota State Art Society, praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the duty on works of fine art; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of the Religious Liberty Bureau of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation looking to the foundation for a union of church and state; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to restore the name of California avenue; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of A. P. Tasker, department commander, of James A. Garfield Post, No. 7, and of George G. Meade Post, No. 5, all of the Department of the Potomac, Grand Army of the Republic, Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a temporary home for the ex soldiers and sailors of the late wars; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a petition of the State Board of Health of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Trinity Council, No. 50, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Trinity, Ky., and a petition of True Blue Council, No. 14, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Phillips, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Crown Hill, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Glade Valley Council, No. 46, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Glade Valley, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration and for the revision of the laws governing naturalization; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1160) to correct the military record of John McKinnon, alias John Mack, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MALLORY. On behalf of the minority of the Committee on Commerce, I beg leave to submit the views of the minority on the bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The views of the minority will be printed and appended as a part of the report of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. ALLEE introduced a bill (S. 2836) granting a pension to M. Elizabeth Kent; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2837) for the relief of the widow and children of Daniel McDonough, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 2838) authorizing the extension of T street (formerly W street) NW.; and

A bill (S. 2839) for the protection of producers, manufacturers, and venders of milk and cream, and of lawful milk beverages composed mainly of milk, in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2840) granting an increase of pension to George L. Jaquith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOPKINS introduced a bill (S. 2841) granting a pension to Lucy L. Bane; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURNHAM introduced a bill (S. 2842) for the relief of John H. Dawe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2843) granting an increase of pension to Philester S. Elliott; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2844) to prohibit gambling in the Territory of Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Indian Territory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. PILES introduced a bill (S. 2845) making an appropriation for the purchase and installation of machinery, for the erection of new buildings, and for the reconstruction and repair of other buildings for a central agency school at the Tulalip Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 2846) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Jane Cameron; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2847) for the relief of the estate of Adam Schweitzer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULBERSON. I introduce a bill for the relief of Alexander Moore, late captain, Third Cavalry, United States Army, and ask that the bill, with the accompanying paper, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I have not had time to examine the facts in relation to the bill sufficiently to commit myself to it, and I make this statement at the time I introduce it.

The bill (S. 2848) for the relief of Alexander Moore was read twice by its title, and with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 2849) granting an increase of pension to James H. Street; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FLINT introduced a bill (S. 2850) granting a pension to Benair C. Sawyer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2851) granting an increase of pension to George Chambers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a bill (S. 2852) granting a pension to Bridget Manahan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2853) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Quinn; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NIXON introduced a bill (S. 2854) for the relief of Chris Deiss; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2855) for the relief of B. Klucny; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ALGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2856) granting an increase of pension to Edwin P. Pierce;

A bill (S. 2857) granting a pension to Augusta D. Murdock;

A bill (S. 2858) granting a pension to General M. Brown;

A bill (S. 2859) granting a pension to Ann E. Hack;

A bill (S. 2860) granting a pension to Thomas H. Reynolds;

A bill (S. 2861) granting an increase of pension to Aimé M. Dobbelaere;

A bill (S. 2862) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Dwyer;

A bill (S. 2863) granting an increase of pension to Garrett Rourke;

A bill (S. 2864) granting an increase of pension to Asahel C. Washburn; and

A bill (S. 2865) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Cheney.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 2866) to correct the military record of William T. Rominger; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2867) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Dawson;

A bill (S. 2868) granting an increase of pension to George W. Flick; and

A bill (S. 2869) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Foulk (with accompanying papers).

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 2870) for the relief of the legal representatives of Charles W. Adams, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 2871) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Brunnell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HALE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 18) authorizing the appointment of J. O. Johnson as a commander on the retired list of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GAMBLE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $7,500 for extension of sewer and repair and rebuilding of same at the Indian Industrial School at Chamberlain, S. Dak., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR INSANE.

On motion of Mr. GALLINGER, it was

Ordered, That the Secretary be instructed to take from the files of the Senate the original manuscript copy of the financial report of the Government Hospital for the Insane for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905, and return the same to the Department of the Interior for the files of that Department, the report having been printed as Senate Document No. 61, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session.

CLASSIFICATION AND GRADING OF CEREALS.

On motion of Mr. McCUMBER, it was

Ordered, That there be printed, for the use of the Senate document room, 2,000 copies of Senate bill No. 151—"to provide for fixing a uniform standard of classification and grading of wheat, flax, corn, oats, barley, rye, and other grains, and for other purposes."

EMPLOYEES OF PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION, ETC.

Mr. SIMMONS. I offer a resolution which I ask may be read and that it may lie on the table. It is my purpose to call up the resolution to-morrow in the morning hour.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate the names, and compensation received by each, of every officer, agent, attorney, counsel, solicitor, or other employee of the Panama Canal Commission and the Panama Railroad Company as of date December 1, 1905, where the salary or compensation is $3,000 per annum or over; also the names, salaries, allowances, and expenditures of the board of consulting engineers.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed, and will lie on the table.

MESSENGER FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. HANSBROUGH submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ a messenger at an annual salary at the rate of $1,440, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. MILLARD submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and are hereby, authorized to investigate all matters relating to the Panama Canal and the government of the Canal Zone and the management of the Panama Railroad Company, to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths and employ a stenographer to report such hearings; and that the committee be authorized to sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate, and that all expenses thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. KEAN subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the foregoing resolution, reported it without amendment.

Mr. GORMAN. I move to amend the resolution by inserting after the word "authorized" the words "and directed."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

REGULATION OF RAILROAD RATES.

Mr. MORGAN. If I am in order at present, I call for the second reading of Senate bill 2828.

The bill (S. 2828) to provide for the regulation, by judicial authority, of the freight rates of railroad companies and other common carriers and the preferential advantages granted by such common carriers to certain persons and places, to the wrong and injury of others was read the second time by its title.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to submit some remarks upon the bill and will proceed now unless the Senate otherwise orders. I ask leave, without reading it, to introduce a copy of the bill as a part of my remarks.

The bill introduced by Mr. MORGAN January 8, 1906, is as follows:

A bill to provide for the regulation, by judicial authority, of the freight rates of railroad companies and other common carriers, and the preferential advantages granted by such common carriers to certain persons and places, to the wrong and injury of others.

Be it enacted, etc., That all railroad corporations or companies and all other corporations, companies, and persons engaged as common carriers in transporting, by land or water, freight or passengers among or between the States, or in or through the District of Columbia, are prohibited from demanding or receiving more than a reasonable compensation for such service on their respective lines of transportation, or any part thereof on which they are so engaged, directly or by agreement with any other corporation, company, or person; and they are likewise prohibited from giving unreasonable preferences in rates or charges for transportation services, or in the facilities of transportation, to any shipper or passenger to or between any place or places on such routes or lines of transportation to other shippers or passengers.

SEC. 2. That the shipper or owner of any property, or any passenger on lines or routes of transportation, such as are mentioned or described in section 1 of this act, may sue such common carrier in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to the suit for the recovery of such unreasonable charges for transportation or for any damages sustained by the plaintiff in the suit by reason of the giving unreasonable preferences in rates or facilities of transportation that are prohibited in the first section of this act; and in any suit brought under or in accordance with the provisions of said section the court shall entertain jurisdiction without respect to the sum sought to be recovered therein: *Provided*, That the sum claimed by the plaintiff in the action shall be $50 or more.

SEC. 3. That appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States may be granted or writs of error may issue from the Supreme Court of the United States for the review of a final judgment in any suit authorized in sections 1 and 2 of this act on the application of any of the parties litigant without reference to the amount of the judgment therein, rendered in a district court of the United States, and in such cases the district courts and the Supreme Court of the United States shall advance the same for trial or hearing over other civil causes on their dockets if, in the opinion of the court, the public interests are not injuriously affected by such order.

SEC. 4. That if the plaintiff in a suit in the district court of the United States instituted under or in accordance with this act shall obtain judgment for a sum less than $50 the costs of such suit may be taxed equally between the parties plaintiff and defendant therein. If the recovery in such suit by the plaintiff shall be as much or a sum greater than $50 the entire costs shall be taxed against the defendant therein.

SEC. 5. That any citizen of a State may make complaint to the governor thereof, setting forth the facts which show a breach of the provisions of this act by any common carrier engaged in the business of transportation described in the first section hereof, and thereupon such governor, if he determines that it is proper and expedient for the people of the State that suit should be instituted, and is empowered by the laws of such State to institute suit for the determination of the questions and matters mentioned in the first section of this act, is hereby authorized to institute and prosecute a suit against any of the common carriers referred to in this act, in the name of the State of which he is governor, in any court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof, for the recovery of any such demand, or for the recovery of any damages that such citizen may be entitled to recover or that the people of such State or of any defined locality in such State have suffered through the unlawful conduct of such common carrier. Such sums as may be recovered in such suits in the name of the State are to be at the disposal of the legislature of such State. The State instituting such suit shall be regarded in all respects as the plaintiff in the action: *Provided*, That such a suit shall not be brought in any State in a district court of the United States for any judicial district of the United States within such State; but such suit in a district court of the United States may be instituted in any other State or district of which the defendants are citizens, or in which any of them are liable to be sued in the district or any other courts of the United States.

SEC. 6. That the service of process upon any director or officer of a corporation, or company, mentioned in the first section of this act, at any place in which he is liable to be sued in any court of the United States, shall be sufficient service as to such corporation or company, and as to all the members thereof, to compel their appearance to abide by and perform its orders and the final judgment of the court when rendered.

SEC. 7. That nothing in this act contained shall be construed as depriving any person who sues in his own right and name from instituting any suit under its provisions, or any other suit, at law or in equity, in any State court or in any court of the United States, against any common carrier.

SEC. 8. That in all suits instituted under the provisions of this act, or in accordance therewith, against common carriers in the district courts of the United States the question of the reasonableness of rates or compensation demanded by or paid to a common carrier for the transportation of freights or passengers, and the question of the reasonableness of any preference given by a common carrier to shippers of

freights or of passengers over other shippers or passengers, or to any place over any other place, shall be considered as mixed questions of law and fact, to be determined and decided by a court and jury.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, in all the great number of suggestions and propositions to regulate, by statute, the rates of compensation that common carriers may lawfully demand and receive for the transportation of passengers or property, there are two that can not escape final decision by the Supreme Court of the United States. Unless Congress cuts off from the parties to a suit the right of appeal or writ of error, for review by that court, of the judgments of inferior courts, such cases as are the subject-matter of this bill, they will reach that court and will be finally decided by it through some channel. But the journey will be slow.

It is by no means certain, if Congress should deny the right of appeal or writ of error in such cases, that the Supreme Court, in its constitutional power and right of review, prohibition, and mandamus over inferior tribunals, can not compel them to obey the Constitution of the United States.

But the occasion for the discussion of such a proposition is so very remote that I only allude to it to call the attention of the Senate to the supremacy of the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States as the final arbiter of all suits for all causes of action brought by a State of the Union in that court.

The two causes of action to which the provisions of this bill relate that I now have the honor to offer in the Senate involve the contract rights that may be claimed by carriers as being beyond the final control of the powers of Congress—rights that are so protected by the Constitution that Congress can not lawfully impair them if they are, in fact, reasonable and just—contract rights that can only be decided to be reasonable and just by the judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction.

There is a contract, express or implied, in every lawful act or engagement of a common carrier in the transportation of passengers or freight. No phase or form of legislative enactment can extinguish this essential element that inheres in such engagements between a shipper and a common carrier.

A common carrier can not lawfully transport freights against the consent of the shipper. Such an act is a conversion of the property so transported. As to a passenger, such wrongful transportation against his will is a tort. If the transportation is with the consent of the parties it is lawful as to them, and the right to demand compensation and the amount of it is only governed by the reasonableness of the charge. If the amount of the compensation for such service is not settled by agreement, the law implies that it shall be reasonable. If it is fixed by agreement between the parties, the law, for reasons of public policy founded in justice, requires that the rate or compensation shall be reasonable; otherwise, the recovery for the service is limited to the quantum meruit, or the sum that is reasonably, and therefore justly, due to the carrier from the shipper, without regard to the price stated in the contract.

The test of reasonableness, which is an equitable phase or form of justice in the contracts of public carriers and other like employments, has grown out of a public policy that has the effect of law, and is practically inviolable. This public policy is based upon the necessity of placing restraints upon common carriers and some other classes of persons who, in virtue of their business occupations, in which not a great number of persons are usually engaged, have monopolistic advantages over the general community, and are yet indispensable to the success of commercial pursuits. If such advantages are not checked by active competition or by some principle of law that is of universal application to persons so employed in the service of the people, monopoly and extortion will necessarily exist, to the serious detriment of trade and commerce. These interests are sedulously guarded against such wrongs and evils in all civilized countries, and especially by the common law of England.

In official service the officer, great or small, who practices extortion is denounced by the common law and by many highly penal statutes as an enemy of society, and is weighted down by courts and juries with just and severe punishments.

The situation with which Congress is anxiously trying to deal at this time closely resembles extortion by public officials, and it deserves and requires the check and punishment of severe laws. It is difficult in the present state of public feeling on this subject to resist the inclination of lawmakers who are free from partialities to enact laws by State legislatures and by Congress to treat the officers of railroads, whether engaged in transportation among the States or within the States, as holding their offices in those corporations in trust for the people, as if they were governmental officers, by adoption of law. I am not quite sure that Congress and the State legislatures can not so regard their public service and hold them to the full responsibilities of such officers as are elected or chosen to the performance of governmental service and punish them for official extortion. But it is not yet necessary to make any new departure in legislation to reach this class of public extortioners. In the Elkins law there is as near an approval of this principle as is necessary at present, and if amendments to that excellent law are found necessary to prevent its evasion, Congress should make them.

Returning to the two questions with which this measure is intended to deal, they both arise out of the question of the reasonableness of contracts, express or implied, as to the compensation that common carriers may justly demand for transportation of goods or passengers, and the reasonableness of any discriminations or preferences in the rates or facilities of transportation as between different shippers or passengers or between different places on the same lines or routes of transportation.

Contracts, express or implied, are of the essence of such operations, and as contracts these matters are to be dealt with. I have selected these features of the situation that includes other evils, because they are very comprehensive in character, including other resulting or dependent evils, and because they are the most prominent and earnestly contested points that are being urged upon the consideration of Congress.

If these abuses can be corrected by Congressional legislation through methods that are not entirely new, and are not expensive to those who are being wronged by the railroad companies, and by decisions that are finally conclusive of all the questions involved, such a line of procedure must certainly engage the careful study and examination of Congress, as it will command the confidence of the people. I believe that such a result will follow the enactment of this bill into a law substantially as it is formulated.

While this measure removes some existing statutory difficulties to its successful operation, chiefly such as relate to the sum in controversy, as an element of jurisdiction in the district courts of the United States, and as to the amount of the judgment that carries the right of appeal or writ of error to remove causes in the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, and as to the costs of the suits in the cases provided for in this bill, there is not a principle of law upon which this bill rests that is not well established. It only brings to the support of justice methods and forms of procedure in the courts that are apparently being overlooked in our anxiety to deal summarily with widespread and dangerous combinations and extortionate monopolies that seriously oppress many of the productive, industrial, and commercial classes of our country.

The course of this proposed legislation in this bill is anticipated by and is marked out plainly in the history of the jurisprudence known as the "common law of England" from the beginning and also as it is extended and amplified in our courts and applied to the genius of our Government. It will stand as a reaffirmation of that great body of laws, both customary and statutory, and it is not in the way of any new and experimental system that has been presented for arriving summarily at results that are in the end the same that are reached by the provisions of this measure.

It can be stated with perfect confidence as a fact that no leading question that relates to the rights of shippers or railroads, or as to the rights, duties, and liabilities of the railroad companies that engage in the transportation of commerce and passengers among the States, can be finally settled until it has been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States. As that is the bourne to which all such questions are destined and must finally reach, the choice of routes can only be a question of expediency. It is especially a fatuous mistake on the part of those who seem to believe in threatening the railroad companies into submission to the will of the people by summary proceedings of commissions or by harsh and aggressive legislation, that their measures can escape trial by jury in the courts of first instance or that they can escape the powers of prohibition, mandamus, or injunction of the Federal courts or the final judgment of the Supreme Court.

This bill is not designed to defeat or embarrass any such experimental methods, and need not be framed with such a purpose, for the reason that all legislation affecting the contracts of shipment and transportation between common carriers and their employers, when its validity or its effect is finally settled as to the principles of law involved in any such controversy, will be settled in the Supreme Court of the United States.

As we must all seek the same forum of final arbitrament, the question of the route we shall take to reach it is merely one of public convenience.

In the first section this bill declares a settled principle of common law by act of Congress. Why is this apparently con-

ceded principle of law reaffirmed in this bill? There are several reasons why it is appropriate to the occasion, such as showing a common agreement among the States to settle its application to the provision in the Constitution for regulating commerce among the States, which is new in our present plan of government and was directly the reverse in the Articles of Confederation.

The prohibition of unreasonable charges or rates of transportation as being unlawful or extortionate by force of the statute law reaches to validity of an oppressive contract or bargain driven by a railroad company that has an opportunity to force a shipper into terms who has no other means of reaching a market with his produce. This form of duress, when it is practiced by a railroad company, as, for example, in the shipment of fruits from the Pacific States to the Atlantic States, greatly impairs, if it does not check or destroy, an industry of enormous value.

In the English common law precedents may not be found to meet the case of shipments to very distant markets of perishable fruits, and it might be answered to a suit for redress that the common law does not impose the doctrine of reasonable rates upon a carrier who might undertake to carry and deliver such goods in good condition at points so unreasonably distant. Our present condition as to transportation to great distances is so altered that the common-law rule as to the reasonableness of freight charges by common carriers should be extended by statute over the entire country.

As for the common law of England, the Supreme Court does not admit that it necessarily obtains as a rule of decision in our Federal courts, and some of the States have never adopted the common law. Without such a declaration, in some form, the decree or rule of reasonableness as applied to the freight charges of common carriers should be uniform throughout our Union and all of our possessions; but it may not be so held in all the State courts, and it should be the general law of the land.

Such a declaration by Congress will establish the rule as one of public policy in respect of interstate commerce and will necessitate the participation of juries in the law courts in ascertaining the facts, at least, which properly enter into and properly control the question of the reasonableness of such demands, which is the basis of their lawfulness.

The prohibition of any other than reasonable charges by common carriers of interstate commerce will establish, also, a predicate for penal legislation in cases where the intent of the carrier is extortionate.

There is a necessity for such laws that grows out of the enormous powers of railroad companies in controlling oppressively the handling of the commerce of the people. Their powers are so great and the just control of them is so difficult that if it was permitted by the Constitution Congress would institute, in the place of the common law, a statutory code that would extend to every question among the vast number of new questions that have arisen and are to be settled by new applications to them of the rules and principles of the common law.

The frightful tendency of such a code, shaped and controlled by partisan politics as it would be to the end of government ownership or the manipulation of all railroads and all lines of ocean transportation by acts of Congress, is quite great enough to admonish the friends of our present form of government that such a departure would be fatal to it.

The new situation, not contemplated when this great plan of government was ordained, that common carriers have become the exclusive owners of the routes over which interstate commerce is conducted, accounts for all the difficulties we are now endeavoring to provide against. The navigable water courses are still in the ownership of the people, and are free to all, like the ordinary public roads, but the railroads and the reluctance of Congress in keeping the water courses open to safe and convenient navigation have well-nigh destroyed their usefulness to the people.

The railroads have the field and the mastery and, as to the justice and reasonableness of their exactions, the courts alone can afford any real security to the people. The right of trial by jury as to the reasonableness of such exactions is the true palladium of the safety, the rights, and the liberties of the people as against the corporations. I say the rights and the liberties of the people because the seventh amendment of the Constitution was ordained to preserve the right of trial by jury in all actions upon contracts, express or implied, as well as for many other purposes. It was a barrier, made necessary by the aggressions of the great English judges, against the exclusion of juries from their courts as an embarrassment of justice.

The Anglo-Saxon founders and builders of the common law resisted these aggressions of the great chancellors of England with trembling and yielding opposition, and with little success, but the American people interposed the seventh amendment as an inviolable barrier to the aggressive spirit of the English judges and placed their right of trial by jury among the essential liberties of the people.

I am a devotee to the right of trial by jury, esteeming it among our most valuable liberties, and I oppose every measure yet offered in Congress, or that may be offered, to have the reasonableness of freight and passenger rates settled by a commission, or by a court from which trial by jury is excluded, and every such measure that attempts to define by statute, or by a special tribunal acting in virtue of a statute, what are reasonable rates and to make such definitions conclusive upon the courts and the people.

Trial of such questions by juries is the only safe and proper method of reaching just results.

The railroads are public servants of all the people, and their usefulness is so great and so universal that the people can not afford, with justice to themselves, to inflict any serious injustice upon them, and will not do so through their representatives in the jury box.

There is also an element of equity in every controversy in the courts as to the reasonableness of railroad freight rates and preferences in transportation that appeals to the judicial conscience. Such a sense of justice and right is not more completely exercised by any tribunal than it is in a law court, of which a jury is a constituent and indispensable part. This is a grand theme for the consideration of an American Congress, which I must leave to the more enlightened judgment of the Senate, without further comment at this time.

This bill aims to place a remedy, by suit in a district court of the United States, in reach of every person whose rights are violated by unreasonable charges or unreasonable preferences by any common carrier engaged in transportation among the States, without regard to the amount that may be recovered in the suit, where the sum claimed by the plaintiff is at least $50. And if the sum recovered is less than $50 the court is required to divide the cost equally between the parties, plaintiff and defendant.

This provision is intended to create some degree of equality between a poor suitor who has a just ground of complaint and a rich and powerful corporation that has wronged a citizen.

The inducement that is thus offered to several or many persons who are interested in the questions presented in the complaint to assist the plaintiff in bearing the burdens of the litigation strongly recommends this feature of the bill to my support.

In one such suit it is possible to settle questions that affect extensive communities.

The appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States in such cases is also required to be exercised under the existing general laws and regulations without regard to the sum claimed in the complaint or recovered in the judgment by either of the parties to such suit, and all of the courts are required to advance such causes on their dockets, unless the public convenience is thereby obstructed.

This plan seems to me to be quite sufficient to reach conclusive results with reasonable speed. But there is to me a much more attractive feature. It is to leave in the hands of the people the initiative as to the proceedings that they believe are necessary to secure justice to them, instead of leaving such matters to the discretionary and arbitrary determination of law officers of the Government.

The advantage and justice of such a provision needs not to be discussed before legislators who have the experience in such matters, as Senators must have had. When a just cause is denied a hearing by reason of an adverse governmental policy, or through the partiality or indifference of a law officer of the Government, the situation is even worse than if a stranger sat in the seat of judgment.

The next feature of the bill is a provision that brings the States into active cooperation with the Federal Government in giving judicial protection to the rights of the people who have grievances to redress against interstate common carriers, and, likewise, to protect such carriers against popular indignation and hasty injustice in consequence of their conduct in conducting such transportation. It empowers the governor of a State to bring suit in the district court of the United States in another State, and in the name of the State he represents, based upon causes of action such as are described in the first section of the bill, when he is thereto requested by a citizen, or citizen of the State of which he is governor, to whom the cause of action thereby enures. The request of the citizen to whom the cause of action belongs, that the State should bring suit in its own name against the carrier, transfers the cause of action to the State and makes the State the party plaintiff when the governor, being thereunto empowered by a law of the State, consents to bring such suit. The use to which the recovery shall be ap-

plied, if a judgment is recovered, is to be declared by a law of the State, and if it is not so declared the recovery will be for the use of the State.

The jurisdiction of the district court of the United States to entertain a suit by a State against the citizen or corporation of a different State is clear under section 2 of Article III of the Constitution, "that the judicial power shall be extended to all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution, the laws of the United States, * * * and to controversies * * * between a State and citizens of another State."

In all such cases "the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction."

If this bill becomes a law, the right of trial by jury in the cases provided for in the first section arises under the provisions of the seventh amendment. It is also "a case arising under a law of Congress" that enables the governor of a State to sue on a cause of action in the name of the State, on the request of a citizen to whom the cause of action enures or belongs. It is also a controversy "between a State and the citizens of another State" where the citizens of one State are wronged or oppressed, as to interstate commerce, by the citizens or corporations of another State.

In any of these characters, and for the adjudication of the Federal questions that are stated in the provisions of this act, the State has the right to sue in the United States district courts of other States, they being so empowered by this act and by the laws of such State. No plan, it seems to me, could be more propitious for the control of the enormous powers of the railroad corporations and of the navigation companies and combines than through the cooperation of the States and the Federal Government in the manner presented in this bill, and nothing could more effectively promote the general welfare.

It is a painful and alarming fact that a political issue that was joined between great contending parties in the first years after the adoption of the Constitution, and was at daggers drawn as a party question in Jefferson's candidacy for the office of President, and reached its climax in the time of the great triumvirate—Calhoun, Clay, and Webster—should still be the cause of suspicious jealousy between the States and the Federal Government. And whatever may tend to bring our country under the benign influence of a more generous regard for all the rights and powers of the Federal Government and of these forty-five sovereign States should be welcomed with joy by every true American.

In the presence of the great questions respecting the powers and duties of the common carriers, that have become the greatest combination of wealth and commercial power that has ever existed and are a controlling factor in political contests, it is our duty to bring about the friendly cooperation of the States and the Federal Government, all of whose combined powers will be needed in the adjustment of these new conditions, that owe their origin almost exclusively to the acts of State legislatures in the promotion of commercial rivalry between the States.

If Congress should be so wise and so fortunate as to check the power and subdue these combined aggressions of interstate common carriers, there will still follow a retinue of questions that will breed still more dangerous contentions between the States and Congress. The States can and will control the corporations created by them as to commercial transportation within their respective limits, but that field will be too narrow for any national benefit, and its limits will be constantly contracting. The States will attempt to tax the property of their own corporations and to forfeit their charters for violation of their charter duties and of State laws; but they will be put down by the laws of Congress if the exertion of such positive rights shall in any manner interfere with interstate commerce or with any authority they may choose to exercise over the instrumentalities of commerce, which are already being defined as including everything that is appurtenant to a railroad, from its right of way and roadbed and tracks up to palace cars and "Jim Crow" cars and leased cars and refrigerator cars and all their paraphernalia, and all their crews, from engineers and conductors down to the scrub women.

In this wide and constantly expanding field of conflict there will be no end of controversy until the Federal Government has become the owner of all the connecting railroads in the United States. When that is accomplished the Government of the country will be in the hands of the common carriers and their officials, and Congress will only register their edicts. No election will be carried against their nominees.

If it is possible to point out a constitutional forum provided by the builders of the Republic that has the power to bring the States and the Federal Government into harmonious action in conducting this tremendous task no man will be accused of an immodest ambition who will venture to perform so high a duty to the country.

A brief consideration of the fact that such a forum was established in the Constitution and of the reasons for its existence and of the breadth of its powers should not be heard with impatience or rejected because it may dispense with the consideration of some favorite plan of procedure that others are advocating with honest zeal and great ability. Let us not reject any remedial legislation that promises good results and is not in conflict with the Constitution.

I do not object to any law that will reach the evils we are trying to suppress if it is foursquare with the Constitution. In the end all the measures that may be enacted by Congress on this subject must pass the ordeal of final trial as to their constitutionality in the Supreme Court of the United States, to stand or fall by the judgment of that great tribunal.

While I may support other measures that are offered, I will give the preference to the measure that is the most direct, the most speedy, with the least cost to the people and the least embarrassed with doubts, and is broad enough to cover the real causes of the evils that we are trying to cure.

This is no proper occasion for the exploitation of party politics, for trying to get the lead of excited people for party purposes, or to gratify a prurient ambition to sit in the focal rays of "the lime light," which is the coveted apotheosis of the demagogue.

Next to the sovereign will of the people, the greatest and most potent power of the Government ordained in the Constitution is the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is a court in which alone sovereigns or their representatives are the complainants, and in which a hearing in that character is never refused on account of the character of the party summoned to answer at its bar if the complaint is for causes occurring within the jurisdiction of the United States, or on account of the sum in controversy or the character of the suit if it comports with the peace and dignity of the United States and with its laws that are constitutionally enacted.

The original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States depends upon the character or office of one of the parties to the suit, either as plaintiff or defendant, and is limited to two classes of cases, as follows:

> In all cases affecting ambassadors or other public ministers or consuls, and those in which a State should be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. (Constitution, section 2 of Article III, second paragraph.)

The force of this supreme ordinance is intensified and its scope is more clearly defined in the second clause of section 2 of Article III, as follows:

> In all other cases before mentioned—

As in cases of "controversies between State and citizens of another State"—

> the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as Congress shall make.

When the suit of a State has relation only to its sovereign, governmental rights, powers, or duties, or when it chooses to invoke the aid of the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States in a case in controversy with its own citizens or with the citizens of another State, or with another State, or with an ambassador or other public minister or consul, or in cases "in which a State may be a party," as in the case of the removal of such a suit pending in the district court of the United States into the Supreme Court for trial on the motion of either party, it is within the option of the State to bring its suit in the Supreme Court, at least as to all parties defendant, except ambassadors and other public ministers and consuls.

The original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States had an august origin and was clothed with its supremacy by the authority and right of thirteen sovereign American States, now increased to forty-five in number, that were recognized by Great Britain, their former sovereign, in the treaty of peace, and by other great powers as being each a sovereign and independent State. That treaty was made with each of the thirteen States, by its name and in its independent character, through their diplomatic agents, who were chosen and commissioned by their common representatives, the Congress of the Confederation. After years of anxious conference and discussion the delegates of these separate States met in convention and ordained the Constitution of the United States, which was submitted to and finally ratified by all these sovereign powers.

In their delegation of powers to the new government they cast about to devise and create a supreme arbiter of all controversies of a judicial nature that might arise between them, or between a State and a citizen of another State, and as to foreign ambassadors and other ministers and consuls.

Probably it was not the purpose of the Constitution to create a tribunal to decide any political controversy between the States, or between a State and the citizens of another State, or as to foreign countries, except as to the interpretation of treaties, which function is included in the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, but in all other controversies such a tribunal was necessary to settle questions that might arise where a sovereign power was a party.

In this great conception of an arbitral tribunal there was the assurance of peace, with justice and honor, and the further assurance that the citizen, when sued by a State, should have the safeguard of a tribunal that represents all the States.

The sovereign State enters this tribunal as a party to a suit as a demandant of justice for its people, and the court decides upon the convenient form of procedure to reach the merits of the case. It may proceed as in equity cases, or as in common-law cases, and may call a jury to decide the facts, as has been several times done. It may formulate writs and processes to meet the exigencies of the litigation, and impose costs according to its judicial discretion upon the litigants. It is not confined in the exercise of its jurisdiction to statutory provisions of law, either as to the scope of its powers or as to the method of their exercise or of compelling obedience to its decrees, except by the principles of the Constitution of the United States, which the justices are sworn to observe, protect, and defend. Its decrees are final—without appeal. No other court has shared in its judgment or participated in its opinions, or can do so.

In a suit brought by a State in the Supreme Court of the United States, asking the exercise of its original jurisdiction for the correction of abuses by a railroad company, in the demand of unreasonable freight rates, or in giving unreasonable preferences to certain shippers, it requires no trained mind to see that such original jurisdiction would include in its rightful authority all the judicial powers of the court to establish justice in that and in all other cases of a like character. Such a decision from that tribunal would be alike conclusive on all courts and legislatures and on all interstate and common carriers.

That high tribunal would not exercise legislative powers to prescribe freight rates to all railroads, for that is not within the competence of any judicial tribunal. Neither can Congress prescribe to the Supreme Court that, in the exercise of its original jurisdiction, it shall consider a freight rate, established by its act, as being just and reasonable, for political reasons or any reason of public policy. Congress has no power to compel the Supreme Court, in the exercise of its original jurisdiction to follow its decisions, by statute, upon the construction or validity of any contract that was valid when the Constitution was ordained. And no tribunal, constituted by act of Congress, can settle, judicially, that a freight rate is unreasonable and unjust and prescribe, legislatively, that a different rate shall, in the future, apply to all railroads; for that is an unconstitutional blending of the powers of the separate departments of the Government.

In the present state of our organic law no separate department into which the powers of the Government are distributed can have or exercise all the requisite authority to adjudicate upon, and to legislate so as to establish and execute a uniform law to prescribe the charges of common carriers that shall be held to be reasonable or just, as an absolute rule of law.

The present system, much as it may be criticised or condemned, is safer than any result that is to be expected from such a tearing up of the solid foundations of the Republic.

Trial by jury is the institution by which natural justice will in a large and uniform method be introduced into the judgment of the courts in deciding upon the reasonableness of freight rates. This we have, and the courts will see to it that it is not abrogated.

If a State prefers to bring its suit in a court that can not render judgment except upon the verdict of a jury and to resort to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court for the correction of errors, it will bring its suit in the district court of the United States. If a State prefers to invoke the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States, where it is in the discretion of the court to summon a jury, it will sue in that court and in such form of civil action as it may direct.

If it is necessary to sue every corporation in the lines of transportation from Portland, Me., to Galveston, Tex., or from Miami, Fla., to Seattle, Wash., for the purpose of settling a freight rate or contract in which they are all interested through a common agreement as common carriers, such corporations, or the States under whose laws any of them are acting, may be summoned as defendants in a single suit in the Supreme Court of the United States, exercising its original jurisdiction.

The citizen, suing in his own right and in his own name, can go into a district court of the United States with his suit against a railroad company, where he will find a jury to pass upon his claim, if it is as much as $50, and will divide the costs with his powerful antagonist if he obtains a verdict for a sum that is less that $50.

Some jurists are in doubt as to whether the right of a State to sue in the Supreme Court of the United States and invoke its original jurisdiction is not exclusive of its right to bring a suit in any other Federal court.

I take it that this question depends upon the character of the cause of action upon which the suit is founded and not upon the sovereign character in which the State acts in bringing the suit.

I think the rule on this subject is well stated and supported by authority in the language of a careful and able law writer, which I will quote:

> Where the character of a cause gives appellate jurisdiction, and the character of the party (an ambassador or State) gives original jurisdiction, the appellates' jurisdiction is not thereby ousted.

Citing Cohens *v.* Virginia, 6 Wheaton, 392 et seq.; Martin *v.* Hunter, 1 Wheaton, 337; Curtis Commentaries, S. 109; Story's Constitution, S. 1697 to 1792.

The existence of this doubt has caused the insertion in the bill of a separate section providing for suits, in certain cases, by States, in the Supreme Court of the United States.

It could not have been intended by the framers of the Constitution that a State should be excluded from the right of appeal to the Supreme Court in all cases, and that being so restricted it could only sue in the Supreme Court of the United States on such cases of action as relate to its rights, powers, and duties as a government.

The Supreme Court, in the exercise of its original jurisdiction, is a supreme council of state, discretion, and judgment, as to the right of the matter in controversy between a State, representing its people, and other States and their citizens, corporations, or municipalities. It can annul or sustain acts of Congress and of State legislatures, and it can issue mandates to the executive officers of the States and of the Federal Government to restrain them from the usurpation of unlawful powers, or the abuse of lawful authority. In that court only the States can demand to be heard as plaintiffs, representing citizens or the body politic whose rights are in jeopardy.

I am glad to quote the following statement on this point from the distinguished constitutional lawyer of Alabama, Hon. Hannis Taylor, LL. D., who has the sincere respect of the American bar for his abilities and his learning:

> WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 8, 1906.*
>
> MY DEAR SENATOR: I have been reflecting upon the interesting question propounded in your letter of the 3d instant. By reference to my book on the Jurisdiction and Procedure of the Supreme Court of the United States, I find that I have stated the matter in this way:
>
> "23. *Original jurisdiction not exclusive.*—In settling the doctrine in Marbury *v.* Madison that the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court can not be enlarged by Congress the court went so far as to deny the right of that body to give appellate jurisdiction where the Constitution confers original. That proposition was modified, however, a few years later in a suit in which Virginia and one of its own citizens were parties (Cohen *v.* Virginia, 6 Wheat., 397, 398; 5 L. ed., 289), the question at issue involving the construction of an act of Congress. When it was argued that as the Supreme Court had original jurisdiction in cases in which a State is a party, that fact excluded its appellate jurisdiction, the court held otherwise on the ground that the original jurisdiction in cases in which a State is a party refers only to those cases in which the Supreme Court obtains jurisdiction by reason of the character of the parties, and not at all to those cases in which the Federal jurisdiction attaches, because the question involved arises under the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States."
>
> My test, therefore, supports the view you now put forward. In looking at the record in Cohen *v.* Virginia I find that Mr. Pinkney said:
>
> "4. Lastly. It is insisted, for the defendant in error, that this court has no jurisdiction in the present case, because a State is a party to the original controversy which the writ of error brings before the court. That the jurisdiction of this court in all cases where a State is a party is original, and therefore it can not have original jurisdiction in this case. The obvious answer to this argument is that the jurisdiction now claimed does not arise under that part of the Constitution which gives original jurisdiction to the Supreme Court in cases in which a State is a party; but the jurisdiction is asserted under that clause which gives the Federal judiciary cognizance of all cases arising under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States, without regard to the character of the parties."
>
> That view the court adopted. In a note to the case in the Lawyers' Cooperative Edition South Carolina Reports I find this:
>
> "Federal courts have jurisdiction of cases arising under the laws and Constitution of the United States whoever may be parties, and even when a State is a party and the proceedings a writ of error to the State court."
>
> As ever, faithfully, yours,
>
> HANNIS TAYLOR.
>
> Hon. JOHN T. MORGAN,
> *United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

Evidently the power to sue in the Supreme Court was a privilege extended to or reserved by the States that created that

court, in consideration of the fact that they were independent sovereignties, as to each other, and could not properly be compelled to sue in courts subordinate to other States, or in Federal courts within the limits of other States, whose judges and jurors might be controlled by local influences. There is no restriction as to the nature of the cause of action, or as to the amount in controversy, that affects the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court when a State appears at its bar to demand justice.

There is no attempt in this bill to do more than to qualify a State as a plaintiff who may bring a suit and recover for the wrongful acts of common carriers of interstate commerce, as to freight rates and preferences done to the citizens thereof.

This declaration does not add to the exclusive classes that may sue in the Supreme Court of the United States under its original jurisdiction. It only defines certain cases in which the State may sue as the real party in interest. When a sovereign State appears in that court as a plaintiff in an action it would be assumed, most probably, that the State has authority to control the demand sued upon in its own name and that it has the duty of giving aid to its citizens in obtaining justice as to all their constitutional rights and equities in the claim sued upon. Such is the universal rule of international law under which the governments that are parties to treaties and conventions for the settlement of private claims alleged to be owing to their citizens or subjects assume a right to have a decree or award made to them, as governments, in case of recovery, whereby the claim of the real owner of the demand or cause of action is merged in the finding of the commission and is barred, as to a further recovery by the claimant, although the real owner never receives compensation from his own government for the amount of the award recovered by it. But this rule of international law may not extend to the States of the Union that have no interstate code, unless Congress declares their right to represent their ciitzens in all cases in which the States may sue in the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is a cautionary provision in this bill intended to prevent a failure of justice.

This bill does not rest solely on that principle of international law, although it might be done safely. It goes further and requires a law of a State or the petition of the claimant made to the governor to enable him to accept control of the claim as governor and to sue upon it in the name of the State. This is intended as a security to the defendant against further suit in any court upon the claim that is sued upon in the name of the State in any Federal court having jurisdiction to hear and determine it upon its merits.

In such original suits in the Supreme Court of the United States the court would not be obstructed by rules of practice, statute laws, or precedents as to the consolidation of suits or as to setting down for hearing many suits involving like questions or other questions depending for their decisions on the same or like principles, so that the speedy and final settlement of a wide variety of cases and questions might be considered and decided at the same hearing. In the vast amount of litigation that is likely to arise out of any view of this sea of railroad troubles it is well that we have a court of supreme constitutional powers, that no legislature can fetter with rules of procedure, that can take original cognizance at the suit of a State of any and all questions of a civil character in respect of common carriers of interstate commerce and settle them speedily and economically to all concerned.

I earnestly appeal to all Senators, who desire to compose these public troubles that threaten to become public calamities, to give earnest consideration to the great powers provided for such emergencies in the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States that is created by the Constitution.

I can not look forward hopefully to any event of the future that will more benignly bless our country than will be realized when the States and our Supreme Court take up these vexed questions and threatening conditions and work together patriotically for their speedy and just settlement.

Congress can not compass this great national evil by the exertion of all its powers, with all its wisdom, and the occupation of all its time in devising and executing schemes of legislation. In its power to define and provide for the punishment of crime it can, in a large degree, prevent extortion and other abuses of justice and public policy by railroads and navigation companies, but that phase of the subject is not touched by this measure. A predicate for such legislation will be established in its prohibitory clauses, if this bill is enacted into a law, that will serve as the broad foundation for the punishment of such crimes.

I do not agree with those who essay to cure these public evils through Congressional legislation in fixing rates of transportation that must at last pass under the judgment of the Supreme Court, weighted with a heavy load of intermediate embarrassments, as to the constitutionality of the laws and of the tribunals created to administer them; but this bill does not obstruct their plans in the slightest degree. It is only an additional way or facility for reaching the same results, that should be opened to the service and assistance of the people.

It should be the desire of all that controversies between the railroads and the people should never take on a political aspect. It is not the right or the province of political leaders to force into partisan caucuses or conventions or into the ballot box questions of such immense magnitude, which are purely judicial in their character and can only be finally settled by courts of justice.

The measure I have the honor to offer is intended to open the doors of the courts of justice to the people where they can get speedy redress for their grievances on terms that, to a great extent at least, equalize the powers of litigants, so that the rich and powerful corporations will not be able to force weaker men to the wall, and thus enforce, through the delays and costs of litigation, that power of duress and oppression which their combinations are employing to increase their power and riches and to oppress the people.

If the States and the Federal Government act in concert, through their courts, to repress these evil conditions they will cease, and the railroads of the country, instead of being oppressors of the people, will become the useful and honored instrumentalities of good government and of progress in our splendid country.

It is worthy of most serious examination, whether the needful reform in present conditions should not begin with the people and the States in the courts of the country, under the final supervision of the Supreme Court of the United States, to which such questions must come for final settlement, rather than with Congress, where no great economic question can escape entanglement with partisan politics.

In my judgment it is better for the public health to drink the pure waters from their fountains rather than from the contaminated brooks after they have wandered through the marshes and infections of political camps.

I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (H. R. 58) to prevent the unlawful wearing of the badge or insignia of the Grand Army of the Republic or other soldier organizations;

A bill (H. R. 4459) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations respecting the rights and privileges of the fish wharf;

A bill (H. R. 4461) to provide for the abatement of nuisances in the District of Columbia by the Commissioners of said District, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 4463) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a sealer and assistant sealer of weights and measures in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MONETARY AGREEMENTS WITH PANAMA AND OTHER GOVERNMENTS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. BAILEY, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate, That the Finance Committee of the Senate be instructed, and it is hereby instructed, to inquire—

1. Into all of the facts and circumstances concerning certain monetary and exchange agreements made by the Secretary of War with the Government of Panama and others, and to report such facts and circumstances to the Senate, together with their opinion as to the authority under which said agreements were made; and

2. Into all of the facts and circumstances under which certain bonds of the Panama Railway Company were recently sold, and report such facts and circumstances to the Senate, together with their opinion as to the authority for the sale of said bonds.

Mr. KITTREDGE. Mr. President, the Committee on Interoceanic Canals has under consideration the subject-matter of the second paragraph of the resolution, and I suggest to the Senator from Texas the propriety of amending his resolution by striking out that part thereof.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, when the resolution was introduced the Senate had not received the report of the Secretary of War, which report relates to the sale of the Panama railroad bonds. I recognize that it is not desirable to have two committees of the Senate concurrently pursuing an inquiry with refer-

ence to the same subject, and I have no particular care that the Finance Committee shall pursue that inquiry. If there be no other objection to the resolution, I am entirely willing to accept the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota; and I ask leave to strike out the second subdivision of the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has the absolute right to amend his resolution by striking out the second subdivision.

Mr. BAILEY. I will ask the clerks to strike out that part of it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be changed as the Senator desires. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Texas, as modified by him.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

AFFAIRS OF MOROCCO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolutions submitted by Mr. BACON yesterday was read, as follows:

Whereas it has of late been announced in the public press, both of Europe and the United States, that for the purpose of considering certain grave questions relative to the commercial and political affairs of Morocco, and of reaching an agreement and determination thereof, the governments of the leading powers of Europe, including Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, Austria, and Spain, have agreed and arranged to hold in the near future, through delegates to be appointed by each of said Governments, a conference at Algeciras, in Spain, and that the Government of the United States has, by said European Governments been invited to participate through duly appointed delegates in the said conference; and

Whereas it is further announced in the public press that the President of the United States has, in compliance with said invitation, appointed delegates of the United States to and in said conference; and

Whereas the questions at issue relative to the affairs of Morocco, and the relation of European governments thereto, are reputed to be of such gravity, and the antagonistic demands of European governments to be so acute as to endanger the peace of Europe, as is evidenced by the publicly announced preparations for war in the dispositions of troops and fleets, and in the gathering of war material by several of said European powers, and as is also evidenced by press dispatches from the capitals of said powers, such as the following, which have been received and published in the newspapers of the United States, to wit:

"PARIS, *December 31.*

"Sensational papers here continue to publish lengthy telegrams from frontier towns reporting extraordinary activity of the military authorities. The evening edition of the Intransigeant to-day reproduces the alleged declaration of a superior Belgian staff officer concerning the military precautions Belgium is taking in order to preserve neutrality, and also a lengthy special dispatch showing the defensive strength of the main frontier points.

"Deputy Jaures reflects the pessimistic view of the socialistic element, writing in the Humanite that 'the antagonism in which France and Germany enter the Morocco conference causes a terrible uneasiness to weigh upon Europe, as the slightest untoward incident might unchain a catastrophe.' Most of the serious journals take a more conservative view, although all recognize the existence of widespread feelings of inquietude."

"LONDON, *January 6.*

"According to official information received in London from Berlin, Germany not only demands that all the powers shall participate in the execution of reforms in Morocco, but that the work of watching the frontier shall be divided among them, thus realizing the fears expressed by an official of the foreign office in an interview last Thursday that the German delegates might insist on regulations clashing with what France considers her special privileges—for instance, the policing of the frontier.

"If Germany persists in this attitude in the conference, it is believed a most serious situation will arise, as France is certain to resist, and Great Britain will support France. The British Government, while believing the conference will finally reach a satisfactory settlement, realizes that persistence by Germany in her demands will cause irritation which will require all the efforts of the delegates to remove, and in this it expects the support of the United States, Spain, and Italy."

"ROME, *January 6.*

"Interest here in the conference on Moroccan reforms is growing. This is due to the predominant position that Italy will assume because of the importance of her delegate, the Marquis Visconti Venosta, who, when he was Italian minister of foreign affairs, concluded an agreement with France by which Italy abandoned her claims on Morocco in favor of France. This agreement was completed later by Foreign Minister Prinetti, who pledged Italy's help to France in Morocco, receiving in exchange the help of France in Tripoli.

"At that time Germany had shown no interest in Morocco, while Italy considered herself free to so act, Morocco not being included in the agreement of the triple alliance concerning the equilibrium of the Mediterranean. Now, Germany, it is said, maintains that any question, even if it were not contemplated by the triple alliance, comes within the terms of the treaty, and that if Germany is attacked by any other power the other two members of the triple alliance—Austria and Italy—are compelled to assist her with arms. Thus the situation of Italy in the conference is becoming more delicate, as the conference may lead to war, though the prospects at present point toward peace;" and

Whereas our only legitimate concern with Moroccan affairs relates to the very limited commerce between that country and our own and is in no matter connected with the grave political controversy which has been carried on for some time past between Germany on the one side and France and England on the other as to the future political control of Morocco, it having been the settled policy of this Government since its foundation to abstain from taking part in such political controversies between European nations: It is therefore

I. *Resolved by the Senate,* That the President be respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the Senate with copies of the following papers:

(*a*) Such invitation or invitations as were received by this Government to participate in said conference, and of the reply or the replies of this Government thereto;

(*b*) Of any protocol, agreement, or other paper setting forth the objects of said conference, and the subjects with which it is expected to deal;

(*c*) Of all instructions sent to the delegates designated to represent this Government at said conference, with the names of said delegates;

(*d*) Of any agreement fixing the time and place for the meeting of said conference.

II. *It is further resolved,* That the President be respectfully requested to inform the Senate whether under the terms of said invitation and the acceptance thereof, or under the instructions given to said delegates on the part of the United States, they are limited in their authority to a participation in the deliberations, judgments, and awards of said conference to questions concerning commercial and business matters in which the Government and people of the United States have an interest, either present or prospective; or whether the said delegates on the part of the United States have authority to participate in the deliberations, judgments, or awards of said conference relative to the political affairs of Morocco and her political relations to one or more of the said foreign governments, and to the respective rights and powers of any one or more of said foreign governments relative thereto.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia desires to have the resolutions referred to the Foreign Relations Committee without discussion, I have no objection to make. If they are to be discussed, I think I shall be obliged to move that we discuss them behind closed doors.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, it is the right, not to say the privilege, of the Senator from Massachusetts, if he sees fit to do so, to move that this discussion be behind closed doors. Why he should do so I am at a loss to determine. This is not a matter which relates to a treaty——

Mr. LODGE. I shall take pleasure in explaining to the Senator why I do it after the doors are closed.

Mr. BACON. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I have the floor. The Senator from Massachusetts has not made the motion.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Georgia has not the floor against that motion.

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Massachusetts did not make a motion. He said——

Mr. LODGE. Then I make the point of order, and move that the doors be closed.

Mr. BACON. I am entitled to be heard on the point of order. I have the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I beg the Senator's pardon. I ask him to read the rule.

Mr. BACON. I was not proceeding to discuss the resolutions, Mr. President. I was speaking of the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts being made in the alternative, if the Senator had permitted me to proceed to that extent.

The Senator had said that if I would consent to the reference of the resolutions to the Committee on Foreign Relations without discussion he would not object to action upon them at this time, but that if I would not so consent he thought he would at some future time—I presume in the near future—move that the discussion be had behind closed doors. If the Senator had made that motion of course I would have been out of order in saying anything whatever, provided the motion had a second, which I suppose it would have had. I am quite familiar with the rule to which the Senator kindly refers me.

I was proceeding to say that I was at a loss to understand why, when that emergency should develop into an actuality, the Senator would be induced to make such a motion, as this was not a proceeding which related in any manner to a treaty, but to a matter in which the entire public of the United States——

Mr. LODGE. That is the precise question which I think ought to be discussed behind closed doors.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the doors of the Senate be closed. Is there a second?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

Mr. ALDRICH. I second the motion.

Mr. BACON. I do not understand that the Senator had made the motion or that he now has the floor for that purpose.

Mr. LODGE. The motion can be made at any time. I have been taken off the floor in the middle of a speech to have such a motion made.

Mr. BACON. I think the Senator is quite right. I see the situation.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understood the Senator from Massachusetts, while having the floor in his own right, to move that the doors be closed. There is a second, and the galleries will be cleared and the doors closed.

The doors were thereupon closed, and at the expiration of

three hours and fifty minutes were reopened; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 10, 1906, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 9, 1906.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

Robert Treat Whitehouse, of Maine, to be United States attorney for the district of Maine in the place of Isaac W. Dyer, whose term expires January 12, 1906.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Francis H. Sherman to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, vice Commander Daniel D. V. Stuart, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 9, 1906.

CONSUL.

Chester C. Mercury, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Managua, Nicaragua.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

Asa P. French, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

Thomas B. Latham, of Indian Territory, to be United States attorney for the central district of Indian Territory.

James L. Martin, of Vermont, to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont.

Samuel Platt, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

Lunsford L. Lewis, of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia.

MARSHALS.

John W. Overall, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

Leo E. Bennett, of the Indian Territory, to be United States marshal for the western district of Indian Territory.

John E. Kendrick, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island.

INDIAN AGENT.

Ret Millard, of Oklahoma, to be agent for the Indians of the Osage Agency in Oklahoma.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Hiram P. Mackintosh, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Newburyport, in the State of Massachusetts.

Frank L. Shaw, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Machias, in the State of Maine.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Asst. Surg. Louis P. H. Bahrenburg to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 26, 1905.

Asst. Surg. John T. Burkhalter to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 25, 1905.

Asst. Surg. Bolivar J. Lloyd to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 16, 1905.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

First Assistant Engineer Robert Edward Wright to be a chief engineer with the rank of first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from August 23, 1905.

Second Assistant Engineer Quincy Bogardus Newman to be a first assistant engineer with the rank of second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from August 23, 1905.

Third Lieut. George Clayton Alexander to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from July 1, 1905.

Third Lieut. Muller Stuntz Hay to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from June 7, 1905.

Third Lieut. William Thomas Stromberg to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from October 30, 1905.

Third Lieut. Hiram Rex Searles to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from April 29, 1905.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *January 9, 1906.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3—Philippine tariff bill.

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the bill now under consideration I shall not weary the committee with citations of a vast mass of statistics. I prefer to discuss this bill and to base my opposition to the measure upon what I conceive to be the fundamental principles involved in its consideration. I shall undoubtedly have something to say about the possible effect of this legislation upon the beet-sugar industry, an industry of vital importance to the district which I have the honor to represent upon the floor of this House. In the First Congressional district of Colorado there are to-day seven beet-sugar factories in operation. These factories have all been erected during the past seven or eight years, and, in my judgment, they stand as monuments to the wisdom of the sugar schedule of the Dingley tariff bill. Deeply interested as are my people in that industry, both because of the pride they feel in the present proportion that it has assumed in the industrial life of the State and because of the hope that they entertain for its future growth and development, I prefer to base my opposition to the passage of this bill upon more fundamental grounds than even the selfish interest, if you please, of the people of my district in their local industry.

I approach the discussion of this question, Mr. Chairman, as a protectionist and as a Republican. As a protectionist I have been taught to believe, and I still believe, notwithstanding the speech of the eminent chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, that it is within the power and it is the duty of the National Government to protect and encourage and to uphold the growth of the infant industries of this land where they are capable of such development, and to protect American labor against the cheap labor of alien people, who do not live according to the standards of American life and American citizenship.

As a Republican I have been taught to believe, and I still believe, notwithstanding the views that have been announced upon this floor in the advocacy of this measure, that when the Constitution of the United States was ratified a new nation came into existence, clothed with all the inherent powers of nationality and fully equipped for the discharge of its duties, both domestic and international.

I believe that this measure is Democratic in principle and in theory upon both of these fundamental principles. I believe that if it shall be enacted into law it will mark a departure from Republican principles and Republican theories upon both of these principles that are fundamental to the existence of the Republican party. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I was very much amazed the other day when I listened to the argument of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PAYNE]. I was amazed to hear fall from the lips of so strong a protectionist as our chairman has always been the statement that American farm labor, receiving $1.50 and $2 a day, could successfully compete with the cheapest paid labor on the face of the earth—Philippine labor. I was more amazed, sir, when the chairman based that argument upon the proposition that American labor engaged in the beet-sugar industry did not receive a larger proportion of the wealth that it produced than does Philippine labor. I deny the statement, Mr. Chairman. I submit, sir, that the statistics are abundant to disprove that statement, and to establish the fact indisputably that American labor is not only paid more in dollars and cents, but that it is relatively paid more in the production of the wealth that it produces than any labor upon the face of the earth. I was not surprised when yesterday afternoon the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN], in making an attack upon the tariff system of the United States, referred to that argument of the chairman of our Ways and Means Committee. It seems to me that it does not require a prophet or the son of a prophet to predict that in the future

when attacks are made upon our tariff system the speech of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PAYNE] will be the speech to which the opponents of that system will turn for comfort and for ammunition. If any attack is to be made upon our tariff system as the result of the agitation of this question, all true protectionists should remember that in this House the attack is being made upon it, not by the enemies of the tariff system, but by the friends of that system. And if it shall be destroyed let it be remembered that it was the Samson of this House, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who tore down the pillar that supports the entire structure.

I have said, Mr. Chairman, that this measure would be a reversal of our policy both in regard to the tariff system and in regard to the relation that exists between our new insular possessions and the United States Government. Let me briefly refer to what has been the policy of this Government heretofore in regard to infant industries, and particularly in regard to the beet-sugar industry. As the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] said the other day, the beet-sugar industry is one that has engaged the attention of the best statesmen of the world. The Republican party, recognizing that this was a country of vast agricultural possibilities and that so essentially an agricultural product as sugar could be produced in this country, very wisely passed in a Republican Congress, in the McKinley tariff bill, signed by a Republican President, a provision which granted a bounty to the producers of sugar upon American soil. In addition to that the McKinley bill contained a provision exempting from the payment of tariff duties all machinery imported into this country for the purpose of being erected in the beet-sugar factories.

When the Democratic party came into power in the legislative branch and in the executive branch of the Government it passed what was known as the Wilson tariff bill, repealing the provision of the McKinley bill granting the bounty.

When the next Republican national convention was held, in 1896, the party adopted a platform condemning the Democratic party in unmistakable terms for what it charged to be a breach of faith to the sugar producers of the country and pledging itself to the enactment of such legislation as would enable the people of the United States to produce upon American soil and by American labor all the sugar consumed by the American people, and for which the people of the United States at that time were annually paying something over a hundred million dollars. The first measure passed by the Republican Congress elected upon that platform was the Dingley tariff bill, a bill which, in my judgment, has contributed very largely to the prosperity that this nation has enjoyed from that time to the present. In the Dingley tariff bill the present sugar schedule, still upon the statute book, was enacted for the purpose of encouraging and promoting the growth of beet sugar.

There were a good many people, both in Congress and out of it, particularly in my State, who either opposed or refused to give their support to the Dingley tariff bill, but I am glad to say that they have now become ardent supporters at least of the sugar schedule in that bill; but I regret to say that there were a great many in Congress who were earnest and honest supporters of that measure, and of the sugar schedule, who, by changes in regard to the importation of sugar from foreign countries and from our insular possessions, have been gradually but surely destroying the efficacy of that measure so far as the beet-sugar industry is concerned. The beet-sugar industry has grown from 1896 to the present time, but it has not grown anything like as rapidly as it would have grown had it not been for the free admission of sugar from Porto Rico and the reduction of duty on sugar from Cuba and from the Philippine Islands. As the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PAYNE] said when discusing the Porto Rican bill, there were at that time 51 beet-sugar factories—not 100, as the gentleman said in his exaggerated statement the other day, but 51 beet-sugar factories—then arranged to be constructed in this country, only 5 or 6 of which have since been erected.

The reduction of duty on sugar from Cuba may not have shut up any of the beet-sugar factories in my State—I do not know how it was in Michigan—but unquestionably, in my mind, it has retarded the growth and development of that industry. I have said also, Mr. Chairman, that if this bill should be enacted into law it marks the reversal of Republican policy in regard to the relation existing between our new insular possessions and the United States Government. That question, sir, to my mind, is the most important one involved in the consideration of this measure. It rises far above any local interest in any domestic industry. It is one fraught with possibilities that affect all of the industries of the United States.

For the first time, Mr. Chairman, upon the floor of this House since the Spanish-American treaty was signed, the argument has been made in advocacy of this bill that although this Government has the legal right to impose a tariff duty for protection upon imports from its insular possessions into the United States and upon imports from the United States into its insular possessions, although it has that legal right, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, yet we have no moral right to impose such a duty. It is urged now for the first time, I say, Mr. Chairman, that when we have any possessions in any part of the globe, no matter what may be the conditions that may prevail in those possessions, no matter what may be for the welfare of the people of those possessions, no matter what may be for the welfare of the people of the United States, yet we must extend to all of those possessions the same tariff laws that we have in force governing our importations into our own country and governing our own market.

Mr. Chairman, I deny that we have any such limitation in governing our possessions. I would rather go back to what was the principle and policy of the Republican party when we acquired these possessions. At that time it was the declared purpose and policy of our party, declared repeatedly on the floor of this House, declared in its platform, that when we acquired possessions we had not only the legal right but the moral duty to impose such tariff upon imports from these possessions into our own country as might be best for the welfare of the people of those islands and for the welfare of the people of the United States.

I can well conceive, Mr. Chairman, that it may be possible in the course of time that the United States Government will have some possessions where it may be necessary, not only for the welfare of those possessions that the tariff duty shall be a protective tariff duty, a duty that shall be imposed upon the imports into those possessions, but it may also be necessary to protect the industries of one possession against the industries of another possession. No other nation on the face of the earth, so far as I know, as I now recollect, has ever felt that it was bound to treat all of its possessions by one fixed and unalterable rule. All the nations of the earth that have had possessions have gone on the theory that the mother government has a right to legislate as will be best for each possession, taking each case alone, and governed by the conditions and circumstances that exist in that possession. That was the rule of the Republican party. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that if it had been urged at the time we acquired the Philippine Islands or Porto Rico that we would be compelled, either legally or morally, to extend our tariff laws to them, and to make it possible that the industries of those tropical countries should come into competition with the industries of our country, that the cheap labor of those semicivilized countries should come into competition with the highly civilized labor of this country, that any political party would have been found that would have been in favor of annexation of those islands, or any respectable number of people of the United States would have indorsed such a policy. It was not the view of our leaders at that time, as I shall attempt to demonstrate to you. In quoting from the speeches of these gentlemen I do not do it, Mr. Chairman, in any critical spirit, not for the purpose of showing that they have changed their views, because I well know that all men change their views as conditions may change, but this is a fundamental principle that I am discussing, and I cite these gentlemen and the speeches made by them because I believe they are eminent authorities upon such a proposition.

The first gentleman whose speech I desire to quote from is the gentleman who now so ably presides over the Committee on Ways and Means of this House. I want to quote from the speech made by the gentleman upon the floor of this House on the 19th of February, 1900, at the time the Porto Rican bill was under discussion. The gentleman from New York at that time said, Mr. Chairman, after telling the part that he had taken in putting the bounty in the McKinley bill, and after telling the House of the pride he felt in having secured the sugar schedule in the Dingley bill, for all of which I most cheerfully pay my gratitude to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—he then used this language:

> I want to go a step farther than that and declare to the country and to the world that when we legislate for this island, when we propose the tariff, we have the duty and the power and the privilege, under the Constitution, of imposing a tariff on all articles coming to the territory belonging to the United States from the United States, or coming to the United States from the territory belonging to the United States.

You will notice that he says not only that we have the power under the Constitution, but that we have the duty under the Constitution. It was not simply a question of power, it was a question of right or wrong, a question of duty, and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said we not only had the power, but that we had the duty of imposing this tariff

upon the importations from those possessions. He went further than that. He also said:

I want to make a precedent that all men can read with reference to the Philippine Islands; and if Cuba shall come, I want to give notice to Cuba that we propose to protect this industry—

And he meant the beet-sugar industry—

when it comes to the question of admitting 1,000,000 tons that will come from Cuba.

You will notice that he linked the Philippine Islands and Cuba together in that statement. "I want to give notice," says the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, "that if Cuba shall come I propose to establish this precedent both for Cuba and for the Philippine Islands."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to what another member of the Ways and Means Committee said, a gentleman who served then and serves now with very great ability upon that distinguished committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. He delivered upon the floor of this House upon the same day a most able argument upon the constitutional power and the legal proposition involved in placing the duty upon Porto Rican sugar. It was one of the ablest speeches that was delivered at that time upon that weighty question. It was one that I am sure I have read with interest and with instruction. It is one that I would have every Member, and particularly every Republican Member, of the House read, and read often. He not only discussed the legal power that this Government had, but he, like the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, went farther and discussed what was our duty in the premises. Let me now call attention to what he had to say upon this question:

And yet, attempting now for the first time to legislate for one of our new possessions, we are met with the proposition that all of our new possessions must be governed by one fixed, unvarying system, and that the system which applies to ourselves, the freest and the most intelligent people on the face of the earth.

Is not that the argument which is now being made on this bill, that we must extend free trade to the Philippine Islands because we have granted free trade to Porto Rica and to Hawaii, and that we must have but one rule to govern all of our possessions? Was I wrong when I said that it never before was urged upon the floor of this House by any Republican—yes, by a Democrat, many of them, but never by a Republican—that we must treat all of our possessions in exactly the same way? What further did the gentleman say upon that occasion? How did he characterize this proposition? I shall let him speak for himself:

An amazing proposition, involving free trade with the Philippines, the extension to them of our navigation laws, and the incorporation into the body politic of from six to twelve millions of semisavages. How do you like the problem?

How do you like the problem? That was the question that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] then propounded to the House and which I now propound to the Republican Members on the floor of the House. That was not all that the gentleman from Pennsylvania had to say upon that occasion. Let me read a little further:

The question of free trade or protection with reference to this little island is one of absolutely no importance, but when you come to say that under the limitations of the Constitution you must give free trade to the Philippines, you must incorporate into the body politic 12,000,000 Malays as citizens of the United States, and must extend to that archipelago our navigation laws, I call a halt. In behalf of my own people I am not willing to see the wage-earner of the United States, the farmer of the United States, put upon a level and brought into competition with the cheap, half-slave labor, savage labor of the Philippine Archipelago.

[Applause and laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I indorse his language and appeal now to the Republican Members on the floor of this House to see to it that the cheap, half-slave, semisavage labor of the Philippine Islands shall not be brought into competition with the American farmer and the American laborer. The issue is here, gentlemen; you can not escape it or evade it. You must meet it, and meet it as men. From one of our own leaders you have had the prediction that this question would arise and that he would stand up against such competition. Now, as a good Republican, believing in the doctrines of your party, I ask you to follow the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] when he made that speech and see that this competition is not brought about. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it was not alone some of our leaders who declared what the Republican policy was upon this question. After the Porto Rican question had been before the House of Representatives a Congressional election came before the people of the United States. The Republican party was anxious—and properly so, as I was also—to see that Republican Members were elected. I was unfortunately a candidate at that time, and I was not able to convince a majority of the people of my district that it was to their interest to elect a Republican, but in that campaign the party to which I was then proud to owe allegiance, and to which I am prouder now than ever before—for I do not believe my party will ever commit this wrong against the farmers and laborers of the United States—issued a campaign text-book which was intended as a guidebook, with which the speakers should go to the people of the United States, and that had something to say about this Porto Rican measure. Let me tell you what is contained in that text-book:

The first thought which came to the minds of the farmers, when the events following the war for the liberation of Cuba brought under our control certain tropical areas, was whether or not the possession or control of tropical territory by the United States would injure, or, perhaps, destroy the opportunities which they believed they had almost within their grasp for supplying the $100,000,000 worth of sugar which the people of the United States annually consume. This fear, if it reached a stage in which it could be called by that name, was answered in the negative by the Republican party when it passed the Porto Rican bill. The Democratic party fought with all its power to prevent the enactment of that measure which placed a duty upon articles coming into the United States from Porto Rico. That duty was small—

But, said this text-book—

It was an explicit declaration—

Mark this language, gentlemen—

It was an explicit declaration by the Republican party that it proposed to retain the power to fix such tariff as it might deem judicious against the products of cheap tropical labor wherever located and under whatever conditions. In other words, it was a distinct promise—

Listen to this also—

It was a distinct promise to the farmer that he need not fear that the Republican party would permit the cheap labor and the cheap sugar of any tropical territory to be brought in a manner which would destroy the infant industry of beet-sugar production, which the farmers of the United States have, under the fostering care of the Republican party, been building up during the last few years.

Will you keep your promise, gentlemen? I believe you will when you vote upon this measure. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have demonstrated this measure is a Democratic measure, and not a Republican measure; that it is what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], in his report, as minority leader, said—a step, from the standpoint of Democracy, in the right direction, a step in favor of free trade, and, consequently, from the standpoint of Republicans, a step in the wrong direction. It ought to be voted down by every Republican member of this House.

I have talked with little effect so far if I have not also demonstrated that the passage of this bill involves a complete reversal of the policy of the Republican party in regard to its treatment of our insular possessions. It is not a question of legal power, it is not a question of moral duties that is involved. It is, sirs, merely a question of policy—a policy as to whether it is best for the interests of the people of these islands and best for our eighty-odd millions of people in continental America that this bill should pass. In the consideration of that question there are three matters involved. First, will the legislation, if enacted, benefit the Filipino? Second, will it injure any domestic industry? Third, will any possible benefit to the Filipino be offset by any possible injury to American industries? I want to discuss those three questions. In doing so, Mr. Chairman, I shall not refer very freely to the testimony taken before the Ways and Means Committee. I think it is a perfectly fair statement to make in regard to that testimony that you can prove anything on earth in regard to this question you want from that testimony. I do not know anything about the truth of the story that my friend from Michigan told on the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee the other day. I do not know and do not believe that he occupied the position that gentleman said he did; but I do know, and I say so after attending practically all the sessions of the Ways and Means Committee, that the sugar-beet industry did occupy the position before that committee that the gentleman said, viz, that of a defendant. I am satisfied that the gentlemen upon that committee—a majority of the majority members—in fact, all of them—honestly believe that this legislation will not injure the beet-sugar industry; but I was convinced from the first day I timidly entered the room of the Committee on Ways and Means that the majority members of that committee had then determined upon the bill that they would bring into this House, and that the testimony taken before that committee was not for the purpose of getting information upon the question, but practically for the purpose of getting argument in support of the bill that they had predetermined they would report to this House.

I listened, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, to the profound and technical arguments that were made before that committee both at the last session of Congress and at this session of Congress. I confess that at times that testimony was somewhat unintelligible to me. It was in a language with which I am not familiar. I heard a great deal about pesos, centavos, carabaos, quintals, kilos, ratoons, and piculs, and other digestible and indigestible

things. It may have been that the other gentlemen understood all of the testimony, but I took consolation in my ignorance when I found the chairman of the committee or some other distinguished member of the committee asking one of the witnesses to translate his testimony into the English language. I submit that that testimony is full of contradictions and of conflicts. You can prove from that testimony that it does not cost but a little over half a cent a pound to raise sugar in the Philippine Islands. You can prove from that testimony that it costs a cent and a half a pound to raise sugar in the Philippine Islands. You can prove from that testimony that the Filipinos will never be able to produce to exceed two or three hundred thousand tons of sugar, and you can prove from that testimony that there are 50,000,000 acres of land in the Philippine Islands capable of producing from 2½ to 3 tons of sugar an acre—far beyond the total world's consumption. You can prove from that testimony that a ratoon crop, which I learned to be a subsequent crop grown from the first planting of the cane, is rarely raised in the islands. You can prove by other witnesses that were called before that committee that ratoon crops are of frequent occurrence in the Philippine Islands, and that each ratoon crop is better than the original. And so it is not my purpose to refer very much to that testimony in support of my argument.

The first question that I have taken up in considering the policy of this legislation is whether or not the legislation will benefit the Filipino. You will remember, gentlemen of the committee, that after the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee concluded his argument upon the floor of the House the other day I asked him the explicit question, "Will this legislation, in your judgment, benefit the Filipino?" What was his answer? I may not quote him exactly, because I am speaking from memory, but the effect of it and the substance of it, as I recall, was this: "I am somewhat doubtful myself as to what, if any, benefit the Filipino will derive from the legislation." And then I said, "What is the purpose of this legislation?" "Oh," said the gentleman, "the Filipinos think it will, and I am governed somewhat by sentiment in this matter."

And then I asked the gentleman if it were from a sentimental rather than from an economical standpoint that he proposed this legislation, and he burst forth in one of those vigorous announcements of his, "Why, no; it is right. Can you not comprehend it? That is why I am for it. It is right." That is an argument that is always made when you can not think of anything else to say in support of your position. Right? Was it right when the Porto Rican question was under consideration? Not then. Right does not change, whether gentlemen change their views or not. Will it benefit the Filipino? I believe what the gentleman who presides with such dignity and ability over the destiny of this House proved to my satisfaction when he discussed the Porto Rican bill was right, and that was that the reduction of duty to Porto Rico, or rather the admission of sugar from Porto Rico free of duty, would go to the benefit of the sugar trust and not to the poor Porto Rican. I think it was the distinguished gentleman who described that trust in that debate as that damnable, infernal, red-eyed, baldheaded, brimstone-eating sugar trust, and proved that the benefit of this legislation would go to that trust instead of to the Porto Ricans.

And so I submit to you, gentlemen, that if this legislation is passed you are not helping the Filipino. You are helping that trust so graphically described, and the benefit of this legislation will go into the pockets of the sugar trust and not into the pockets of the poor Filipino. Why, even the President of the United States—and I yield to no man upon the floor of this House in my admiration for his ability, for his patriotism, for his courage, and for his wisdom—but even he, in recommending this legislation to the House, seemed to be very doubtful as to what benefit, if any, the Filipino will receive from the legislation. On page 50 of his message as it came to the House you will find the following language:

> I do not anticipate that free trade between the islands and the United States will produce a revolution in the sugar and tobacco production of the Philippine Islands.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The enactment of a law by the Congress of the United States making provision for free trade between the islands and the United States, however, will be of great importance from a political and sentimental standpoint; and while its actual benefit has doubtless been exaggerated by the people of the islands, they will accept this measure of justice as an indication that the people of the United States are anxious to aid the people of the Philippine Islands in every way, and especially in the agricultural development of their archipelago.

Undoubtedly, as I think, I hear the gentleman from the Ways and Means Committee now whisper, he got his suggestion of sentimentality from the message of the President of the United States.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman evidently did not hear "the gentleman's" suggestion.

Mr. BONYNGE. May be I misunderstood the gentleman. But at all events it is suggested that this legislation would be wise from a political and a sentimental standpoint. I think, gentlemen, before we enact it we ought to stop to consider what the effect will be upon the local industry before taking that step.

Now, let me say in conclusion, about the first proposition, relative to the benefit to the Filipinos, that the best conclusion I can arrive at upon that phase of the question is that it may do the Filipinos some good; how much, nobody knows. But certainly, according to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and even according to the President of the United States, and according to every witness who has been heard upon this proposition, certainly very much less benefit than the Filipino himself expects he will get from this legislation. We know that it will disappoint the Filipino, and necessarily trouble will arise from that disappointment. Now, what will be its effect upon the home industry? I am not a beet-sugar expert; I am not interested in any beet-sugar factory or in any farm upon which beets are grown; but I speak upon this phase of the question as a protectionist and as a Republican. I do not believe we can determine from the testimony taken in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee what its future will be. I think we can determine that question far better by considering what has been the effect of similar legislation that has been enacted in regard to other tropical countries. We have had a treaty of reciprocity with the Hawaiian Islands for something like thirty years. I think the treaty was ratified in 1875. At that time these islands produced, as I remember the figures, a little over 11,000 tons of sugar a year. To-day they are producing nearly 400,000 tons of sugar annually. What has been the effect in Porto Rico? Prior to the passage of the Porto Rican bill the island of Porto Rico did not produce more than 66,000 tons of sugar a year. Last year it produced 116,000 tons, I believe it was; and if I remember the statement made by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, it will produce this year 210,000 tons of sugar. Now, what has happened in Cuba? Prior to the reduction of the duty upon Cuban sugar they produced, as I remember the figures, last year something like 600,000 tons of sugar. This year it is estimated, as I got the figures yesterday from the chairman, as I remember his figures, 1,100,000 and some odd tons.

Mr. FORDNEY. One million three hundred thousand.

Mr. BONYNGE. The gentleman says that Willett & Gray make it 1,100,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. One million three hundred thousand.

Mr. BONYNGE. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means says it is 1,100,000 tons. It does not make any difference whether it is 1,100,000 or 1,300,000; I do not care which it was; the effect of the legislation was to increase enormously the production of sugar in Cuba, in Porto Rico, and in the Hawaiian Islands, and with the Philippine Islands or any other tropical country it can not be other than that. I find that I am getting close to where my time will expire.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has eleven minutes remaining.

Mr. BONYNGE. I thank the gentleman. I do not think I will consume more than twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BONYNGE. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems incredible to me that a great committee of the House of Representatives should seriously propose a measure purporting to be for the benefit of the Filipinos and purporting to be introduced for the purpose of encouraging and promoting the development of the cane-sugar industry of those islands and then argue that it is impossible to expect any growth or any increase in the production of sugar that will amount to anything at all. I do not believe that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means or a great committee of this House would ever say so futile and absurd a thing as that. To enact legislation for the purpose of promoting and encouraging an industry in the Philippine Islands and at the same time to say that they are handing the Filipinos a "gold brick" and that there will not be any increased production or do them any practical good is a proposition I can not comprehend. It stands to reason, I think, that if we enact this legislation there will be an enormous increase in the production of sugar in those islands, just as there has been in every tropical country for which we have opened the markets of our country for their sugar.

But they tell us that even if there should be an increased

production we need have no fear of it, for the sugar will go to Hongkong, and that the market for Philippine sugar is China and Japan and not the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to what some witnesses for the Government have said, and I believe this is the only time I have quoted from this testimony upon any proposition. There was one witness called, a very voluble gentleman from Mississippi, a free-trade Democrat, as I remember, who liked "a little protection on the side," and he made this statement in reference to where the sugar of the Philippines would go:

I think we can well afford to take this risk, because I have always believed myself that the reduction in duty which we ask for will send a large part of our sugar—

Where—to Hongkong? Not much—

to the United States, where there is and always will be a market for much more than we will ever grow.

Another witness, called by the Government upon these hearings, was the governor of the Philippine Islands, Governor Wright, who came, I suppose, from the Philippine Islands purposely to testify before this committee. Here is what he said:

I have heard the argument advanced by Mr. Hathaway or Mr. Humphrey, I am not sure which, probably both of them, that in view of the Brussels treaty the signatory powers will regard the reduction of the tariff here as a bounty to the Filipino sugar growers, and therefore will impose a differential against them. I am not prepared to say—of course we must be frank about these matters—that the result of passing this bill will not be very largely to cause the sugars that grow in the Philippine Islands to come to the United States. I rather think, and certainly hope, this will be so.

That was the testimony of the governor of those islands. Why do gentlemen tell us that we need not fear competition from the Philippine Islands if they have an increased production of sugar? Why tell us that, when their own witnesses, those who ought to know about this subject if anybody does, say that if there shall be an increased production of sugar in the Philippine Islands the sugar will come, and they hope it will come, to the United States?

It occurs to me, as I now proceed, Mr. Chairman, that in discussing one other branch of this subject I omitted what seems to me to be a very essential point. While I was discussing the relation that this Government bears to Porto Rico I attempted to show you that it had never been the policy of this Government since the Spanish-American treaty to establish the principle that we must have one fixed and invariable rule for the government of all these possessions. I want now to show you that we never have treated them alike, that we never propose to, and that the bill now under consideration by this committee, if it shall be enacted into law, does not propose to treat the Philippine Islands as it treats Porto Rico and the rest of the possessions of the United States. I want to show you that it is not only a gold-brick proposition in reference to the production of sugar and the benefit that the Filipino will get from the increased production of sugar, but I want to show you also that they will not have free trade with the United States in 1909, after this bill goes into effect; that this bill is adroitly drawn for the purpose—no, I will not say that, because I do not know, but that this bill is adroitly drawn—so that the result of it will be that while the Filipino may think he is treated exactly the same as the other States and Territories and as a part of the United States in all respects in regard to tariff, it will not be so. Let me call your attention now to this language; and, gentleman of the committee, both Republicans and Democrats, I want you to listen to this language. Here is what it provides:

That on and after the 11th day of April, 1909—

Now, mark you—

all articles and merchandise going from the United States into the Philippine Islands—

Shall be admitted free of duty. Free trade upon all articles and merchandise of every kind and description going from the United States into the Philippine Islands. Is the relation to be reciprocal? Listen now to the language of the bill that we are considering:

And all articles wholly the growth and product of the Philippine Islands coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands shall be admitted free of duty.

Note the distinction. All articles and merchandise, of whatever kind and description, going from the United States into the Philippine Islands shall be admitted free of duty; but not all articles and merchandise coming from the Philippine Islands into the United States. No; not much.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BONYNGE. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is the Dingley tariff in force in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. BONYNGE. Certainly not. Therefore you are not treating the Philippine Islands as you are treating the rest of the United States. That is my contention and that is the reason why——

Mr. MANN. The Philippine tariff is less than the Dingley tariff, is it not?

Mr. BONYNGE. I do not know; I think it is. I think it is an ad valorem tariff.

Mr. MANN. So that this is to protect articles from an oriental country coming to this country by way of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BONYNGE. Undoubtedly; showing that you are not treating the Philippine Islands as you treat the rest of the United States, because you have given the Philippine Islands an entirely different tariff bill that governs importations into the United States from foreign countries. When you ship goods into the Philippine Islands from any country upon the face of the earth except from the United States you pay a different rate of duty than when you ship those goods into the United States or into any other possession of the United States, and that difference in treatment of the Philippine Islands has made necessary this distinction in this bill. That is just as useful for the purposes of my argument, and even more so, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois for calling my attention to the fact that there is a separate and distinct tariff bill for those islands. The purpose of my argument was to show, and I think I have shown conclusively, that the same sort of relations do not exist in the tariff laws with those islands, and will not exist after 1909, as with the other possessions of the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have also demonstrated that there is but little if any benefit which will go to the Filipino from this legislation, and from what we have seen occur in other tropical countries there is certainly, to put it mildly, at least very grave danger that not only may the sugar-beet industry be menaced, but be seriously crippled in its growth and development in this country. I hope I am wrong. I hope the gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee who have proposed and advocated this bill are right, and that no injury will come to this industry; but I do say, and I say it as forcibly and earnestly as I am capable of, that it is not the duty or the right of this Government, when no benefit is going to the Filipino or a part of the benefit is going to the sugar trust, that this legislation should be enacted even if it is only a menace and a threat to the beet-sugar industry of this country. I fear it will be more.

The American farmer, Mr. Chairman, is entitled to as much consideration from the American Congress as the little brown man across the Pacific. The people in my district are patriotic people. If they believed that it was necessary for the honor of their country that the beet-sugar industry of which they are so proud should be menaced or even destroyed they would sacrifice it gladly upon the altar of patriotism. They do not believe that it is either necessary or wise that they should be subjected to such a risk or asked to make the sacrifice.

We listened the other day to a most eloquent and entertaining description of the trip taken last summer by certain Members of this House to the Philippine Islands. I would take you gentlemen with me to-day upon another trip. I would take you to fair Colorado, where the sun shines the brightest, the sky is the clearest, and the air is the purest, where all life is one continual joy from the rise of the early morning sun until it sinks below the snow-capped peaks of our eternal mountain range, the very treasure house of the nation's wealth. I would take you to the farms that have been tilled by American farmers who left their homes in the East, traveled across what you knew in your boyhood days as the great American desert, and who have by their indomitable will and their indomitable courage converted that desert into rich and fertile farms, the home of American citizens, rearing American families and American children for the discharge of American citizenship. I would take you to the beet fields of Colorado and show you the wonderful change and improvement that this new industry has brought about.

I would take you to the proud city of Denver, that no American has ever visited without feeling the blood flow a little faster in his veins, when he realizes that his sons and his daughters have built that magnificent city in the very center of what was once the despised American desert. I would have you see its costly public edifices; I would have you see its stately structures of mart and commerce; I would have you see its churches, its universities, its schools, its palatial homes of the rich, its comfortable homes of the men of moderate means, and even its cozy homes of the few poor we have in our city. I would have you see these and many other things that are far beyond my power of description. And then, gentlemen, I would have you legislate so as to make it possible under the reclamation act that there shall be not only the farms that now exist on that desert, but that all of that great region shall be converted into the homes of happy and contented people. I would have

you so legislate that not only the city of Denver but many cities like Denver might grow up in the Rocky Mountain region.

Oh, my Republican friends, I appeal to you as Republicans, believing in the fundamental principles of your party, to defeat this un-Republican measure. I appeal to you, my Democratic friends on the floor of this House, I appeal to the entire membership of the House, to defeat this un-American measure. [Prolonged applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2558. An act authorizing the Washington Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Columbia River near the city of Wenatchee, Wash.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, during my service in this House no bill has been presented to this House that in my judgment presents so many difficulties to the candid, honest legislator as does this bill now under consideration. While I have reached my own conclusion as to how I shall vote on this bill, I am frank to confess that in my judgment either a Democrat or a Republican can vote either for or against the bill and logically defend his action. This fact grows out of the character, the essential nature of legislation itself, and the peculiar position of the two countries which are to be affected by the legislation.

I learned long ago as a law student that law is "a rule of action;" that it presupposes permanency, that it seeks to establish and extend precedent, that it contemplates fixed relations, and seeks to establish rules of conduct for the permanent control of those to whom the legislation applies.

How can either a Democrat or a Republican vote on this question from that basis? Are there any fixed relations known and read of all men subsisting between the United States and the Philippine Islands? Are lawyers or statesmen, either or both, agreed as to what the condition is or as to what it will be a year, two years, three years, ten years, a generation, or a hundred years from now?

It strikes me as irresistible in logic that a man who is honestly and intelligently on the tariff question either a Republican or a Democrat must find a difficulty in determining how he should vote on this bill. If a Democrat, he believes in the doctrine of "tariff for revenue only;" he believes that the tariff is a tax levied upon the consuming masses of the country to furnish a revenue sufficient to meet the needs of an honest government economically administered. He knows no protection to any section, class, or industry in any part of the country to which the Constitution applies. If a Republican, he believes in that economic theory which says it is better and wiser to use the taxing powers of the Federal Government to build up the manufacturing classes and increase the wage of the employees of those. Both these definite and settled views on the tariff question came into being, were taught and fixed by great men, when no man dreamed that we would plunge out into colonial conquest and have dependencies or colonies, or whatever you desire to call them, that would be a now-you-see-them and now-you-don't-see-them when you come to legislate on the tariff.

No man here is bound to support this bill by any Democratic platform, or by any caucus expression. I am in favor of treating them now as I hope them ultimately to be, and that is as foreign territory. I hope to see them ultimately become that when we can cut loose from all the pestiferous gang over there that afflicts us, and I am willing to treat them now no better and no worse than we treat other and more civilized and enlightened nations. I see no reason in logic why we should discriminate in their favor with tariff and against France, England, or Germany, or any other country with whom we have trade relations. I see no Democracy in that, no business sense in that, and yet I am so much a Democrat, so much a lover of the Constitution of my country that if you will say by Congressional enactment, if you will fix by the will of the people that the status of the Philippine Islands is to be a part of American territory, then I will vote cheerfully to support the Constitution and hence for free trade absolutely between the islands and the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But so long as you fix no status, so long as a man is free to choose for himself, whether they shall be American territory or foreign territory, whether we shall take them in and make them ultimately States and clothe them with all the powers and duties and responsibilities of American citizenship, whether we shall hold them perpetually in vassalage as a colony, or whether we shall ultimately turn them loose to some foreign government or by the establishment of an independent government there—so long as these three views are open I feel free to take the one which I think most logically tends to the result I hope to produce and which I know to be decidedly most in the interest of the people which I represent.

Mr. Chairman, I am weary, I am tired of all this talk and all this voting to reduce Philippine and Cuban tariffs while the trusts, organized under the Dingley bill, milk the American consumer to the limit and sell their surplus abroad cheaper than they sell to the American consumer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am for an honest revision of the tariff; for the revision of the tariff which does not extend to the trusts an increased foreign market at the expense of the agriculturists of the land and allow them to milk the home market to the limit by organization under high protection under the Dingley bill. I tell you the country is tired of this standing pat on the domestic tariff and whittling away the interests of the agricultural masses with treaties and Philippine bills, reducing the tariff which touches the products of the American farmer. I do not think this bill will ruin either the sugar, the tobacco, or the rice industry in the United States. I do not think that and I do not say that, but the tendency is to hurt them. About that there can be no question. Take the sugar schedule. The differential remains. It bars off European competition with refined sugar in the American market. Men who do not know that ought to go home and find out something from their wives. They know it. Everybody that frequents the grocery store knows that. We tried that with Cuban reciprocity and we got a dose, and the Government has been losing from ten to twelve millions in revenue, the American consumer has got no manufactured product any cheaper, and the Cuban is still crying for bread.

This bill is like that. Reduce the sugar schedule between the Philippines and the United States and what will be the result? Why, if we leave the differential, which bars off competition with refined sugar in the American market, the sugar trust will only bring the raw material from the Philippines cheaper into the American markets and pocket the difference, and the consumer will pay the same old price, and you can console yourself with talking about taking a step in the right direction; but I have no use for steps that never go anywhere. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Take the rice situation—a great growing industry in Texas, in Louisiana, and in other parts of the country, contributing rapidly more and more to the untold wealth of American products. This rice schedule will operate this way. Why, they say they must import rice into the Philippine Islands. Why, surely they do, and under the Philippine tariff they can import rice there and eat imported rice and send the Philippine rice over here and make 98 cents a hundred on the deal. That is what this bill permits on rice.

It will not do to say it will not hurt the rice raiser in the United States because they import rice into the Philippines, because the Filipino is not a fool when it comes to a trade, and if he can sell the rice he raises at bigger price and import under a lower tariff rice to meet his necessities in place of it, of course he will do it. More than that, likely some shrewd speculators who see a great opportunity to organize a corner in the Philippine rice crop will buy at a slight advance and import in lieu of it Japanese rice into that market and sell to them at a slight advance, then export the Philippine rice into the market of the United States and pocket the profits which this legislation will permit. I do not believe that is Democratic. You take the tobacco schedule. I frankly admit that I do not know if that cuts very much ice; but I do know that the rice and sugar propositions are serious ones. Oh, my friend CHAMP CLARK, with that distinguished air which characterizes this brilliant man from Missouri, in reply to BOB BROUSSARD'S question, said, "Why, the sugar they raised in the Philippine Islands did not amount to a drop in the bucket," yet you will find in his speech this morning that he says that the Filipino people the year before the war raised within a few hundred tons of as much cane sugar as all the United States raised. That is a fact.

You remember after the Cuban war the Cubans did not raise so much sugar, because agriculture and everything was broken up by the war, and so in the Philippines; but they will raise it faster when you give them a start, and it will pour into the coffers of the trust the difference between existing tariff now and this cut. Will they manufacture it into refined sugar and sell cheaper, to the benefit of the American consumer? Not on your life. They will use the benefits of that trade to crush out the beet-sugar industry in this country, and the cane sugar also to the extent they think it is a business proposition to do it.

Now, the difficulty which presents itself to my mind and which must present itself to the mind of every thinking man here is, Can I fix any fundamental view upon which I can determine how I ought to vote upon this bill? And this only illustrates the continued difficulty which arises in this House upon every subject of legislation which touches the Philippine Islands. They bring in a bill here that fixes a coinage, banking, and currency system for the Filipinos.

Take a Democrat who believes in a bimetallic coinage of intrinsic value money and a paper money redeemable in such coin or a Republican who believes in metallic money, gold money alone, and a paper money redeemable in such coin, both believe that every dollar ought to be equal to every other dollar everywhere the Constitution applies, and that the system should be fixed, and yet we are up against the same trouble. Are the Philippines to be a part of us or not; are they to be colonies with independent legislation or not; are we to turn them loose finally or not, and until that is decided how can you legislate in a successful business way? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Take another illustration——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman from Texas permit an interruption now?

Mr. BURGESS. Surely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I take it that the gentleman will agree with me that whatever the Philippines ought to be, they are on equality with the American Government at present?

Mr. BURGESS. That is about the size of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the American revolution we were colonists of Great Britain. Would the gentleman have deemed it right, just, and fair at that time, with the legislation which Great Britain had upon its statute books, putting up tariffs against all sorts of products from America, so that Great Britain, the home country, could manufacture and sell to us everything? Was it not one of the grievances of which we complained that they did not give English money in America the same trade rights that they gave English money in Great Britain? Does the gentleman think, in other words, that under a colonial system even, and we have it now, that it is fair to exploit your colony by commercial discrimination?

Mr. BURGESS. I do not seek to exploit them, but I do not propose to help them exploit us. I am not willing to legislate from the basis that we will treat these people as colonists. I do not believe in colonial government, and I am not willing to begin to legislate from that basis of assumed relationship between them and us. [Applause.] I did not create the existing conditions and I will not recognize it by tariff or otherwise. [Applause.]

More than that, the gentleman's report has shown that he did not do it, because he said they are a part of the American territory, and there ought to be free trade between them and us. That is what the gentleman's report says. And yet he says a step in the right direction is to tax them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What my report says or what the report of the minority of the committee says——

Mr. BURGESS. The gentlemen are mutually responsible for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is that the present condition of things, where they are neither domestic or foreign, and both domestic and foreign, is somewhat intolerable, but that while they are under the flag of the United States they ought to receive all the benefit as well as the burden of our control.

Mr. BURGESS. Yes, sir; then the contention of the gentleman, which I conceive to be Democratic, and with which I agree, is that, in fact, notwithstanding the decision of the Supreme Court, in fact, notwithstanding what any man or men may say, the Constitution follows the flag; that the territory is American territory; that the Constitution applies, and that no tariff can be rightfully and constitutionally levied between that country and ours. Does the gentleman agree with that? Yet the gentleman recommends that Democrats vote for the tariff, because it is slightly lower, he says, to vote to tax them as a step in the right direction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit——

Mr. BURGESS. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The substitute bill recommends we do the very thing the gentleman says ought to be done.

Mr. BURGESS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To wit, give these people absolute free trade with the balance of the United States while they are a part of the United States.

Mr. BURGESS. That carries with it——

Mr. WILLIAMS. And we do not recommend the enactment of a tariff between us and them. We do recommend, if we can not get absolute free trade, that the present tariff that the Republican party has enacted between us and them be cut down as far as they are willing to cut it. So far as enacting a tariff is concerned, we are reducing tariff rates even if we vote for the Republican bill after our own bill—expressing our opinion of what really ought to be done—has failed. Would the gentleman say that if I was in the hands of a robber who demanded a hundred dollars as a ransom, that I would be recognizing his robbery by paying the hundred dollars in order to make my escape from captivity?

Mr. BURGESS. I think not. I would not so deem it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, what we are doing, then, in this is that we are in the hands of these tariff robbers as between us and the Philippine Islands. We tried to get free trade, and if we can not get free trade we pay our ransom in the shape of reduced tariff, if we can get them to agree to it.

Mr. BURGESS. We are agreed about that—that the decision is wrong, that the Philippines are a part of American territory, that the Constitution followed the flag there, the decision to the contrary notwithstanding, and that under the Constitution no constitutional tariff can be levied between those islands and us; and you justify voting for this bill by a piece of sophistry and false logic by saying you would rather be robbed out of a less sum than a larger. That is your answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand the gentleman to contend that when I agree to cut down a tariff between us and the Philippine Islands that I thereby stand in the attitude of favoring a tariff with the people of those islands?

Mr. BURGESS. Undoubtedly. If you vote for a thing, my friend, surely you are for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I understand the gentleman to say that, having paid these robbers in the case that I supposed $50 to let me away, that I would be justifying the principle of robbery?

Mr. BURGESS. No, sir; I do not think much of your robbery illustration. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. And the logical effect is to admit that petty larceny is as criminal as grand larceny.

Mr. BURGESS. Sure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And yet all the laws of civilized nations do make a distinction in the punishment dealt out to them; and so I recognize, and I am only a man of plain common sense. I thank God that Tom Carlyle said that mankind are not always logical. Sometimes they use common sense. I recognize that it is nearer right to have free trade in everything except tobacco and sugar between us and the Philippines and only a duty of 25 per cent of the existing duties upon those articles than it is to have a tariff upon everything with the present rates now existing. Now, as a matter of common sense, does not the gentleman recognize that the nearer you can approach the Democratic position—and he admits with me that the Democratic position as between us and the Philippine Islands as long as they are a part of the United States is one of free trade—does not he admit that the nearer we can approach that the more nearly Democratic we are?

Mr. BURGESS. As applied to the Philippines, I do not agree, for this reason. Let me state the logical difference from the standpoint of the Constitution between the gentleman from Mississippi and myself. He frankly confesses that because he can not defeat the grand larceny that he will vote for petty larceny, and I shall vote for neither. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will permit me, because the man who has me on the grand larceny and may hold me there, if I can settle with him for $20 instead of $100, and I can not help it, then as a matter of common sense I would settle with him for the least amount.

Mr. BURGESS. The gentleman can not tell whether he can accomplish that. There may be enough votes of Republicans to join with the Democrats voting against this reduction to defeat it and defeat the whole bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Defeat it, yes; but that would result in bringing about another result, that of leaving upon the statute books the present tariff laws between us and the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not want to defeat it to that extent.

Mr. BURGESS. Yet we would have this result: We could at least say as Democrats we did vote for what we believed the Constitution teaches, and that you can not say if you vote for any rate of tariff between the Philippine Islands and the United States. You will have to abandon your Democratic contention that the Constitution follows the flag if you vote for a tariff, be it 10 per cent, 20 per cent, or 30 per cent, for if there is any tariff at all it will be against the Constitution of the United States, and you will vote for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman surely must see that I am

not voting for the enactment of a tariff, but for reducing a tariff, and as a matter of common sense the gentleman must see the difference between the two propositions. Now, another matter, and then I will not interrupt the gentleman any more. I am glad to interrupt him when I can, because we are such goods friends personally that we can argue and interargue matters without any trouble.

Mr. BURGESS. Indeed we are.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No matter what the gentleman may think about the Constitution following the flag; no matter what was contended by the Senator from Texas, then the leader on this floor, the Hon. JOSEPH W. BAILEY, in one of the most eloquent speeches I ever heard in my life upon that point; no matter what you or I would have decided if judges upon the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court has practically decided that the Constitution, so far as the Philippines are concerned, is about as was expressed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], "As an overcoat in the possession of Congress, and Congress can put it on and take it off whenever Congress in whim or fancy may see fit to do so, Congress being the judge as to whether the Filipino is cold enough to need the overcoat for a little while or warm enough to dispense with it for a little while." Now, I want to put this question to the gentleman: The Supreme Court of the United States has decided in those cases that Congress had a right to enact a tariff law. It upheld this very tariff law. Now, I can not reverse the Supreme Court of the United States. It was fixed by our forefathers as the governmental voice for this country upon the subject of constitutionalities and unconstitutionalities. It may be true, and it is true that I do not agree with it. It is true that you do not agree with it, but that is the constitutional law of the land.

We are standing here as practical legislators, with a high-tariff law between us and the Philippines, and we have an opportunity to make that tariff lower, and the Supreme Court says that the present tariff is constitutional. Now, how can the gentleman say we violate the Constitution in voting to lower that tariff?

Mr. BURGESS. I want to ask the gentleman a question, because I do not want any misunderstanding about our position. Does the gentleman think the decision of the Supreme Court on this question binds the legislative conscience under its oath of office?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, I do not contend that the decision binds the legislative conscience under its oath of office, but I do contend that every practical legislator in making laws will be guided by what the court has decided to be constitutional, and he must be guided by it if he is practical, if he is not a mere doctrinaire.

For me to say that I do not believe the Supreme Court ever had a right to decide the Federal law to be constitutional which taxed State banks out of existence with a 10 per cent tax, for me to say that that decision was wrong, is one thing; but for me to go on forever butting my head up against the wall, when I can not change the decision, is another thing. I do not believe the decision was right. I do not believe the Federal Government had a right to tax State bank notes out of existence under the taxing power. Neither does the gentleman. I would not imitate that decision; in other words——

Mr. BURGESS. I would not vote for it, either, no matter if they did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But when I come to offer an amendment to the present national-banking laws, I do not think I would take the position that because the present national-banking laws were founded upon what I thought to be a constitutional error, or what I would have decided to have been an unconstitutionality if it had been within my province to render the decision, that therefore I would not perfect or better or make less onerous the national-banking law.

Now, the Supreme Court has decided the present Philippine tariff law to be constitutional. Because I do not agree with that, am I to be forbidden to vote for a bill which proposes to make it less onerous to consumers, both in the archipelago and in America? It strikes me that that is doctrinaireism.

Mr. BURGESS. Now, let me restate the difference between the gentleman from Mississippi and myself. We are agreed that in spite of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States the Philippine territory is a part of the United States. That is a matter of fact to which our oath of office commits us, to obey the Constitution, that no tariff, at any rate, can be levied between this country and the Philippines. Now, conceding that, you report here a substitute bill in accord with that Democratic contention, namely, that we strike off all tariffs and have free trade between the Philippine Islands and all other territory of the United States, and say I am with you on that if we are to vote on a theory. Then you say that if that fails we ought to vote for the Republican bill which levies a certain other rate of tariff than the subsisting one, and I say I can not do that, because the Constitution says I can not vote for any tariff between the United States and the Philippine Islands.

Now, let the gentleman go and study that proposition, and get up against it right hot, and see whether he can answer it or not. If we start to vote on a theory not sustained by the courts or Congress, it seems we should adhere to the theory and not vote for any tariff at any rate. If we abandon this theory and vote practically recognizing existing conditions, then we can treat it as foreign territory and vote to let the existing tariff remain.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Texas has stated that there are a certain number of Republican recalcitrants who are willing to vote against this bill—enough to beat it if we will vote against it. I want to ask him if these Republican recalcitrants are as anxious to get rid of the competition of Philippine sugar as they say they are, what is the reason they will not come in and vote with the gentleman and myself to turn those islands loose and cut loose from them forever and so remove that competition. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Is that the only alternative we have?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; it is.

Mr. BURGESS. I am very glad of the interruption of the gentleman from Missouri, because I think this purely academic discussion between the gentleman from Mississippi and myself had gone far enough so that every sensible Member can see his position and mine and determine for himself who is right. I stand on my position and he stands on his, and that is all there is to it. But I started out in this discussion with a view, not of making an extended argument about this pending bill, but of using it and collateral measures to lead up to the discussion of a resolution which I have introduced, which proposes to settle all these vexed questions about which we differ, and I think in a businesslike, reasonable, correct way, in accord with all American traditions, and in a nonpartisan way besides.

I want to send that resolution up to the Clerk's desk and ask the Clerk to read it; but before he reads it I wish to resume my argument at the point I was when the gentleman from Mississippi interrupted me. Another character of legislation which comes up here every year and which afflicts me is that the Naval Committee brings in a bill recommending an increase of the Navy to two, three, four, five, and six it may be, more battle ships. It entails an expense upon the American people of $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 to start with, and many millions more to maintain it. Now, I am up against that proposition. How shall I vote? At once my eye runs over the country and across the Pacific, and takes a panoramic view of the country of which the gentleman from Connecticut had a map hung up here which reminded me of a target that I used to shoot at when I was a boy. If we are to hold the Philippine Islands permanently, either as a colony or a part of this country, we may as well face the proposition and vote for ten new battle ships, because God knows that we shall need them in the turmoil of European politics in the Orient by the possession and dominion of the Philippine Islands.

It is true I am a Democrat, but I am much more an American than I am anything in politics. [Applause.] But I am willing, so far as I am concerned, to fling it out to the world, from Congress or elsewhere, that so long as the flag of my country flies over a single human being in the Western or Eastern Hemisphere, black or brown, every drop of American blood, every dollar of American money, shall, if necessary, stand behind American guns to protect that individual in his rights, his liberty, and his property. [Applause.]

Again, the same awful condition confronts us, if we turn the Philippines loose, or if we neutralize them by treating with European powers. There is no necessity, of course, for an increase of the Navy; there is no necessity for an increase of the Army; there is no necessity for confusing and complexing our bank currency and coinage laws; there is no necessity for gumming up our tariff situation against the interests of the American farmer.

Let me ask this House one pointed question: If the Philippine Islands were people engaged in mining coal and iron manufacturing and sending out their products into the markets of the world, show me the hair of the man in this House who believes any such Philippine legislation as this would ever come before this House! [Applause.] You stand here and ask me to vote for a mess of pottage while the steel and iron schedules of the Dingley bill afford a cover for numberless combinations

that are milking the South and West and the whole country and amassing great profits and laughing up their sleeves at what Barnum called the American capacity to be gulled.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. I agree with his position in reference to the Philippine Islands as being a part of the territory of the United States. I do not believe that under the Constitution we have a right to provide a protective tariff against her productions brought into this country; but, coming to the practical part, I would like to ask the gentleman if the proposition was made in this House to reduce the Dingley rates 5 per cent or 10 per cent or 20 per cent, whether he would vote for or against that proposition?

Mr. BURGESS. I am glad the gentleman from Kentucky asked the question, and I will answer it in the frank spirit it was asked. If a bill were introduced to reduce the Dingley rates, especially on the steel and iron schedule 25 per cent, I would vote for it. If that failed and 20 per cent were offered, I would vote for that. If that failed and 15 per cent were offered, I would vote for that. If that failed and 10 per cent were offered, I would vote for that. If that failed and 5 per cent was offered, I would vote for it. If that failed and one quarter of one per cent were offered, I would vote for that. But just think a moment. The tariff operates under a common constitution, and I do not violate the Constitution or my oath of office voting for a tariff; I only get in a controversy with my Republican friends as to whether it is for protection or for revenue; and the Democratic party never in its history declared for free trade.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. One other question. I want to know if the gentleman really believes that under our Constitution any tariff law that has the least iota of protection in it is constitutional? How is it constitutional where there is protection in it when it exceeds the revenue point?

Mr. BURGESS. I will answer that fairly. I am not a great statesman, but I think I am sound on the tariff. I think I can make it ring like a bell any time. Yes, there always was recognized to be the vice of protection inherent in the tariff system from which we can no more get away than we can the air we breathe and everybody knows it. [Applause.] The Democratic position has been, and the Democrat has said to the Republican, "We object to your taking the incidental evil of the system of taxation and making it the basis of its levy and operation." [Applause.] A Democrat never has contended that there would not be protection to some extent to the class manufacturing the article taxed, because the Democrat has ever said the tariff is a tax to the extent of its levy, which bars competition and gives to the extent of its levy a monopoly to the home manufacturer of the article taxed. You can not get away from it. I stand for this. I say, give us on the tariff a square deal; quit cutting down the schedules of the agriculturist and his products and turn your attention to iron and steel a while. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. One other question. I think I understand the gentleman's position. I do not agree with him fully upon that.

Mr. BURGESS. Oh, come along and we will get together directly.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I do not believe the Government has a right to exercise the taxing power of the Government to build up any industry.

Mr. BURGESS. I fully agree with the gentleman in that assertion.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. I do not believe we have a right to pass a law that has a particle of protection in it.

Mr. BURGESS. But you can not avoid that.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. For the purpose of protection. It may have an incidental protection in it, but for the sole purpose of protection we have no right to pass it.

Mr. BURGESS. I agree with the gentleman entirely.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Now, then, let us take the national-banking system, upon which, I suppose, the gentleman and myself agree. I want to know if the gentleman would support a proposition to compel national banks to pay interest upon their deposits?

Mr. BURGESS. Well, what on earth has that got to do with what we are talking about? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Just this. Is the gentleman against the national banks?

Mr. BURGESS. Sure.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. And I understand the gentleman to be against the protective tariff?

Mr. BURGESS. Sure.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. The gentleman is taking the position now that because he can not get his views entirely he will vote for them partially.

Mr. BURGESS. No, no; the gentleman forgets. I have stated clearly, and I will restate it to the gentleman so that there can be no question about it, no difference between the gentleman from Kentucky and myself, that when you speak of cutting down the Dingley rates, you speak of a constitutional tariff sustained by the courts and by Democrats—some of them voted for it, by the way, unfortunately, but they were wrong——

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. We will agree on that.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The Lord has forgiven them.

Mr. BURGESS. The difference between the Democrat and the Republican on that proposition is not that the Constitution does not authorize the levy of a tariff. Everybody believes that, but the Republican says it should be levied looking to protection and the Democrat says, "No, it should be levied to raise revenue to run an honest government economically administered; get out, you whole horde of selfish fellows who want to work the Government!" But this constitutional Philippine question is another question. The Constitution by one section which controls the matter provides that taxation shall be uniform; this tariff has to be the same everywhere, and by the Democratic position the Philippines are a part of the American territory just as Texas is a part of the United States, just as New Mexico and Arizona and the Territories are a part of the United States, and that Constitution from a Democratic standpoint prohibits the levy of one-millionth of 1 per cent tariff between the Philippines and the United States.

My contention is, and the gentleman can settle with his conscience and his Democracy; my contention is, I can not vote for any tariff offered by anybody between the United States and the Philippine Islands if I vote upon the assumption they are a part of this country.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, one other question. Then the gentleman can not discriminate between the two propositions—voting to impose a tariff in the first place and voting to reduce an existing tariff in the next place.

Mr. BURGESS. Why, the gentleman must know that is a schoolboy argument that does do credit to his ability. To vote for a lesser tariff is to vote for that tariff——

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. To vote for a lesser tariff is to vote to impose a tariff?

Mr. BURGESS. No matter whether reduced or increased, if you vote for it, can you say you did not vote for that rate? Can you? Suppose the proposition is to increase, and you voted against it? You would say, "Under the Constitution, I can not vote for any tariff between the Philippine Islands and this country." Suppose they offered to reduce it and you vote for it, would you say you can vote for a tariff between the Philippines and this country? Gentlemen, you must either get back from your follow-the-flag position or vote against any tariff between the Philippine Islands and the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, the Supreme Court has knocked out the follow-the-flag business.

Mr. BURGESS. Does the gentleman take his Democracy from the Supreme Court?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not; but I take my law from the Supreme Court of the United States, and so does everybody else. I take my law from them.

Mr. BURGESS. The gentleman admits under our oath of office we are held bound in conscience to the Constitution, regardless of what the Supreme Court has said it means. The gentleman has conceded that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question. He did not seem to catch the pertinency of the question put by the gentleman from Kentucky a few moments ago. You would vote—I know you would, and I need not ask the question—for a bill to compel national banks to pay interest upon their deposits?

Mr. BURGESS. I surely would.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You would do that notwithstanding the fact, from your standpoint of what you believe about the Constitution, that the whole national banking system is founded on an unconstitutional act of Congress taxing out of existence State bank issues. Now, is not that true?

Mr. BURGESS. No; I do not agree to the whole proposition as the gentleman puts it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you not agree the whole national banking system could exist for a moment except by virtue of that act?

Mr. BURGESS. That is likely true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then this whole system is based upon that. Then I say, are not the two cases analogous? When you are voting to diminish a burden, making less onerous burdens under

a system in your opinion unconstitutional, assuredly the gentleman must recognize that when we sat down here, for example, and voted for the Wilson bill as it left this House that we were not able to get every particle of protection out of the Wilson bill.

Mr. BURGESS. There is no question of that sort now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think there is, from my standpoint, and for this reason, and I have pretty good Democratic authority for it, that any tariff levied for any other purpose than for revenue is unconstitutional. I think the gentleman agrees with me. Of course if it is levied for a revenue and incidentally protects that is another thing that is incidental. But the gentleman agrees with me that a schedule levied for protection, to hot-house an industry, from the standpoint which he and I occupy, and which by the way very few people else do occupy——

Mr. BURGESS. I think that is true. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS (continuing). Is unconstitutional, because even Democrats in these days palter with the immorality and unconstitutionality of the tariff system. Then, whenever we vote for a bill which contains upon it any schedule that was protective in its character, then, though it was a reduction from the schedule still more highly protected the gentleman would say that we violate the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. BURGESS. No; I would not say that, because the question the gentleman suggests can only be solved in the conscience of the legislator himself. But that is not the case; it is not the question here. It is not a question of cutting down the abuses of the constitutional tariff system here, but it is a question of whether any tariff at all can be constitutionally levied between the United States and the Philippines.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. BURGESS. Now, wait a minute. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SMITH] interrupt, and they ask a lot of other questions, but this is the question, namely, Can any rate of tariff be constitutionally levied between this country and the Philippines? I think not, and therefore I will vote against any rate of tariff.

Now, the gentleman, if by his reasoning or otherwise can satisfy his mind, and the gentleman from Kentucky can satisfy his mind, by saying that I will vote against grand larceny and vote for petty larceny, and let it go at that, let us consider the incident closed, and let me go on with my speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman let me ask him one more question?

Mr. BURGESS. I think I have been mighty nice to the gentleman. He has taken up most of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman has also tried to be nice to you. If he desires to go ahead, however, I shall not ask him the question.

Mr. BURGESS. Go ahead and ask your question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will take the gentleman's standpoint now. He regards the present tariff between us and the Philippines as unconstitutional. The Supreme Court says it is not, and I take my law from the Supreme Court. But suppose I agree with the gentleman for the sake of argument. Suppose I say this is an unconstitutional burden upon consumers in both countries, then does the gentleman mean to tell me that he can not see the difference between bringing into existence that unconstitutional burden, and when opportunity presents itself, rendering it less burdensome by reducing it?

Mr. BURGESS. I confess I do not. I confess that I face the same proposition when I vote for any rate of tariff. I do not care whether it reduces or whether it increases—that is immaterial. I am voting for it, and I can not get away from it. I go on record by saying that I voted for a tariff at such a rate between the Philippines and this country when I believe that under the Constitution I ought not vote for any tariff.

Now, let that go. Will the Clerk please read the resolution?

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 44) requesting the President to consider the expediency of effecting a treaty with European powers providing for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands and to protect an independent government there when established.

Resolved, etc., That it is the purpose of the United States to cease exercising sovereignty over the Philippine Islands as soon as may be with justice to them, and honor to the United States, and that it is the preference of the United States to accomplish this purpose by establishing an independent government in said islands; that in pursuance of such purpose and preference the President is respectfully requested to consider the expediency of opening negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Italy, Spain, and Japan with a view of effecting a joint treaty with such governments, by which it shall be provided that an independent government in the Philippine Islands, when established by the United States, shall be recognized and preserved; that pending the establishment of such independent Philippine Government the Philippine Islands shall be neutral territory; that such Philippine Government, when established, shall agree that it will maintain equality of trade relations toward all the signatory powers, and that in the event of war between any of the nations of the earth it shall be neutral; that such concessions as may be made the United States in the establishment of such independent government shall be recognized by all the signatory powers.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I shall claim the indulgence of the House while I attempt to discuss what I conceive to be an American plan, nonpartisan, to which any man of any view in politics may subscribe, and solve once and for all the most difficult problem which now confronts the American people. I have been thinking for more than three years, with whatever ability I possess, more about this question than all other questions combined. I have recognized the difficulty in the settlement of the question growing out of the political aspect which it immediately assumed when it came into being, and it is my earnest desire in what I shall say in reference to it to-day to utter no partisan expression, no partisan criticism, but to discuss this matter as an American citizen, freeborn and expected to exercise the right of such, and as such I desire to appeal to every Member on this floor, regardless of what party commission he may hold here, to consider earnestly and seriously this matter.

I introduced at the last session of the Fifty-eighth Congress a House resolution almost identical with the one which has just been read. Subsequent reflection convinced me that the resolution ought to be joint, and I introduced it on the day shown by the resolution. I have been happy to find since that I have much support, regardless of party, of the resolution which I have presented. I notice that on the 4th day of January this year the distinguished and very able gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], who sits on the other side of the House, introduced a resolution in part like mine, and which has been referred to the same committee. I wish to say briefly of that in passing, that as far as it goes I am in hearty accord with the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts. But I think it does not go far enough; that it is not clear enough; that it does not protect the particular interests, and does not give proper direction to negotiations, if we direct they shall be undertaken.

Now, I want briefly to discuss the reasons why I think this resolution ought to be adopted. In addition to all that I have said about the difficulties that confront us in every character of Philippine legislation—and I am frank to say that was the main purpose I had in view in what I have to say with reference to these matters—I do not attach very much importance one way or the other to the Philippine bill except as being a striking instance that we can not legislate intelligently at all with respect to those islands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may be permitted to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to discuss the reasons why the first sentence of this resolution ought to be adopted regardless of whether the rest is, or whether, if it should be, the treaty proposed under it could be negotiated. The first sentence reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That it is the purpose of the United States to cease exercising sovereignty over the Philippine Islands as soon as may be with justice to them and honor to the United States, and that it is the preference of the United States to accomplish this purpose by establishing an independent government in said islands.

The adoption of that resolution involves the discharge of a plain duty inherent and exclusive in Congress. If you have read much of the political history of our country you will agree with me when I say that almost from the beginning, due perhaps to a spirit of hero worship that a few men like George Washington were big enough to repel, we began to extend and expand the Presidential office.

We have continued that straight along down the pathway of our history until to-day we have reached a point where Cabinet officers and politicians talk about the Administration policy as binding upon the American people. Not long ago a distinguished gentleman, for whose ability and character I have the profoundest respect, wrote a letter in which he outlined the Administration policy in the Philippines. My countrymen, my colleagues, regardless of what party is in power, regardless of all other questions, nothing can be more destructive to the perpetuity and safety of the American people than for the people to acquire the habit of acquiescing in the will of their masters. [Applause.] It is reversing the ancient constitutional order of things. The Constitution of the United States makes no mention of Cabinet officers. As a matter of fact, they are merely Presidential clerks to aid the President in the execution of the

will of the American people as declared by the American Congress. No President, no Cabinet, no Administration, can constitutionally fix the status of the Philippine Islands toward the United States. No lawyer of any respectability believes that can be done. The question is, How long are the representatives in Congress of a free people charged with the duty of directing the Executive in the discharge of his duties under the Constitution to sit silent and acquiesce in whatever administration policy the Administration may see fit to promulgate?

I am not singling out this Administration; I have not one word to offer against any member of it. I am trying to discuss this question from the standpoint of an American and a Member of the American Congress, who owes his duty to the American people under his oath of office, which binds him to the Constitution of the United States. It is unnecessary to ask whether indifference on the part of the people or aggressive, steady grasping for power on the part of the President has produced a different situation; the fact is that it exists. There has grown up in this country a false idea subversive of fundamental principles, a reflection on the importance, the dignity, and the power of this House and the Senate as well, which has become almost universally accepted in the current press of the country, constantly referred to on the stump, and seeming to have the indorsement of many of the great officials of our past history, as well as our present. You hear talk now constantly of Administration policies, in the sense of the President and his Cabinet pursuing a certain course never directed by any legislative expression, and we are rapidly drifting into the practice of committing the Government insidiously and indirectly and unconstitutionally about this or that situation.

I would not detract from the full constitutional duty of the Presidential office to recommend legislation, and in every honorable way to further its accomplishment in the interest of the whole people, and, though a Democrat, with pleasure I commend that line of effort of the present Chief Executive of the nation to have just railroad rates, but it is of vital importance that this constitutional method be pursued with discrimination and strict attention to its limitation. No legislation has been enacted, no legislation has been sought, no legislation has been recommended which fixes, or which tends in declared purpose to fix definitely, the future status of the Philippine people. A great secretary gravely writes a letter declaring the Administration policy with reference to the Philippine question, and the terms of the letter, as well as the servile acquiescence on the part of Congress, seems to indicate that such an announcement is to settle the question, and that the people are expected to acquiesce in the administrative will, and by appropriations and other similar ways not only establish this administrative will by legislative acquiesence, but perhaps in the great court of international opinion estop the American people from declaring through Congress that will, which is in accord with their desires, and with the present equities of the situation I offer and feel no harsh criticism of this Administration for pursuing this course.

I will say no unkind word, and I feel none, toward Secretary Taft for having written such a letter. These and similar things are the evidences in our history for many years of the future and ultimate destructive policy of substituting for legislative expression of the people's will the views of the people's servants. It is but one of the many indications of the fatal tendency all along in our history for a President of the United States constantly to overstep the boundaries of Executive duties and seek to become the executor of a great estate whose owners sleep a sleep as profound as death. No man will contend that the power, under our Constitution, of settling this Philippine problem is lodged anywhere save in the Congress of the United States. A great Senator, not a member of my party, but a man of the highest order of ability, has stated in a breath the constitutional situation as follows:

> We have differed upon the Philippine question. Many Senators on the other side thought the United States ought not to have acquired the Philippines. There was fair ground for difference of opinion, probably, upon that proposition. I think there is no difference between the minority and the majority in this Chamber that we have acquired the Philippine Islands and that to-day the United States is titular sovereign of the Philippine Archipelago. What the people of the United States will choose in the long run to do with the Philippines, what the ultimate policy of the United States will be as to the Philippines, no man now can say. There has been no committal by Congress, and it is a matter entirely, under the Constitution, for Congress to determine as to the ultimate attitude of this country toward the Philippines.

So said Senator JOHN C. SPOONER March 17, 1905.

No Congressional enactment states what the will of the American people is on this subject. My colleagues, it is my deliberate belief that 95 per cent of the American people would vote for this resolution to-morrow if they got a chance; that 90 per cent of the voters in your district, regardless of party, would vote for it if they got a chance. We stand here afraid of the powers that be, afraid of this right-angled triangle order of things in which the hypothenuse is the White House, the base the Senate leaders, and the perpendicular the House leaders, and the square deals described on the hypothenuse are equal to the square deals of both the other two sides, still the system is wrong. I tell you the whole business ought not to be allowed to continue to the suppression of the American will on this great subject. Nor do I believe they want to. The expression of the President himself and the expression of two of the master minds of his Cabinet, and possibly of the country, Secretary Root and Secretary Taft, do say that ultimate independence is the solution of this Philippine problem. My judgment is, if Congress would declare this to be our ultimate purpose, to adopt some method by which it can be hastened and accomplished, that these same men will welcome any such programme.

Of course I am not authorized to speak for either one of these gentlemen; I am not on very close political relations with either of them. But some of you gentlemen are. Why not talk to them about it? Why not let us get together as Americans and attempt to do something to fix a definite basis upon which we may with safety proceed in all of our legislation touching the Philippine Islands? There is not a business man in the country but knows that ought to be done. There is not a legislator in the country but knows that ought to be done.

But there is another reason that appeals to me with the greatest force—why this sentence in the resolution which I have read ought to be adopted. I shall not to-day take the time to discuss all the old contentions between the two parties and among the two parties with reference to the rights of the brown man, and the consent of the governed, and the uplifting of the brown man in his religious life and the development of his country and the building of schools, and all that old straw.

Frankly, that never did worry me much. Frankly, I never have shed a tear and never expect to shed a tear about the brown Filipino. I believe that legislation, like charity, ought to begin at home, and let the rest take care of themselves. I am not especially concerned about that end of the thing, but I am concerned about what the effect on American institutions and American doctrines and American safety may be by reason of this or that action which we take there. And this brings me to this reason: I want to say to this House that there never has been a political doctrine asserted in the history of this country that has been so uniformly approved by every President and every Cabinet officer since its assertion as the doctrine known as the "Monroe doctrine." Not a single President from Monroe down but has either directly or indirectly given his approval to this doctrine. Not a Secretary of State—and we have had many distinguished men in that high office—but has either directly or indirectly given his approbation to the Monroe doctrine.

Perhaps the brightest jewel in the crown that decks the brow of one of the greatest living Democrats is the action of Grover Cleveland in the Venezuela controversy, when he stood for the Monroe doctrine though it might mean war. McKinley and Hay, Roosevelt and Root, Cleveland and Olney, and so on, all along down the line, our statesmen have approved this doctrine as essential to the vitality, to the perpetuity, to the safety of this American Republic. What is that doctrine? What is its scope and force? What does it say to the world? What do we stand for when we stand for the Monroe doctrine? I have seen no finer statement than this, from an editorial in the Washington Post of December 14 last:

> The Monroe doctrine—
>
> Says the editorial—
>
> was announced in response to a threat by a group of European nations, known as the "Holy Alliance," to aid Spain in recovering her revolted Spanish colonies. Monroe and Adams admitted fully the right of Spain to reestablish her authority over them, but Monroe made the following declaration in his message of December 2, 1823. Referring to the allied powers in Europe which had indicated a purpose of aiding Spain in the forcible recovery of her revolted colonies on this hemisphere, he said:
>
> "We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere; but with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European nation, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."
>
> This, and this only—
>
> Says the Post—
>
> is the Monroe doctrine.

I understand that the Monroe doctrine, in plain United States,

as we would say it down in Texas, means this: We say to the world we will not permit European monarchies to acquire territory and exercise dominion over it in the Western Hemisphere, and that is all.

Now, it is true that a good deal of discussion has arisen as to the scope of the Monroe doctrine. Some great men have contended that it involves going further than merely saying this to Europe; that it involves the assertion of a protectorate over South American republics and the thrusting of our fingers into their internal affairs, dictating to them or restraining them from contracting debts and entering into treaties with foreign nations. I myself do not subscribe to any such extension of the Monroe doctrine as that. But that is immaterial in this discussion. For the purpose for which I use the doctrine it is immaterial how much you extend its scope toward a protectorate over the South American republics. The point is that all of us are agreed it is a Western Hemisphere doctrine. It has and can have no application to a single inch of territory a part of the Eastern Hemisphere.

Now, let us think a minute. Every session of Congress that goes by without an expression of the American people as to our ultimate will in the Philippines constitutes a menace to the vitality of the Monroe doctrine. Why? Because no man with sense can contend for America that Europe can not acquire territory on the Western Continent and exercise dominion over it, but that the United States can acquire and exercise dominion over territory in the Eastern Hemisphere. This doctrine has a reciprocity which constitutes the heart of the doctrine, the equity of it, the vitality of it, the force of it, and whenever you strike out that you ultimately whittle away the doctrine itself. When we promulgated that doctrine, accentuated it step by step in our history, we just as good as said to Europe, "We will not dabble in your affairs, and you shall not dabble in ours." Whenever we abandon that position we abandon the Monroe doctrine. This is not a Democratic idea, this is not a Republican idea, but I am presenting to you an American argument for the declaration of our purpose there, in consonance with our Monroe doctrine, in consonance with our Constitution, in consonance with our Declaration of Independence, and, as I verily believe, in consonance with the views of a vast majority of the American people.

Whether we ever adopt the rest of my resolution or not, whether a treaty neutralizing the islands and recognizing their independence can ever be negotiated or not, if we adopt this much of the resolution we shall at least proclaim an honorable position to the world, and we shall not mortgage the future with reference to the Philippines by doing it. I have only said that it is our preference to accomplish this purpose by setting up an independent government there. If that can not be done effectually and any door opens by which other righteous disposition may be made of the islands, it will be open to the American Congress to accept any such open door. For myself, I am frank to say that if the Japanese Government were to intimate even that they would like to have the Philippine Islands I would offer them to them as a Christmas present, provided they would enter into a treaty to protect certain rights of life and liberty and property there. I would be glad to turn the whole bunch of trouble over to them, who could handle them and work out their destiny better than we could under all the commissions that we should be able to organize. Now, then, so much for the declaration which is the basis of the method by which I propose to solve this question.

It will not do to adopt the scuttle policy; it will not do to turn the Philippine Islands loose, to sail away with our ships and soldiers and let chaos and anarchy reign there. Nobody with any sense could advocate that sort of procedure, but, why can not we do this; why can not we direct the President by this resolution to enter into negotiations with the governments of Europe to arrange a treaty by which these five things shall be fixed and agreed upon between this country and the signatory powers to the treaty.

First, that pending the accomplishment of this purpose and this preference of the United States expressed in the resolution, that the islands shall be neutralized; that when it has established its independence, it shall be recognized; that it shall agree to maintain toward the signatory powers when established, the open-door policy, and that it shall be neutral in the event of war involving any other signatory power, and that such concessions as may be made to the United States by the Philippine people in the establishment of this independent government shall be recognized and observed by the treaty.

Now, before I briefly discuss these five propositions, I wish to state the parliamentary history of this character of resolution in order that the House may see that I am offering nothing striking or novel in the history of our country. Even if this were a House resolution, as my original resolution introduced last winter was, I would be perfectly in accord with the early and continued precedents in this House.

On February 28, 1823, the House passed by a yea-and-nay vote of 131 yeas to 9 nays the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to enter upon and prosecute from time to time such negotiations with the Federal maritime powers of Europe and America as he may deem expedient for the effectual abolition of the African slave trade and its ultimate denunciation as piracy under the laws of nations by the consent of the civilized world.

This resolution was offered in the House by Mr. Mercer, of Virginia. An examination of the debate in the House not only shows no objection to the method by any Member of the House, but a general recognition of the duty of Congress to declare the will of the people for the guidance of the Executive is observed in all the discussions; Mr. Wright, of Maryland, voicing that idea in these words:

Sir, this Congress ought to take upon themselves the responsibility of this measure by their positive opinion and leave it no longer a subject of doubt what is the will of the American people.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to ask the gentleman when that resolution was offered.

Mr. BURGESS. 1823.

Mr. SULZER. Was it adopted?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes; by the overwhelming vote of 131 yeas to 9 nays. There were only 9 nays against it among the distinguished men that were Members of that House. Henry Clay was Speaker, and there were other big guns in the House. Webster and perhaps Calhoun—Webster certainly was there; I do not think he had then gone to the Senate.

On December 23, 1823, Mr. Livingston, of Louisiana, offered the House a resolution that—

the President of the United States be requested to negotiate with the Government of Great Britain for the cession of so much land on the island of Abaco as may be necessary for the erection of light-houses, etc.

This was adopted without debate or objection. Henry Clay was Speaker; Daniel Webster and many great names in our history were Members. On May 16, 1826, on motion of Mr. Livingston, a resolution was agreed to that—

the President of the United States be requested to inform this House whether any arrangement had been made with the Government of Great Britain in consequence of the resolution of this House of the 23d of December, 1823.

Verily, in those days the House asserted itself! In his message of December 3, 1833, President Jackson says:

I have the satisfaction to inform you that a negotiation which, by desire of the House of Representatives, was opened some years ago with the British Government for the erection of light-houses on the Bahamas has been successful.

On April 23, 1879, in this House, Mr. Fernando Wood offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President be respectfully requested to consider the expediency—

And from this I have borrowed the verbiage of my resolution—

of entering into a convention with the Government of France for the negotiation of a treaty which shall secure a more equal interchange of the products and manufactures of each country and serve to cement closer relations of amity, trade, and commerce.

Many distinguished men were Members of this House, including such as Thomas B. Reed, W. P. FRYE, NELSON ALDRICH, both now Senators, Warner Miller, Frank Hiscock, Ben Butterworth, William McKinley, and the present Speaker of this House. The record shows no discussion, and the resolution was adopted without any dissenting vote of record.

Now, such in brief is the parliamentary history of this sort of matters in the House. I shall quote, not at length, from Senate Document No. 104, which is a reprint of an article by the senior Senator from the State of Massachusetts, dealing with the treaty-making powers of the Senate, a document which I recommend to every Member of the House, regardless of his politics, as affording one of the most interesting, clear, and accurate discussions of the office of the Senate with reference to treaty making that I have been able to find anywhere.

He cites numerous instances similar to the resolution which I now offer. For instance, on March 3, 1835, the Senate passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be respectfully requested to consider the expediency of opening negotiations with the governments of other nations, and particularly of the governments of Central America and New Grenada, for the purpose of effectually protecting, by suitable treaty stipulations with them, such individuals or companies as may undertake to open a communication between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by the construction of a ship canal across the isthmus which connects North and South America, and of securing forever, by such stipulations, the free and equal right of navigating such canal to all such nations, on the payment of such reasonable tolls as may be established, to compensate the capitalists who may engage in such undertaking and complete the work.

On March 3, 1888, the Senate of the United States passed a resolution asking President Cleveland to open negotiations with China for the regulation of emigration from that country, and President Cleveland replied that such negotiations had been undertaken. So that so far as the parliamentary status of this resolution is concerned it is supported by the precedent both in the House and in the Senate without a break of nearly one hundred years. It is perfectly right and proper to instruct the President to open any negotiations which we conceive to be for the benefit of the American people.

Now, as to the treaty method proposed, it is my confident belief that such a treaty could be easily negotiated. Why? If we should resolve here that it is our ultimate purpose to get out of the Philippines and that it is our preference to get out by setting up an independent government there, protected by treaty with different powers, drawing about it the magic circle of peace in the interest of the people as well as the peace of the world, any one of the European powers would hesitate not to approve the treaty for fear if the treaty failed we might make other disposition of the islands, either to Japan or to Germany or to Russia or to England, and of course all the others would not like that and would not want that to be done.

So that an antagonism of interest between the powers would force an agreement to this method which would present a community of interests not only of Europe, not only of the United States, but of the civilized world. It would establish an open-door zone by treaty agreement between the powers of Europe and the United States. It would establish a peace zone where war could not enter. It would establish a peaceful opportunity without fear of outside molestation for independence to work itself out in the Philippine Islands. It would afford a fixed and definite relation upon which we could pitch all of our legislation so as to facilitate its accomplishment without involving any of our domestic institutions or theories. Nor do I take it that any European power would object either to neutralizing the islands or to preserving their independence when the government was set up by the United States. Nor would they object to its then agreeing to be neutral—to the open-door policy. Nor would they object, in my judgment, to such reasonable concessions being made to the people of the United States as the equities involved in our relation with them suggest. I think, for instance, that it would be entirely right and proper in the establishment of an independent government there for the Philippine people to make certain cessions to us as part of the enormous price in blood and treasure which we have expended to secure for them their independence.

I think no European government could or would object to such a provision as that. If they did, so far as I am concerned, rather than have the treaty fail and have the plan fail, I would freely give up any concession to us whatever and occupy precisely the same relation to them that any other government did which was a signatory power to the treaty. I am not willing for the United States to ever set up a protectorate over an independent government in the Philippine Islands. I shall never vote while I am a Member of Congress to expand the Monroe doctrine and then extend it across the Pacific and thrust it upon a European country. The doctrine of an American protectorate over any sort of a government in the Eastern Hemisphere is, to my mind, utterly unstatesmanlike, utterly unbusinesslike, contrary to all our traditions and principles, and fraught with infinite danger to the American people. I would rather hold the Philippines in tutelage for years and years and years, aye, for centuries, than to give them an independent government under an American protectorate. That is worse than a European alliance, because with an alliance there is reciprocity, but with a protectorate you are responsible for all they do, and they are responsible neither to you nor anybody else. But if we should have them hedged about by a treaty all these difficulties would disappear as if by magic.

Nor is this idea any novel invention. It is not a new thing in the procedure of the nations of the earth. The history of the little Republic of Switzerland, lying nestled in the lap of the European powers for seventy-five years, is a vindication of the value to the world and the peace of the people of such a treaty agreement as this. Switzerland is the most advanced republic on the face of the earth to-day, and it draws its life, imbibes its progress, has made its mighty evolution under an agreement of the powers to preserve and conserve its neutrality and its independence. We can do the same thing in the Philippines. All we have to do is to have the courage of freeborn American citizens and vote like we believe and it will be done.

Now, in conclusion I wish to read an editorial in the Washington Post, which I do think throws cold water on me in the cleverest, sweetest way I ever had that done to me in my life. On December 21, shortly after this resolution had been introduced, the Washington Post published an editorial which is as follows:

MR. BURGESS'S VISION.

Mr. BURGESS, of Texas, expresses a happy thought in House joint resolution No. 44, thus described in the official document: "Requesting the President to consider the expediency of effecting a treaty with European powers providing for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands and to protect an independent government there when established."

It begins and it will end in a thought, so far as concerns the existing dispensation, we feel very sure; but what a bright vista of encouragement it opens through the clouds that now obscure the prospect! We do not want the Philippines. We do not need them in our business. The possession is an incumbrance, a constant care, a bunghole of waste, a distributing center of embarrassment and peril. Leave out the officials who thrive upon the harvest of salary and power—and their name is that of the swarm of Kansas grasshoppers—what thoughtful American citizen wishes to keep the Philippines and to have his country entangled in its destinies?

Mr. BURGESS's proposition is ideal. To realize it would be to undo a world of follies and futilities, to unload an innumerable legion of grafts and barnacles, to remove the United States from a sphere of unprofitable danger and insane adventure. But it it is too beautiful to live. Mr. BURGESS is a fine fellow, but he is a poet and a dreamer.

My countrymen, my colleagues in this House, whether this matter is a dream or a vision or is made a real business-working reality, is not dependent upon me, but it is dependent upon the will of this House. Will the membership of this House have the courage to express their honest convictions about it? Will they for once forget the power that may operate from this or that source? Will they for once bend down to the earth, consecrated by the blood of the bravest and best, and catch an American inspiration and vote like American citizens for the preservation and perpetuity and safety, not only of the American Republic, not only of the Philippines people, but take a great step toward the open-door policy, toward arbitration, toward peace by treaty everywhere on earth? [Applause.] This resolution is practical. It is common sense. There is no party policy involved in it. There is no reason why it should not pass, and I do hope that the membership of this House will take hold of it in the spirit in which it is offered. Think of it, and if you believe it is wise and right, vote for it in obedience to the situation and the desire to benefit the American people and the Filipino people.

No war could threaten the peace of the Filipino while he was working out his destiny nor threaten the safety of the American Republic while they are aiding him to do it. No war with any European power could affect the status which we bear toward them under this resolution or which they bear to the world. If there ever can be an independent government set up there it can be quicker and better done under this sort of a treaty, and all of you know it, than it ever could be done otherwise. Now, I ask you one question. I leave it with your conscience and then I am through. Can you give me one single, good, honest reason why this resolution should not be adopted? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of saying anything upon this bill, because I was confident that my views upon it would be amply and ably expressed by others, until last evening, when my colleague from Massachusetts made some criticisms upon the attitude of the Massachusetts Republicans. I am aware that criticisms upon us have come not only from that side of the House, but also from the Republican side, and while we, of course, expect and, I hope, deserve criticism from the Democratic side, for if we did not I would be very sure we were derelict to our principles, yet I do not desire and I do not think we deserve criticism from this side. The position the Republicans of Massachusetts have taken on revision is very simple. It is the old Republican doctrine that no tariff is sacred, that time always makes changes, and we thought in the last eight years there have been such extraordinary inventions, so much improvement in methods of production and distribution, that it was theoretically fair to presume there must be need of change; and when that was brought home to us in particular instances we thought it was good Republican doctrine and good common sense that we should now have the tariff revised.

But my colleague yesterday intimated that we held a very difficult position here in trying, as he said, to steer between the Charybdis of home popularity and the Scylla of the Speaker's wishes. Now, for myself, with the utmost respect and consideration for the Speaker, I do not think I am excessively anxious to always be in accord with him, but I admit that I am always anxious, and particularly on a question like this, to be in accord with the majority of this side of the House. That I trust will always be my position; and I do not intend, as I never have, to be tempted by any Democratic alliance to go counter to the views of the majority of the Republican party, for I am very confident that any such alliance, founded as it must be upon entirely different motives and different principles, would in the end be unsatisfactory to both parties. Conse-

quently my personal intention is to abide by the decision of the majority of the Republicans of this House; but I do not wish that majority to misunderstand or misinterpret our position.

I think my colleagues from Massachusetts on the Democratic side have a much more difficult task than we to keep at once popularity with their constituents and popularity with their colleagues here. What is the Democratic argument at home? It is free raw materials. That for years has been the Democratic contention.

Is that the position of the Democratic party in this House? Is that the position of their dominant faction? Why, the Democrat who spoke last on this subject before my colleague made this remark:

> There is just about as much justice in that proposition as there is in the proposition to tax the people of Kentucky to maintain manufacturing institutions in the New England States.

That is the ordinary Democratic doctrine which we hear in this House. It is not free raw materials—that is not Democratic doctrine—but it is a reduction of the tariff. And yet my Democratic colleagues go home to Massachusetts and argue to their constituents there for free raw materials and allow it to be understood that the Democratic doctrine is to keep up the protection of our industries so that they may flourish as well as ever, but to give this additional boon of free raw materials which the Republicans are denying to them. Now, you see that is a difficult proposition for us to face, because every constituency, every State, is more or less selfish—all are looking for their own advantage. And Massachusetts just at this time is perhaps in a peculiarly delicate condition, because the great industries that have been built up there we see gradually deserting us; we see that the West and the South are becoming rivals, and year by year we see industry after industry going away, and we have got to do something to fill their places.

Massachusetts, you know, was not originally friendly to protection. Massachusetts, when protection was first suggested, fought it vigorously, because, moved by the same selfish interest which, as I say, influences all communities, they felt that their source of wealth was the sea. They felt that with our location and our harbors the sea was our natural source of wealth. We had our shipyards and we were beginning to build the clipper ships, distancing the world, and whitening all the seas with the American commerce, and we felt that freer trade meant more trade, and a protective tariff would tend to stifle trade and so tend to injure us; and therefore Massachusetts originally opposed protection. But when it was forced upon her, with Yankee ingenuity she built up her manufacturing industries and her ocean trade languished, until now it is her great manufacturing industries that make the wealth of the people. Therefore she is to-day for protection, and therefore to-day you will not be surprised that when she sees rivals growing up all over the United States, when she sees that the natural law which brings the manufacturer as near as possible to the raw material is drawing away from her the great wealth that she has acquired, and that the capital which has been a great advantage is now being accumulated in the West and South, she must strain every nerve to do what she can to maintain her industries.

Therefore, when Democratic orators go to her and say, "We will give you free raw materials, and then you can compete with the other Western and Southern States, which have the raw materials close by them," is it any wonder that such ingenious and disingenuous arguments lead many thoughtless Republicans to disregard the fact that these claims will never be substantiated by any Democratic legislation in this House and to crave and work for this alluring Democratic doctrine? Do you not see that this theory of free raw materials, so attractive to any manufacturing State, naturally will have the effect of undermining Republican principles and reducing our majority?

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if, given an opportunity himself, he would support and vote for a proposition for free hides?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. And for free coal?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. And free lumber?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. That I am doubtful about.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. And free wood pulp?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. That I am doubtful about.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. And for a substantial reduction on the products of steel?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. That does not affect Massachusetts.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. So far as the gentleman's answers go, then, he stands on the same platform that the Democrats of Massachusetts stood on in the last election.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. But, Mr. Chairman, my reasons are very different. Why do we favor free hides and free coal? Because we say that free hides and free coal are both of them in strict accord with the principles of protection on which we stand. They are not like free wool, for instance, which I suppose the gentleman will advocate. They are not brought in competition here with any other American industry. I claim that one American industry is just as much entitled to protection as any other, and I contend that if they want it they shall all have it. But talking about free hides, I do not believe that the protective duty on hides gives any protection to the American farmer. It is a mere by-product. If it could be proved that a duty on hides was a protective duty for the benefit of the farmer, I would not argue to strike it out. I am not asking for ourselves anything that I would deny to any other portion of the country. The duty on hides is not protective, and the repeal of that duty would assist our industries; and if so, then I will do the utmost in my power to favor a repeal of that duty on hides, because it is not in violation of the protective principle.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like the gentleman to answer why the duty upon hides is not a protective duty, why a duty upon coal is not a protective duty equally with the products of steel, for example.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not think the duty on hides has had the slightest effect upon the price of the article to the farmer. It does not protect him at all, and therefore it is not a protective tariff and is not needed. Now, as to coal, we would export as much as we would import. It would be a matter that might affect different localities, but it would be a mere matter of exchange.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. The farmer who sells the beef from which the hide is taken certainly has some voice in fixing the price of the article which he sells. Now, will the gentleman tell the House what agency exists which defeats the intention of the duty upon hides, namely, the intention to make it a protective duty in fact?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. As I have already said, it is because the hide is a by-product, and the tariff on hides, in my opinion, makes no difference to the producer.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I want the gentleman to explain why it does not.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Because it is a by-product.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Is not the hide of the beef sold with the rest of the beef?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Why, yes; but it is so small compared with the rest of the whole product that it does not enter into the price in such a way as to make a difference in it.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think the farmer pays no attention to the value of the hide when he sells the whole beef? Is not that a part of the transaction?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not suppose he thinks of the value of the hide when he sells it, although I will say this, Mr. Chairman, that I have no doubt that the farmers of the country generally do believe that the tariff on hides increases the value of their sale and I have no doubt that is one reason why so many Members of this House favor the retention of the duty.

Mr. LACEY. I would ask my friend from Massachusetts whether he regards the porterhouse steak as a by-product of the beef also?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Oh, no; of course not.

Mr. LACEY. It is much less than the hide.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not see the parallelism.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to ask my friend another question——

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not know whether my friend is intending to be humorous or not.

Mr. LACEY. No; I am serious about it, representing, as I do, a locality that is interested in producing beef, and where the hide is a finished product. Now, as to the actual addition to the cost of a pair of shoes. The gentleman comes from a shoemaking district. I will ask him, how much does the tariff figure on a pair of ordinary farm shoes?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I suppose it makes a difference of from 2 to 5 cents in the cost.

Mr. LACEY. In the actual cost to the manufacturer does it exceed more than 3 or 4 cents?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. No, I think not. I think myself that the value of free hides is very much exaggerated in

the opinion of the people of Massachusetts. I do not think it would be of any such large importance to them as they think it would; but they have been brought to believe that it would very largely increase the prosperity of the shoe and leather industry.

Mr. STERLING. I would like to ask the gentleman, if the tariff on hides does not affect the price, what difference does it make to the shoe manufacturers whether it is taken off or not?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Well, it might make a difference in the price of hides that come in. As I said, I think it would be very much less than is supposed.

Mr. STERLING. It would reduce the market price that much to the western farmers, then, would it not?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. It might reduce it some fraction of that, but I do not think it affects the farmer.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is not aware that his colleague on his side of the House [Mr. LAWRENCE], in his speech the other day, quoted with approval the statement of a Democratic governor of Massachusetts that the duty upon hides increased the cost of shoes about 6 cents per pair?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. No; I did not see that.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman, further, if he is willing to answer (and if not I will suspend at any moment), whether it has not been the intervention of the beef trust between the farmer and the consumer, and the intervention of the coal trust between the coal miner and the ultimate purchaser, that have increased the prices of those articles to the consuming public?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I have no doubt they have largely done so; yes.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that the beef trust has been organized since the Dingley bill was passed in 1897?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. No; I think that was organized before that.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts is mistaken about the beef trust; I think it is since 1897.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not know whether the present organization existed before that or not, but there was practically a combination which was effective. It is being perfected from year to year.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. At all events, the fact that there was a tariff on coal and beef which competed with the products of these trusts was the factor which enabled these trusts to keep up the prices of the articles they sold in the United States?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Now, the gentleman is going into the old trust question.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Did I not understand the gentleman some time ago to say that the 15 per cent duty on hides operated to increase the price of hides imported into the United States?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Very possibly.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Would not the same be true of coal?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Then the fact is that the duties upon hides and coal have operated to increase the price of coal and hides to the consumer in the United States?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. It has increased the price—yes, it has increased it to the consumer.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. POWERS. There was one year in which the duty was taken off from coal?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. Can the gentleman tell us how much coal was brought into the country while that duty was off?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I can not; as I remember, it made no difference.

Mr. POWERS. Was it not a mere bagatelle?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I think there was very little.

Mr. POWERS. Now, let me ask the gentleman this question——

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. That duty was taken off from coal at the request of Massachusetts.

Mr. POWERS. Yes. Now, let me ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, does the gentleman propose to introduce a bill taking the duty off from hides alone?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. No; I have introduced no bill.

Mr. POWERS. Does the gentleman think it would be wise——

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I think various bills have been introduced.

Mr. POWERS. There has been no bill reported from the committee, but does the gentleman think it would be wise to pass such a bill?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I personally would be glad to see it done.

Mr. POWERS. Does the gentleman not think that any revision of the tariff on hides would open up a general revision if such a bill was brought in here, and does not the gentleman think that any revision of the tariff would leave Massachusetts in a position worse than she is to-day?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I will confess, Mr. Chairman, that I have great fear that it would, and still I would be willing to take that risk. [Laughter.]

Mr. POWERS. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me, I believe it is not on the products of the farmer, but upon other manufactured articles that changes in the tariff should be made—that we should change the duty. I think that the hide is a part of the product of the farm, and that the duty upon it has raised the value considerably to the farmer, and that he should have it. Why should he not have it?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. That is where I differ with the gentleman from Maine. I do not believe the farmer gets any more for his hides than if there was no duty on them.

Mr. POWERS. The only reason I ever heard given for taking the duty off of hides is that hides are largely used in Massachusetts for the manufacture of boots and shoes and is a product that Massachusetts does not produce, and therefore the duty should be taken off. Is that the position of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Maine knows that it is not. I have stated my position. I think it raises the price to the consumer, but it does not raise the price for the original producer—the farmer.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. I simply want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Chairman, that I happen to be a farmer, and I allow some cattle to grow up on the farm. I sell half a dozen steers a year. My accounts show that I used to be allowed from $1.90 to $2.20 for a hide. I noticed the other day that I had not been allowed less than $3.50 for a hide for the last three or four years. If it is not the duty that has raised the price, what is it?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Is that any more of a rise than other parts of the cattle have risen in the same time?

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Very much greater.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have believed and I do believe that while the price is raised to the consumer it is not the farmer who gets the benefit of it; it is the middleman.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Well, I have got that dollar and a half on each hide, and I want to know who pays for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. If that comes from the duty of 15 per cent, then the gentleman certainly does get it, and if I am convinced of that fact I will not object, nor shall I raise my voice for free hides, for I recognize that the farmer, if he gets the benefit of it, is just as much entitled to it as we are to our manufactured articles; but I have believed that the farmer did not get the benefit of it; that it was all absorbed by the middleman, the trust; that we, as consumers, have to pay more, and that it was not of the slightest advantage to the people for whom the tariff was put on. I may of course be mistaken about that. I do not pretend to any original knowledge or experience.

Mr. HINSHAW. How much does the gentleman estimate there would be an advantage in the price of a pair of shoes from a factory in Massachusetts by having hides put on the free list?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Personally I doubt if there would be any difference to the consumer.

Mr. HINSHAW. Who would get the benefit of the reduction in the duty on hides?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. The manufacturer.

Mr. HINSHAW. Upon whom, therefore, would the loss fall? Would it not fall on the farmer?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. It would be on whoever gets it. If the farmer gets it, which, as I say, I do not believe—that, of course, is the foundation of my argument, that I do not

believe the farmer is getting the advance of the duty on hides, but I say frankly if he is I think it ought not to be taken off.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if the Republican tariff reformers in Massachusetts, in order to secure free hides, are willing to take the tariff off boots, shoes, harness, and the other product of leather either wholly or in proportion?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. As to that I understand there is a difference of opinion. I understand that about 50 per cent of the manufacturers of boots and shoes think that they could get on without the present tariff if they had free hides. I understand that the other 50 per cent think they could not go on without the tariff; that if they did other competition, largely Canadian, would beat them.

Mr. McNARY. Does the gentleman seriously contend here before this House that 50 per cent of the Massachusetts manufacturers of boots and shoes feel that they need the tariff on that article to protect them from Canada?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. That is what I understand.

Mr. McNARY. So far as I have been able to ascertain the opinion of any manufacturer in Massachusetts, and acting upon that opinion, every one of them that I have known is perfectly willing to take the duty off boots and shoes if the duty is taken off hides, and are perfectly willing to meet competition from Canada or any other nation, and believe that if the duty is taken off hides not only would they be able to meet Canadian competition, but to flood the markets with their products, if we have raw materials. I think the gentleman is entirely wrong in respect to his opinion of the manufacturers of Massachusetts.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McNARY] mean the duty on hides or leather?

Mr. McNARY. I mean hides and leather.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I did not yield to allow the gentleman to make a long statement.

Mr. McNARY. I am not going to make any statement, but acting upon the idea which is contrary to the idea of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], I have introduced a bill here to take the duty off not only hides, but off boots and shoes, harness and leather of all descriptions, and in that I am backed up by the sentiment of many of the manufacturers of Massachusetts. And I would like to ask the gentleman right now, if he represents the views of the manufacturers of Massachusetts and the people interested in that industry, whether or not he will vote with me for a bill to take off the duty not only on hides, but on boots and shoes and every other article of leather manufactured in our State?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be a representative of the manufacturers of Massachusetts, as the gentleman does. I am representing nobody but my own opinion, and I will say I will not vote for the bill which the gentleman has introduced.

Mr. McNARY. Allow me to ask whether or not the gentleman believes his colleagues on that side of the House will vote any bill taking duties off any article, either hides, leather, or boots or shoes.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I did not catch the first part of the gentleman's question.

Mr. McNARY. Allow me to ask you whether or not you believe the gentlemen on that side of the House will report any bill to this House taking the duties off hides, boots or shoes, or any other article of leather if we concede we are willing to take the duties off everything?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am not a prophet, and I can not speak of what this side will do. What they will do on that side of the House if they have to construct a tariff bill——

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The gentleman from Massachusetts is a free trader?

Mr. McNARY. Who said so?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I heard you make free-trade speeches.

Mr. McNARY. Where did you hear me?

Mr. MANN. Are you?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think I had better resume the floor.

Mr. McNARY. When I have the floor I will state my position, to my own satisfaction if not to yours.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, let me restate what I say. I am not sure about this duty on hides, whether it really goes to the farmer or not. I do not believe it does, from what I am told; and if it does not, and this is the foundation of my argument—if it goes to the middleman—I think it ought to come off.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman tell the House that the farmer is entitled to protection and that the middleman is not?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. The middleman at the present time is the beef trust, and I do not care to add protection to them.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then the gentleman makes a distinction as to what men are entitled to protection according to the business they are engaged in?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. When there is a large trust like that I do.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is the gentleman willing to vote with the Democrats to take off duties where the benefit goes only to the trusts in other matters?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. It is dependent upon the trust, of course. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SHERLEY. I will let it go at that.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if there is a trust which monopolizes the business of the country, I believe they are not entitled to our consideration; but if it is a trust, as there are so many of them, which has competition right here at home, then I think, of course, it is like anyone else. It is dependent upon whether they have a monopoly or not.

Mr. SHERLEY. What does the gentleman say to the steel trust?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I am not going into the details of the different trusts.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the gentleman knows there has been a report made to this House by his own colleague showing the steel trust is selling its products at greatly reduced prices abroad, and that one of the reasons of our stagnation in shipbuilding is because of the exorbitant prices they are asking now. Will the gentleman join with us to hit the steel trust?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to—and the gentleman can very well see the reason—state just where that tariff revision ought to come and where not, because if I say what exact article or businesses I think can stand reduction, of course it follows that anybody who favors them is not going to join with me. So I advocate simply a general revision, and I am willing to go into the Republican caucus and abide by its result, and I am not willing to enter into any alliance with the Democratic party on any of these propositions, for I know very well what that means. We have all the experience of what Democratic legislation means on this subject. In fact, that is the one sure source of hope in the future of the Republican party in Massachusetts. Against these ingenious assaults we know there is one remedy which we can always depend upon to bring people back to their senses, and that is Democratic success. [Applause on the Republican side.] We know very well if once the Democratic party has power the Democrats and Republicans of Massachusetts alike will see how impotent in the Democratic House their Democratic Representatives are. They will see how little their interests are considered there, and that is sure to bring a general revulsion to the Republican party.

We all remember the experience of twelve years ago. The Democratic party in Massachusetts, on exactly this same issue, free raw materials, when I first ran for Congress was in control of the State. They had elected the governor for three years, one year a Presidential year, and they had seven out of twelve Representatives in this House. What has changed it? Why is it that since then the Democrats have never been able to elect more than four out of thirteen Congressmen? Because there was elected a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President, and a Democratic tariff bill was enacted, and from that time there was no doubt of the action of Massachusetts until their memories began to forsake them. Now, I do not believe their memories will forsake them long. I think they will remember what happened then, and although they may be discontented, as they are discontented to-day under the pressure of competition, and although they may ascribe their fears to our legislation, yet when the critical time comes and they remember what the alternative is, I do not think they will permanently leave us.

I remember that when King Charles the Second was on the throne, his brother James, who was his heir and the most unpopular man in the country, one day said to him: "Charles, you ought not to expose yourself so freely to the public; you will be assassinated;" that the witty monarch turned to him and said, "Jamie, they will never kill me to make you king." [Laughter.] So I think the Republicans of Massachusetts, discontented as they may be with us, when they recollect what the alternative is will not destroy us to put you permanently into power. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him two questions?

Mr GILLETT of Massachusetts. One at a time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. All right. Now, if taking the duty off of hides is not going to reduce the price of shoes and boots, and so forth, made of leather, to the consumer, as you stated some minutes ago, it was not——

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Now, let me say right there I do not pretend to be an authority on that. Some say it will and some say it will not. Personally I do not believe it will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it is not going to reduce the price of boots and shoes and harness and other articles made of leather, then what inducement to anybody in this House, except the man in Massachusetts, to vote for free hides? [Democratic applause.]

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. They think in Massachusetts, of course, that it will. A great many people claim that it will, and Massachusetts is not the only home of such manufactures.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask another question. I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he indorses this statement from Governor Guild. This is in his letter to President Roosevelt:

> The Republican ticket, in my judgment, would have been overwhelmingly defeated if our platform, on which both Mr. Draper and I stood, had not contained the plank indorsing the position taken last spring by our delegation in Congress in favor of immediate tariff revision.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I was not at home in the last campaign. I was, with many others, trying to get information as to how to vote on this bill in the Philippines, and therefore I took no part in the campaign, and I can not tell whether that was a fact or not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will not ask the gentleman where he was last summer or when King Charles the Second was on the throne, but I will ask him whether at this minute he indorses that statement made by Governor Guild in his letter to President Roosevelt?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. No; I do not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then the house is divided against itself in Republican Massachusetts?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Yes; there is a great difference of opinion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to his colleague?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. McNARY. I would like to ask the gentleman two questions. I would like to ask him, first, whether it is not true that the Republican Members of Congress from Massachusetts voted with their Republican colleagues to put the duty on hides?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. We voted for the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Now, I would like to ask——

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. We did all we could before it came to a vote, but when it came to a vote we voted—I did, at least, and I think all my colleagues did—in favor of the tariff bill which included the duty on hides. We bowed, as I always intend to do, to the rule of the majority of the Republican party, and therefore I voted for a great many things, I have no doubt, in that tariff which I did not approve; and I have no doubt that every Democrat here who was present when the Wilson bill was passed did the same.

Mr. McNARY. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question. I would like to ask him if, when the question of tariff reduction comes before a Republican caucus or comes as a result of a Republican caucus into this House, whether or not he or his colleagues from Massachusetts, if the Republican caucus decides that duty must be taken off of hides, will vote with them to keep it on?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I will tell you squarely that if that comes in as a Republican caucus measure I shall vote for whatever the Republican caucus decides. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] I speak for myself and not for my colleagues. I do not know what they would do. We all understand that there is no tariff bill that suits every Member. Every tariff bill is a compromise, where there are a great many items we do not like, yet we vote for it. Whatever the Republican party decides I shall stand by.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will permit me, this tariff on hides that is now the subject of discussion was put there in the Dingley bill, as I understand.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Can you state the magnitude of the production of boots and shoes of the United States for the year of the Dingley bill, and a comparison with each year since?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; I do not carry these figures in my head.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will ask you if the foreign trade in American manufactured boots and shoes has not increased every year, and was it not this last year more than double what it was in the year prior to the Dingley bill?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. It has certainly increased prodigiously, but I do not know just the proportion.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But of course all gentlemen know that when you bring about the production of vast quantities of manufactured goods the manufacturers would not do it unless they were making money.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. They are making money on them, but of course the gentleman sees this—every business man wants to do everything he can to increase his business. It is the same everywhere. If there is brought to them a proposition which they think does increase their business, why of course they are going to welcome it no matter whether their business flourished before or decayed.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman another question following out the question of the gentleman from Ohio. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts believe that the tax upon hides helped to increase the export of boots and shoes from the United States to Europe?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Of course I do not.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does not the gentleman believe that it was the prosperity existing and growing out of the repeal of the Wilson bill and the passage of the Dingley bill that did it? [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not pretend that I am at all an expert in this matter of hides, boots, and shoes. I am sorry that some Member who has studied it more than I is not representing that industry, so that he can bring the exact figures forward. I simply referred to hides as one of the arguments that have been brought forward in Massachusetts by the Democrats as a free raw material. The whole free-raw-material doctrine, of which this is only an incident, is being advocated by Democrats in one part of the country and not in other parts. You all know that if the Democratic party came into power that doctrine would receive no countenance from them and that the duties they would be most eager and determined to reduce would be not on the raw material, but on the manufactured product; and yet in our State they still succeed in holding it out as Democratic doctrine and offer it as an alluring and often a successful bribe.

There is one other question much discussed in Massachusetts—Canadian reciprocity. On that issue I go further than many of the Democrats. I would myself be glad to see absolute free trade between the United States and Canada. [Applause.] I believe that in the first place the United States would be most benefited by it. I believe that our industries are so organized and capitalized and perfected that they could invade Canada, and that despite the cheaper labor there now we would gain very much more than she. It would, of course, temporarily disarrange business and cause some suffering, but I believe we would ultimately profit largely from it. I do not think she could successfully compete with our capital and organization and industrial energy. I believe also it would help us in our relations with Canada. I never favored the annexation of our tropical possessions. I always opposed it, thinking it would be expensive and troublesome for us, and my opinions have never changed, and I know of no land south of us which I should like to be ours; but I would like to see Canada part of the United States. It is the only portion of the world I covet.

But I fear it is now too late, that the spirit of nationality has developed there, and that it is no longer possible for us ever to unite with that splendid domain, whose people are so akin to us. But I think we should do all we can to cultivate intimate relations with her, and become as close to her as possible. I think that free trade with Canada would tend to that result, and for that reason, too, I favor it. To my mind the greatest crime that the Democratic party ever committed was when they went through a Presidential campaign with the bold and taking cry, "Fifty-four forty or fight," and then after they had won the campaign had neither the courage to fight nor the foresight to keep "fifty-four forty." We never can repeat that mistake. That was the one chance when we might have owned that whole Pacific coast and acquired all that splendid northwest section of Canada.

But the time may possibly come again, if we cultivate warm relations with Canada, when we may have the opportunity to be united, and that, it seems to me, is an ambition that we might well keep before our eyes. For these two reasons, because I think in the long run it would advantage us in the matter of trade, and because also I think it would increase our

friendly relations and might sometime bring us to a closer union—for these two reasons I ardently favor Canadian reciprocity, although I admit that at present there is but the faintest possibility that Canada would enter into any substantial reciprocal treaty.

There was one other sentence which my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] used in his speech yesterday to which I wish to refer. He said that the great export trade which we have built up under the Dingley tariff was not the best gauge of the prosperity of the country. I think he depreciated the value of that great excess of exports over imports. I think he did not appreciate that those hundreds of millions of dollars that every year we have been sending over there beyond what we took back were paying back the vast amounts of capital which have come to the United States from foreign countries, which had helped to start us in our development, which built our railroads, which founded our great institutions, which accelerated our prosperity.

I think those hundreds of millions of dollars that we have annually sent over there have made America owned by Americans. We have been paying off our debts, and that is significant and valuable. But I agree with my colleague [Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts] when he says it is not the greatest test of our prosperity, and I agree with this sentence, expressed with his usual felicity:

> No, it is not the excess of our exports that gauges our national prosperity, but the great volume of commercial transactions that are absolutely unrestricted by tariff in the forty-five States and four Territories of this Union.

I applauded that sentence. I agree with the statement contained in it, that the great thermometer of our prosperity is our magnificient internal commerce. And it is that great internal commerce that the Republican party proposes to keep for Americans. It is protection that keeps it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We will build a wall around it and keep that prosperity for ourselves, and it seems to me that when he said that he at once admitted the value of a Republican tariff. He admitted that that is the best prosperity we can have, and is it not worth while to put a wall around it and make it dead sure that we shall have it? I think the wall is in places unnecessarily high, and I think where it is we had better lower it, but I do not believe it is wise to topple the wall over because here and there it is too high. Let us correct irregularities, never forgetting our main purpose.

Mr. CASSEL rose and was recognized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASSEL]. I have no objection to this debate going on to a reasonable length, but I think we ought to get back to the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is entitled to the floor, if he insists upon it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Only a question. Free trade between Canada and the United States would result, would it not, in the importation of many food products from Canada into the United States?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Undoubtedly it would at first.

Mr. HINSHAW. And would they not come in competition with the food products from the Mississippi and Missouri valleys, by reason of the fact that the distance is so much less between Canada and Massachusetts than between Nebraska, for instance, and Massachusetts?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not think it is. I do not think the food products are principally grown in the eastern part of Canada.

Mr. HINSHAW. I so understand. Now, let me ask the gentleman from Massachusetts wherein Massachusetts is benefited by free trade with Canada?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I am not advocating it for that reason, but on national grounds. But I presume the argument which especially appeals to Massachusetts is that, feeling her trade going away from her and seeing this big market of Canada right there at her doors, she hopes that by freer trade she might get a larger and advantageous trade. I think that is the prevalent reason.

Mr. CASSEL. Mr. Chairman, I shall discuss for a short time this afternoon what I think will be the effect of the pending Philippine tariff bill upon the interests of the tobacco growers and manufacturers throughout the United States, but more especially its effect upon such interests in my own district, which lies wholly within the great tobacco-producing county of Lancaster, in the State of Pennsylvania.

During the discussion of this question two statements have been made by the friends of the bill that should be contradicted with the utmost emphasis. On the one hand, it has been argued that the United States should open its markets to Philippine tobacco and its products for the reason that the transfer of sovereignty has resulted in the loss of the Spanish markets. The other statement, which was repeated by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] in the course of his remarks in the House on the 6th instant, was to the effect that in the last few years there had been a heavy falling off in the exports of cigars. His table of exports is as follows:

Exports of tobacco from the Philippine Islands to the countries mentioned during the fiscal years 1899–1904.

LEAF TOBACCO EXPORTED.

	1899.[a]		1900.		1901.		1902.		1903.		1904.		1905.	
	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.
Exported to—														
United States			110	$7					244,377	$42,293	211	$35		
Hongkong			1,774	402	15,075	$2,060	16,236	$2,185	6,358	1,421	8,510	1,078	103,461	$11,328
United Kingdom	954,058	$46,463	1,271,115	72,581	2,254	569	204,170	7,337	309,731	15,024	10,349	1,981	21,950	6,985
Germany	258,000	25,809			36,134	4,823	11,909	2,067	18,009	2,240	59,952	4,586	5,731	895
France			408,051	14,044	1,394	169	2,299	384	33,816	1,106	755,277	31,472	378,157	16,810
Spain	6,315,232	343,886	9,102,729	487,492	14,372,911	726,418	16,665,735	600,714	14,624,495	531,669	13,073,021	646,405	13,455,065	830,533
Austria-Hungary			1,948,986	157,021	3,378,178	197,641	3,285,677	83,108	3,284,877	153,107	3,425,488	225,145	473,356	29,715
China	1,846,631	130,138	136,882	14,055	8,863	1,128	6,553	1,786	3,209	374	1,038	125	14,642	1,382
Japan			1,030	102	75	15	12,999	1,461	6,116	1,346	4,607	683	30,799	3,601
Egypt			777,571	21,894					3,384	155			329,740	18,708
East Indies	65,717	6,552	288,735	46,793	83,354	16,192	291,476	29,410	408,617	37,916	317,339	31,190	305,258	27,578
Australasia	2,510,476	252,080	1,009	145	10,992	3,275	2,816	910	16,459	2,793	21,014	1,230	17,773	2,116
Other countries			72,364	3,304	19,870	1,230	544,735	55,181	1,670,720	113,426	1,367,484	78,019	1,140,334	55,753
Total	11,950,112	804,919	14,010,356	817,840	17,929,100	953,520	21,044,615	784,523	20,630,168	902,870	19,044,290	1,021,949	16,276,266	1,005,404

VALUE OF CIGARS EXPORTED.

	1899.[a]	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Exported to—							
United States	$7,002	$1,885	$5,027	$8,539	$3,866	$1,795	$6,790
Hongkong		206,283	337,111	350,140	355,628	376,154	393,534
United Kingdom	558,441	233,082	201,591	624,445	128,211	85,113	94,185
Germany	583	30,226	43,421	27,485	28,994	15,697	5,446
France	14,584	31,699	35,303	31,190	29,293	25,374	19,028
Spain	14,428	47,578	13,901	2,049	1,563	2,664	11,700
Austria-Hungary		7,068	12,115	4,899	5,776	3,947	5,417
China	475,922	222,299	63,978	93,554	58,561	98,759	113,921
Japan	61,729	11,546	10,260	24,008	5,869	17,569	7,497
Egypt	11,092	2,411	1,813	887	2,443	2,038	928
East Indies	59,548	223,771	139,141	195,048	184,995	198,972	172,576
Australasia	89,924	131,809	341,899	227,268	88,360	90,328	93,327
Other countries	1,448	38,504	44,615	77,210	53,945	50,519	46,828
Total	1,294,701	1,188,161	1,250,175	1,666,722	947,504	968,869	971,177

Exports of tobacco from the Philippine Islands to the countries mentioned during the fiscal years 1899–1904.

VALUE OF CIGARETTES EXPORTED.

	1899.[a]	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Exported to—							
United States				$76	$3	$27	$30
Hongkong		$145	$4,416	5,341	9,931	8,041	11,289
United Kingdom		150	15	308	41	171	219
Germany			5,335	214	109	119	
France		375		120		143	851
Spain		837		250	460	301	249
China	$525	178	860	576	1,236	1,750	1,699
Japan		63	197	150	627	169	32
East Indies			269	2,590	1,361	1,528	1,017
Australasia		150		136	215	95	302
Other countries				334	6,776	242	716
Total	525	1,898	11,092	9,995	20,699	12,586	16,404

VALUE OF ALL OTHER MANUFACTURED TOBACCO EXPORTED.

	1899.[a]	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Exported to—							
United States							
Hongkong		$37,508	$1,832	$230	$181	$133	$405
United Kingdom	$10,864	12,753	407	706	5,033	490	32
France		57	200	246	600	1,670	500
Spain	12,191	21,205		36,944	1,562	1,247	2,582
Austria-Hungary		2,900			25		
China	79,047	77,003	12	118	44	301	223
Japan	30	375		11	5	42	
Egypt				2		3	3
East Indies	7,604	13,180	490	667	6	89	20
Australasia	2,593	9,142		3			
Other countries	288			1,200	3,489	5,908	2,323
Total	112,617	174,123	2,941	40,127	10,945	9,883	6,088

[a] From August 20, 1898, to June 30, 1899, inclusive.

STEMS AND TRIMMINGS.[a]

	1905.	
	Pounds.	Value.
Belgium	1,230	$65
Hongkong	620	55
Total	1,850	120

[a] Not included in the above figures.

With regard to the Spanish market, it is only necessary to refer to the latest available figures to be found in the Monthly Summary of the Commerce of the Philippine Islands for the fiscal year 1905, issued by the Bureau of Insular Affairs, to show that Spain is not only by far the largest customer the Philippine Islands have for their leaf, but that her takings of this leaf have increased during the past two years. In 1904, for example, the total exports of leaf tobacco from the Philippines aggregated 19,044,290 pounds, of which Spain took 13,073,021 pounds. In 1905, when the total exports were 16,276,266 pounds, Spain imported 13,455,065. It thus appears that not only was the Spanish import of Philippine tobacco actually larger in the fiscal year 1905 than in 1904, but it was proportionately very much greater. It is an interesting fact in this connection that the total value of the Spanish imports of Philippine leaf in 1905 increased fully 30 per cent.

The gentleman from Connecticut, in his effort to show a depressed condition in the cigar industry of the islands, referred to the exports of 1902 as though they were of normal proportions, and sought to convey the impression that there has since been a steady downward tendency. As a matter of fact, the exports of 1902, which aggregated $1,666,722, were larger than for many years previously and were in all respects abnormal. In 1903 the shipments again resumed normal proportions, aggregating $947,504. Since that year there has been a steady increase, the exports in 1904 aggregating $968,869, and in 1905, $971,177.

It is significant in this connection to quote the figures compiled by the Bureau of Insular Affairs showing the five-year annual average for the quinquennial periods ending with 1894—before American occupation—and 1904, after the islands passed into the possession of the United States. The average annual value of the exports of cigars, cigarettes, and all other manufactured tobacco for the five-year period ending 1894 was but $972,805, while for the corresponding period ending with 1904 the average annual value was $1,228,019, an increase of nearly one-third. These figures will be found on page 623 of the Monthly Summary of Commerce of the Philippine Islands for December, 1904.

In this connection, it should be stated that there has been much juggling of the tobacco-export figures with respect to the distribution of leaf and cigars in the Orient. The fact should be borne in mind that up to 1900 all exports intended for Hongkong were credited to the British East Indies, while from 1888 to 1894 they were credited to China. It is not practicable to state the countries constituting the ultimate destinations of these shipments for the reason that Hongkong is a distributing point from which merchandise of all kinds is sent to nearly all the countries of the world.

The Philippine Islands contain 73,345,415 acres, of which, we are told, 68,405,415 acres and over are public lands. One-half of the latter, or about 33,000,000 acres, according to Governor Taft, may be converted by irrigation into good agricultural lands. Governor Taft, before a committee of Congress, said that we (meaning the Philippine Archipelago) have resources for a large population, and compared with Japan and Java, the Philippines are a little less in area than Japan, but they have much more arable land and much more rich soil.

The Philippine Islands are an acquisition of the United States. I must differ with the gentlemen who have discussed this question when they say that they are a Territory of the United States. They are not a Territory in the sense that we refer to Arizona or any of our other Territories. The people of the Philippine Islands are wards of the United States. We have taken them and we hold them as wards until we are able to give them their independence. Now, we will all agree that it is not the duty of the guardian to take money from his own pocket and place it in the hands of the ward, but it is his duty to utilize the property of the ward and to see that it is properly administered.

In discussing this question the honored chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, when we talked to him about the tobacco question, with a wave of his hand dismissed the whole subject and said, "There is nothing in it." I am sorry indeed to differ with him and with the report of the Republican majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, but representing as I do a district which is engaged in raising tobacco upon 5,000 farms, utilizing about 20,000 acres of land, employing about

10,000 people in planting, caring for, harvesting, and marketing the crop—a district producing annually between twenty-four and twenty-five million pounds of tobacco, which sells at a price which nets the farmer between $2,750,000 and $3,000,000; a district having invested in tobacco buildings over $15,000,000; a district which in 1904 produced 64,000,000 cigars, which yielded to the Government a revenue of two and a half million dollars, and which has 2,461 cigar factories, employing over 20,000 people—I should be recreant to my duty and misrepresent my constituents if I did not vote against this bill.

I have here in my hand the protest of these tobacco growers, which I will read:

The undersigned tobacco growers of Lancaster County, impressed with the danger that threatens the tobacco industry of the country from the introduction of Philippine cigars and tobacco at reduced tariff rates, as has been proposed, do most earnestly protest against such action by the Congress of the United States. Owing to our dearer lands and the higher cost of producing our domestic tobacco we are positive that such action would prove ruinous to our home industry, and we therefore appeal to the Ways and Means Committee and to the Members of Congress to prevent, by their action and votes, the possibility of such a result.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say here that I have petitions signed by over 6,000 tobacco growers in my district, all of which were secured in less than ten days. I also have before the Committee on Ways and Means and in my office at the present time the protest of all the cigar makers, and those employed in the cigar factories, in my district, numbering between 10,000 and 15,000 people. Thus, still more do I feel that I would fail in my responsibility to my constituents were I not to oppose this measure in every way possible.

Mr. Chairman, the people of my district have always looked upon the member of the Ways and Means Committee from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] as a man whose opinion they have taken in important matters, and one whom they would follow. I want to repeat to you again an extract from a speech of this gentleman, made in 1900, which was quoted here this morning:

The question of free trade or protection with respect to this little island (Porto Rico) is one of absolutely no importance; but when you come to say that under the limitations of the Constitution you must give free trade to the Philippines, you must incorporate into the body politic 12,000,000 Malays as citizens of the United States, and must extend to that archipelago our navigation laws, I call a halt. *In behalf of my own people I am not willing to see the wage-earner of the United States, the farmer of the United States, put upon a level and brought into competition with the cheap half-slave labor, savage labor, of the Philippine Archipelago.* [Loud applause.]

It may be interesting to speak for a few minutes of the planting, cultivating, harvesting, shedding, stripping, and packing of tobacco in our State; giving employment, as it does, almost all the year, and especially during the winter months. In addition to the people whom I have mentioned above, there are employed in the various warehouses in my district thousands of men who are kept busy in the final sorting of tobacco and packing it for shipment.

From March in one year, when our farmers plant their seed in some sheltered spot, until March of the following year, when they deliver the cured crop to the warehouse, our farmers are constantly employed in the care and growing of this tobacco. First, the seed is sown and afterwards the plants are put in the ground. They are cared for as any farmer would care for his plants. The tobacco is cut and hung in the barns; it is taken down in the winter time, stripped and packed in bundles, and delivered to the tobacco dealers' warehouses, thus furnishing work to thousands and thousands of people in our towns and villages who have no other employment, giving to them a subsistence which they could not otherwise get. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] calls my attention to the fact that I have omitted also the gathering and destroying of the tobacco worm. That is also a very important part of the growing of tobacco. We must watch, as we grow our tobacco, that the worms are destroyed or they will destroy the tobacco. I am a tobacco farmer myself, and I know all about the sowing and growing and harvesting of tobacco. In addition to the people I have mentioned, there are employed in my district many hundreds of people who have the care of the handling of the tobacco after it is delivered and put into the warehouses.

The gentleman from Connecticut has told us there is no danger from the growing of tobacco in the Philippine Islands, as there is not sufficient arable land there to produce any large amount of tobacco. The reports on the Philippines, the accuracy of which as to their acreage, I think, is not questioned, state that the islands contain 73,345,415 acres. The estimate placed upon the arable land is 9½ per cent. We believe that a great deal more land than this can be farmed to great advantage, yet, taking the percentage at 9½, we find there are 6,967,781 acres which is good farming land.

If we take but 10 per cent of this land for tobacco raising, we find that we have 696,781 acres of tobacco land. Figure 1,500 pounds to the acre, which is about one-half the amount which will be produced in these islands under good conditions, and we find that they can raise 1,045,000,000 pounds.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The gentleman is a tobacco grower himself. What is the yield of the product per acre?

Mr. CASSEL. About 1,600 to 2,000 pounds per acre.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Why does the gentleman say that they produce more in the Philippines per acre than in Pennsylvania, when the record shows the production in the Philippine Islands is from 500 to 900 pounds per acre? And why does he not figure the product in Pennsylvania by the number of acres in it multiplied by 1,700?

Mr. CASSEL. Just wait until I get a little farther down in my figures and I will tell the gentleman about that. We do not produce, we do not farm that proportion.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Why not? The gentleman is figuring that in the Philippines, and why not figure it in Pennsylvania?

Mr. CASSEL. If we were to farm that proportion in Pennsylvania we would.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Does the gentleman know of an ounce of tobacco raised within 10 miles of salt water in Pennsylvania?

Mr. CASSEL. No. We have no salt water in Pennsylvania.

Mr. MAHON. They will raise more tobacco in the Philippines on 1 acre than you can in Pennsylvania on 2.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not care to take the gentleman's time, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania is entirely mistaken, and the record shows it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania one question. How do you figure the correct acreage of the Philippines as you have just given it? By including all the islands of the archipelago in that statement?

Mr. CASSEL. I am giving the figures reported by Secretary Taft.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That includes all the islands of the archipelago, of course.

Mr. CASSEL. Oh, no; just the land.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, the land; I did not mean the water.

Mr. CASSEL. I am figuring on taking the whole area.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Before answering the next question, I will remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania of this fact and then he can answer the question. By uncontradicted testimony we find that they do not raise in the Philippine Archipelago good merchantable commercial tobacco within 10 miles of the sea anywhere on the islands. Now, you draw that line 10 miles from the sea and it excludes every island for tobacco raising except only two.

Mr. CASSEL. Well, my dear sir——

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That knocks out the great bulk of that acreage, provided your incorrect and false premise was true.

Mr. CASSEL. I am only taking 1 per cent of the land of the entire archipelago. Further than that, the statement laid down here by members of the committee and gentlemen who have returned from these islands when they say they can not raise tobacco within 20 miles of the seacoast is certainly a misstatement.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The statement is not that you can not raise tobacco, but no tobacco that is salable in the United States. We saw it—rank, bad-smelling, tough tobacco.

Mr. CASSEL. Where do they raise tobacco in Porto Rico?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Near the center of the island. The best tobacco is raised in a certain section about Cayey. It is about 80 miles from San Juan to Ponce, and Cayey is about half way.

Mr. CASSEL. The island is about 40 miles wide. It is about 48 miles by air line from San Juan to Ponce. Cayey is exactly 10 miles from the sea at the farthest point. With reference to the contention of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] that tobacco can be grown in only a limited area in the Philippines, "owing to the fact that it is a matter of world-wide knowledge that cigar tobacco can not be grown within 20 miles of the seacoast," I offer the statement of Professor Lyon, of the Bureau of Agriculture, made during the public hearings in the Philippine Islands before the Secretary of War and the Congressional party accompanying him. This statement is as follows:

The statement was made in the memorandum just read, and also it is one that is generally stated, that tobacco of good commercial quality is not produced within 12 to 20 miles of the littoral of any country. That is a very general statement that I am inclined to doubt, however, as applying to the whole world. If it were true in all cases, I am afraid that it would rule out the tobacco land of Porto Rico, as the tobacco raised there is raised under just such conditions. I am very sure that it would

cut out a great deal of the famous Vuelta Abajo district of Cuba, which lies to the east of the city of Habana. I am sure that a great deal of that district lies between 10 and 20 miles of the seaboard. Also, in Mexico there is tobacco grown within that distance of the coast.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. They do raise in Cuba good tobacco in less than 10 miles from the sea, but the fact they can not raise it in the Philippine Archipelago is a fact just as the other fact they can not raise the so-called "hemp plant" except in the Philippine Islands. Yet in other islands they have just the same soil and the same temperature and the same climate.

Mr. MAHON. May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has the floor, yield to his colleague?

Mr. CASSEL. Let me finish just a few of my figures. Comparing the 1,045,000,000 pounds produced under favorable conditions on 1 per cent of the total land of the Philippine Islands with the total amount of tobacco grown in the United States, and we find at the present time there is devoted to tobacco culture 776,000 acres, producing annually about 800,000,000 pounds of tobacco.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. That is in the United States.

Mr. CASSEL. Yes, sir. Or, if we follow the argument furnished by the gentleman from Connecticut and limit the cigar-tobacco product to the provinces of Cagayan and Isabela, which he acknowledges produce a fair quality of cigar leaf, we find those two provinces have a combined area of six and one-half million acres; and while we may believe this land is nearly all adapted to the raising of tobacco, if we take but 2 per cent of this specially adapted land we find that there will be 130,000 acres available for the production of cigar leaf. The entire acreage in the United States devoted to the production of cigar leaf is 125,000 acres, producing 140,000,000 pounds. This would leave all the lands of the Philippine Islands, except 2 per cent of the area of the provinces of Cagayan and Isabela, for the production of hemp, sugar, etc., and may make more reasonable the fear of the tobacco men that the Philippine tobacco, grown with cheap labor, without fertilizer, and the advantages of a tropical climate, will seriously affect the growing of cigar leaf in the United States, and may possibly displace it altogether.

So the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] and the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs [Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin] that you can not grow good tobacco within 20 or even a dozen miles of the seacoast in the Philippines is not sustained by the report of the Department of Agriculture.

I want to say that in all of the arguments before the Ways and Means Committee and in all the arguments made before this House there has been a misunderstanding or misstatement in reference to the value of domestic and Philippine tobacco. They take the value of the Philippine tobacco ready for the manufacturer, and they take the value of the tobacco in the United States in the field. Tobacco in my district this year is selling at from 10 to 12 cents a pound in the field, and that same tobacco is worth from 20 to 35 cents after it is packed, sweated, and ready to deliver to the manufacturers.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. What do you mean by the statement "in the field?"

Mr. CASSEL. I mean that this tobacco of ours was sold before it was harvested, with the understanding that it was to be put into the sheds, dried, sweated, stripped, and delivered to the warehouse.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. And then weighed?

Mr. CASSEL. Then weighed.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to say that the Ways and Means Committee of this House do not know anything about the tobacco interest—not a thing. [Laughter.] They would not know if they would chew it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CASSEL. Now, there was an earnest attempt made to find out the values and the proportions of the tobacco grown in the Philippine Islands, and Colonel Edwards appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means January 27, 1905, and made the statement that—

the tobacco interests that have been represented here came to the conclusion that the price of tobacco in Manila was 5 cents a pound, practically from these figures. Quoting from the official returns of the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the quantity and value of Philippine exports of leaf tobacco from 1899 to 1904 and dividing the number of pounds into the value they got 5 cents as the value. To disprove this claim, presumably, the War Department sent the following cable to its officials in Manila.

Now, there was a report of the Department of Insular Affairs which said that the average price of the tobacco raised in the Philippine Islands, delivered to the cigar manufacturers, was 5 cents a pound. An effort has been made to secure through the Bureau of Insular Affairs a positive value for the tobacco grown in the Philippine Islands.

I hold in my hand copies of a number of cablegrams sent in January, 1905, by Colonel Edwards, together with replies to the same, which I will read:

Opposition to 75 per cent reduction Philippine tobacco claim if total Philippine tobacco exports diverted to the United States will injure seriously 120,000,000 pounds annual United States domestic production cigar leaf. Cable immediately what proportion total Philippine exports unmanufactured tobacco is suitable for wrapper, proportion suitable for filler, suitable for other purposes, and average valuation each class per pound at Manila.

To which came the following reply:

With reference to your telegram of 18th, Shuster reports total exports tobacco fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, 19,044,290 pounds. Tavera gives exporters' figures 18,226,000 pounds. Twenty per cent of exports for wrappers at 30 cents gold per pound; remaining 80 per cent used for fillings and smoking tobacco. Price, fillings, 10 cents per pound; smoking tobacco, 7½ cents.

This did not appear to be satisfactory, so the War Department telegraphed again, as follows:

Customs figures fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, show amount exportations from the Philippine Islands unmanufactured tobacco, nineteen million odd pounds, at a value of million odd dollars. Opponents of our bill claim that this shows value in Manila, cigar leaf, 5 cents per pound. How do you reconcile these figures with price stated in your telegram of January 20? Consult Shuster; answer as soon as possible.

Which brought this reply:

With reference to your telegram of 22d, upon investigation Shuster finds his statistics as to amount of tobacco exported during the last fiscal year correct—as to value, incorrect—but based on sworn invoices by exporters, who, for some reason not very clear, have systematically and, as they claim, since 1883 undervalued tobacco exports. Figures given from investigation made by Tavera correct. In other words, value of tobacco exported last year was about $2,500,000, instead of $1,000,000 reported by Shuster. Made no actual investigation, for the reason that duties specified and no fraud on revenue committed.

He says the value is incorrect, but it is based on sworn statements by the exporters. There is no occasion for these people to make any unfair or any unjust reports when they come to export tobaccos, because there is no fraud committed upon it. This was supplemented by another cablegram from Manila, as follows:

Conference with tobacco exporters this morning develops following unanimous opinion: If Dingley tariff removed, no wrapper tobacco, as it is known in the United States, will go to the United States; only cigars and small amount selected filler. Think value exported tobacco stated yesterday at 2,500,000, based on Tavera's figures, is too high; less than 2,000,000 nearer correct. Figures given result conference with exporters' and Shuster's personal investigation. Difficult to get real values.

Now, here we have three different valuations placed upon the same year's exports by the Government experts in Manila. Is there any use trying to depend on any of the reports? Then comes another telegram.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would suggest to the gentleman that if he would ask the amount collected for tax he would find exactly the amount. Last year, in 1905, it was $16,276,266, about $8,000,000 less than was raised in one single county in Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASSEL. Let me read this other telegram:

[Answer received January 27.]

With reference to your telegrams of 26th, further investigation by Shuster develops estimate of 20 per cent of exports of tobacco being suitable for wrappers is misleading. The facts are there is only a small part of 1 per cent of this tobacco which would be used for wrappers by the manufacturers in the United States. It is very low grade tobacco used for cheap cigars made in Spain and other tobacco-monopoly countries. There is not more than enough wrapper tobacco produced here to meet demands local manufacturers' high-grade cigars. The most of these cigars are used here; a small proportion exported.

Impossible to get any accurate idea of the comparative amount of filler and smoking tobacco exported last year. It is nearly all very low grade, and little of it could be used in the United States for fillers.

Now, they first telegraphed that there was 20 per cent, and then a few days thereafter said there was only 1 per cent of exports of wrapper tobacco. I submit that this big drop in their estimate demonstrates the utter unreliability of the War Department's reports as to the valuation of the tobacco grown in the Philippines and exported.

I have examined the samples brought from the Philippines by the gentleman from Connecticut, and before referring to them further I desire to refer to the speech of the gentleman from New York, the honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in which he criticised the statement made by Mr. Bijur, president of the National Cigar Leaf Tobacco Association, when he said before the committee that the prices of our tobaccos, when compared with the shipping prices of Philippine tobacco, should be: New England, 35; New York, 18; Pennsylvania, 21, etc. In order to have a positive understanding regarding Mr. Bijur's position, I wrote him immediately in reference to same, and I will read his reply:

THE NATIONAL CIGAR LEAF TOBACCO ASSOCIATION,
New York, January 6, 1906.

Hon. H. B. CASSEL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your favor of yesterday calling to my attention that part of Mr. PAYNE'S speech on the Philippine bill in which

he quotes me as giving certain values to tobacco and using the words "that these should be the prices," in the sense of "that these ought to be the prices," I beg to say that it was not my intention that there should be any double meaning conveyed by the words I used. If you will look up the record of the hearing given the tobacco interests you will see that I complained of the use of tables furnished by Colonel Edwards of the prices of our domestic cigar tobaccos, because his table of prices furnished the farm values of our domestic tobaccos, and these values had evidently been used by the advocates of a reduction of duty on Philippine tobacco as a basis of comparison with a table of market values of Philippine tobacco, also furnished by Colonel Edwards. I distinctly told the Committee on Ways and Means that if the table of market values on the Philippine tobacco be used, they should substitute for Colonel Edwards's table of farm values the table of market values which I presented. In other words, instead of the prices—

New England	21.6
New York	10
Pennsylvania	8.9
Ohio	7.5
Wisconsin	7.8
Georgia and Florida	28.8

they must use:

New England	35
New York	18
Pennsylvania	21
Ohio	21
Georgia and Florida	80

The prices that I give in these tables are the market prices to-day, have been the prices for months past, and will be the prices for a long time to come if the domestic tobacco business is not upset by tariff tinkering in Washington. The affected misunderstanding by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of so elementary a distinction as the difference between values of tobacco at the farm and values of tobacco in condition for market is of a piece with the extraordinary and suspicious density that has confused all the testimony brought up by the domestic interests in connection with this Philippine reduction measure. The committee and the War Department as well has greedily swallowed all the testimony, no matter how contradictory and ridiculous, that has been offered by Manila manufacturers and their advocates and has refused credence in the slightest degree to the representations of American manufacturers, growers, and packers.

It is more remarkable that this attitude should obtain because in cables received by the War Department from the governor-general of the Philippines it is openly stated that for twenty years back Philippine exporters have persistently given false values on their exports of tobacco, apparently for the mere pleasure of deceiving the government, as no satisfactory explanation of this remarkable state of affairs has ever been given. Assertions, for example, that Sumatra wrapper, notoriously the toughest and strongest wrapper leaf produced in the world, was too tender to be worked by the hands of the expert Philippine cigar maker have been accepted as gospel.

In the face of the fact that Sumatra wrappers come into the United States—which takes the finest and fanciest grades alone of this tobacco, and gets it at an average price of 90 cents—in the face of this, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means indorses the statement of the Philippine manufacturers that the Sumatra they use costs them, inclusive of the duty of 23 cents a pound, $1.50 a pound. There is not a tobacco merchant familiar with Sumatra wrappers who would not cheerfully undertake, if the 23-cent duty remains in force, to supply the Manila manufacturer with a Sumatra wrapper for the next five years at a cost of 85 cents per pound, duty paid, and I for one would gladly pay a premium to get such a contract if it can be secured. As it takes about 2 pounds of Sumatra to wrap a thousand cigars, this would bring the cost to the Manila manufacturer who uses Sumatra to $1.70 a thousand, as against a cost of using Connecticut Habana seed, under absolute free trade, at $2 a thousand, using 4 pounds to the thousand, plus double the freight cost, and of using broad-leaf Connecticut to $5 a thousand, plus four times the freight cost.

The folly of suggesting that Connecticut wrappers, or American wrappers of any kind, will be used by manufacturers to whom other wrappers are available is apparent when I tell you that neither I nor any other packer of American tobacco has ever sold a box of high-grade American wrappers to any foreign country whatever.

I am glad to see, however, in the concluding paragraph of Mr. PAYNE'S remarks on tobacco that he has recognized the force of our objections to having one rate on Sumatra tobacco coming into this country and a much lower one on Sumatra tobacco going into the Philippines, although at the hearings granted by the Ways and Means Committee he ridiculed our claims as to the possibility of fraud in the customs under these conditions. If a change to the Dingley rates on Sumatra tobacco going into the Philippines is made, while it will in no way alter the force of the arguments presented by us against the desirability of our competition with the cooly (I do not refer exclusively to Chinese) labor of the East, it will at least permit our importers to maintain their standard of honesty and honor and not compel them in order to survive to devise means for defrauding the Government.

Yours, respectfully, A. BIJUR, *President*.

Thus you will see that the values of the Pennsylvania tobacco in the market, ready for the cigar manufacturer, is at the present time 21 cents.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I want to ask the gentleman another question. I do not wish him to answer unless he feels inclined to do so, and I do not wish him to put the question and the answer in the RECORD unless he chooses, if he will tell the House what he sold his crop for this year.

Mr. CASSEL. Yes, sir; I am very glad to say that I got for my crop this year on one field, 11 cents; on another field, 12 cents, right through, for the tobacco as it stood in the field, to be delivered after it was cured. But that is the price for that tobacco as it comes out of the shed; it is not the price that it sells for to the manufacturer. It goes into the hands of the dealer, and the dealer puts it through a sweat, and he must be at the expense of handling it and at the expense of insurance and interest. This all adds largely to the cost of the tobacco to the dealer, and he sells it to the manufacturer at an average of 21 cents a pound, against the price for the tobaccos shown us by the gentleman from Connecticut, which were delivered to the cigar manufacturers in the Philippines—some for 5 cents, some for 6 cents, some for 7 cents, and some for 10 cents per pound. According to the report of the War Department, there is not over 1 per cent of wrapper tobacco grown in the islands and it sells for 30 cents in gold per pound. While we do not believe this is correct, yet taking it with the other qualities of tobacco it will average the price of tobacco delivered to the manufacturer of cigars, at about 8 cents per pound. Add to this the duty of 8¾ cents, which is proposed by this bill for the next three years, and you make the price delivered in the United States 16¾, and this tobacco it is proposed to bring here and sell against our own product at 21 cents. Thus you see this tobacco will come into direct competition with ours, and will force our people to a reduction in price of from 2 to 3 cents per pound, costing the farmers of my district alone a loss of from $500,000 to $1,000,000 per annum.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has claimed that our cigar workers run graver danger of competition from the use of the Williams machine by the large manufactories than they do from the cheap labor of the Philippines. The Williams machine has been in use in this country about twenty years. It is a tool rather than a machine, and its chief advantage to the cigar manufacturer has been the readiness with which entirely green hands could learn to make cigars by its use. It has enabled the large manufacturer to go to small towns where there is a great number of unemployed girls and teach them, after a period of tutelage varying from six weeks to three months, to become efficient and satisfactory cigar makers of the lower grade of cigars. We have the testimony of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] that machinery is not used at present in the Philippines. When we learn that this Williams machine, or rather tool, not only enables a green hand to become an efficient cigar maker in this short period of time, but also enables this hand, when expert, to turn out double the cigars that can be produced by hand work, it can readily be seen what an impetus the mere introduction of this tool into the Philippines will give their industry of producing low-grade cigars. It will reduce their already low wages per thousand while increasing the earning capacity of the operators; moreover and most important, figuring that it will take the native Filipino six months to learn what the American country girl can readily absorb in six weeks, it will enable Manila manufacturers to increase their cigar-making force any desired amount in six months' time from any given period.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] stated that the Connecticut growers who came before the Ways and Means Committee were converted from their hostility to the Philippine bill at an interview which I understand they had at the residence of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] on the evening of the day of the tobacco hearing. If this refers to Messrs. J. H. Pierce, of Enfield, and Col. E. N. Phelps, of Windsor, the only Connecticut growers who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, I can say that this statement is wholly erroneous. I am at liberty to quote the following extract from a letter from Mr. Pierce, dated December 26, in which Colonel Phelps concurs:

> You have probably heard from Colonel Phelps before this time, so that I will only say that Mr. HILL tried to make us think that we were in no danger whatever from Philippine competition, but he was unable to convince us. He promised to try to get the 25 per cent duty on. That was the most we could do.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The gentleman will pardon me. I understand the gentleman to say that the price he got for his tobacco was 11 cents for one field as taken from the barn and sent to the manufacturers.

Mr. CASSEL. No, no; not to the manufacturers. Sent to the dealer.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Oh, yes. Will the gentleman kindly look at the prices, taking the average for five years, and there can not have been any change for five years, the tobacco taken from the box at the factory in Manila precisely in the same way as from the bale from the farm, the first quality sold for 18 cents, and the second 15, and the third quality 12, the fourth 9, and the fifth 6¼, and see whether it does not average in Manila away beyond what he sold his for in Pennsylvania this year?

Mr. CASSEL. I think they are getting more for their tobacco than we do get here, but my figure is this——

Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS. If these people can not compete with us, why should we drive them out of the industry?

Mr. CASSEL. I will go further into that and answer in a short time from the argument of the gentleman from Connecti-

cut [Mr. HILL] himself, in which he shows by his own figures that the people in the Philippine Islands are getting more money to-day for their labor than the people of the United States are getting for doing the same kind of labor. Now, why are we trying to break down this interest of our farmers by creating a disturbance and unsettling conditions in this country when we are not going to give these people any benefit whatever by so doing? If you will take the average prices as given to us by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], that tobacco does not average the grower in the Philippine Islands over 5 cents at his farm.

I will incorporate in my remarks at this point the following letter and table from the speech of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL]:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, December 21, 1905.

SIR: Referring to conversation with reference to wages paid workmen in cigar factories in the Philippine Islands, I have the honor to inform you that the census of the Philippine Islands shows that prior to 1898 and in 1902 the following wages (local currency) were paid, and while I regret to state that we haven't an official statement of the rate of wages paid now, it is very generally known that the wages of employees in the Philippine Islands have, up to the present time, increased steadily since American occupation, and that at present the wages received are considerably greater than those indicated in the census report for 1902:

	Average wages paid prior to 1898 (pesos).[a]		Average wages paid in 1902 (pesos).[a]	
	Per day.	Per month.	Per day.	Per month.
Cigar box factory foreman	0.75	.....	2.00	.....
Cigar box fillers	.80	.....	2.00	.....
Cigar box makers	.50	.....	1.50	.....
Cigar factory foremen	.....	35.00	.....	80.00
Cigar sorters	.80	.....	2.00	.....
Cigarette packers	.50	.....	1.00	.....
Cigarette makers	.40	.....	1.37	.....
Cigar makers	.80	.....	2.00	.....

[a] Take one-half of these rates for value in American gold.

Very respectfully,

FRANK MCINTYRE.

Hon. EBENEZER J. HILL,
House of Representatives.

The familiar cry of ruin, starvation, and imminent disaster of various kinds is brought in all the cables sent here from the Manila operatives. In this connection the figures of the gentleman from Connecticut are very interesting. It has been claimed right along that the cost of living in the Philippines has advanced 100 per cent since American occupation. It is gratifying to note from the gentleman's table showing the wages of cigar makers since 1898 that these have increased in much greater proportion than the advanced cost of living. He tells us that the average wage rate of the cigar maker in 1898 was less than a dollar per day, in 1902 it had advanced to $1, and that it is to-day still higher, reaching as high as $2. If this is correct there is no industry in the United States that has made such an advance in prosperity in this or any other line. It seems as though the cry of hard times for the Philippine cigar maker is rather unjustified. With these circumstances in mind, it must be that the advocates of reduction of duties on Philippine tobacco have in mind added prosperity for the capitalists who own the factories. The prosperity of the workman would appear to be already looked out for.

If they get as much as our farmers, why should they ask for more?

Mr. MAHON. I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. Has a case of tobacco from any part of the United States ever been shipped to Manila?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes; I will answer that question. I was going to answer it a little further along, but if my friend wishes to hear about it I will answer him now. The gentleman from Connecticut in his speech, on Saturday last, stated that he had seen 5 boxes of Connecticut wrappers in a cigar factory in the Philippines, and that he had seen some of the cigars made from the same. He said:

I found one factory where they had been experimenting with five cases of Connecticut wrappers. The first case was bought at 50 cents a pound, and so much satisfaction had from it that a second purchase of four cases was made at 55 cents a pound. In addition to this, a duty of 23 cents and expenses of shipment halfway around the world brought this domestic wrapper of ours to their hands at a practical cost of 80 cents a pound.

I told him at the time he made his speech that I could find no record in the Monthly Summary of Commerce up to the ending of July, 1905, of any tobacco imported into the Philippine Islands from the United States.

I want now to correct my statement and to say that the Bureau reports no tobacco to have been received in the Philippine Islands during the year 1905, and no tobacco to have been received during 1904, and no tobacco to have been received after the 31st day of July, 1903, but prior to that date there were received five cases, containing 1,434 pounds of tobacco, costing $768. This would be, according to the figures submitted by the gentleman from Connecticut, one case at 50 cents and four cases at 55 cents per pound.

But this tobacco was shipped to the islands prior to 1903. It has been there ever since. It certainly could not have proved a profitable investment or the tobacco would have been used up long before this time. I have no doubt that that is the tobacco which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] found in Manila, still standing there in the factory after three years. If that is so, then if those people could use this tobacco in competition with the tobacco of Sumatra and that which they themselves grew, why did they keep it in their factory for three years without making use of it?

It shows, I think, the utter fallacy of the argument of the gentleman from Connecticut that any of their tobacco will ever be used in the Philippine Islands for wrappers so long as the manufacturers over there can secure Sumatra at a reasonable price.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I have a statement from the War Department that there was shipped to the Philippine Islands last year 20,665 pounds of unmanufactured tobacco.

Mr. CASSEL. They do not show that in their report of the Philippines Islands. Here is your own table, furnished you by the Insular Bureau of the War Department, showing the entire tobacco traffic between the Philippine Islands and all nations, which is as follows:

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1899	None.	.....
1900	None.	.....
1901	4,655	$435
1902	2	2
1903	1,417	783
1904	26	1
1905	None.	.....

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. That is easily accounted for by the fact that the calendar year does not coincide with the fiscal year. One ends on the 30th of June and the other ends on the 31st of December.

Mr. CASSEL. Yes; I know that; but your own figures are for fiscal and not calendar years. And no figures are compiled, I understand, for a portion of a year.

Mr. MAHON. That was tobacco that was shipped for the War Department. If you want to get statistics, you go to the Treasury Department. The War Department knows nothing about commercial affairs.

Mr. CASSEL. Now, there is a difference of opinion, of course, between the two Departments of the Government as to whether they received any, or whether they did not. I have only the record filed by the gentleman from Connecticut himself.

Now, if you will bear with me for a few moments longer, I want to refer in detail to a few of the arguments made by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL]. He says that there are to-day in the Philippine Islands seven and a half million people and that in fifty years from now they will have a population of 25,000,000, if a stable government is maintained. The people of the Philippine Islands grow about 50,000,000 pounds of tobacco. They export about 20,000,000 pounds, 17,000,000 pounds of which go to Spain. They can grow, as I showed you, an unlimited amount of tobacco if they have the labor. The records show that they can grow the finest kind of tobacco if given the proper care. Under Spanish rule when, we were told by the gentleman from Connecticut, they were compelled by the government to raise a certain quantity of tobacco as well as a certain quality, as far as they could, they raised the finest kind of tobacco that was grown.

I desire here to quote the interesting statement of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] regarding the cultivation of tobacco in the Philippines:

The growing of tobacco was introduced into the Philippine Islands in the sixteenth century by the Spaniards. Its cultivation and sale was held as an absolute monopoly by the Spanish Government for one hundred years.

With reference to the success of the industry and the quality of the product I shall not express my individual opinion, but shall quote from well-recognized authorities on the subject.

First, from the commissioner of internal revenue of the islands, from the advance sheets of his report for the fiscal year of 1905, not yet printed, and to which I have fortunately had access within the last few days. He says:

In the provinces of Cagayan and Isabela is produced the only to-

bacco fit for use in the manufacture of the better quality of cigars and cigarettes. Except for limited local consumption by the persons raising it or for purposes of blending it with the better leaf, there is no demand for the tobacco raised outside of the provinces of Cagayan and Isabela. The Spanish Government had a monopoly which lasted one hundred years in the manufacture of all leaf tobacco produced in these islands. The Government supervision over the planting, curing, and sorting of the leaf was absolute, and the quality of the tobacco was improved and the quantity increased by such supervision. In 1882 the Government monopoly was abolished and the planting and manufacture of tobacco become free for all. Since then the quality of the leaf produced in Cagayan and Isabela has constantly deteriorated from season to season. No sufficient preparation of the soil, no care in the selection of the seed, of the method of planting, or of the growing of the leaf, crude methods in curing the leaf, and dishonest practices of middlemen in sorting it for sale have all contributed to discredit the former fair fame of Philippine tobacco both abroad and at home. A constantly increasing number of smokers in these islands are discarding the domestic cigar and cigarette and are smoking cigars imported from Sumatra and elsewhere, imported Chinese smoking tobacco, and even cigarette and pipe tobacco from the United States. On May 18, 1905, some of the leading cigar and cigarette manufacturers of Manila entered into an agreement having for its object an increase in the production and improvement in the quality of the tobacco leaf in Cagayan and Isabela, as well as to secure, if possible, more uniformity in the sorting of the leaf by middlemen. Little effective work, however, has as yet been done along these lines. Meanwhile the quality of the leaf continues to deteriorate, and the local manufacturers find it an increasingly difficult task to supply demands for domestic consumption.

It is beyond dispute that the abolition of this government supervision and the leaving of the natives to their own devices and methods and crude cultivation has been exceedingly disastrous to the quantity and quality of the tobacco product of the archipelago. So that the general conclusion, quoted by Internal-Revenue Agent Brown on page 191 of the report referred to, may be accepted as accurate at the present time. He says:

"Manufacturers of cigars in these islands, dealers in native leaf tobacco, consumers in the islands of Manila cigars, manufacturers and merchants abroad who have handled in past years Philippine tobacco, consumers abroad of Manila cigars, and the Filipino, whether grower or tobacco merchant, are all of one mind on the tobacco question. Philippine tobacco has gradually sunk to a deplorable level."

We see from this that the tobacco grown upon the islands is inferior to what they formerly raised because of the indifference of the farmer. Let American capital and push once get established on the island and you will find not only an increase in the quantity, but also in the quality. Secretary Taft recommends leasing of the government lands to individuals or corporations of 5,000 acres for tobacco culture and 20,000 acres for sugar culture. He must expect people with capital to go there or he would not make recommendations of this kind.

Testimony has been given before the Ways and Means Committee showing that 3,000 acres of land in Florida and Georgia covered with shade had produced last year 12,000 bales of wrapper tobacco, equal in wrapping capacity to one-third of our importations of Sumatra, and the experts have told the Committee on Ways and Means that it will require only 9,000 acres, covered with shade, in the Philippines to produce as many bales of wrappers as our entire importation of Sumatra wrapper. Thirty thousand acres of shade-grown Philippine wrappers, an undertaking easily within the means of any of the big Dutch companies now settled in Sumatra, will produce enough wrappers to supply the entire cigar production of the United States, eliminating every leaf of Connecticut and Florida wrapper grown and every bale of Sumatra imported.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I presume the gentleman is not familiar with the fact, but I made inquiry in regard to shade-grown tobacco in the Philippine Islands and was informed that the experiment had been made, and that it was a total failure and had practically been given up.

Mr. CASSEL. Yes; and so the Department of Agriculture will tell you that the experiment in Lancaster, Pa., was a failure; and so they told me a few years ago that it was a failure in Connecticut, when the first experiment was made; that it was not a success, and it is because it takes an intelligent grower, an intelligent man, to be in charge of tobacco raised in that way. Now, there is no question but that the climatic conditions in the Philippine Islands will produce the finest tobacco grown under the sun if properly cared for and cultivated.

Now, the gentleman from Connecticut told us in reference to the people over there that if you paid a man 25 cents a day he would work enough days in a week to support him through the week; that if you doubled that amount, he would work one-half the time, and if you increase it to a dollar or $2, he would cut down the amount of his labor in proportion; that all his ambition was to maintain existence.

Now, these are the people that you want to bring in contact and in competition with the sober, honest, industrious, hard-working, saving people of this country, and put them on a par with our people without giving any recompense in the matter.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him another question?

Mr. CASSEL. Certainly.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I know the gentleman is thoroughly familiar with and understands the growing and cultivation of tobacco. Why do we not get tobacco from the Sandwich Islands? They have the climate and soil; why do not we get a pound of tobacco from those islands?

Mr. CASSEL. There are many places under the sun where they could produce different kinds of agricultural products which they do not grow because they are not accustomed to grow them.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Is the gentleman aware that in the Sandwich Islands they made a determined effort to grow tobacco, and they grew a plant 6 to 10 feet high, a magnificent product, but when they came to cure it they couldn't cure a pound of it? It was as black as your hat; they couldn't cure a pound of it. It was absolutely worthless for tobacco.

Mr. CASSEL. Yes; that is owing to the peculiar conditions there.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Precisely the same condition exists in most of the Philippine Islands. There is no tobacco produced in the Sandwich Islands, although the soil, labor, and climate are as good as could be desired in the world.

Mr. CASSEL. But I am taking the gentleman's own figures. I am eliminating from my reckoning all of the Philippine Islands except Cagayan and Isabela, and I am taking but 2 per cent of that territory, and certainly the amount of land we are using in the proposition is so small it is hardly worth while considering further. Now, Mr. Chairman, I purpose at the proper time——

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Will the gentleman pardon me a moment again?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Why do we not raise good tobacco in southern California and make it a great product of southern California? Simply because of the climatic conditions, which make it impossible.

Mr. CASSEL. But you say these two provinces would and could produce good tobacco—Cagayan and Isabela—and I am figuring now, and my whole contention in reference to the tobacco grown in the Philippine Islands is that those two provinces, taking only 2 per cent of their land, will produce more leaf tobacco than the United States at the present time.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will say to the gentleman that estimates are good at times, but when he has statistics—he can get from the Agricultural Department exactly how many acres were planted with tobacco last year and the year before and the year before, and so it is not necessary to figure in millions when he has the actual figures in thousands before him if he chooses to take them.

Mr. CASSEL. And does the gentleman mean to say the idea of this bill is to restrict the tobacco from there to the amount produced at the present time?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Of course I do not. I say the restriction is made by the Almighty, and not by anybody else.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is there any difference in the conditions of the tobacco raised in your district and in the district represented by the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. CASSEL. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. What are they?

Mr. CASSEL. The tobacco grown in my district is the filler tobacco. The tobacco grown in the district which Mr. HILL represents in Connecticut is wrapper tobacco. The filler tobacco sells in the market at the present time at about 31 cents. The wrapper tobacco which Mr. HILL represents sells in the market at the present time at from 50 to 70 cents a pound. Is that right?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. At about 50 cents. I think they told me a month ago up there about 40 cents. The gentleman from Hartford can give more definite figures in regard to that than I can.

Mr. CASSEL. But it is the filler-tobacco growers who will be specially affected by this competition.

In considering figures of domestic tobacco values it should be remembered that Pennsylvania and Ohio tobacco is considered as entirely filler tobacco, that Connecticut tobacco contains both wrapper and binder, and that Wisconsin and New York tobacco contains binder and filler, and Florida and Georgia, wrapper and filler tobaccos. As less than 1 per cent of Philippine tobacco is adjudged by the Department witnesses to be suitable for wrapper in this country, it is perfectly clear that the immediate brunt of the invasion of our market by Philippine tobacco must be borne by the filler-producing States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, New York, Wisconsin, and Florida.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Now, let me ask the gentleman why does he not raise 40-cent tobacco in Lancaster instead of

the 10 or 11 cent tobacco that he does? Why does he not raise the 40-cent tobacco?

Mr. CASSEL. I would say it has been my privilege to raise and sell tobacco at 25 cents a pound in the field, but it requires a great deal of care, a great deal of fertilizing; it has an effect upon the land for future uses, and on that account, and because of certain——

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Climatic conditions?

Mr. CASSEL. Possibly climatic conditions. We have not been raising that quality of tobacco, and I want to say this: I believe our district and many other districts can grow good wrapper tobacco, but that the profits on it will not be as much in proportion as tobacco they are now growing, because we grow more pounds to the acre than you do. The filler tobacco weighs more than that fine wrapper tobacco, and the income from the growing of it on our land is nearly as great as you have from yours.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. If the gentleman will pardon me, I hold a supplement of the United States Crop Reporter, issued by the Agricultural Department here a few days ago, in which the yield per acre of Pennsylvania is given at 1,370 pounds and Connecticut at 1,725 pounds to the acre, so I would have to differ on the proposition that you grow more to the acre than we do.

Mr. CASSEL. I have no record here to show my contention in that respect.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I have.

Mr. CASSEL. But I do know we grow and get more money for the acre of good heavy filler than we do for an acre of fine wrapper, which does not bring us in the amount of money which your wrapper brings to you. With this explanation I am willing to insert here the gentleman's own tables for the information they contain:

I will insert in the RECORD here prices of the various samples of tobacco brought by me from Manila and now on exhibition in the lobby of the House. The large samples were furnished at my request by the Insular Company, and the prices are the average prices for the past five years, as taken from their books, and is the bale price.

The samples in envelopes are sorted leaves, furnished by the Yebana Company, in Manila.

I also put with these prices extract from the Supplement of the Crop Reporter of the United States, published by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, at Washington, December, 1905, page 77, showing average production and value of the tobacco crop of the States and Territories for the year 1905.

Large tobacco samples, Isabela de Luzon, in hands as taken from bales:

1. 1ª de 1904. Isabela de Luzon: Eighteen cents, United States gold, per pound; average price during past five years.
2. 2ª de 1903. Isabela de Luzon: Fifteen cents, United States gold, per pound; average price during past five years.
3. 3ª de 1903. Isabela de Luzon: Twelve cents, United States gold, per pound; average price during past five years.
4. 4ª de 1903. Isabela de Luzon: Nine cents, United States gold, per pound; average price during past five years.
5. 5ª de 1900. Isabela de Luzon: Six and one-half cents, United States gold, per pound; average price during past five years.

Tobacco samples in envelopes, sorted and in separate leaves:

1. Isabela leaf, different crops (wrappers): Selling price, ₱60 to ₱80 per quintal (30 to 40 cents, United States currency, per pound). Best tobacco districts, average yield of good wrappers from Isabela tobacco, 3 to 5 per cent. "Le Yebana," Fabrica de Tobacos, Cigarrillos y Picadura. Baer Senior & Co.'s successors.
2. Isabela 1900 crop, bunch filler: Selling price, ₱40 (20 cents, United States currency, per pound). Best tobacco district, "La Yebana," Fabrica de Tobacos, Cigarrillos y Picadura. Baer, Senior & Co.'s successors.
3. Isabela leaf, new crop (1905): Selling price, ₱15 per quintal (7½ cents, United States currency, per pound). Only fit for cigarettes; thick, gummy; village of Angadanan, best tobacco district. "La Yabana," Fabrica de Tobacos, Cigarrillos y Picadura. Baer, Senior & Co.'s successors.
4. Tobacco Barili Seacoast Cebu (ordinary kind): Selling price, ₱10 per quintal (5 cents, United States currency, per pound). "La Yebana," Fabrica de Tobacos, Cigarrillos y Picadura. Baer, Senior & Co.'s successors.
5. Bad tobacco, province of Union: Selling price, ₱9 to ₱10 per quintal (4½ to 5 cents, United States currency, per pound). "La Yebana," Fabrica de Tobacos, Cigarrillos y Picadura. Baer, Senior & Co.'s successors.

[From supplement of United States Crop Reporter.]

State or Territory (1905).	Tobacco.				
	Acreage.	Yield per acre.	Production.	Price per pound.	Total farm value.
	Acres.	*Lbs.*	*Pounds.*	*Cents.*	*Dollars.*
Maine	125	1,700	212,500	17.0	36,125
New Hampshire	191	1,650	315,150	17.0	53,576
Vermont	4,488	1,850	8,302,800	16.9	1,403,173
Massachusetts	13,340	1,725	23,011,500	17.0	3,911,955
Rhode Island	6,151	1,148	7,061,348	10.5	741,442
Connecticut	15,324	1,370	20,993,880	10.8	2,267,339
New York	30,143	650	19,592,950	6.0	1,175,577
New Jersey	6,244	819	5,113,836	6.0	306,830
Pennsylvania	39,294	1,370	53,832,780	10.0	538,328
Delaware	1,132	900	1,018,800	6.0	61,128
Maryland	776,112	815.6	633,033,719	7.7	48,674,118
Virginia	118,447	675	79,951,725	7.6	6,076,331
North Carolina	136,770	608	83,156,160	8.8	7,317,742
South Carolina	12,574	736	9,254,464	8.7	805,138
Georgia	2,036	525	1,068,900	17.0	181,713
Florida	5,321	600	3,192,600	18.0	574,668
Alabama	521	450	234,450	16.0	37,512
Mississippi	155	430	66,650	15.0	9,998
Louisiana	63	500	31,500	25.0	7,875
Texas	469	500	234,500	19.0	44,555
Arkansas	1,049	700	734,300	14.0	102,802
Tennessee	41,502	768	31,873,536	7.5	2,390,515
West Virginia	4,005	790	3,163,950	8.5	268,936
Kentucky	275,874	830	228,975,420	7.0	16,028,279
Ohio	59,229	850	50,344,650	8.4	4,228,951
Michigan					
Indiana					
Illinois					
Wisconsin					
Minnesota					
Iowa					
Missouri	1,665	778	1,295,370	8.0	103,630
Kansas					
Nebraska					
North Dakota					
South Dakota					
Montana					
Wyoming					
Colorado					
New Mexico					
Arizona					
Utah					
Nevada					
Idaho					
Washington					
Oregon					
California					
Oklahoma					
Indian Territory					

Now, there are a great many points which we might take up in this discussion. I believe, however, that I have proved to you, first, that the Philippine Islands will produce more tobacco than we grow at the present time in the United States; second, that they will produce a quality of tobacco which will come in direct competition with tobacco grown in the United States; third, that by leaving on 8¾ cents a pound you do not give us sufficient protection for the farmers of our country.

The Hon. Jacob Riis, an eminent sociological writer, recently stated that he had not forgotten the period (under Grover Cleveland's Administration) when women and children starved in cold garrets and when gaunt and hollow-eyed men vainly roamed the streets in search of work. "Lest we forget," every protectionist should ever keep this before him.

You have no right to put a free-trade clause into this bill at this time. And I therefore shall offer at the proper time these two amendments. First:

On page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out "twenty-five" and insert "fifty."

When this amendment comes up I shall be prepared to explain to you in a few words the effect which this will have upon our cigar manufacturers.

I shall also offer the following amendment:

On page 3 strike out lines 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and line 13 to and including the word "duty," as follows:

"*And provided further*, That on and after the 11th day of April, 1909, all articles and merchandise going from the United States into the Philippine Islands, and all articles wholly the growth and product of the Philippine Islands coming into the United States from the Philippine Islands, shall be admitted free of duty."

I want to say that we can not afford to allow that part of the bill to go through at this time. We are told it is left in there in order to raise revenue for these people for the next two or three years. No man living can tell the condition of the Philippine Islands in the year 1909. We do not know whether they will need this revenue or whether they will not need it. Consequently, let us wait until that time comes and then consider that proposition. If these amendments are admitted, I believe that this bill can pass this House, but should these amendments be voted down I shall offer the following:

On page 3, line 13, after the word "duty," insert the following: "And on said 11th day of April, 1909, the President of the United States is hereby authorized to leave the government and control of the Philippine Islands to their people."

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any idea that that amendment is germane to this bill?

Mr. CASSEL. I have seen amendments put into a bill that were not germane. I have seen all kinds of things done in this

House, the wildest of which have been proposed and put through by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why is not that resolution germane? The gentleman has said it is not. Let him tell wherein it is not.

Mr. CASSEL. I will let the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] answer that, if he can. If we are defeated on these amendments, I shall be glad to have the assistance of the Democratic party in passing that amendment to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will advocate the germaneness of an amendment getting rid of the Philippines on any basis, even under the general-welfare clause.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. During ten years' service in the House of Representatives it has been my habit to support legislation whenever recommended by all of the majority members of the reporting committees. With this record in mind it is consoling to be assured that the pending bill did not have the unqualified approval of the Republican membership of the Ways and Means Committee. Nevertheless, I regret that the committee did not agree upon a measure that with a consistent regard for the interests of my constituents I could support.

The bill now being considered would be more satisfactory to many if amended to provide for a duty in the islands 35 cents on filler and $1.85 per pound on wrapper tobacco imported from elsewhere than the United States—in other words, placing the tobacco growing and cigar manufacturing industries of the islands on a common level, conferring the same privileges with like restrictions as in continental America.

In this connection I may say that such an amendment was suggested by my colleague, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and was understood to be acceptable to Secretary Taft.

It is claimed doubtless with candor by advocates of the proposed legislation that if enacted American wrapper tobacco will find a ready market in the Philippine Islands.

This is an attractive but delusive proposition, and does not appeal to tobacco growers in Connecticut, Pennsylvania, or Florida, the principal wrapper-producing States, where it is found difficult to compete with fine light-colored Sumatra-grown wrappers, although subject to a duty of nearly $2 a pound, and of which, despite a seemingly high duty, more than $5,000,000 worth is annually imported.

With this fact in view, American tobacco growers are naturally reluctant to believe that Philippine cigar manufacturers requiring light wrappers will purchase the American-grown article, when Sumatra, of superior quality in some respects, can be more easily obtained from a neighboring island by paying a duty of only 22½ cents per pound, each pound equal to wrapping nearly four times the number of cigars than the same weight of Connecticut wrappers will cover.

If the Philippines are to remain permanently under American jurisdiction, as most of the statesmen, members of the Ways and Means Committee, and other distinguished gentlemen who recently visited the islands believe, then the Philippines should be recognized as American territory, alike with Hawaii and Porto Rico, and as Congress may direct the Constitution and laws of the United States should follow the national flag, for under our form of government there can be no place for a colonial system without endangering the stability of the Republic. Wherever the American flag is raised as a token of sovereignty the Constitution and rights of citizenship inherent in that instrument should speedily follow.

If correct in the assumption that the Philippine Archipelago will continue to be an American possession, the Ways and Means Committee should withdraw the makeshift bill the House is asked to approve and report a comprehensive measure extending to the Philippines the customs duties and internal-revenue laws, the merchant-marine and coastwise-shipping laws now operative in our other insular possessions. Should it be claimed that our treaty obligations with Spain prevent such drastic legislation at this time, then I say that until these obligations lapse our first duty is to protect the rights of American citizens rather than to consider the interests of an alien race upon the other side of the globe. [Applause.]

When legislation upon the broad lines I have indicated is brought before Congress it will be a patriotic duty to support the measures proposed, but until this is done, as a representative of one of the largest tobacco-growing interests in the country, a constituency notably intelligent, prosperous, and fair minded, a people who usually reach correct conclusions and who generally believe that the enactment of legislation proposed in the bill before the House will be injurious to important industries, I must, when a roll call is had, cast my vote in accordance with a sense of duty as well as in deference to the views of constituents whose judgment I have learned to respect. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour it would look like cruelty to animals to attempt to make a thirty-minute address. I have no desire to afflict my associates on the floor of this House with a speech of that length, but I shall, however, before I begin, ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, so that I may not occupy more than fifteen or twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the very able address of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LAWRENCE], who closed with this:

> The Committee on Ways and Means has heeded the prayer of the Filipino; will it not now give some attention to the petitions of our home folks?

I will go a little further, and say not only the home folks but the industries of this country.

In the debate which took place before the holiday recess on the reference of the President's message to the proper committees, the House was treated to a very interesting discussion on the deterioration of our legislative bodies, and especially the House of Representatives. Various general causes were assigned, such as the lack of exercise of the important functions of the taxing power and the fear of popular government on the part of so-called "better citizens," and such special causes as the gradual usurpation of power on the part of the Executive and the Senate.

I fear the gentlemen overlooked a much simpler and more fundamental explanation—the suggestion that perhaps our legislative bodies no longer represent the sentiments of the actual people. In looking over these assemblies we find many members who are political placemen and who are obedient to some leader or boss. From such assemblies the people no longer expect legislation intended for their benefit, as experience has proven that such favors are shown only to influential and wealthy private citizens or to special industries or interests or combines. As the people no longer expect much, if anything, from such bodies, they have grown indifferent to them, and by this means it has come to pass that the assemblies have lost or are losing their representative character.

The application of this thought to the House of Representatives is very strikingly illustrated by the bill now under discussion for regulating the tariff on imports from the Philippines. I desire to say at the outset that I have the most profound respect for this House, its traditions, and its members, and I feel second to none in the pride of membership. If, therefore, I am prompted to say even a single word of criticism on its character and tendencies, it is with the deepest regret that I should be justified by the spectacle of this House falling away from some of its lofty ideals.

We have been assured by the Administration that the Philippine Islands are already an inseparable possession of our country, which the Democratic party will not be permitted to give away or allowed to achieve its independent existence. We are told that for all purposes it is as much a part of the country as Porto Rico or Alaska. And the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee admit in their report on this bill that the islands should have free trade, as free as obtains between all the States in the Union.

Yet the very object of the bill is to continue a tariff on Philippine tobacco and sugar, not because they are in urgent need of the money to be raised thereby, which might have been some excuse, if true; but because the American tobacco and sugar industries must be pacified. Think of it. The products of our Philippine fellow-citizens are to be taxed, and incidentally we ourselves must pay the tax, because two private industries might make trouble. It is not the good of the American people or our Philippine wards which is being considered, but the good of certain private interests. Is this the way the House of Representatives justifies its title?

I have listened patiently to all the arguments advanced in favor of the retention of these duties, but they are all frankly addressed to the tobacco and sugar growers without a thought of what the people might say of them. For instance, in the majority report we are told that "with absolute free trade both ways, it would seem that American tobacco is more likely to go to the Philippine Islands than that their product should come here." There is a demand for Sumatra wrappers grown in Connecticut, and they will take the place of the real Sumatra as soon as the Philippine tariff is removed. The free traders should take heart when assured by protectionists that the abolition of tariffs both ways will stimulate American exports.

But the Philippine manufacturers can not produce a cigar that will have an extensive sale in this country because of the inferior quality of their tobacco and the effects of a long ocean

voyage. In fact, on account of the way they are made, with the leaf wrapped lengthwise, these Philippine cigars could not be given away in this country; our people would not have them as Christmas gifts. However, the cigar-making industry is assured that this bill is no menace to it, because there will be no free trade, the bill providing for the retention of part of the existing tariff.

As to the effect on the cigar makers I quote from the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who made two trips to the Philippine Islands for the purpose of studying the existing conditions:

So far as Chinese labor is concerned, in the census of the year 1902 out of 1,714 cigarette makers all but 2 were Filipinos, there being of the Chinese 1 male and 1 female. Of the 11,036 cigar makers, there were of Chinese 29 males and 1 female; of whites, 38 males, and of negroes, 3 males. In other words, there were 8 more white cigar makers than there were Chinese, and only 71 of any other nationality than Filipino. But last February Mr. A. Determan, appointed by the cigar manufacturers and workmen of Manila to represent them before the Ways and Means Committee, made a statement in writing, found on page 231 of the hearings, in which he says, "There is not one Chinese cigar maker in Manila, to correct a false statement to the contrary." I am entirely satisfied from personal observation that the statement is correct. I stood at the gate of the Oriente factory one Saturday afternoon during the past summer and saw the employees, 1,400 in number, pass out at the close of the week's work, and a more clean, orderly, intelligent-looking body of employees it would be difficult to find anywhere outside of the United States. They were all Filipinos.

It is claimed by some that the lowering of the duty on cigars puts the American workman in competition with a cheap class of labor in the Orient, and efforts have been made before the committee and in other places to show that Chinese coolies are employed in this industry in Manila. A greater mistake could not have been made by the opponents of this bill. I have heard these statements and received these communications with great surprise, for in four of the largest factories in Manila which I visited this summer I did not see one Chinaman employed, and I respectfully refer all who entertain this fear to the census statistics of the islands. These persons do not seem to understand that Chinese exclusion and alien contract labor laws exist in the Philippines, and that upon the demand of the Filipinos as well as Americans they are more vigorously enforced there than they are here.

The main point in all this is that the American people are not told that the object of the tariff is to protect them from poor cigars or that it would menace their health if some 100,000,000 Philippine cigars were to be admitted free; there is no indication in the bill or the report that the hearts of the majority Members are throbbing with any such philanthropic purpose. No; only the tobacco industry, a private interest, is assured of the majority's extreme consideration; they are several times assured that the bill is no menace to them.

These American manufacturers are even assured that the Manila manufacturers are not at all enthusiastic over the passage of this bill, even with the prospect of cheaper American wrappers, because they believe that the result will be a growing demand for more wages. Here is a frank admission that the reduction and abolition of tariffs will result in raising wages. Can it be that the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee are surrendering their whole position, the platforms of their party for many years, and are making a bid for a standing in the Democratic ranks? What need of further argument when they admit that free trade produces higher wages?

Then, as to Philippine sugar, the report assures the growers that they have nothing to fear from this bill. We are told that Philippine sugar can not be laid down at New York, even free of duty, at much less than 4 cents a pound, while the growers admit that the cost of refined sugar at the Michigan factories is less than 4 cents a pound, and at the Colorado factories is little more than 3½ cents a pound. Since the freight charges to the markets will be practically the same from New York as from Michigan or Colorado, these growers are assured that even without a tariff conditions are just about equal and they have nothing to fear.

Again, the growers are told that the sugar industry of the Philippines is an infant one; that its growth is bound to be slow because the working animals are dying off, and the Filipinos are not as strong as our workers; besides, they will have to learn modern methods of growing sugar, and when they have learned they will demand higher wages; in the meanwhile, the American consumption of sugar is increasing by leaps and bounds, and it will not wait until the Filipinos have acquired enough skill to furnish the supply. All this to assure the growers that they have no fear of the Philippine sugar, even if admitted free.

But in order to satisfy them a duty of 25 per cent of the present Dingley rates has been retained, thus settling all doubts as to their protection against our Philippine fellow-citizens.

Do we hear any arguments addressed to the American public in all this? Are they told that through the kindness of Congress in lowering the tariff our Philippine brethren will be given a chance to sweeten the cheering cup at about the same cost as at present? Are we even told that after a careful investigation the Philippine sugar has been found not up to the standard, and we must be protected against the consumption of such a demoralizing article? No; nothing of the kind; only the sugar growers are considered, and they are assured that a tariff will be retained for their special protection until 1909.

What a spectacle is here presented! We have a bill providing for the admission of all Philippine products into the United States free of duty, with the exception of sugar and tobacco, on which the duty is to be lowered to one-third of the present rates. This is beautifully noble and patriotic, and speaks volumes for American brotherliness; unfortunately, the exceptions which are made spoil all the beauty of the act, for it is fair to presume that nothing else of much consequence is imported from the Philippines or some powerful interest would arise to demand its addition to the 25 per cent list.

It is generally conceded that if we are to keep these islands there must be freedom of trade; both national parties are united in that, and the report of the committee frankly admits it. A bill to establish free trade should pass unanimously and without discussion.

But the sugar and tobacco men immediately raise a tempest and claim that such a bill would seriously hurt them. The Philippine sugar, of which we now import less than 1 per cent of the American consumption (21,000 tons to 2,750,000 tons), might become a dangerous rival. Philippine sugars made in the Cuban fashion, of which their total output is about 1½ per cent of the American consumption, might actually be given away and not hurt their business.

These gentlemen are assured that they have nothing to fear, that Philippine competition will have no more effect on them than the competition of one State in the Union will have on another; but they will not be satisfied. Then an exception is made in their favor and a duty of 25 per cent is retained. This should serve not only as a salve to their wounded feelings, but as a bonus which they are permitted to collect from the American people for a few years more, by which time they will probably be so rich that they won't care whether there is free trade or not.

Thus we have the spectacle of the House of Representatives turning away from its admitted "plain duty" in order to placate some few people; of the House sacrificing the general interests of the people for the benefit of special industries, or, to put it in a much-hackneyed expression, of the House legislating for the classes as against the masses.

This bill, as I have already suggested, furnishes a striking example of the tendency of our legislative bodies to drift away from their representative ideal and to become the creatures of special interests or even individual bosses. I would respectfully request the distinguished philosophers of the House to take this into account when again searching for the causes of its decline in power and influence.

The same reactionary tendency is observable of the treatment of every phase of the tariff question by the party in power.

There is a growing demand in every section of the country and among all classes for some reduction or revision of the tariff. I need hardly speak of the attitude of the Democratic party, which misses no opportunity of showing the people how necessary is such action, but of course it is accused of being partisan and actuated by a desire for power. However false this accusation, it can not be urged against the press of the country, which is unanimous in advising revision in one way or another. And what shall be said of that wing of the Republican party advocating the Iowa idea, which has grown so large and powerful that it is no longer considered heretical and which was accorded a half-hearted recognition in the last Republican national platform? The Republican party of Massachusetts, in its State convention last year, made similar demands, and the gentleman from that Commonwealth [Mr. LAWRENCE] ably voiced its views on the floor of this House on Saturday last.

Yet, in spite of this grand chorus for revision inside and outside their party, the majority leaders of this House have announced that they will "stand pat." No measures looking to revision will be considered, because they fear a general discussion of the tariff. The voice of the people, the cry of the overprotected, the appeals from members of their own party, made with full knowledge that the fate of Ishmael awaits them, all are of no avail. A deaf ear is turned, and all attempts to broach the subject are sternly discouraged. It can not be that these worthy gentlemen are ignorant of the demand and the necessity for some revision, and we will not be uncharitable enough to believe that they mistake their own personal views for the opinions of the people.

The only explanation of their attitude is that trusts and powerful interests, which have grown and fattened on the tariff, if not actually created thereby, will not consent to having it disturbed, and these gentlemen must "stand pat," even if

against their will. This state of affairs is very humiliating, and they are perforce obliged to deny it whenever it is exposed in its naked truth. And yet it is the sad truth.

The infant industries, of which we have heard so much, which required such tender nursing, have fed so well on the American people that they have grown into powerful giants, reaching out to grapple with the world. But the people have found them to be like the white elephant of the story, and they are begging Congress to take back its gift before it eats them out of house and home. But Congress would rather let the elephant continue its present ruinous feeding than undertake the task of toning down its appetite.

A proposition for tariff revision would threaten the source of supply of these industrial giants and would arouse them to furious indignation. Their one tender spot is the fact that the people are always disposed to interfere in their private business; and a tariff discussion is such an exquisite tickling of that spot that they almost explode in an apoplectic fit.

It may not be uninteresting, in this connection, to state that I had the pleasure as well as the honor of living in the city of Pittsburg for many years and know something about the gentlemen connected with the various protected industries. Away back in 1864 or 1865 two brothers and a friend purchased a half interest in a small iron mill of an old neighbor of mine, Mr. Anthony J. Kloman. The interest did not cost them a very large sum, and they did not have much money at that time. The protection afforded that industry by a paternal government has kept at least one of the brothers, who is now living, busy in the establishment of public libraries all over these United States in order to get rid of his surplus yearly income. He is a most estimable gentleman and lives in my city, has a mansion that covers a whole block in the most fashiouable street, and a castle across the water, in his native land, Scotland. I am not in a position to say how many hundred millions that gentleman is worth, but I do know that if the men in his mills had received even and exact justice in the matter of wages he would not be so busily engaged to-day in spending his money.

In 1875, in conversation with Captain Jones, then superintendent of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, in the town of Braddock, I saw and was pointed out a young man in overalls, working as a laborer, who had recently come from Loretto, Pa., where his father was engaged as a liveryman in conducting a small stable. I find no fault with him for that; he deserves a great deal of credit for it; but later he was wondering how to spend his millions, until he was caught in the shipbuilding trust and was obliged to take a rest for a time.

The protection afforded him in the shape of the duty on iron and steel gave him the opportunity to accumulate money in a way which in no other industry in this land would it have been possible to make the millions that my good friend has been spending. [Applause.] In 1875 I had the honor of renting desk room in my office in the city of Pittsburg to a gentleman standing high in the councils to-day of the great steel trust. He paid me $10 a month. This, remember, was in 1875, when that gentleman was in very moderate circumstances indeed, but to-day could write his check for a hundred million or more without very much trouble. It was made in the steel industry and in the great steel corporation of this country and in the coke regions. [Applause.] Is it any wonder that the gentleman from Massachusetts is asking that something be done for the people at home and not all for the people in the Orient? It seems to me to be a very pertinent question, though I presume it might be regarded as impertinent; but why is it, Mr. Chairman, that we find the tobacco and sugar interests selected as victims in this case? Why not take the steel, glass, lumber, hides, and other equally protected industries and make this rule applicable to them for the benefit of our own people? [Applause.] We would find great trouble in getting Members from Pennsylvania and Ohio to vote for it. Now, the assertion is made, has been a campaign slogan for years, that you must have this high protective tariff to protect the laboring man. I say now that that is not true, for the reason that when a few years ago the puddlers in the steel mills of Pittsburg were getting $5.50 a ton for puddling, the same work was done in your section, Mr. Chairman, for $3.50 a ton, and we tried to find out why it was so, that in Harrisburg, Pottsville, Reading, and Pottstown the rate of wages was so much less—40 per cent—than was paid for the same work at Pittsburg, Wheeling, and in Ohio. We discovered that at the places named a magnificent labor organization, the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers, was in existence, and that they held the manufacturers accountable for the wages paid, whereas in your section, Mr. Chairman, and elsewhere in the East there was no such association at that time.

Now, if the protective tariff helps the workingman, it should have protected them equally in one section with another; but I find that is not the case.

But if revision had finally been agreed to, the war of the giants would begin among themselves. The thousand and one protected interests would struggle to see which would keep most of the present advantages, and of course the stronger would win; the weak ones would be offered as a sacrifice to the people, so that the others might continue on their ravenous way unmolested. Such a picture is painted in vivid colors as a warning to those who want revision; they are told to gaze upon it, and determine if they want such a war precipitated.

But while it would create a terrible noise in the land, it would after all be only a rending of each other by overgorged giants; and when the noise had died down and the smoke of the battle had cleared, the people could bury the carcasses and find themselves relieved of their white elephant.

But we have been notified that there will be no revision; therefore all appeals in that direction will be useless. The Saginaw Valley Lumber Dealers' Association, at their last annual meeting, adopted some resolutions, in which they claimed that "the white-pine forests of this country are annihilated." From other sources the same statement is made, and all authorities seem to agree that white pine has gone the way of the bison and other extinct things. The manufacturing industries depending upon a supply of this wood are demanding the removal of the tax on it, so that they may be able to obtain material from Canada and prevent the ruin of their enterprises.

This tax can not reasonably protect an interest which is practically dead, and its continuance will kill a whole class of industries depending on white pine. Yet it is written that they shall perish, for a discussion of their grievance might bring to light many similar ones and the whole tariff question might have to be taken up. This can not be thought of; therefore these industries must perish, a sacrifice on the altar of tariff peace.

We are all familiar with the demand of the artists for the removal of the duty on works of art. The former is an example where a previous excuse for protection no longer exists, but this latter is a case of where an excuse never existed. Here we find the entire protected class vehemently denouncing the protection and begging to be relieved of it; and surely they are the judges of the effect of their protection. We know that the abolition of this tax would not affect the revenues, since the income it brings is ridiculously small, and in no way can it be defended as a just tax. And yet these artists will continue to be protected against their will, because a discussion of their grievance might serve as an entering wedge for a general tariff discussion.

In March our reciprocal arrangements with Germany will expire, and as no new arrangement is in sight we can expect Germany to place a tariff on the products we sell to her. Other European nations are preparing to follow the same course, which is simply our own. They are taking our own lesson to heart and are erecting tariff walls for the protection of their own industries. Germany's action means the loss or serious crippling of some $40,000,000 of trade in foodstuffs. If we let down the bars a little to German manufacturers this trade will not be disturbed; if we keep up our bars Germany will also erect hers.

Our farmers, whose products are thus threatened, will arise and demand protection—something heretofore unheard of on their part. But they will be met with a stern refusal; a reciprocal tariff to favor their interests can not be considered, for it would mortally offend our American manufacturers, and might accidentally cause a general tariff discussion. How proud we have been of our farmers heretofore; what a fine example they have set their fellow-countrymen! Buying what they needed in the home market, necessarily the dearest because of the tariff, they have sold their products in the cheapest markets, because they had to compete with the world. They never complained, never asked for protection, were happy, and contented.

But now, when they realize the need of protection, and ask a favor for the first time, they will immediately fall from grace and be covered with reproaches. How can they have the heart to ask for protection, when it can be given only at the expense of our poor manufacturers! No, they must try to make ends meet in some other way; perhaps they can find some other nation which might take their threatened food stuffs and agree not to adopt the iniquitous American system of raising the tariff against them.

The district which I have the honor of representing is one which nature has most bountifully favored. It has an immense water frontage, with navigable rivers and fine harbors; it has hundreds of acres capable of a rich cultivation, with desirable sites for manufacturing industries, iron and steel plants, and many other activities. Its natural advantages have been known

and appreciated for years, and when New York City was little more than a town this district was looked to as the site of a future great metropolis. The famous Morris family was especially hopeful and enthusiastic, and gave many evidences of their loyalty to and faith in the district; none more so than Gouverneur Morris, of revered memory.

Many of these hopes are in a fair way to being realized, and it is a particularly happy privilege to be able to represent such a district. But some of its finest advantages are of no use to its people because of present tariff regulations. Its miles of magnificent water front should be crowded with American ships and shipping, and factories and mills should be busy turning out American products; but the high tariff prevents all this.

In common with the New England and coast towns generally, whose mills were forced to close when the tariff was raised on iron and steel, we ask for such reduction of this duty as will give us an opportunity to make another start. But the great steel trust will see to it that our demand gets no further than its mere verbal expression.

Recent history has shown that the only way to stimulate American shipping is to reduce the tariff; this produces a freer trade, with more freight to be carried, and a chance to make a legitimate profit on it; it produces a healthy commerce, taking care of itself, and existing of its own volition. The only American shipping we can have under the existing tariff will consist of empty boats, floating at the expense of the people; an unhealthy commerce, existing only by reason of subsidies.

When, therefore, my district asks for a reduction of the tariff, in order that the freer trade may stimulate the shipping interests and our water front be put to some use, we are confronted with the announcement that no tariff proposition will be listened to. The protected manufacturers of the country must continue to be protected, and our natural advantages and immense possibilities can go to waste.

No matter from what point you approach the question you are met with refusal. Whether the appeal have an international or foreign interest, like the farmers' appeal; a national interest, like that of the artists or manufacturers of wooden articles; like that of the Massachusetts Republicans, or only a local interest, like that of my own district, it is all one to the powers that be; they are going to "stand pat," and no help need be expected.

We are sadly forced to the conclusion that this House no longer represents the people, whose appeals are not heeded therein. These people will soon grow indifferent to it and look for help elsewhere, and if they find it, then the day of this House is at an end. I trust this event will never come to pass, but if it does, future historians will relate that this bulwark of our institutions and of our liberties began to perish on the day that its guardians denied the voice of its people in order to prevent the warring clashes of the few, when they adopted expediency as their guide instead of justice and truth.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3—the Philippine tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

BRIDGE BETWEEN FORT SNELLING AND ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported the bill (H. R. 8103) to authorize the construction of a bridge between Fort Snelling and St. Paul, Minn., and asked unanimous consent that the bill be committed to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2558. An act authorizing the Washington Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Columbia River near the city of Wenatchie, Wash.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

KENSEY J. HAMPTON.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. HAY, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Kensey J. Hampton, Fifty-seventh Congress, second session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting changes of estimate of appropriation for repairs, etc., on public buildings—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Treasurer of the United States submitting an estimate of appropriation for clerical force in his office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the estimate of appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report as to employment of civilian engineers in river and harbor work—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator and Railway Company, submitting a statement as to the receipts and expenditures and the distribution of the stock of the company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5293) to provide for the building of a new light-house and range light at Honolulu Harbor, Territory of Hawaii, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 158); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5294) for the establishment of a light-house at Makapuu Point, on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 159); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4348) granting an increase of pension to William McCraw, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 88); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10365) granting a pension to Emeline T. Hayner, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 89); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4196) granting an increase of pension to James J. Wians, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 90); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5779), granting a pension to Hannah W. Green, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 91); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5654) granting a pension to Moses Eggleston, reported the same without amend-

ment, accompanied by a report (No. 92); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4731) granting an increase of pension to Robert McMullen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 93); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6183) granting an increase of pension to Amanuel Russell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 94); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4644) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Dickens, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 95); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4153) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Wildy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 96); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5253) granting an increase of pension to Greenberry Suddarth, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 97); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4876) granting an increase of pension to William L. Beeks, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 98); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5546) granting an increase of pension to James Eastwood, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 99); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5686) granting an increase of pension to Adelle Tobey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 100); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4747) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Robinson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 101); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7237) granting an increase of pension to Philip Bacon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 102); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4744) granting an increase of pension to Thomas O'Connor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 103); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4392) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Miller, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 104); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4226) granting an increase of pension to William Painter, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 105); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4706) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Gardner, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 106); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5831) granting an increase of pension to Julius Zuehlke, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 107); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7309) granting a pension to Maj. Louis Dieckgraefe, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 108); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7206) granting a pension to Nannie Frazier, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 109); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7758) granting an increase of pension to John L. Whitman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 110); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8409) granting an increase of pension to George H. Stowits, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 111); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7950) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Heath, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 112); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8404) granting an increase of pension to John H. Ferguson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 113); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7673) granting an increase of pension to Homer A. Barrows, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 114); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8181) granting an increase of pension to Martin B. Noyes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 115); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9382) granting a pension to Mariam T. Shreve, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 116); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9352) granting a pension to Mary Van Blarcom, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 117); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10389) granting an increase of pension to John W. Ellsworth, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 118); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8237) granting an increase of pension to Noah Palmer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 119); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2395) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Clinton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 120); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3481) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cranston, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 121); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3506) granting an increase of pension to George W. McCormick, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 122); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3487) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Weise, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 123); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2266) granting an increase of pension to George H. Hodges, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 124); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 532) granting an increase of pension to James T. Berry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 125); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3402) granting an increase of pension to Sidney S. Brigham, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 126); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 723) granting an increase of pension to George W. Raigle, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 127); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1986) granting an increase of pension to Morris Bennett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by report (No. 128); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1434) granting an increase of pension to Eleazer A. Patterson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 129); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3295) granting an increase of pension to George W. Knapp, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 130); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3340) granting an increase of pension to William Moorhead, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 131); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred to bill of the House (H. R. 2594) granting an increase of pension to Levi Bearss, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 132); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2262) granting an increase of pension to John Seymour, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 133); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1653) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Weeks, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 134); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1853) granting an increase of pension to William J. Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 135); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3449) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Gaskill, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 136); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 486) granting an increase of pension to John Armstrong, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 137); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1766) granting an increase of pension to John T. Stone, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 138); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2011) granting an increase of pension to John Lezenby, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 139); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3451) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Alonso Rockwell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 140); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1062) granting an increase of pension to George E. Brickett, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 141); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 604) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Armstrong, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 142); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1572) for the relief of Thomas W. Higgins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 143); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 186) to authorize the readjustment of the accounts of Army officers in certain cases, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 144); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6530) for the relief of David C. McGee, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 145); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10610) for the relief of James N. Robinson and Sallie B. McComb, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 146); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 6948, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 136) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of S. D. Sprinkle, accompanied by a report (No. 147); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9877) for the relief of James P. Barney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 148); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 7753, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 138) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the estate of Eliza A. Fielder, deceased, and Benjamin L. Fielder, accompanied by a report (No. 149); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 1020, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 139) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Lee Robbins, accompanied by a report (No. 150); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HASKINS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9569) for the relief of the Compagnie Francaise des Câbles Télégraphiques, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 151); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 10482, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 140) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the owner or owners of the barge *Charlie*, accompanied by a report (No. 152); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 9098, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 137) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the legal representatives of John McCabe and Patrick McCabe, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 153); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 3210, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 141) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Sarah H. Milvaney, accompanied by a report (No. 154); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5927) for the relief of the board of trustees of West Tennessee College, Jackson, Tenn., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 155); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7889) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Noble, reported the

same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 156); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8799) granting an increase of pension to Bartholomew Moravity, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 157); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 11014) to amend section 5278 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, on extradition—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULKERSON: A bill (H. R. 11015) to provide for the repairing, furnishing, and completing of the public building at St. Joseph, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 11016) for the preservation of American antiquities—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 11017) in amendment of section 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 11018) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, and for other purposes," approved May 28, 1890, by striking out the words "not to exceed two dollars per day" and inserting "not to exceed four dollars per day"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 11019) making an appropriation to reward certain Indians in South Dakota for the rescue of certain white captives in the custody of the White Lodge bands of Sioux Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 11020) to promote the better distribution of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 11021) to add a corps of dental surgeons to the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WELBORN: A bill (H. R. 11022) providing for the erection of a public building at Lexington, Mo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11023) to appoint an additional judge for the third division of the district of Alaska—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 11024) to acquire certain ground in Lanier Heights for an addition to the National Zoological Park, District of Columbia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11025) to extend Seventh, and Franklin, and Sixth streets NE.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 11026) to authorize the counties of Holmes and Washington to construct a bridge across Yazoo River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A bill (H. R. 11027) authorizing the consolidation of and evidence in actions for libel—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 11028) for the advancement of certain officers of the Navy who served during the civil war and were retired prior to March 3, 1899—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 11029) to authorize the holding of a regular term of the district and circuit courts of the United States for the western district of Virginia in the city of Big Stone Gap, Va.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 11030) to authorize the counties of Yazoo and Holmes to construct a bridge across Yazoo River, Mississippi—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 11031) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Schnectady, in the State of New York—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 11032) to prevent the adulteration of blue grass, orchard grass, and clover seed—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 11033) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Jersey City, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 11034) to provide a site and erect a public building at Willimantic, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11035) to establish a postal savings system in the United States, and to provide for the conduct and regulation of the same—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 11036) to purchase additional land and provide additional buildings at the Cold Springs fish hatchery at Bullochville, Ga.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 11037) relating to the transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 11038) to amend the seventh section of the act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 11039) to provide for the disposal of abandoned and useless naval reservations—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11040) to authorize the receivers of public moneys for land districts to deposit with the Treasurer of the United States certain sums embraced in their accounts of unearned fees and unofficial moneys—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11041) to provide for the fulfillment of contracts for land surveys relet by the Government—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11042) for the relief of receivers of public moneys acting as special disbursing agents in the matter of amounts expended by them for contingent expenses, expenses of depositing public moneys, and expenses of hearings in land entries—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11043) to authorize trustees appointed under the town-site laws to administer oaths, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11044) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury, in certain contingencies, to refund to receivers of public moneys, acting as special disbursing agents, amounts paid by them out of their private funds—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 11045) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize Washington and Westmoreland counties, in the State of Pennsylvania, to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania," approved February 21, 1903—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) authorizing the Secretary of War to return to the officers of the Officers' Association of the Third Regiment of the United States Volunteer Engineers in the late war with Spain their national color and the regimental color which were forwarded to the War Department, Washington, D. C., when the regiment was mustered out of service, May 17, 1899—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: A resolution (H. Res. 135) calling upon the Secretary of the Navy for information as to conditions at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 136) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 6948—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee, a resolution (H. Res. 137) referring to the Court of Claims bill H. R. 9098—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. OTJEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 138) referring to the Court of Claims bill H. R. 7753—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. FULKERSON, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 139) referring to the Court of Claims bill H. R. 1020—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 140) referring to the Court of Claims bill H. R. 10482—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 141) referring to the Court of Claims bill H. R. 3210—to the Private Calendar.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 11046) granting an increase of pension to Hellen G. Heiner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11047) for the relief of Mary F. B. Grice—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11048) granting an increase of pension to Richard Gogin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 11049) for the relief of W. T. Strickland, administrator of John M. Strickland—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANDRUS: A bill (H. R. 11050) granting a pension to Margaret Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 11051) granting a pension to Henry T. McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BANNON: A bill (H. R. 11052) granting an increase of pension to John P. Vance—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11053) granting an increase of pension to William Salyers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11054) for the relief of William Large—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 11055) for the relief of Miller Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 11056) for the relief of R. J. R. Newcomb—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11057) granting an increase of pension to Lewis J. Post—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 11058) granting an increase of pension to Orrin W. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 11059) granting an increase of pension to Charles V. Richards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 11060) for the relief of Jacob C. Barkley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11061) granting an increase of pension to Reanna Pile—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 11062) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Harlan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11063) granting an increase of pension to John T. Hetherlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 11064) granting an increase of pension to Perry Mullen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 11065) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Pollard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 11066) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Stafford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11067) for the relief of Cornelius Cahill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEEMER: A bill (H. R. 11068) granting an increase of pension to Henry Golder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11069) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel T. Leib—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11070) granting an increase of pension to Fitch Spoor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11071) granting an increase of pension to Allen E. Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11072) granting an increase of pension to William T. Hosley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11073) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Allison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11074) granting an increase of pension to Wilbur H. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11075) granting a pension to Anna C. Partlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11076) granting a pension to Marion W. Starks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11077) granting a pension to Sarah E. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11078) granting a pension to Rosa Zurrin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11079) granting a pension to Phoebe A. Barnum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11080) granting a pension to Charlotte M. Eckstine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11081) granting a pension to Charles W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11082) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Winkler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11083) granting an increase of pension to Herman Brunce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11084) granting an increase of pension to Hiram N. Humphrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11085) granting an increase of pension to Isaac A. Chandler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11086) granting an increase of pension to John Baer, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11087) granting a pension to Eunice M. Stickle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11088) to correct the military record of John Mix—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 11089) to correct the military record of Charles H. Potter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11090) granting an increase of pension to William S. Malette—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11091) granting an increase of pension to Frances W. Graves—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11092) for the relief of the heirs of Nancy Montgomery—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11093) granting a pension to Martin M. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11094) granting a pension to Henry Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11095) for the relief of J. D. Coleman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 11096) granting an increase of pension to Sion B. Glazner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 11097) granting a pension to George W. Hale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 11098) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 11099) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Bitgood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11100) granting an increase of pension to John Browne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 11101) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11102) granting an increase of pension to William D. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11103) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Gring—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11104) granting an increase of pension to Albert Hertel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11105) granting an increase of pension to Michael Comer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11106) granting an increase of pension to John S. Millman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill H. R. 11107) granting an increase of pension to William E. Fritz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11108) for the relief of Benjamin F. King—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 11109) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Paducah, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11110) for the relief of S. Hodge—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11111) for the relief of the estate of Timothy Burgess, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11112) for the relief of the estate of P. F. Waterfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11113) for the benefit of W. H. Dupree—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11114) for the relief of J. C. Glenn—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11115) for the relief of the estate of James A. Gregory, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11116) for the relief of the estate of S. F. Crider—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11117) for the relief of the estate of Seth Wright, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11118) for the relief of Allison W. Pollard—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11119) for the relief of the estate of H. Cothis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11120) for the relief of the heirs of C. R. Young, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11121) for the relief of the estate of W. M. O'Hara, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KNOPF: A bill (H. R. 11122) granting an increase of pension to John Hopper—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 11123) granting an increase of pension to Jacob N. Lott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11124) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Lindsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11125) granting an increase of pension to Harvey W. Shockey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11126) granting an increase of pension to William N. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11127) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Wall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11128) granting an increase of pension to William T. Fleming—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11129) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Lindsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11130) granting an increase of pension to Jerome B. Weller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11131) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester B. Bloomfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11132) granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Lydy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11133) granting a pension to Amanda Jane Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11134) granting a pension to Caroline Hettesheimer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11135) granting a pension to Theresa Kilpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11136) granting a pension to Mary Liddy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11137) granting an increase of pension to John R. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11138) granting a pension to Laura Ferman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 11139) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11140) granting an increase of pension to Henry Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11141) granting an increase of pension to Jesse S. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11142) granting an increase of pension to James McQuade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: A bill (H. R. 11143) granting an increase of pension to Levi B. Noulton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 11144) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11145) granting an increase of pension to Melvin J. Lee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAW: A bill (H. R. 11146) granting an increase of pension to Patrick H. Corrigan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 11147) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Thurston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11148) granting a pension to Angeline Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11149) for the reference of the claim of the estate of Isaac P. Tice against the Government of the United States to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 11150) granting an increase of pension to James P. Roby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 11151) granting an increase of pension to John Sirmyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11152) granting an increase of pension to Theodore S. Currier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11153) to correct the military record of Robert B. Tubbs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 11154) for the relief of Andrew H. Russell and William R. Livermore—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr MANN: A bill (H. R. 11155) granting a pension to John Echerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11156) for the relief of Julius Frank—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11157) to compensate E. C. Sturges for property lost during the Spanish-American war—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11158) to authorize the Secretary of War to correct the military record of Oscar B. Knight—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11159) placing Hugh F. Reed on the retired list with the rank of captain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 11160) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Herbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 11161) granting an increase of pension to Michael Aaron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 11162) for the relief of Benjamin P. Loyall—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11163) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. Samuel E. Hall, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 11164) granting a pension to Sarah Culp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11165) granting a pension to Katherine E. Kemble—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11166) granting a pension to Charles C. Rumpf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11167) granting an increase of pension to William N. Gemmill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11168) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Mathews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 11169) granting an increase of pension to Robert P. Call—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 11170) for the relief of Andrew Jackson Mondy—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11171) granting an increase of pension to John M. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11172) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Tobias K. Brenner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11173) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11174) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Richards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 11175) granting a pension to Florinda Butler Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 11176) granting a pension to Charles T. Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11177) for the relief of J. W. Knox, of Gallatin County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 11178) for the relief of Mrs. E. C. McIntyre—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11179) for the relief of James Goodwin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11180) for the relief of the heirs of Cyrus Ratliff, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11181) for the relief of François Jefferson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11182) for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11183) for the relief of C. E. Booty—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11184) for the relief of the estate of Henry J. Heard, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11185) for the relief of the estate of Morty Lynch, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11186) for the relief of the estate of François Laglaize, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11187) for the relief of the estate of H. Pierce, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11188) for the relief of the estate of Louis Baron, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11189) for the relief of the estate of William Griffith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11190) for the relief of the estate of George W. Dyson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11191) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. R. V. Packer and the estate of R. J. Packer, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11192) for the relief of the estate of Adelcn Vigues, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11193) for the relief of the estate of Louis Vuagnat, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11194) for the relief of the estate of François Dormenon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 11195) for the relief of the estate of Josuah Parnell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 11196) granting an increase of pension to William H. Joslyn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11197) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Alexander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11198) granting an increase of pension to E. Sandusky—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11199) for the relief of Jacob Vaught—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11200) granting a pension to Henry C. Shover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMYSER: A bill (H. R. 11201) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Rhoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11202) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Polen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11203) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Hartley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11204) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Giles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11205) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Spice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11206) granting an increase of pension to John Wilhelm—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11207) granting an increase of pension to Sampson McNeal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11208) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11209) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Griffith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11210) granting an increase of pension to John Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11211) granting an increase of pension to Ransom D. Lydick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11212) granting an increase of pension to John H. Blessing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11213) granting an increase of pension to Solomon D. Sturtz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11214) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11215) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Moffitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11216) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Ling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11217) granting an increase of pension to Jordan H. Banks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11218) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11219) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel G. Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11220) granting an increase of pension to James Knox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11221) granting an increase of pension to Moses Stockdale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11222) granting an increase of pension to James L. Mellor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11223) granting an increase of pension to Beal H. Bryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11224) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Stansbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11225) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Cash—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11226) granting an increase of pension to Marcus L. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11227) granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. Winsch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11228) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton Johnston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11229) granting an increase of pension to John C. Ramsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11230) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Cunningham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11231) granting a pension to Henry B. Speis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11232) granting a pension to Aaron L. Packer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11233) granting a pension to William S. Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11234) granting a pension to John Ryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11235) granting a pension to Margaret Robison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11236) granting a pension to Herbert O. Kohr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11237) granting a pension to Sarah Tagg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11238) granting a pension to Minnie Dice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11239) granting a pension to Eliza E. Marr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11240) granting a pension to Rachael Humphrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11241) granting a pension to Watson Hammel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11242) granting a pension to Richard Metcalf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11243) granting a pension to Henry Newcomber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11244) granting a pension to Elizabeth Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11245) granting a pension to Charles W. Wood—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 11246) for the relief of the heirs at law of Patrick H. Burnett, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11247) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 11248) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Woodward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11249) granting an increase of pension to Daniel D. Jennings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 11250) granting an increase of pension to Walter G. Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELBORN: A bill (H. R. 11251) granting a pension to Michael Boyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11252) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Glasgow, Howard County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11253) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 11254) for the relief of the legal representatives of David Weil and Henry Moore, who were late copartners, of Montgomery, Ala., under the name and style of Weil & Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11255) for the relief of the estate of A. P. Gafford, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON: A bill (H. R. 11256) granting an increase of pension to William M. Ewing—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11257) granting a pension to George F. McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 11258) for the relief of the heirs of John Patterson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11259) granting an increase of pension to Barnes B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 11260) granting an increase of pension to James H. Van Camp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11261) granting an increase of pension to James Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11262) granting an increase of pension to John W. Langford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9541) granting a pension to Frank Klein, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the State Teachers' Association, of Denver, Colo., favoring the Mesa Verde Cliff Dwellers' National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the mayor and city council of Sante Fe, N. Mex., relative to the sale of nonmineral-bearing lands to

ratify bonded indebtedness against certain counties—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade and Business Men's Association of Norfolk, Va., against taking away the power of the States to regulate the pilotage system—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Damascus Council, No. 536, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Art Club of Philadelphia, favoring abolition of duties on works of art—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Tobacco Growers' Association, of Lancaster, Pa., against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance of the United States, for a treaty of reciprocity between Germany and the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the New Century Club, of Philadelphia, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward G. Hansen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ida J. Lasswell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Kurzwig and 15 mercantile firms of Watertown and Madison, Wis., favoring repeal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, against spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of Honest Abe Council, No. 66; Acme Council, and South Side Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Welcom Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, favoring a new post-office building for that city—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 172, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of Cigar Makers' Union No. 44, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against enacting the Philippine tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Miller Smith, heir of Lawrence Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of Harrison Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 172, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of masters and pilots of steam vessels and others navigating Block Island Sound, for a lightship at Point Judith—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASSEL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry P. Wills—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John T. Hetherlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of cigar makers of Iowa City, Iowa, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jurgen F. Schreck and 58 others, of Davenport, Iowa, against spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Conoway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEEMER: Petition of the Williamsport Mirror and Glass Company and the Muncy Manufacturing Company, against tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution of the General Synod of the Reformed Church, in favor of excluding members of the Mormon Church from Congress—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, opposing legislation excluding immigrants except criminals and persons obviously likely to become paupers—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Rice Growers' Association, favoring reciprocal relations by treaty relative to free admission of standard cereals—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLACK: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 10007) granting an increase of pension to Appleton Gibson and papers to accompany bill (H. R. 10211) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Whites—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of settlers of the Minidoka reclamation project, for money from land sales to go into the Minidoka reclamation fund—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FULLER: Resolution of the Anti-Joint Statehood League of Arizona, in opposition to joint statehood for Arizona and New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolution of the board of trustees of the sanitary district of Chicago, in favor of a deep waterway to the Gulf of Mexico—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolution of the Interdenominational Council of Women, advocating a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: Petition of Capital City Council, No. 221, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Charles Town, W. Va., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of John Yeager, of Pocahontas County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Riley, of Pocahontas County, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of Success Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GARNER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of A. M. Beall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jonathan H. Terrell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Petition of the Globe-Wernicke Company and the Triumph Electric Company, of Cincinnati, Ohio, against tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, relative to shipping in the Orient—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, relative to river and harbor improvements in and about the city of New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Hoboken Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Reliable Council, No. 90, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 172, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, favoring a new post-office building for Pittsburg—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of the Newport Horticultural Society, favoring an increased appropriation for agricultural experiment stations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry J. Kinzel, of Knox County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petitions of Jellico Council, No. 1, and Councils Nos. 2186 and 211, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of the board of agriculture of Connecticut, favoring bills H. R. 285 and 286, appropriating $250,000 to suppress gypsy moth—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the board of agriculture of Connecticut, favoring bill H. R. 345, to increase experiment stations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KNAPP: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Levi B. Noulton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: Petition of Charles A. Gerasch Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Kutztown, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 172, of Davenport, Iowa, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the General Synod of the Reformed Church of America, against admission of persons to Congress engaged in the practices of the Mormon Church—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Protest of cigar makers of the Twenty-fifth New York Congressional district, against the enactment of bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Angeline Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Margaret Thurston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of Coalmont Council, No. 860, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George H. Bryner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Marysville, Perry County, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of Columbian Commandery, No. 132, Knights of Malta; citizens of Middletown, Highspire, and Royalton, Pa.; citizens of Enders, Pa.; Jacksonville Council, No. 80, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and citizens of Loyalton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalizaton.

By Mr. PADGETT: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to William Hughes and papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Albert Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Cupps—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Phoenix and Maricopa counties, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, for creation of a Federal judicial court in the Orient—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Wilford Twyman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of Lincoln Trades and Labor Council, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Meredith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas B. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Illinois Coal Operators' Association, of Springfield, Ill., relative to railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of J. N. Westland, of Center City, Minn., protesting against issuance of "fraud order" of the Peoples' United States Bank—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution adopted by the Minnesota Good Roads Association in favor of the Brownlow bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution from the Minnesota State Art Society, for removal of the tariff on imported works of art—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, favoring establishment of a Federal judicial court in the Orient—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of B. Lishitz, of New York City, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the general assembly of Indiana, for an appropriation of $6,000 by Congress for suitable auditorium in the national cemetery at New Albany, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of W. L. Sanderson Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of New Albany, Ind., for better facilities for the decoration of soldiers' graves in the cemetery at New Albany, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Bethany Grange, No. 748, Patrons of Husbandry, of Alexander, N. Y., asking that the revenue tax be removed from alcohol unfit for use as a beverage—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEEMS: Petition of Maynard Council, No. 61, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of Carpenters and Joiners' Union No. 657, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Sheboygan, Wis., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of A. P. Gafford—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *January 10, 1906.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. DICK presented petitions of Cleveland City Council, No. 55, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cleveland; Piqua Council, No. 80, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Piqua; Price Hill Council, No. 210, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cincinnati; Arcanum Council, No. 149, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Arcanum; Norwalk Council, No. 189, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Norwalk; Pleasant Hill Council, No. 86, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pleasant Hill; Miami Council, No. 7, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Dayton; Vienna Royal Council, No. 15, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Vienna Crossroads; Anona Council, No. 165, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Hamersville; Lewisburg Council, No. 22, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Lewisburg; Martins Ferry Council, No. 39, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Martins Ferry; Bucyrus Council, No. 184, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bucyrus; Wayne Township Council, No. 227, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Good Hope; Thomas Jefferson Council, No. 100, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of North Industry; Reliable Council, No. 181, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Mogadore; G. W. Hirst Council, No. 132, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New Weston; Harmony Council, No. 50, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cincinnati; Crown Council, No. 35, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Dayton; Steubenville Council, No. 144, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Steubenville; Bushnell Council, No. 163, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Springfield; Benton Ridge Council, No. 321, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Benton Ridge; Tippecanoe Council, No. 313, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Inland; Cumminsville Council, No. 75, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cincinnati; Magnetic Council, No. 231, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bellbrook; Woodward Council, No. 49, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cincinnati; Hannibal Council, No. 28, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Hannibal; Union Council, No. 76, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bokes Creek; Diamond Council, No. 5, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wellsville; Eagle Council, No. 4, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Shawnee; Tri-County Council, No. 47, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Loveland; Kyger Council, No. 154, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Kyger; Madison Council, No. 17, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Madisonville; Bethel Council, No. 187, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Dunnehill; Washington Council, No. 12, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Canton; Gallipolis Council, No. 269, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Gallipolis; Copus Council, No. 60, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Ashland; General McPherson Council, No. 110, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Canal Fulton; Attica Council, No. 317, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Attica; St. Clari Council, No. 6, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Eaton; Wyandot Council, No. 95, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Nevada; Excelsior Council, No. 83, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Home City; Highland Council, No. 204, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New Petersburg; Mad River Council, No. 56, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Urbana; James A. Gar-

field Council, No. 118, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Canton; Hampton Council, No. 77, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cincinnati; Byesville Council, No. 73, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Byesville; Lakeside Council, No. 120, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Perry; Valley Council, No. 140, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of McConnelsville; Cincinnatus Council, No. 82, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cincinnati; Amity Council, No. 87, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of South Lebanon; Bethlehem Council, No. 79, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cincinnati; Storms Creek Council, No. 108, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Terrehante; Wilmington Council, No. 34, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wilmington; Seneca Council, No. 58, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Fostoria; Western Star Council, No. 340, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Sidney; Stars and Stripes Council, No. 159, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Philipsburg; Brighton Council, No. 324, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cincinnati; Cozaddale Council, No. 78, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cozaddale; Lebanon Council, No. 19, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Lebanon; Ohio Valley Council, No. 21, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Bellaire; Rawson Council, No. 46, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Rawson; Chester Council, No. 127, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of West Chester; Rockwood Council, No. 105, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Rockwood; Rushsylvania Council, No. 236, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Rushsylvania; Samuel J. Randall Council, No. 96, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Youngstown; Patrick Henry Council, No. 84, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Canton; Blanchester Council, No. 134, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Blanchester; Muskingum Council, No. 40, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Marietta; Empire Council, No. 68, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Fletcher; Guernsey Council, No. 73, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Cambridge; Burlington Lodge, Knights of Pythias, of Homer; Galion Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Galion; Galion Tent Maccabees, of Galion; Mansfield Lodge of Machinists, of Mansfield; Carpenters' Union of Cincinnati; Street Railway Employees of Akron; Scioto Lodge, No. 150, International Brotherhood Maintenance of Way Employees, of Portsmouth; Metal Workers of Lorain; Knights of Pythias Lodge No. 159, of Plain City; Daughters of America Council No. 99, of Cincinnati; Amity Council, No. 87, of South Lebanon; Iron Molders' Union No. 61, of Salem; Iron Molders' Union No. 98, of Columbus; Iron Molders' Union No. 198, of Mansfield; Iron Molders' Union No. 432, of Cincinnati; Local Union No. 437, Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Portsmouth; Standard Lodge, No. 702, International Association of Machinists, of Cleveland, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Marion and Dayton, in the State of Ohio, protesting against the ratification of the Isle of Pines treaty; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Butler Grange, No. 993, Patrons of Husbandry, of Salem, Ohio, and a petition of the Postal Progress League of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Ohio State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, praying for the enactment of legislation to remove the duty on denaturized alcohol; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Grocers' Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Business Men's Club of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the ratification of a reciprocity treaty between the German Empire and the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Coshocton, Ohio, praying for the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Conference of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ, of Akron, Ohio, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of the Ideal Club of Fremont, of Sunday school children of Fremont, the Board of Trade of Marysville, the School Principals' Association of Columbus, the Cosmopolitan Club of Fremont, and of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side by the diversion of the waters for manufacturing purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented petitions of the Board of Trade of Greenville, of the Live Stock Commission Merchants' Association of Cincinnati, of the Receivers and Shippers' Association of Dayton, and of the Furniture Exchange of Cincinnati, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SCOTT presented petitions of Evelyn Council, No. 39, of Lucile; Freed Council, No. 105, of Freed; Chapel Council, No. 174, of Riffle, and of Young America Council, No. 201, of Morgantown, all of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, in the State of West Virginia, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration and also for the revision of the laws governing naturalization; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCREARY presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nicholasville, Ky., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Tobasco Council, No. 29, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Berwick, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FRAZIER presented a memorial of the Grain Dealers' Exchange of Nashville, Tenn., and a memorial of the Federation of Trades of Knoxville, Tenn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Phoenix, Ariz., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of Arizona and New Mexico into the Union as one State; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented petitions of Washington Council, of Nashville; of Local Council No. 36, of Briceville, and of Major Council, No. 46, of Greenback, all of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, and of sundry citizens of Calhoun, Morristown, Coal Creek, and Christiana, and of Typographical Union No. 426, American Federation of Labor, of Bristol, all in the State of Tennessee, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of Cumberland Division, No. 473, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Tennessee, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented a petition of the Commercial Club, of Lead, S. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called "Esch-Townsend railroad rate bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of Wells and McComas Council, No. 6, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of East Alton, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation requiring uniformity of naturalization certificates; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Granville, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Kenney, Ill., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. KNOX presented petitions of Council No. 66, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Carnegie; Welcome Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; Coalmont Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Coalmont; Charles A. Gerasch Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Kutztown; Mahoning Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Punxsutawney; Steelton Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Steelton; Western Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Belle Vernon; Sherwood Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Pittsburg; Tunkhannock Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Tunkhannock; Wanamie

Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Wanamie; Damascus Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Damascus; Mount Pisgah Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Mauch Chunk; Lewisburg Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Lewisburg; Hoboken Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Hoboken; New Tripoli Grand Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Tripoli; Sargeant Wyant Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Oakridge; Moses Taylor Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Scranton; General McClelland Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Orient Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics; South Side Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics; America Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were rereferred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Reading, Baldwin, and West Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called "ex-prisoners of war pension bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the Ladies' Library Club of Athens; of Sarah C. Neilson, of Philadelphia, and of the Delaware County Woman's Suffrage Association, of Swarthmore, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the impending destruction of Niagara Falls on the American side by the diversion of the waters for manufacturing purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented petitions of the Young Men's Christian Association of Easton, of the Home Missionary Society of McKeesport, of the Germantown Branch of the Christian Endeavor Society of Germantown, and of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Sewickley, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings, grounds, and ships; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Easton, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented petitions of William Spencer, of Erie; Asher Miner, of Wilkes-Barre, and of the Board of Trade of Bradford, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Lodge bill, providing for the reorganization of the consular service; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of Raymond Koehler, of Kingston; of R. P. Brodhead, of Kingston; of F. J. Coates, of Cochranville, and of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, and of the International Council of Women for Christian and Patriotic Service, of New York City, N. Y., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against the Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. OVERMAN presented petitions of Mooresville Council, No. 89, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Mooresville; of Stokesdale Council, No. 91, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Stokesdale; of Rockingham Council, No. 131, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Rockingham; of Randleman Council, No. 31, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Randleman; of North State Council, No. 34, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Burlington; of Cannonsville Council, No. 25, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Concord; of Greensboro Council, No. 13, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Greensboro; of Dilworth Council, No. 12, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Charlotte, and of Henrietta Council, No. 61, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Henrietta, all in the State of North Carolina, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CRANE presented a memorial of the American Humane Education Society and the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, remonstrating against an increase in the number of hours required in the interstate transportation of live stock; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of Ben Miller Council, No. 11, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Danbury, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SCOTT. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2801) to withhold from sale a portion of the Fort Brady Military Reservation, at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to ask that the committee be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and it will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SCOTT subsequently said: In regard to the bill I just asked to have referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, the author of the bill would like to have it go back to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds because it is to withhold from sale a part of a military reservation that has already been authorized to be sold.

Mr. BURROWS. It is a military reservation the sale of which has been already authorized. The bill proposes to reserve for the uses of a public building a quantity of land that is to be exempted from the sale and kept for a public building. I think it properly belongs to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be recommitted to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Fisheries, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 92) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Idaho; and

A bill (S. 284) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. 2872) for the relief of the French Trans-Atlantic Cable Company; which was read twice by its title.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1345) to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1804) providing for the use of certified checks to secure compliance with proposals and contracts for naval supplies, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DUBOIS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 577) granting to the State of Idaho 50,000 acres of land to aid in the continuation, enlargement, and maintenance of the Idaho State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 608) granting to the State of Wyoming 50,000 acres of land to aid in the continuation, enlargement, and maintenance of the Wyoming State Soldiers and Sailors' Home, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2873) granting an increase of pension to James Blue;

A bill (S. 2874) granting an increase of pension to Josephine S. Wainwright; and

A bill (S. 2875) granting an increase of pension to A. B. Leeper.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

A bill (S. 2876) for the relief of Elizabeth L. W. Bailey, administratrix of the estate of Davis W. Bailey, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2877) increasing the penalty for certain offenses in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. SUTHERLAND introduced a bill (S. 2878) to establish an assay office at Salt Lake City, State of Utah; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2879) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hoge;
A bill (S. 2880) granting an increase of pension to James C. Coad;
A bill (S. 2881) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. King;
A bill (S. 2882) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Johnson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 2883) granting an increase of pension to John Alves (with an accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 2884) granting a pension to Earl V. Williamson (with accompanying papers).

Mr. GEARIN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 2885) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan F. McKubbin;
A bill (S. 2886) granting an increase of pension to Martha Hoffman; and
A bill (S. 2887) granting increase of pensions to soldiers and widows of the Indian wars, under the acts of July 27, 1892, and act June 27, 1902.

Mr. WARNER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 2888) granting an increase of pension to Philo M. Russell;
A bill (S. 2889) granting an increase of pension to John Dixon; and
A bill (S. 2890) granting a pension to Alexander Ross.

Mr. ALGER introduced a bill (S. 2891) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Esseltine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McENERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:
A bill (S. 2892) for the relief of the heirs of Jean Baptiste Malvean, deceased (with an accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 2893) for the relief of the estate of Louis Malvean, deceased;
A bill (S. 2894) for the relief of the estate of Jean Louis Malvean, deceased;
A bill (S. 2895) for the relief of the estate of Blaize Motte, deceased;
A bill (S. 2896) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Gradengo, deceased;
A bill (S. 2897) for the relief of the estate of Jean Baptiste Rabot, deceased;
A bill (S. 2898) for the relief of G. S. Cheves;
A bill (S. 2899) for the relief of Florimand Izard;
A bill (S. 2900) for the relief of the estate of Jean Marie Tatin, deceased;
A bill (S. 2901) for the relief of the estate of Emile Lambert, deceased;
A bill (S. 2902) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Moncla, deceased;
A bill (S. 2903) for the relief of the estate of George Neck, sr., deceased;
A bill (S. 2904) for the relief of Alonzo L. Boyer;
A bill (S. 2905) for the relief of the estate of Oneziphor Delahoussaye, deceased;
A bill (S. 2906) for the relief of the estate of James R. Young, deceased;
A bill (S. 2907) for the relief of Pierre Breaux;
A bill (S. 2908) for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Smith;
A bill (S. 2909) for the relief of the estate of Raphael Segura, deceased;
A bill (S. 2910) for the relief of Sylvester Chevalier;
A bill (S. 2911) for the relief of Arvillien Broussard;
A bill (S. 2912) for the relief of Bennett Lilly;
A bill (S. 2913) for the relief of the estates of Henry Vedrine and Alexis Hebert, both deceased;
A bill (S. 2914) for the relief of Julien Semere;
A bill (S. 2915) for the relief of the estate of Edward Sigur, deceased;
A bill (S. 2916) for the relief of Mrs. E. C. McIntyre;
A bill (S. 2917) for the relief of the estate of C. E. Booty, deceased;
A bill (S. 2918) for the relief of the estate of Louis Baron, deceased;
A bill (S. 2919) for the relief of the estate of R. J. Packer, deceased, and Mrs. R. V. Packer;
A bill (S. 2920) for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Moore;
A bill (S. 2921) for the relief of the estate of François Laglaize, deceased;
A bill (S. 2922) for the relief of the estate of William Griffith, deceased;
A bill (S. 2923) for the relief of James Goodwin;
A bill (S. 2924) for the relief of the estate of George W. Dyson, deceased;
A bill (S. 2925) for the relief of the estate of François Dormenon, deceased;
A bill (S. 2926) for the relief of the estate of Morty Lynch, deceased;
A bill (S. 2927) for the relief of François Jefferson;
A bill (S. 2928) for the relief of the estate of Henry J. Heard, deceased;
A bill (S. 2929) for the relief of the estate of Louis Vuagnat, deceased;
A bill (S. 2930) for the relief of the estate of Adelon Vigues, deceased;
A bill (S. 2931) for the relief of the heirs of Cyrus Ratliff, deceased;
A bill (S. 2932) for the relief of E. A. Givens;
A bill (S. 2933) for the relief of the estate of H. Pierce, deceased;
A bill (S. 2934) for the relief of the estate of Jacob A. Wolfson, deceased;
A bill (S. 2935) for the relief of the estate of Phillip Poote, deceased;
A bill (S. 2936) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Israel, deceased;
A bill (S. 2937) for the relief of the estate of Emile Rost, deceased;
A bill (S. 2938) for the relief of the estate of Patrick McCormack, deceased;
A bill (S. 2939) for the relief of the estate of Francis M. Fisk, deceased;
A bill (S. 2940) for the relief of W. G. Wheeler;
A bill (S. 2941) for the relief of the estates of Martha Keller and Jacob Keller, both deceased;
A bill (S. 2942) for the relief of M. W. Stewart;
A bill (S. 2943) for the relief of the estate of John R. Temple, deceased;
A bill (S. 2944) for the relief of Washington West;
A bill (S. 2945) for the relief of the estate of Mary A. Meredith, deceased;
A bill (S. 2946) for the relief of the estate of John East, deceased; and
A bill (S. 2947) for the relief of the estate of William Burgess, deceased.

Mr. KNOX introduced a bill (S. 2948) to amend section 1 of the act approved March 3, 1905, providing for an additional associate justice of the supreme court of Arizona, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. OVERMAN introduced a bill (S. 2949) granting an increase of pension to John D. Copps; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2950) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Stines; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MALLORY introduced a bill (S. 2951) for the relief of John Scott; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PATTERSON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:
A bill (S. 2952) granting an increase of pension to William A. Gipson;
A bill (S. 2953) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Burr; and
A bill (S. 2954) granting an increase of pension to Hanna Welch.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 2955) granting a pension to Charles M. Snyder; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2956) to amend section 617 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, relating to corporations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALLEE introduced a bill (S. 2957) to correct the military record of John C. Carroll, alias John T. Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2958) to refer the claims for the *Saugus* and *Napa* to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2959) granting an increase of pension to William R. Gallion; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2960) granting an increase of pension to William T. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 2961) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

Mr. CRANE introduced a bill (S. 2962) to establish in the Department of the Interior a bureau to be known as the Children's Bureau; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2963) to further increase the efficiency of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2964) for the relief of the L. S. Watson Manufacturing Company, of Leicester, Mass.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 2965) to authorize the construction of a steam tug for use at the naval coaling station, City Point, San Francisco Bay, California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2966) for the protection of animals, birds, and fish in the forest reserves, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. FRAZIER introduced a bill (S. 2967) for the relief of the Church of Christ, of Lavergne, Tenn.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CRANE (by request) introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 19) declaring the policy of the Government of the United States in reference to the Philippine Islands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

ASSISTANT CLERK OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. FULTON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the salary of the assistant clerk to the Committee on Claims, authorized by resolution of December 12, 1901, at $1,440 per annum, be, and it is hereby, increased to $2,100 per annum, to take effect January 1, 1906.

EMPLOYEES OF PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION, ETC.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, is the morning business over?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, the morning business is closed.

Mr. HEYBURN. I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 88) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill indicated by him.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Idaho to yield to me a few minutes for the consideration of the resolution which I introduced on yesterday, in reference to salaries in Panama.

Mr. GORMAN. It comes up in order.

Mr. SIMMONS. It comes up in order, I think.

Mr. HEYBURN. I understand the Senator desires to bring up a resolution of which he has given notice?

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to make just a few remarks.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is not a matter that will result in protracted discussion?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think not, sir.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not desire to yield for any great length of time, but will cheerfully yield for the consideration of a resolution that will——

Mr. SIMMONS. I think this is the regular order anyhow, Mr. President.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I think it is in order at any time after the morning business to call up for consideration—I am not asking unanimous consent—General Orders on the Calendar. But I do not desire to antagonize the Senator for a reasonable length of time.

Mr. FRYE. Was the Senator's resolution offered yesterday?

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRYE. And it took its place on the table?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. FRYE. Then it would this morning be laid before the Senate for consideration under the rule.

Mr. SIMMONS. So I supposed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the resolution did not go over under objection. It was laid on the table on the request of the Senator from North Carolina subject to his call.

Mr. FRYE. To be called up at any time?

Mr. SIMMONS. I stated that I would call it up for consideration this morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho was recognized by the Chair and has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HEYBURN. I would cheerfully yield to the Senator from North Carolina for anything except a resolution that will involve protracted discussion or proceed for an indefinite length of time. I am very anxious that the measure I have called up shall be taken up at an early day for consideration.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that I do not think this resolution will provoke any discussion. I simply desire to make a short statement, and I do not believe there will be any opposition from any source to the passage of the resolution.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will yield with the understanding that if it involves any considerable amount of discussion I shall ask that we proceed under the regular order, which, as I understand it, is the bill which I have now called up.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks that the resolution which he introduced yesterday be now considered.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask, merely as a question of order, whether, if a Senator introduces a resolution and requests that it lie upon the table subject to his call, it is not his right to make that call at any time. Under the rule it would come up of itself; and he simply reserves that right to such time as he chooses to exercise it. I merely ask for information.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that he is of opinion that if the Senator from North Carolina had been first recognized for the purpose of calling up his resolution he would have been in order and his resolution would be entitled to precedence. But the Senator from Idaho was recognized by the Chair first and his motion was stated to the Senate, and is now the business before the Senate. The Senator from Idaho now yields his right to the Senator from North Carolina for the consideration of his resolution provided it does not lead to long debate. The resolution of the Senator from North Carolina will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. SIMMONS, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate the names, and compensation received by each, of every officer, agent, attorney, counsel, solicitor, or other employee of the Panama Canal Commission and the Panama Railroad Company as of date December 1, 1905, where the salary or compensation is $3,000 per annum or over; also the names, salaries, allowances, and expenditures of the board of consulting engineers.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not desire or intend to enter upon any discussion of salaries and methods on the Isthmus in connection with the construction of the canal. In fact, I do not think the Senate or the country is in possession of sufficiently full and reliable information upon those subjects to discuss them with entire fairness to all concerned. In offering this resolution I have no desire to provoke agitation and discussion, and I have no desire to embarrass anybody. My only purpose is to secure for the use of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, of which I am a member, for the Senate and for the country such information as the records of the War Department may disclose upon this subject.

Mr. President, I want it distinctly understood, so far as I am concerned, that while I possibly disagree with the President and the Administration with reference to certain things connected with the policies being pursued upon the Isthmus and in connection with this question of salaries, neither now or at any other time in the future do I intend to engage in any captious criticism of the present or any future Administration that may be charged with the construction of the canal, concerning its policies there, or salaries paid, or anything else. My feeling toward that great work is one of sympathy and not of antagonism.

Now, in this matter of salaries, concerning which I have introduced the resolution, I feel, and I think the American people feel, that owing to the greater cost of living upon the Isthmus, owing to the great hardships and inconvenience that those who

live there have to endure, and especially owing to the great danger to the health and to life of people of our race who live upon the Isthmus, the officials and the employees of the Government there are entitled not only to liberal consideration, but to sympathetic consideration in the matter of salaries as well as in many other things.

But, Mr. President, there is a difference, there is a broad difference, between liberality and extravagance, between generosity and waste; and there is a liberality and a generosity which makes for waste—which benefits nobody, neither the giver nor the receiver; and while I believe that the American people will stand for and are willing to be taxed to pay to the officials and employees engaged in the work salaries which under all the conditions and influencing circumstances are liberally remunerative not only for the work which they may perform, but the hardships which they may endure and the dangers which they may incur, I do not believe that the American people are in any humor to tolerate or even to countenance any extravagance or waste or graft or scandal in connection with the prosecution of this great work.

I hold in my hand here, Mr. President, a publication. It is the New York Independent, I believe a weekly publication, containing an article written by Mr. Poultney Bigelow, a man of character, as I am advised, who has recently visited the Isthmus for the purpose of studying the facts and conditions connected with our operations there.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator state to the Senate how long Mr. Bigelow was on the Isthmus studying conditions?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not advised.

Mr. LODGE. I will inform the Senator that he was there from November 29 to December 1.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope, Mr. President, that while he was there his investigations were directed in a way to find out the truth, more so than seems to have been, according to Mr. Bigelow's statement, the investigations of the Secretary of War while he was upon the Isthmus.

Mr. LODGE. He was there twenty-eight hours. I merely wanted to get in the length of time he devoted to the investigation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Within that length of time reasonable information might be obtained with reference to the conditions at Colon and Panama, and it is chiefly with reference to the conditions at these two cities that Mr. Bigelow speaks.

But, Mr. President, it is not my purpose to say that Mr. Bigelow's statements are true. I hope that they are not true. I was merely proposing to state the fact that this gentleman of character, who had gone to the Isthmus for the purpose of making these investigations, had written this article containing certain charges, which I hope are not true and which I am inclined to think exaggerate the situation; for if true, conditions there are scandalous and a reproach to the Administration and the country.

The fact is, Mr. President, this publication became so popular by reason of its containing this article that on Saturday evening when I went into nearly every book and news store in this town to secure it I ascertained that the whole issue which had been sent here had been disposed of, and many of the stores had ordered extra copies, so that I only succeeded in getting it yesterday. I cite that fact merely for the purpose of showing that these and similar charges which have appeared in the press of the country have found lodgment in the public mind, and that the people are considering them, and not for the purpose of asserting or of attempting to support their accuracy or truth. If the Senator from Massachusetts will wait he will see that I am not in sympathy with these and similar charges and that my attitude toward the Administration in the prosecution is not hostile.

Mr. LODGE. I have not read the article. I have read previous articles of Mr. Bigelow, but I have not read this one. I merely wish to ask the Senator if he thinks that a stay on the Isthmus from November 29 to December 1 is really a sufficient time to master the whole subject thoroughly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly, Mr. President, not the whole condition on the Isthmus.

Mr. LODGE. Or to make a report which is of the slightest value.

Mr. SIMMONS. It might be of very great value as to the conditions existing at Colon and Panama, the chief stations on the Isthmus, to which points this investigation was directed. In the three days, Mr. President, during which this gentleman was on the Isthmus he directed his investigations, as I gathered from the article to which I referred, chiefly to the conditions in Colon and in Panama; and he makes the statement that during that time he visited and inspected all the important streets and quarters in these cities; that he went to the camps where our laborers are housed; that he visited various and sundry employees and officials in both cities, and that he had many conferences with leading business men in those cities with reference to the actual conditions on the Isthmus. Statements made by such a man under such circumstances are not to be brushed aside, and when taken in connection with other press criticism of somewhat similar import will receive respectful consideration.

Mr. President, the charge is made by Mr. Bigelow in this article that Panama is full of incompetent and grossly inefficient officials—men in positions of authority for which they are utterly unfit, some of these positions requiring expert knowledge while the occupants possess no expert knowledge. He charges further, together with many other much more serious things perhaps, which I shall not allude to now because they are not pertinent to the line of argument I wish to pursue, that there are officials on the Isthmus who are overpaid, and that there are on the other hand some who are underpaid, according as the official may possess a political or an official pull. In general effect he charges a state of official inefficiency and demoralization on the Isthmus.

Mr. President, as I said before I do not mean to assert the truth or accuracy of these charges, but I do mean to assert here upon this floor that there is in the public mind of this country the impression that there is something radically wrong in the administration of affairs upon the Isthmus, and that there is enough before the public to beget a wish and demand for a thorough and searching investigation into the facts, with a view to ascertaining the true conditions that now exist upon the Isthmus.

Of course, Mr. President, I understand that in the expenditure of so vast a sum of money as will be required to construct the Panama Canal it is perhaps not to be expected that there will be no extravagance, no waste, no graft, no scandal. It would be very remarkable if we should escape these things in connection with the expenditure of this great sum of money; and if these things do occur, but only in isolated cases and infrequently, followed with frank avowal and speedy remedy, I do not think the American people will be disposed to be hypercritical about the matter.

But, Mr. President, it is the duty of the Administration, in my judgment, and especially is it the duty of the Congress, charged with the appropriation of the people's money to carry on this work, to take every possible precaution to guarantee as far as possible the public service against these things. It is probable that no amount of vigilance on the part of the Administration or Congress can altogether prevent these things, but if they can not be avoided they can be minimized. If the Administration does not take the precautions, if the Congress does not take these precautions, then, Mr. President, criticism, harsh criticism, and just criticism of both the Administration and Congress will come from the people whose money and pride are involved in this great enterprise.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent us a message, in which he assures us that these statements, with reference to extravagance and incompetence and general official demoralization in the Isthmus, are not true. I hope the President is correctly informed and advised. I congratulate him upon the position which for himself he has taken in this matter. He has said to the country that, so far as he is concerned, he is in the open about it, that he has no concealment, that he courts the fullest investigation. What, then, is the duty of Congress; what, then, is the duty of the Senate with reference to this matter? When the President says that these charges are not true and demands an investigation, is the Senate, is the Congress going to refuse to make that investigation, when it is the only body which can make an investigation which can probe this matter to the bottom, ascertain what the truth is, and give the public the benefit of that information, so that through the instrumentality of publicity, which will be our best guaranty against graft and fraud and corruption down there, we may immediately apply the great corrective remedy of public opinion to the situation—not a public opinion based upon idle gossip; not a public opinion based upon interested and unfounded charges, but a public opinion based upon the facts, the real facts of the situation.

In my opinion it is the duty of Congress in the existing condition to apply the probe, to ascertain the facts and give them to the people, so that a just and righteous public opinion may be created in this country, and that our officials upon the Isthmus may understand that the eyes of the public in America are upon

them, and that if they are guilty of wrongdoing upon the Isthmus that wrongdoing will bring upon them the same disgrace and the same condign punishment that would follow similar wrongdoing in this country.

My purpose in asking the indulgence of the Senate this morning was that, while expressing my sympathy with the Administration in this work and my wish to uphold its hands without captious criticism, I thought it the duty of Congress to make this investigation, to the end that the truth might be known and that the public service might be relieved of the embarrassment of these misrepresentations, if they are such, and that our officials on the Isthmus might be put on notice that they are not too far away to escape notice and punishment if they shall prove unfaithful.

Mr. President, in conclusion—and I have said more than I intended to say, for I did not expect to make a statement of more than two minutes when I got the floor—I wish to say that this great constructive work, the greatest which this nation has ever undertaken, the greatest, perhaps, which any nation in the world has ever undertaken, was not undertaken in pursuance of a Republican policy or in pursuance of a Democratic policy; it was undertaken at the behest of the people of this country. I do not think that I should be very far from the truth if I were to say that this Government has never undertaken any great work of a constructive character in all its history in which the people were so thoroughly united and sympathetic as they are as to this work. If success shall attend our efforts upon the Isthmus, neither of the great political parties in this country will be entitled to preferential credit for that success. If failure shall attend our efforts in this regard, neither party, in my judgment, will be entitled to more blame than the other, unless our operations on the Isthmus shall, like those of the French Company, be characterized by extravagance and graft and corruption. In that case, of course, the party responsible for that extravagance and graft and corruption would be justly saddled with the responsibility and odium of our failure.

So far as I am concerned, I hope that nothing has transpired on the Isthmus up to this time to bring discredit upon the enterprise in which we are there engaged. I hope that nothing has occurred there to bring reproach upon this Government; and I want to say right now if the present Administration, or any other future Administration charged with the duty of building this canal, shall do well down there, or shall do even fairly well down there, so far as I am concerned as a member of the Interoceanic Canal Committee, as a member of this Senate, and as a citizen, I shall, without regard to party or party advantage, uphold that Administration though it may be one to which I do not belong and with which upon general lines I have no sympathy.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. What disposition does the Senator desire to have made of the resolution?

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

The motion was agreed to.

POTOMAC RIVER MEMORIAL BRIDGE.

Mr. HEYBURN obtained the floor.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President——

Mr. HEYBURN. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, after conference with the Senator from Idaho, he has kindly consented that I may call up the bill (S. 1373) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from Washington to the Arlington estate property.

This bill has several times passed this body and has the indorsement of the Administration. I ask unanimous consent that it may be taken up. I think it will occupy but a few moments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLISON. That is an important bill to be considered at this time, and one which I think will lead to some debate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa objects.

Mr. DANIEL. Before the bill goes over, I wish to submit the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the bill, on page 1, line 5, by striking out the word "of" and inserting the words "upon or near;" in the same line, after the word "the," by inserting the word "old," and in lines 5 and 6, by striking out the words "or adjacent thereto;" so that if amended the bill will read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be constructed a memorial bridge from the most convenient point upon or near the old Naval Observatory grounds across the Potomac River to the most convenient point of the Arlington estate property, the said bridge to be constructed on a plan to be approved by a board composed of the Secretary of War, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, and not to cost more than $5,000,000. And the Secretary of War is authorized to expend so much of the amount hereinafter appropriated as may be necessary for the purpose in securing and determining on a proper plan, opening the competition to all who may desire to submit plans.

SEC. 2. That the sum of $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of securing and determining on a proper plan and to commence the construction of said memorial bridge.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being made to the present consideration of the bill, it will go over.

PURE-FOOD BILL.

Mr. HEYBURN. I now renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 88) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I submit that this bill is one of very great interest to all the people of the country in their homes and home life. I think it is only a question in this body as to whether this bill accomplishes what this body desires to accomplish. It is merely a question as to whether its provisions are fair to all of the people, those who manufacture, those who sell, and those who use the ordinary commodities of life. Committees of this body have been endeavoring for many years to reach a conclusion and to formulate a bill that would accomplish this purpose, and we sincerely hope that we have reached that point.

It has seemed to the committee in presenting this bill that the first consideration was to prevent the manufacture of articles that were deleterious to health and to prevent the combination of articles that would deceive and defraud the public. That was the primary object of the committee in preparing this bill.

Mr. President, I shall occupy but a few moments of the Senate's time in stating the general features of this bill. It has not been read, and perhaps it will not be necessary to take the time needed to read it, inasmuch as it will be considered practically by sections.

The first section of the bill provides that it shall be unlawful to manufacture forbidden or proscribed articles. It prescribes a fine and imprisonment against the manufacturer of such articles; it provides that for the first offense the party shall be fined not to exceed $500, or shall be sentenced to one year's imprisonment or both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court, and for each subsequent offense on conviction he shall be fined not less than $1,000 or sentenced to one year's imprisonment or both, at the discretion of the court. That applies to the manufacturer who makes and sells such articles.

Section 2 of the bill provides against the introduction of forbidden articles from one State or Territory or district or insular possession into another jurisdiction, and prescribes practically the same fine for the introduction of the articles as it does for the manufacture of them.

Then there is a new feature to this bill that has not been heretofore embodied in any bill that has been introduced, so far as I know, in regard to the manner of the execution of the law. Section 2, on page 3, provides:

That in the case of any violation of the provisions of the foregoing two sections by any corporation, the fines and penalties imposed therefor may be enforced against the officers of such corporation personally responsible for such violation, and any violation of any of the provisions of this act by any corporation shall be deemed to be the act of the officer of such corporation directly responsible therefor, and such officer may be punished for such violation as though such violation was the personal act of such officer.

That is a new feature in bills of this kind. It was intended to obviate the possibility of escape by the officers of a corporation under a plea, which has been more than once made, that they did not know that this was being done on the credit of or on the responsibility of the corporation.

There is another innovation, or rather a new feature, in the beginning of section 3, which provides a different method for the collection of specimens from which to make a determination as to the character of the article. Heretofore it was provided that this should be done under rules and regulations made by the Secretary of Agriculture; but we find, as a practical matter, that the Secretary of Agriculture can not make and enforce rules in the other coordinate bureaus of the Government. So it is provided here—

That the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor shall make uniform rules

and regulations for the collection and examination of specimens of foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors manufactured or offered for sale in the District of Columbia, or in any other district, Territory, or insular possession of the United States, or which shall be offered for sale, etc.

It provides that those three Departments—the Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce and Labor—shall make rules jointly covering the manner of collecting specimens for determination. That became necessary from a consideration of the application of those several Departments to the subject-matter of this bill. We find that the Treasury Department must make its investigations at the custom-houses and other branches particularly under its control; and it would be neither right nor proper that any Department of the Government should undertake to make rules to be executed by another Department of the Government. So that the Secretary of the Treasury, cooperating with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, will make rules sufficient for the execution of the purposes of this act so far as the collection of specimens is concerned. That was the object of requiring the joint action of these three Departments of the Government. It did not appear that any other Departments of the Government than those three would be necessarily involved in the collection of these specimens.

Then it is provided that, after such specimens are collected, the determination shall be made by the Bureau of Chemistry of the Department of Agriculture. While we have minor bureaus of chemistry under the Government, yet the combination of accommodations for that purpose is in the Department of Agriculture. The peculiar functions of that Department require a more thorough equipment than that of any other Department of the Government. So that after these specimens are collected, they are all submitted to the determination of the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture.

Another new feature in this bill is that we have separated liquors from foods. Heretofore the proposed measures have denominated all liquors, wines, and so forth as food. It did not appear to the committee reporting this bill that they should be so classified. Liquor is not a food necessary for the maintenance or sustenance of the human frame. If anything, it is a luxury. But, however much difference of opinion there may be upon that subject, it was eminently unfair to that great portion of the people who do not believe that liquor is a necessity, to classify liquors with foods in determining a great question of this kind. So we have separated them, and, as an independent part of this bill, provided for a method appropriate to the determination of the standard of purity and helpfulness of liquors.

Those are the new features of this proposed legislation. The spirit of the bill is crystallized—if that is an appropriate term—in the responsibility that is primarily placed upon the manufacturer of these forbidden articles. The first intendment of the bill is to prevent the making of them. Of course, we can not presume that the bill if enacted would be entirely successful in accomplishing that purpose. So we have provided that, if they are made and put upon the market, they may be detected and be driven from the market or excluded from sale.

As to the necessity for this legislation, I think it would be a waste of time to do more than suggest it. Nearly every State in the Union, Mr. President, has a pure-food law. The States have undertaken to legislate upon this subject, with, I believe, but one or two exceptions. Some of the laws upon the subject are very meager; some of them are very local; some of them are adapted to the peculiar local interests of the people of the particular State, but, as a rule, the States have enacted intelligent and appropriate legislation upon this question. Their difficulty, which has been made plain to the committee, is that they can enforce the law only to the extent of the impure and adulterated products that are sent in unbroken packages within their borders from other States. There are a number of fraudulent articles that are under the ban of this legislation, not a pound or ounce of which is offered for sale in the State in which they are manufactured, because they are provided against by the legislation of that State; but they are manufactured in one State and sent to another in unbroken packages under the rule of law that is now established, perhaps forever. So that the State into which they are sent is helpless against the flood of these impure articles sent in unbroken packages under the protection of that rule of law and then offered for sale upon the retail market.

It is impossible for a State effectively to enforce a pure-food law without the cooperation of the General Government. It is obvious that it is only the General Government that can protect us from the influx of deleterious and poisonous articles from foreign countries. That must be done at the port of entry. There we stop such importations. There has been a law for this purpose on the statute book since 1848. That law is enforced, I believe, fairly and, perhaps, as efficiently as it can be under existing statutes and rules, but the proposed legislation fortifies the law of 1848 in providing a better method and more efficient cooperation between the branches of the Government in carrying out the spirit and intent of that law.

Then, again, the distribution of ports of entry in the United States is now such that a port of entry may be far inland, and to these ports come goods from foreign ports manufactured in foreign countries that are in violation not only of every principle of common honesty and fairness and against the safety and protection of the people, but in violation of the law of our land. These importations go far inland to ports of entry in unbroken packages; there the lid is taken off and these deleterious articles are abroad in the land.

To what extent does this affect the efficiency and the ability to execute the law of a State having good laws on this subject? There are ports of entry in the West in States that prohibit the manufacture or sale or distribution of these impure articles and do so efficiently, except as against outside interference. There is the point of necessity for the cooperation of the General Government with the States in the enforcement of this class of legislation. It is merely a question whether or not Congress will extend a helping hand for the enforcement of the laws of the States in the interest of the people so far as this class of imposition is concerned.

I will not at this time undertake to enumerate the frauds perpetrated upon the people further than to state that, according to a statement which I have before me, received this morning, which is from an official source, in some of the great neighboring States more than 60 per cent of all the drugs that are offered on the market are fraudulent, and not only do they not possess the qualities for which the drug is distinguished, or should be, but they are actually adulterated to such an extent that they are dangerous to be used.

Perhaps during the consideration of this bill the details in regard to this matter may become necessary to be discussed; but at this time, assuming that it is obvious, that it is conceded, if the States of the Union have undertaken to protect their people against this kind of imposition, that Congress can not do less than to meet them halfway and to protect the States against the importation within their borders of foreign articles against which they deem it wise to protect their people, I do not consider it necessary to enter into that discussion now.

The bill has been on the Calendar for some time, and there have been no amendments proposed to it other than one or two immaterial or small committee amendments. It is doubtless true that some Senators will have amendments to propose, but I think that with this opening statement I will submit for this time the bill to the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat—I am on the committee that reported the bill, but, unfortunately, was not able to attend the meetings of the committee—I will ask the Senator if in any amendments that have been made to the bill the provision that was so strongly opposed, as I remember, by the late Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Platt, which, it was said, imposed hardships upon retailers of food and drugs, making them amenable to the law for selling what, in the very nature of things, they could not know were adulterated products—I will ask the Senator if any change has been made in the bill that places upon the manufacturer the onus and penalizes him rather than the innocent retailer, who may not really have been at fault? I have not had time to examine the bill, Mr. President, I will say, and that is the reason I make the inquiry.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will say to the Senator that I think we have amply provided against that. The bill provides that where a retailer or any person other than the manufacturer can produce a certificate from the manufacturer that the article is not adulterated it would be evidence of his having purchased in good faith, and that he shall not be prosecuted, provided that he discloses the source from which he received the goods. Then the bill provides that the prosecution shall be against the party primarily responsible.

Mr. GALLINGER. Which is the manufacturer?

Mr. HEYBURN. Which is the manufacturer. The provision was introduced to cover that point, and, I think, does adequately cover it.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator will pardon me a moment—it also provides that the contents shall be disclosed upon the package.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HEYBURN. With pleasure.

Mr. SPOONER. I desire simply to ask a question. What different provision is made in this bill from the provision contained in the bill of last year as to imported articles?

Mr. HEYBURN. The provision is redrawn. The Senator refers to medicines and drugs?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. HEYBURN. The bill contains all that was contained in the bill of last session with some additional provisions or restrictions. But I would say to the Senator——

Mr. SPOONER. If the bill contains all——

Mr. HEYBURN. It contains the spirit of that bill.

Mr. SPOONER. If the bill contains all that was in the bill of last session, I think there is objection to it.

Mr. HEYBURN. Well, it may be objectionable to the Senator——

Mr. SPOONER. I want to be fair. I wish the Senator would indicate briefly, if he can, first, whether the structure of this bill and the theory upon which it is drawn are the same as the bill of last year, and how far it differs from that bill in four or five particulars in which it was criticised by the then Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Platt, and found objectionable by some of the rest of us. The Senator will remember the things which troubled us.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should be glad if the Senator would direct my attention to the particular part of the bill to which he refers.

Mr. SPOONER. It would oblige me to direct the Senator's attention to pretty much the whole bill. I thought he might state briefly the difference between this bill and the bill of last year.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should be very glad to enter into a comparative analysis of the bills, but I would suggest to the Senator that unless there is some particular point in his mind with reference to the present bill it would be rather a fruitless thing.

Mr. SPOONER. My recollection, for instance, is that the old bill, so far as it related to imported articles, made it dangerous for a merchant residing in the interior who had imported or who had purchased goods from an importer to rely upon the fidelity and utility of the investigation made under the Agricultural Department and by its agencies into this very matter of purity before the admission of the articles into the commerce of this country. That was one point.

Mr. HEYBURN. That would go to the penal clause of the bill.

Mr. SPOONER. The whole bill went to penal clauses. The bill was one of penalties, as I presume this bill is, and as every bill upon the subject must be. The objection there was that it imposed a penalty which under certain circumstances was an unjust penalty. Suppose, under this bill, I import a box of drugs from a foreign country, which I understand is examined under existing law at the point of entry by the agents of the Agricultural Department——

Mr. HEYBURN. Of the Treasury Department.

Mr. SPOONER. Of the Treasury Department, with reference to its purity. Would I, under this bill, have any protection against the penalty there, having based my subsequent action upon a belief that the agents of the Government had honestly discharged their duties, and that the fact that the article had been permitted to leave the port of entry or the custody of the Government officials, so as to come to me to be put into the commerce of the country, gave me good warrant, without liability of punishment, to put it on the market?

Mr. HEYBURN. I will answer the Senator that in order to cover just such cases this bill differs from the bill of last session in that in line 22, page 2, it uses the word "knowingly" as applied to just such cases.

Mr. SPOONER. That is one of the questions I wanted the Senator to answer and which he had not answered, but now has. That is a great improvement.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes. The committee has been somewhat criticised for inserting the word "knowingly," but it was done to meet the objections made by the Senator on the former consideration of this bill.

Mr. SPOONER. But there is a distinction as to the use of the word "knowingly" in that connection and the use of the word "knowingly" in so far as it relates to the use of a product manufactured in this country.

Mr. HEYBURN. We only use the word "knowingly" as applied to receiving within the Territories, States, etc.

Mr. SPOONER. But there is a distinction between goods received from abroad, which have already been examined, or at least for which the Government has paid to have an examination made, and goods going from one State into another State, which have not been subjected to governmental examination. There a different rule might very well apply.

Mr. HEYBURN. With the permission of the Senator I will read the provision.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. If it would not interrupt the Senator, I suggest that the whole bill had better be read after the Senator has called attention to the clause he has in mind.

Mr. HEYBURN. It has not been read. I did not ask that it be read.

Mr. LODGE. It will have to be read some time.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator will understand me; I am not asking these questions out of any hostility to the bill.

Mr. HEYBURN. I thoroughly understand that, and I am glad to have the attention of the Senate directed to these provisions in order that they may be made perfectly plain.

I read from the provision beginning in line 18 on page 2:

> And any person, association of persons, or corporation who shall ship or deliver for shipment from any State, Territory, district, or insular possession to any other State, Territory, district, or insular possession, or shall export—

There is no "knowingly" there. A man is bound to know what he himself does. The word "knowingly" is not used. The responsibility is upon every man to know that he is not going to injure his neighbor. But take the next sentence:

> or offer to export the same to a foreign country, or who shall knowingly receive in any State, Territory, district, or insular possession of the United States from any other State, Territory, district, or insular possession of the United States, or from any foreign country, or who, having received—

"Knowingly." "Knowingly" is not in there, but the "knowingly" I have used relates to the whole sentence—

> shall deliver in original, unbroken packages, or shall offer to deliver to any other person, persons, or corporation any such article, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction for such offense shall be fined, etc.

That was intended to meet the objection which was urged against innocent parties being made the victims of this legislation, and the distinction was drawn clearly between the person whom the law presumes to know and the person who might be imposed upon.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest in line 1, page 3, the insertion of the word "knowingly;" so as to read, "or who having knowingly received." I think that is very important.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the word is not carried clear through the sentence it might be well to repeat it, but I think on technical examination it will be found that the word is carried throughout the sentence.

Mr. LODGE. It would do no harm to put it in.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; and I shall not object to its insertion, because it is intended to be there.

Mr. SPOONER. Of course in a statute which carries penalties against the citizen, and plenty of them, we ought not to be so economical in the use of words as to engender the slightest possible doubt.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; I will move to amend it by inserting in line 1, on page 3, after the word "having," the word "knowingly."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HEYBURN. In reference to the importation of goods, I will say that our present law, so far as drugs and medicines and that class of articles are concerned, is a very good law, and it is enforced through the Treasury Department. The Treasury Department cooperates with the Bureau of Chemistry in the performance of its work, although it is equipped to a certain extent for the performance of independent work. I have not deemed it necessary, in drawing this bill, to go beyond the necessities outside of the provisions of existing law.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to offer three amendments to the bill, all to be printed on one sheet, and I ask to have them printed in the RECORD also. Then let them go over, so that they may be considered when the bill shall be voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

The amendments submitted by Mr. LODGE are as follows:

> Insert on page 8, end of line 9: "*Provided further*, That when in the preparation of food products for shipment they are preserved by an external application applied in such manner that the preservative is necessarily removed mechanically or by maceration in water or otherwise, the provisions of this act shall be construed as applying only when said products are ready for consumption."
>
> On page 9, line 2, and after the word "character," insert "and the amount of alcohol, if any, contained in them."
>
> On page 10, end of line 6, after the word "imitation," insert "and to show the amount, if any, of alcohol, contained in them."

Mr. SPOONER. I suggest that the bill be incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. It ought to be read.

Mr. SPOONER. It is not up for action. Let the bill be printed in the RECORD as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin asks that the bill be printed in to-morrow's RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person, association of persons, or corporation within any Territory, District, or insular possession of the United States, to manufacture, sell, offer for sale, or deliver for shipment, or to cause to be delivered, shipped, or transported from within any State, Territory, District, or insular possession to any State, Territory, District, insular possession, or foreign country any article of food, drugs, medicines, or liquors which is adulterated or misbranded, or which contains any poisonous or deleterious substance within the meaning of this act; and any person, association of persons, or corporations who shall violate any of the provisions of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and for each offense shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not to exceed $500, or shall be sentenced to one year's imprisonment, or both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court, and for each subsequent offense and conviction thereof shall be fined not less than $1,000, or sentenced to one year's imprisonment, or both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 2. That the introduction into any State, Territory, District, or insular possession, from any other State, Territory, District, or insular possession, or from any foreign country, or the shipment to any foreign country of any article of food or drugs which is adulterated or misbranded, deleterious or poisonous, within the meaning of this act, is hereby prohibited; and any person, association of persons, or corporation who shall ship or deliver for shipment from any State, Territory, District, or insular possession to any other State, Territory, District, or insular possession, or shall export or offer to export the same to a foreign country, or who shall knowingly receive in any State, Territory, District, or insular possession of the United States from any other State, Territory, District, or insular possession of the United States, or from any foreign country, or who, having knowingly received, shall deliver in original unbroken packages, or shall offer to deliver to any other person, persons, or corporation any such article, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction for such offense shall be fined not exceeding $500 for the first offense, and upon conviction of each subsequent offense shall be fined not exceeding $500 or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

That in the case of any violation of the provisions of the foregoing two sections by any corporation, the fines and penalties imposed therefor may be enforced against the officers of such corporation personally responsible for such violation, and any violation of any of the provisions of this act by any corporation shall be deemed to be the act of the officer of such corporation directly responsible therefor, and such officer may be punished for such violation as though such violation was the personal act of such officer.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor shall make uniform rules and regulations for the collection and examination of specimens of foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors manufactured or offered for sale in the District of Columbia, or in any other district, Territory, or insular possession of the United States, or which shall be offered for sale in unbroken packages in any State other than that in which they shall have been respectively manufactured or produced, or which shall be received from any foreign country, or intended for shipment to any foreign country, or which may be submitted for examination by the chief health officer of any State, Territory, District, or insular possession, and at any domestic or foreign port through which such product is offered for interstate commerce or for export or import between the United States and any foreign port or country.

SEC. 4. That the examinations of specimens of foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors shall be made in the Bureau of Chemistry of the Department of Agriculture, or under the direction and supervision of such Bureau, for the purpose of determining from such examinations whether such article is adulterated or misbranded, or contains any poisonous or other substance deleterious to the health of human beings or domestic animals; and if it shall appear from any such examination that such specimens are adulterated or misbranded or contain any added poisonous or deleterious substance or ingredient injurious to human health when used in the prescribed or usual manner of use of such article, the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause notice thereof to be given to the parties from whom such samples were obtained, and public notice of the facts shall be given by publication in such manner as the rules and regulations may prescribe to all other persons, association of persons, or corporations in whose possession like articles may be found or known to be that such article is within the provision of this act; and shall give such party as may be charged with violation of this act an opportunity to be heard, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed as aforesaid, and if after such hearing it is found that any of the provisions of this act have been violated by such parties, then the Secretary of Agriculture shall at once certify the facts to the proper United States district attorney, with a copy of the results of the analysis or the examination of such article, duly authenticated by the analyst or officer making such examination, under the oath of such officer.

SEC. 5. That it shall be the duty of each district attorney to whom the Secretary of Agriculture shall report any violation of this act, or to whom any health officer or agent of any State, Territory, District, or insular possession shall present satisfactory evidence of any such violation, to cause appropriate proceedings to be commenced and prosecuted in the proper courts of the United States, without delay, for the recovery of the fines and the enforcement of the penalties as in such case herein provided.

DEFINITIONS.

SEC. 6. That the term "drug" as used in this act shall include all medicines and preparations recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia or National Formulary for internal and external use; also any substance intended to be used for the cure, mitigation, or prevention of disease.

SEC. 7. That the term "food" as used herein shall include all articles used for food, drink (other than malt, spirituous, or vinous liquors), confectionery, or condiment by man or domestic animals, whether simple, mixed, or compound.

SEC. 8. That the term "liquor" as used herein shall include all malt, vinous, alcoholic, and spirituous liquors and combinations of them used or intended to be used as beverages.

ADULTERATIONS AND MISBRANDING.

SEC. 9. That for the purpose of this act any article shall be deemed to be adulterated:

In case of drugs:

First. If, when a drug is sold under or by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia or National Formulary, it differs from the standard of strength, quality, or purity, as determined by the test laid down in the United States Pharmacopœia or National Formulary official at the time of investigation: *Provided*, That no drug not defined in the United States Pharmacopœia or National Formulary shall be deemed to be adulterated under this provision if the standard of strength, quality, or purity be plainly stated upon the bottle, box, or other container thereof as originally packed.

Second. If its strength or purity fall below the professed standard or quality under which it is sold.

That such drug shall be deemed to be misbranded:

First. If it be an imitation of or offered for sale under the name of another article.

Second. If the package containing it, or its label, shall bear any statement regarding the ingredients or the substances contained therein, which statement shall be false or misleading in any particular, or if the same is falsely branded as to the country, State, or Territory, or place therein, in which it is manufactured or produced, or if the contents of the original package shall have been removed, in whole or in part, and other contents shall have been placed in such package.

In the case of confectionery an article shall be deemed to be adulterated:

If it contain terra alba, barytes, talc, chrome yellow, or other mineral substances or poisonous colors or flavors, or other ingredients deleterious or detrimental to health.

In the case of food an article shall be deemed to be adulterated:

First. If any substance or substances has or have been mixed and packed with it so as to reduce or lower or injuriously affect its quality or strength.

Second. If any substance or substances has or have been substituted wholly or in part for the article.

Third. If any valuable constituent of the article has been wholly or in part abstracted.

Fourth. If it contain any added poisonous or other ingredient which may render such article injurious to human health: *Provided*, That goods intended for export shall not be deemed misbranded or adulterated when prepared and packed in accordance with specifications of the foreign purchaser, provided no substance is used that is in conflict with the laws of the country to which the goods are to be shipped, when such country having laws upon the subject does not prohibit such process of preparation.

Fifth. If it consists in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, or putrid animal or vegetable substance, or any portion of an animal unfit for food, whether manufactured or not, or if it is the product of a diseased animal or one that has died otherwise than by slaughter.

An article of food shall be deemed to be misbranded:

First. If it is to be offered for sale under the name of another article: *Provided*, That the term "distinctive name" shall not be construed as applying to any article sold or offered for sale under a name that has come into general use to indicate the class or kind of the article if the name be accompanied on the same label or brand with a statement of the place where said article has been manufactured or produced.

Second. If it be mixed, colored, powdered, or stained in a manner whereby damage or inferiority is concealed, so that such product when sold or offered for sale shall deceive or tend to deceive the purchaser or user thereof.

Third. If it be labeled or branded so as to deceive or mislead the purchaser or user, or purport to be a foreign product when not so, or is an imitation, either in package or label, of another substance of a previously established name, or which has been trade-marked or patented.

Fourth. If the package containing it or its label shall bear any statement, design, or device regarding the ingredients or the substances contained therein, which statement, design, or device shall be false or misleading in any particular, or if the same is falsely branded as to the State, Territory, or place in which it is manufactured or produced.

Fifth. An article of food which does not contain any added poisonous or deleterious ingredients shall not be deemed to be adulterated or misbranded in the case of mixtures or compounds which may be now, or from time to time hereafter, known as articles of food sold under their own distinctive names and not included in definition first of misbranded articles of food in this section, or in the case of articles labeled, branded, or tagged so as to plainly indicate that they are mixtures, compounds, combinations, imitations, or blends: *Provided*, That the same shall be labeled, branded, or tagged so as to show that they are of such character: *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as requiring or compelling proprietors or manufacturers of proprietary goods which contain no unwholesome added ingredients to disclose their formulas of production except in so far as the provisions of this act may require to secure freedom from adulteration or imitation.

In the case of liquors, an article shall be deemed adulterated if it contain any added ingredient of a poisonous or deleterious character.

Such liquors shall be deemed misbranded:

First. If it is blended or rectified, or consists of an admixture of different grades of the same liquor, or contains, or is mixed with, other substances, and such fact is not plainly stated on the package in which such liquor is offered for sale, or if the label or any written or printed statement accompanying the package in which such liquor is kept or sold contains any false statement as to the character of the contents of such package, or represents such liquor to be the product of any other country than that in which it was actually produced.

SEC. 10. That no dealer shall be convicted under the provisions of this act when he can establish a guaranty signed by the wholesaler, jobber, manufacturer, or other party residing in the United States, from whom he purchases such articles, to the effect that the same is not adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of this act, designating

such article. Said guaranty, to afford protection, shall contain the name and address of the party or parties making the sale of such articles to such dealer, and in such case said party or parties shall be amenable to the prosecutions, fines, and other penalties which would attach, in due course, to the dealer under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 11. That every person, association of persons, or corporation who manufactures or produces and delivers for interstate or foreign shipment or transportation, or who receives from any State, Territory, district, or insular possession or foreign country other than the State, Territory, district, or insular possession in which it is produced, and any person, association of persons, or corporation who sells or exposes for sale in any Territory, district, or insular possession any article of food, drug, or liquor, shall furnish, within business hours and upon tender and full payment of the selling price, a sample of such drug, article of food, or liquor, to any person duly authorized by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to receive the same, and in any Territory, district, or insular possession, to any officer or agent of such Territory, district, or insular possession, respectively, charged with the inspection of food or drugs in such jurisdiction who shall apply to such manufacturer, producer, or person or association of persons, or corporation selling or exposing for sale as aforesaid such drug, article of food, or liquor for such sample in sufficient quantity for an analysis of any such article or articles in his or their or its possession.

SEC. 12. That any manufacturer, producer, or dealer who refuses to comply upon demand with the requirements of section 11 of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be fined not exceeding $100 or imprisonment not exceeding one hundred days, or both. And any person, association of persons, or corporation, found guilty of manufacturing or offering for sale, or selling, any adulterated, impure, or misbranded article of food, drug, or liquor in violation of the provisions of this act shall be adjudged to pay, in addition to the penalties hereinbefore provided for, all the necessary costs and expenses incurred in inspecting and analyzing such adulterated articles which said person may have been found guilty of manufacturing, selling, or offering for sale.

SEC. 13. That any article of food, drug, or liquor that is adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of this act, and is being transported from one State, Territory, District, or insular possession, to another for sale, or, having been transported, remains unloaded, unsold, or in original unbroken packages, or if it be sold or offered for sale in the District of Columbia or the Territories, or insular possessions of the United States, or if it be imported from a foreign country for sale, or if it is intended for export to a foreign country, shall be liable to be proceeded against in any district court of the United States within the district where the same is found, and seized for confiscation by a process of libel for condemnation. And if such article is condemned as being adulterated or misbranded, or of a poisonous or deleterious character, within the meaning of this act, the same shall be disposed of by destruction or sale, as the said court may direct, and the proceeds thereof, if sold, less the legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, but such goods shall not be sold in any jurisdiction contrary to the laws of that jurisdiction: *Provided, however*, That upon the payment of the costs of such libel proceedings and the execution and delivery of a good and sufficient bond to the effect that such articles shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to the provisions of this act, or the laws of any State, Territory, District, or insular possession, the court may by order direct that such articles be delivered to the owner thereof. The proceedings of such libel cases shall conform, as near as may be, to the proceedings in admiralty, except that either party may demand trial by jury of any issue of fact joined in any such case, and all such proceedings shall be at the suit of and in the name of the United States.

SEC. 14. That this act shall not be construed to interfere with commerce wholly internal in any State nor with the exercise of their police powers by the several States.

SEC. 15. That the provisions of this act shall not apply to common carriers as such, or to their servants, agents, or employees, acting for said common carriers.

SEC. 16. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after the 1st day of July, 1906.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I feel that as a member of the Committee on Manufactures, from which this bill was reported, I owe myself the duty of very critically examining it before it is finally passed upon.

I only rise now for the purpose of saying that I am exceedingly gratified to know that the committee has inserted the word "knowingly" in section 2. That was one of the points which led me during the last session of Congress to feel that I could not vote for the bill in the form in which it then appeared. I think the chairman of the committee and the committee have done a great public service in removing from the minds of some of us, at least, an objection that seemed insurmountable. I presume the bill has in other respects been so carefully guarded that those of us who want to support a bill of this character, who believe in pure food and pure drugs and have no sympathy whatever with those who are adulterating them, will find that they can give it their support.

At any rate, Mr. President, I feel more sanguine than I have ever felt before that we will be able to pass a bill covering this very important subject, which will be of great and lasting benefit to the people of this country. That is all I care to say at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to know from the Senator from Idaho whether any motion is pending before the Senate in regard to this bill?

Mr. HEYBURN. There are only certain amendments which have been submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts, and while I am not thoroughly familiar with all of them, so far as I am advised they are amendments which the committee would be inclined to accept, and it may be we can progress with the bill further than we anticipated.

Mr. LODGE. I think my amendments had better be printed and go over until to-morrow, so that the Senator can have an opportunity to look at them. There are two others besides the one I spoke of to the Senator. I do not want to delay the bill in the least. I shall be ready to vote upon it.

Mr. SPOONER. I hope the Senator from Idaho will not attempt to press the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is not my intention at all.

Mr. SPOONER. It is a bill which requires, of course, careful examination, and no one not connected with its preparation has had any opportunity to examine it carefully.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will say to the Senator that I rose to state that I have no further remarks to make to-day, and that I thought, inasmuch as it was proposed that the bill should be printed in the RECORD and the amendments be printed, that it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. LODGE. Let it go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will go over until to-morrow.

IMPORTATION OF UNWHOLESOME TEA.

Mr. LODGE. The Calendar is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Calendar is now in order.

The bill (S. 1548) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the importation of impure and unwholesome tea," approved March 2, 1897, was announced as the first business in order on the Calendar.

Mr. ALLISON. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

Mr. LODGE. As the next bill on the Calendar is the pure-food bill, which has just gone over, and the next is the unfinished business, I ask that they may be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will be passed over.

PUBLIC PARK ON GEORGETOWN HEIGHTS.

The bill (S. 54) to provide a public park on Georgetown Heights, in the District of Columbia, was announced as the next business in order on the Calendar.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the bill go over without prejudice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will go over.

CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION.

The bill (S. 1244) to amend section 605 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to corporations, was announced as the next business in order on the Calendar, and was read.

Mr. SPOONER. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS POST-OFFICE PAPERS.

Mr. PETTUS. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 2140) to authorize the Postmaster-General to dispose of useless papers in post-offices. The bill was drafted by the Postmaster-General, and it simply authorizes him to dispose of useless papers in post-offices over the country, which your committee can not examine except in a very unsatisfactory way. That is the whole purpose of the bill. The law does not authorize it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN NATIONAL INSTITUTE AT PARIS, FRANCE.

Mr. FRYE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1) to incorporate the American National Institute (Prix de Paris) at Paris, France. A similar bill has been reported three times favorably and unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and has passed the Senate twice. There are two or three amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TELLER. I object to the bill being taken up until it is read. I want to have the bill read, and then we can determine whether or not there is objection.

Mr. FRYE. It should be read for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, which proposes that CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW, Thomas Hunter, Count von Daur, and others, their associates and successors, shall be created a body corporate and politic in the District of Columbia, by the name of the American National Institute in Paris, France, with the right to implead and be impleaded, to adopt a constitution, by-laws, and corporate seal. The objects of the corporation are to construct a

building in Paris, and there to provide favorable conditions of surroundings and direction for American students, to be admitted under proper certificates of examination of fitness by competition, and to facilitate their studies and training in the arts and sciences, including architecture, sculpture, painting, applied design, music, dramatic art, literature, languages, scientific instruction, and research.

The proposed corporation is empowered to acquire property, both real and personal, in the United States and in France.

It is provided that all gifts and bequests of money to the institute, unless otherwise directed by the donor, shall be invested in United States bonds, so far as may be consistent with the conditions of such gifts and bequests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TELLER. I should like to hear what the proposed amendments are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, section 6, line 8, after the word "Congress," it is proposed to insert "or such place as may be decided upon;" in line 10, after the word "Congress," to strike out "or such place as may be decided upon;" and in line 12, after the word "institute," to insert "other than portraits;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6. That said corporation or board of regents may send each year to the Library of Congress, or such place as may be decided upon, subject to the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library of the two Houses of Congress, such works of the students of the institute, other than portraits, as may be agreed upon between the jurors of the American National Institute and the board of regents as suitable for preservation and exhibition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TELLER. It is utterly impossible for anyone to determine, from hearing a bill read in this manner, whether it is objectionable or not. If this were a business proposition I should certainly object. It seems to be otherwise, and I am not going to object to it; but I do not want to give my assent to some things that I think are in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which have been stated.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. There is another amendment. In section 1, line 5, page 1, after the word "Wheeler," I move to insert "Levi P. Morton."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. In the same section, line 8, after the word "New York," I move to insert "and Phœbe Hearst, State of California."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. There are no other amendments.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a question. I have no objection to the bill; I am in entire sympathy with its purpose; but why should section 5 be in the bill? It seems to me the tendency of it is to mislead foreigners as to the relation of this institute or institution to this Government; and that ought, by all means, to be avoided. It is a purely private establishment. It is not an agency governmental in any sense. It is a wise and kindly purpose, but private. The fact that it is created by Congress is enough, and to go on and permit it to make reports to the Secretary of State, which reports, in whole or in part, are to be solemnly communicated to Congress, I can see, and the Senator can, I think, on reflection, will suggest in the minds of people not entirely familiar with our methods and our affairs the notion that it is a national affair, governmental in some respects. So I think, if the Senator does not regard it as important——

Mr. FRYE. I do not regard it as at all important to the bill.

Mr. SPOONER. Then I suggest that it be stricken out, and that the portion of section 6 which refers—that is all right.

Mr. FRYE. I think that is all right.

Mr. SPOONER. I suggest that section 5 be stricken out.

Mr. FRYE. It may be stricken out. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out section 5, in the following words:

SEC. 5. That said corporation may send annually a report to the Secretary of State, who shall communicate to Congress such portion thereof as he may deem of national interest and importance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to strike out section 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

Mr. FRYE. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will not disturb the bill any further.

Mr. SPOONER. I was merely going to make a suggestion to the Senator from Maine, and if he does not agree to it I shall not insist upon it. I am friendly to the purpose of the bill. Why the limitation as to United States bonds?

Mr. FRYE. Because, I suppose, those bonds are perfectly safe, and would be regarded in France as perfectly safe. The Senator is aware that the city of Paris, whenever this institute has been incorporated by the United States, is to make a present of a site—for the building to be erected upon it—worth three or four hundred thousand dollars, and that is one great necessity why the bill ought to be passed at an early date.

I have had experience with these American students. I had the honor of addressing fifteen hundred of them one Sabbath evening, and if there are any Americans in the world who are entitled to our sympathy and to everything we can do for them, they are the American art students in the city of Paris.

Mr. SPOONER. I quite agree with that. I have had something to do with this subject hitherto, and I discovered a purpose, legitimate enough from the standpoint of the promoters of the institute—and I use the word "promoters" in a good sense, of course—so to draft this measure as to give it every possible semblance of connection with the United States Government; and I fancy that this restriction in section 7, following some other provisions, especially that in section 5, is intended partly for that purpose.

There are plenty of bonds in the world that are adequate security. This is a purely private institute. It is to be created by Congress as a corporation of the District of Columbia, we have entire jurisdiction over the District, and that ought to be enough. I do not see why Congress should undertake to limit the investment by this institute to United States Government bonds. I undertake to say there is no purpose on earh for inserting it in the bill except to create a presumption that this is more of a governmental institution than Congress intends.

Mr. FRYE. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken in his suggestion. That is in the interest of the people from whom very large benefactions are expected. Take the names in the bill. Those people are intensely interested in the erection of this building and in this institution which it is proposed to establish. They themselves would feel very much safer in making large contributions if they knew the money was to be invested where it would be perfectly safe. The provision is put in the bill for that purpose and no other.

Mr. SPOONER. It could be put in the by-laws of the company.

Mr. FRYE. This measure has been before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations three times. It has been reported unanimously. It has been very carefully examined by the committee, and the Senator from Wisconsin was present when it was considered.

Mr. SPOONER. No; I am not opposing the bill, but I think that had better be out. The Senator might say "United States or other bonds;" so as to exclude stocks, which are more precarious.

Mr. FRYE. I suggest that it read "United States or other safe bonds."

Mr. ALLISON. That is better.

Mr. TELLER. What is the phraseology suggested?

Mr. FRYE. "United States or other safe bonds."

Mr. SPOONER. I agree to that.

Mr. FRYE. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POTOMAC RIVER MEMORIAL BRIDGE.

The bill (S. 1373) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from Washington to the Arlington estate property was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. I think the bill had better go over. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] objected to it this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is objected to and goes over.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF ARMY.

The bill (S. 1539) to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Army was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCOTT. As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN],

who is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, is not present, I ask that the bill may go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under objection, the bill will go over.

Mr. FRYE. Retaining its place on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Retaining its place on the Calendar.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT OF ARMY.

The bill (S. 1540) to increase the efficiency of the Ordnance Department of the United States Army was next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. LODGE. That will also go over.

Mr. SCOTT. Let this bill also go over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over, retaining its place.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE AT YANKTON, S. DAK.

The bill (S. 979) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak., was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. SCOTT. My colleague [Mr. ELKINS] is detained at home by sickness and unable to be present. I ask that the bill may go over, retaining its place.

Mr. GAMBLE. This is a bill with which I have entire familiarity and acquaintance. The senior Senator from West Virginia simply reported it.

Mr. SCOTT. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. He is not interested in the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "four," to insert "as amended by the act approved February 11, 1905;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of "An act authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak.," approved April 5, 1904, as amended by the act approved February 11, 1905, be, and the same is hereby, so amended that the time within which the said bridge is required to be commenced shall be within one year and the time within which it is required that said bridge shall be completed shall be within three years from the date of the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRAVES OF CONFEDERATE DEAD.

The bill (S. 1234) to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederate army and navy who died in northern prisons and were buried near the prisons where they died, and for other purposes, was read and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALE. Let the Secretary again read that part of the bill relating to the compensation of the commissioner.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

And the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to appoint some competent person as commissioner to ascertain the location of such Confederate graves not heretofore located, and to compare the names of those already marked with the registers in the cemeteries, and correct the same when found necessary, as preliminary to the work of marking the graves with suitable headstones, and to fix the compensation of said commissioner, who shall be allowed necessary traveling expenses.

Mr. HALE. I move to insert, after "commissioner," the words "at not to exceed $2,500 per annum."

Mr. GALLINGER. "At the rate of."

Mr. HALE. "At the rate of."

Mr. GALLINGER. It may not be a year.

Mr. HALE. Let the amendment be read.

The SECRETARY. After the word "commissioner," in line 3, page 3, insert "at a rate not to exceed $2,500 per annum."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, I ask that the clause relating to the appropriation in the bill may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

That for the carrying out of the objects set forth herein there be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is satisfactory, Mr. President. I thought it was not in.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. SPOONER. Is there any limit of time in the bill in which this work shall be performed?

Mr. FRYE. No; there is not.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There seems to be no limit as to time in the bill.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not think, as suggested by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] who sits behind me, that it would be very wise to leave it entirely without limitation as to time.

Mr. GALLINGER. To a commissioner.

Mr. SPOONER. To a commissioner.

Mr. HALE. It might make a perpetual office.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know how long it will naturally take, but I suggest a limitation of two years. I move to amend the bill by inserting, after the word "mentioned," in the fifteenth line, the words "said work to be completed within two years."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. HALE. I suggest to the Senator to add "at the end of which a report of the same shall be made to Congress."

Mr. SPOONER. I am quite willing to accept that amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment as modified will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 15, after the word "mentioned," strike out the period and insert a comma and the following:

The said work shall be completed within two years, at the end of which a report of the same shall be made to Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FORESTRY LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

The bill (S. 951) to grant to the State of Minnesota certain vacant lands in said State for forestry purposes was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It grants to the State of Minnesota for forestry purposes the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter (80 acres, more or less) of section 6, township 134 north, range 29 west, fifth principal meridian, being vacant public land adapted for forestry purposes and adjoining a forest reserve belonging to the State of Minnesota; but this act shall not prejudice any right to any of the land that may have been acquired by any other party previous to its passage.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SABINE RIVER BRIDGE.

The bill (S. 2159) authorizing the Jasper and Eastern Railway Company, its successors and assigns, to construct and operate a railroad bridge across the Sabine River, in the States of Texas and Louisiana, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 21, after the words "United States," to insert "and equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph and telephone companies; and the United States shall have the right of way across said bridge and its approaches for postal, telegraph, and telephone purposes;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the bridge built under this act and subject to its limitations shall be a lawful structure, and shall be recognized and known as a post route, upon which no higher charge shall be made for the transmission over the same of the mails, troops, and munitions of war of the United States than the rate per mile paid for the transportation over the railroad leading to the said bridge; and it shall enjoy the rights and privileges of other post-roads in the United States; and equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph and telephone companies; and the United States shall have the right of way across said bridge and its approaches for postal, telegraph, and telephone purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 4, line 6, after the words "Secretary of War," to insert "and until the plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War the structure shall not be commenced;" and in line 11, after the words "Secretary of War," to strike out "and the said structure shall be changed at the cost and expense of the owners thereof from time to time, as the Secretary of War may

direct, so as to preserve the free and convenient navigation of said river, and the authority to erect and continue said bridge shall be subject to revocation by the Secretary of War whenever the public good, in his judgment, so requires;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That the bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be built and erected under and subject to such regulations for the security of navigation in said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe, and to secure that object said railway company, its successors or assigns, shall submit to the Secretary of War for his examination and approval a design or drawing of said bridge, and a map of the location, giving for the distance of one-half mile above and 1 mile below the proposed location the meanders of the river and such other particulars as may be required by the Secretary of War, and until the plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War the structure shall not be commenced, and should any change be made in the plan of said bridge during the progress of the construction thereof such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 17, to insert the following as an additional section:

SEC. 5. That all railroad companies desiring the use of said bridge shall have and be entitled to equal rights and privileges relative to the passage of railway trains over the same and over the approaches thereto upon the payment of a reasonable compensation for such use; and in case the owner or owners of said bridge and the several railroad companies, or any of them, desiring such use shall fail to agree upon the sum or sums to be paid and upon the rules and conditions to which each shall conform in using said bridge, all matters at issue between them shall be decided by the Secretary of War upon a hearing of the allegation and proofs of the parties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CULBERSON subsequently said: While I was absent from the Chamber Senate bill 2159, Order of Business 21, was passed with certain Senate committee amendments, which I have not yet had time to examine as carefully as I should like. It is a bridge bill, and rather than have the bill go out of the possession of the Senate I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. FORAKER. What is the bill?

Mr. CULBERSON. It is a bill to allow the Jasper and Eastern Railway Company to construct a bridge over the Sabine River, the boundary line between Texas and Louisiana. I simply want to inquire if the amendments suggested by the Senate Committee on Commerce are satisfactory, and if not, of course I will hear the suggestions and submit the bill again to that committee.

Mr. FRYE. All the amendments suggested to the committee were adopted, I think.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes; that is true, but the point is this: I want to see whether these amendments are satisfactory to the authorities of the railroad company who desire to have the bill passed. I did not draw the bill. I have communicated to them, but have not been able to hear from them. I simply enter a motion to reconsider, as a mere matter of form.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator's motion to reconsider is noted.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the unfinished business may be laid before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 529) to promote the national defense, to create a force of naval volunteers, to establish American ocean mail lines to foreign markets, to promote commerce, and to provide revenue from tonnage.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the bill be read; it has not been read as yet.

Mr. MORGAN. There was a special order. There was a discussion at some time in the past, and at some place in the past, that I am not permitted to mention at all, I believe; but at all events the legislative situation got to be this: By the unanimous consent of this body, a certain proposition was made the regular order of business and displaced the present order that is now being called. I think it is the duty of the Chair, considering the parliamentary position, about which there is no record—no record has been preserved of it—to at least put the Senate in the same shape it was in when it adjourned yesterday evening.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Alabama will permit me, I assure the Senator that I desire to extend to him the utmost possible courtesy in this matter, and if he will allow the bill to be read, which will not take long, I will then ask that it be laid aside, and the other matter can be taken up.

Mr. MORGAN. The matter is not one of the slightest interest to me in the world, except it suggests a parliamentary situation that will grow into a precedent; and I have no right to make any suggestion about it except merely to call for the regular order of the Senate which came over from yesterday.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then I shall make the point of order that the unfinished business is the regular order of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the point of order is well taken. For the information of the Senator from Alabama the Chair would further state that the resolution to which he made reference went to the Calendar under the rule and can only be taken up upon motion.

Mr. GALLINGER. Or by unanimous consent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Or by unanimous consent. The bill which is the unfinished business is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and will now be read at the request of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The Secretary read the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment reported by the Committee on Commerce will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 6, page 12, line 12, paragraph 11, after the word "than," it is proposed to strike out "seventeen" and insert "sixteen;" so as to make the clause read:

Eleventh. From a port of the Pacific coast of the United States via Hawaii and the Samoan Islands to Australasia, on steamships of the United States of not less than 16 knots speed, for a service once in three weeks at a maximum compensation not exceeding $217,000 a year in addition to the compensation now provided pursuant to contract under the act of March 3, 1891, entitled "An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports, and to promote commerce."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I understand that no Senator is prepared to debate this bill to-day, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it may be temporarily laid aside and that we proceed with the Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON. Over here we did not understand the request of the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I made the request that the bill be temporarily laid aside, saying that I understood no Senator was prepared to now address himself to the subject. If any Senator is so prepared, I shall be glad indeed to have him occupy the time of the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. Before anything else is done with this measure, I do not want the House of Representatives to be again offended with the Senate and sending back to us revenue bills for us to chew upon. So I raise the point of order on section 8 of this bill, that it is not within the competency of the Senate of the United States to enact a bill "to provide revenue from tonnage," as stated in the title. My reading of the Constitution is that that power belongs exclusively by the express language of the Constitution to the House of Representatives. I raise the point of order upon that section, and the point may go over.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will suggest, Mr. President, that it is not subject to a point of order. The Senator, of course, can file his caveat that he will oppose that provision of the bill; but before even letting it reach that stage, I will say to the Senator that the suggestion he has made has not escaped the attention of some of the rest of us, and we think we shall find a way out of that difficulty if the difficulty exists.

Mr. MORGAN. I have no doubt of your finding a way out.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think we shall.

Mr. MORGAN. But my opinion is that such an enactment is not within the power of the Senate.

Mr. PATTERSON. I desire to inquire if there is an adverse report accompanying this bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] has submitted a minority report. It was not printed early this morning, but it may now be in print. I have not myself seen it, however.

Mr. CULBERSON. I desire to inquire what became of the point of order raised by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]?

Mr. MORGAN. I have suggested that it might go over with the bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Very well.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Calendar is in order.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. PILES. I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from further service on the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Washington that he be excused

from further service on the Committee on Interoceanic Canals? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is excused.

Mr. ANKENY. I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from further service on the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The senior Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that he may be excused from further service on the Committee on Commerce. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is excused.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask unanimous consent that the vacancies created by the resignations of the Senators from Washington may be filled by the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none. The Chair will appoint to fill the vacancy on the Committee on Commerce the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES], and to fill the vacancy on the Committee on Interoceanic Canals the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. ANKENY].

CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Calendar is in order.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I ask that the Calendar be proceeded with now under Rule VIII, as it would have been in the morning hour, so that five-minute speeches only shall be allowed and one objection will carry a bill over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The first bill on the Calendar will be stated.

ARKANSAS RIVER BRIDGE AT VANBUREN, ARK.

The bill (S. 2106) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Vanburen, Ark., was announced as first in order on the Calendar, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MOBILE RAILWAY AND DOCK COMPANY BRIDGE.

The bill (S. 1747) to authorize the Mobile Railway and Dock Company to construct and maintain a bridge or viaduct across the water between the end of Cedar Point and Dauphin Island was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments. The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 9, after the word "constructed," to insert the word "so;" in line 10, before the word "navigation," to strike out "the," and after the word "navigation," to strike out "of Grants Pass, the channel cut for passage of vessels;" so as to make the section read:

That the Mobile Railway and Dock Company, a corporation created and existing under an act of the general assembly of the State of Alabama, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct and maintain a railroad bridge for the passage of railway engines and cars across the water between Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, in Mobile County, State of Alabama, said bridge or viaduct to be constructed so as not to obstruct navigation between Mobile Bay and Mississippi Sound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 16, after the word "said," to strike out "bridges" and insert "bridge."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 2, line 25, after the words "bridge and," to strike out "drawbridge" and insert "drawbridges;" on page 3, line 7, before the word "wharves," to strike out "drawbridge" and insert "drawbridges;" in line 14, after the word "bridge," to insert "and drawbridges;" in line 16, after the words "Secretary of War," to strike out "no work upon the bridge, wharves, and docks shall be commenced," and insert "work thereon shall not be commenced;" and in line 18, after the word "bridge," to insert "and drawbridges;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That the bridge and drawbridges, wharves, and docks authorized to be constructed under this act shall be located and built and subject to such regulations for the security of the navigation of said pass and Mobile Bay as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and the said company or corporation shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawing of the proposed bridge and drawbridges, wharves, and docks, and a map of the location giving for the space of one-half mile on each side of said bridge and wharves, the direction and strength of the currents, and the soundings accurately showing the bed of the water, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for a full and satisfactory understanding of the subject; and until the said plan and location of the bridge and drawbridges, wharves, and docks are approved by the Secretary of War work thereon shall not be commenced; and should any change be made in the plan of said bridge and drawbridges, wharves, or docks during the progress of construction or after completion such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 3, after the word "navigation," at the end of line 23, to strike out "of said Grants Pass or" and insert "between Mississippi Sound and;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act at any time; and if at any time navigation between Mississippi Sound and the Bay of Mobile shall in any manner be obstructed or impaired by the said works, the Secretary of War shall have authority, and it shall be his duty, to require the said company to alter and change the said works at its own expense, in such manner as may be proper to secure free and complete navigation without impediment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 4, line 6, before the word "*Provided*," to strike out "draw" and insert "draws."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I should like my colleague, who is the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, to tell us whether there is ever any examination made as to the need of the many bridge bills that are passed. It has struck me that it is a question whether there are rivers enough in the United States to accommodate all these bridges. [Laughter.] I do not know, and therefore I ask my colleague.

Mr. FRYE. If my colleague were on the Committee on Commerce, as I am, he would find that there are not bridges enough to cover the rivers.

Mr. HALE. My point was whether there are rivers enough to accommodate the bridges.

Mr. FRYE. Without any doubt there are many more.

Mr. HALE. That is satisfactory.

Mr. FRYE. These bridge bills are all referred to the Secretary of War; the Secretary of War sends to the committee any amendments he desires made to such bridge bills, and they are reported by the subcommittee and adopted by the committee without any further consideration, the Engineer Corps having, of course, examined into the matter. I do not think it is possible for a bridge bill to get through Congress that is not proper in every respect.

Mr. ALLISON. I will ask the Senator from Maine whether these bridges are not generally railway bridges?

Mr. FRYE. They are generally railway bridges.

Mr. ALLISON. And they will be utilized only by bringing railroads through either end of the bridge.

Mr. FRYE. That is true.

Mr. ALLISON. I think there can be no harm in being reasonably liberal in the authorization of such bridges.

Mr. KEAN. Is the toll fixed that is to be charged on the bridges?

Mr. FRYE. It is not.

Mr. ALLISON. I suppose the toll will be fixed later on.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WALTER BARNEY.

The bill (S. 327) granting an increase of pension to Walter Barney was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Walter Barney, late of Company C, Mormon Battalion, Iowa Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

URIAH D. BARRETT.

The bill (S. 1505) granting an increase of pension to Uriah D. Barrett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Uriah D. Barrett, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLEN AMBURN.

The bill (S. 202) granting an increase of pension to Allen Amburn was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Allen Amburn, late of Company D, Thirty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT WIPER.

The bill (S. 137) granting an increase of pension to Robert Wiper was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Robert Wiper, late of Company I, Sixty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BYRON LENT.

The bill (S. 777) granting an increase of pension to Byron Lent, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Byron Lent, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES W. OLESON.

The bill (S. 1214) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Oleson, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "Infantry," to insert "Volunteer;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles W. Oleson, late assistant surgeon Fourteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS M'LAUGHLIN.

The bill (S. 471) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McLaughlin was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas McLaughlin, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a thrid reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID L. WRIGHT.

The bill (S. 974) granting an increase of pension to David L. Wright was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "first lieutenant and captain;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of David L. Wright, late first lieutenant and captain Company E, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT F. CATTERSON.

The bill (S. 944) granting an increase of pension to R. F. Catterson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of," to strike out the initial "R." and insert the name "Robert;" and in line 7, before the word "Indiana," to insert "Regiment;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secertary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Robert F. Catterson, late colonel Ninety-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Catterson."

JEREMIAH INGALLS, ALIAS JEREMIAH BOSS.

The bill (S. 1359) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Boss was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jeremiah Ingalls, alias Jeremiah Boss, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Ingalls, alias Jeremiah Boss."

NELSON B. TOOL.

The bill (S. 489) granting an increase of pension to Nelson B. Toole was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Nelson B. Tool, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Nelson B. Tool."

MINERVA BRIGGS.

The bill (S. 144) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Briggs was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Minerva Briggs, widow of James Briggs, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of $12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN F. WALTER.

The bill (S. 204) granting an increase of pension to John F. Walter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John F. Walter, late of Company I, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Mounted Rangers, and to pay him a pension of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCIS GEE.

The bill (S. 205) granting an increase of pension to Francis Gee was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Francis Gee, late of

Company B, Thirty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CASSIUS LISK.

The bill (S. 149) granting an increase of pension to Cassius Lisk was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Cassius Lisk, late of Twenty-sixth Independent Battery New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUCIUS A. LINCOLN.

The bill (S. 150) granting an increase of pension to Lucius A. Lincoln was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lucius A. Lincoln, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATRICK M'CUE.

The bill (S. 147) granting an increase of pension to Patrick McCue was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Patrick McCue, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and Companies C and F, Battalion Mississippi Marine Brigade Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETER P. CHACEY.

The bill (S. 135) granting an increase of pension to Peter P. Chacey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Peter P. Chacey, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY E. BEDELL.

The bill (S. 1164) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Bedell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry E. Bedell, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LYMAN MARSH.

The bill (S. 184) granting an increase of pension to Lyman Marsh was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lyman Marsh, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE W. PATTON.

The bill (S. 1888) granting an increase of pension to George W. Patton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name George W. Patton, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CURTIS A. CARPENTER.

The bill (S. 82) granting an increase of pension to Curtis A. Carpenter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Curtis A. Carpenter, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUFUS H. PAINE.

The bill (S. 1826) granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Paine was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Rufus H. Paine, late of Company A, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARTWELL C. KEYES.

The bill (S. 76) granting an increase of pension to Hartwell C. Keyes was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hartwell C. Keyes, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEE H. BUCKLAND.

The bill (S. 574) granting an increase of pension to Lee H. Buckland was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lee H. Buckland, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Dragoons, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES H. KNIGHT.

The bill (S. 571) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Knight was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles H. Knight, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAURICE DOWNEY.

The bill (S. 708) granting an increase of pension to Maurice Downey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Maurice Downey, late of Company C, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EPHRAIM A. GORDON.

The bill (S. 713) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim A. Gordon was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ephraim A. Gordon, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIZZIE E. SHEHAN.

The bill (S. 15) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie E. Shehan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lizzie E. Shehan, widow of James R. Shehan, late of Company I, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of $12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES A. BRADBURY.

The bill (S. 23) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Bradbury was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles A. Bradbury, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, or-

dered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY G. BRIGHT.

The bill (S. 21) granting a pension to Mary G. Bright was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary G. Bright, widow of George A. Bright, late surgeon and medical director, United States Navy, and to pay her a pension of $30 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OLIVER P. SMITH.

The bill (S. 182) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "of," to insert "Company F, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry and;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Oliver P. Smith, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES W. RYAN.

The bill (S. 844) granting an increase of pension to James W. Ryan was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the biH read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James W. Ryan, late of Company D, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HORATIO CARTER.

The bill (S. 849) granting an increase of pension to Horatio Carter was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Horatio Carter, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MOSES H. SAWYER.

The bill (S. 783) granting an increase of pension to Moses H. Sawyer was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "acting master;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Moses H. Sawyer, late acting master United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATRICK GARVEY.

The bill (S. 786) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Garvey was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "Company," to insert the letter "B;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Patrick Garvey, late captain Company B, Ninth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF STREETS.

The bill (S. 64) for the extension of Seventh street and Franklin street NE., and for other purposes, was announced as the next bill in order on the Calendar.

Mr. KEAN. Let the bill go over until the Senator from New Hamshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over under objection.

Mr. KEAN. I do not object. I only ask that it may be passed temporarily.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed temporarily.

The bill (S. 2260) authorizing the extension of Meridian place NW. was announced as the next business in order on the Calendar.

Mr. KEAN. Let it be passed over also.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It also will be passed over.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently said: In my absence two bills providing for the extension of two streets were passed over. I will state that those bills contemplate assessing the entire cost as benefits upon the property owners, and there is no objection to them in any direction. I hope they will be acted upon at the present time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The first bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill (S. 64) for the extension of Seventh street and Franklin street NE., and for other purposes, was read, and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 3, before the word "days," to strike out "twenty" and insert "thirty;" so as to read:

That within thirty days after the passage of this act the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to institute in the supreme court of the District of Columbia, sitting as a district court, by petition particularly describing the lands to be taken, a proceeding in rem to condemn the land that may be necessary for the extension of Seventh street NE.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 20, after the word "for," to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That the remaining portion of any parcel of land of any party dedicating shall be exempt from any assessment in respect to the cost of condemning any portion of said streets that may not be dedicated or from any assessment for benefits of the extension of said streets.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 7, page 5, line 25, after the word "land," to strike out "by the Treasurer of the United States, ex officio commissioner of the sinking fund of the District of Columbia, upon the warrant of the Commissioners of said District, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia; and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of said judgments and awards is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia," and insert "by the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia from moneys advanced to him by the Secretary of the Treasury upon requisitions of the Commissioners of said District, as provided by law; and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of said judgments and awards is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. That when the verdict of said jury shall have been finally ratified and confirmed by the court, as herein provided, the amounts of money awarded and adjudged to be payable for lands taken under the provisions hereof shall be paid to the owners of said land by the disbursing officer of the District of Columbia from moneys advanced to him by the Secretary of the Treasury upon requisitions of the Commissioners of said District, as provided by law; and a sufficient sum to pay the amounts of said judgments and awards is hereby appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 11, page 7, line 16, after the word "hereto," to strike out "to be repaid to the District of Columbia from said assessments for benefits when the same

are collected as herein provided;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 11. That the sum of $300 is hereby appropriated, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, to provide the necessary funds for the costs and expenses of the condemnation proceedings taken pursuant hereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next bill referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire will be read.

The bill (S. 2260) authorizing the extension of Meridian place NW. was read; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 5, after the word "said," to strike out "avenue" and insert "street;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That all of the amount found to be due and awarded as damages for and in respect of the land condemned for the extension of Meridian place, as herein provided, shall be assessed by the jury hereinafter provided for as benefits, and, to the extent of such benefits, against those pieces or parcels of land on each side of said avenue as extended, and also on any or all pieces or parcels of land which will be benefited by the extension of said street, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 4, line 12, after the word "said," to strike out "avenue" and insert "street;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. That if the use of a part only of any piece or parcel of ground shall be condemned, the jury, in determining its value, shall not take into any consideration any benefits that may accrue to the remainder thereof from the extension of said street or highway, but such benefits shall be considered in determining what assessment shall be made on or against such piece or parcel of land as may not be taken as hereinbefore provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH G. M'GARVEY.

The bill (S. 1239) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. McGarvey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph G. McGarvey, late of Company G, Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN CHRISTOFF.

The bill (S. 1238) granting an increase of pension to John Christoff was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Christoff, late of Company B, Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JULIA W. ESTES.

The bill (S. 1408) granting an increase of pension to Julia W. Estes was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Julia W. Estes, widow of Llewellyn G. Estes, late major and assistant adjutant-general and brevet brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DORA H. KUHNS.

The bill (S. 1444) granting a pension to Dora H. Kuhns was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Dora H. Kuhns, widow of Herman L. Kuhns, late captain and quartermaster, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REBECCA A. WHITE.

The bill (S. 1872) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. White was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 8, after the word "and," to strike out "later of," and in the same line, before the word "Volunteer," to insert "Kentucky;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Rebecca A. White, widow of George W. White, late of Company B, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Battery A, Kentucky Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOPHIA A. KNAPP.

The bill (S. 530) granting an increase of pension to Sophia A. Knapp was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "late," to strike out "senior;" and in line 7, after the word "Volunteer," to strike out "Infantry" and insert "Light Artillery;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sophia A. Knapp, widow of Sylvester Knapp, late of the Twenty-fourth Battery Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN PIEPER.

The bill (S. 195) granting an increase of pension to John Pieper was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of Company B" and insert "commissary sergeant;" and in line 7, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and United States Army;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Pieper, late commissary sergeant, Tenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES E. SMITH.

The bill (S. 1269) granting an increase of pension to Charles Edwin Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles E. Smith, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and captain Company A, Fifty-sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. How much is the pensioner receiving now?

The Secretary read from the report, as follows:

This bill proposes to increase from $12 to $30 per month the pension.

Mr. KEAN. Let the report in the case be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey calls for the reading of the report.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. PILES on the 8th instant, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1269) granting an increase of pension to Charles Edwin Smith, have examined the same and report:

This bill proposes to increase from $12 to $30 per month the pension of Charles E. Smith, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and captain Company A, Fifty-sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry.

The papers on file in this case show that Charles E. Smith, the claimant was a good soldier with an honorable record of five years' service. It is shown by the military records that he enlisted October 22, 1861, as a private in Company K, Fourth Minnesota Infantry, and served as such until August 11, 1863, when honorably discharged. He again enlisted August 12, 1863, as hospital steward, Fifty-sixth United States Colored Troops, and was promoted second lieutenant of Company A, same regiment, December 6, 1864. He was promoted captain April 7, 1866, and was honorably discharged and mustered out with his company September 15, 1866.

Soldier might have obtained arrears of pension had he applied in time, but he was self-reliant and independent and he refused to ask aid from the Government until his necessities compelled him to do so. His first application was filed August 30, 1888, from which date he was allowed pension under the general law for malarial poisoning, chronic diarrhea, and piles of service origin at $8 per month, which was finally increased to $12 per month from October 14, 1891. He applied for further increase March 3, 1900, but his application was rejected July 18, 1902, on the ground that his rate was commensurate with the degree of disability from pensioned causes.

Soldier is about 62 years of age, and is completely broken down physically and absolutely incapable of earning his own support. It appears by the last report of the board of examining surgeons, dated April 2, 1902, that he is unable to perform manual labor by reason of physical disabilities. The examining surgeons described his condition as follows:

"Malarial poisoning: Tongue coated, skin sallow and icteroid, whites of eyes icteroid. Abdomen tympanitic, tenderness over liver, stomach, and spleen; those organs not enlarged. Liver nor spleen not palpable. Applicant looks weak and emaciated.

"Diarrhea and piles: Rectum: Skin around anus relaxed; mucous membrane of rectum red and inflamed; presence of much mucous; six internal piles, tumors about the size of a hazlenut; no ulceration, but evidence of old ulcerations.

"Applicant was merchant; palms give no evidence of manual labor. Disabilities are permanent and not due to vicious habits."

Claimant is in destitute circumstances financially and has absolutely no means of support aside from his present pension of $12 per month.

In view of his advanced age, the length and distinguished character of his services (he being promoted from private to rank of captain), his poverty and inability to earn a support by his own manual labor, your committee are of opinion that an increase of his pension to $30 per month, as proposed in the bill, is eminently just and proper.

The bill is therefore reported back favorably with a recommendation that it pass when amended as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles E. Smith, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and captain Company A, Fifty-sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

Also amend title so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Smith."

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Smith."

EUGENE P. KINGSLEY.

The bill (S. 99) granting an increase of pension to Eugene P. Kingsley was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "Infantry," to strike out "Volunteer" and insert "National Guard;" in line 8, before the word "and," to strike out "also United States Navy," and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eugene P. Kingsley, late of Company K, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HIRAM B. DOTY.

The bill (S. 532) granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Doty was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hiram B. Doty, late of Company G, Seventy-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD KEASTER.

The bill (S. 85) granting an increase of pension to Edward Keaster was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Edward Keaster, late of Company C, Forty-fifth, and Company C, Fiftieth, Regiments Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUSSELL A. M'KINLEY.

The bill (S. 988) granting a pension to Russell A. McKinley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Russell A. McKinley, late of Troop C, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of $100 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES L. COWELL.

The bill (S. 194) granting an increase of pension to James L. Cowell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James L. Cowell, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORANGE G. JONES.

The bill (S. 386) granting an increase of pension to Orange G. Jones was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Orange G. Jones, late of Company A, First Regiment North Carolina Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN LEAVITT.

The bill (S. 1340) granting an increase of pension to John Leavitt was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Leavitt, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIZZIE G. REYNOLDS.

The bill (S. 157) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie G. Reynolds was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lizzie G. Reynolds, widow of Phineas B. Reynolds, late of Company K, Thirty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH DAVIS.

The bill (S. 168) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Davis was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elizabeth Davis, widow of William P. Davis, late captain Company I, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRED PREISINGER.

The bill (S. 1341) granting an increase of pension to Fred Preisinger was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Fred Preisinger, late of Company H, Seventy-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MORTON M. NOAH.

The bill (S. 1342) granting an increase of pension to Morton M. Noah was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Morton M. Noah, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW C. REED.

The bill (S. 560) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Reed was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Andrew C. Reed, late of Company C, Twenty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETH M. TUCKER.

The bill (S. 559) granting an increase of pension to Seth M. Tucker was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "lieutenant," to strike out "Company B, Fourth and Tenth Regiments," and insert "Companies B and I, Tenth Regiment;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Seth M. Tucker, late first lieutenant Companies B and I, Tenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was order to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH HILER.

The bill (S. 627) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hiler was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph Hiler, late of Company G, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES SLOAN.

The bill (S. 1040) granting an increase of pension to James Sloan was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James Sloan, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM C. BRECKENRIDGE.

The bill (S. 217) granting an increase of pension to William C. Breckenridge was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William C. Breckenridge, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM W. LANE.

The bill (S. 1431) granting an increase of pension to William W. Lane was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William W. Lane, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLEN J. NASH.

The bill (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Allen J. Nash was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Allen J. Nash, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM C. BEACHEY.

The bill (S. 1036) granting an increase of pension to William C. Beachey was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "musician" and insert "of;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William C. Beachey, late of Company G, One hundred and eighty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MICHAEL BRADY.

The bill (S. 525) granting an increase of pension to Michael Brady was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "color-sergeant" and insert "of Company C;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Michael Brady, late of Company C, Sixty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES S. M. HOOTON.

The bill (S. 1310) granting an increase of pension to C. S. M. Hooton was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of," where it occurs the first time, to strike out the letter "C" and insert "Charles;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles S. M. Hooton, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Charles S. M. Hooton."

SARAH A. PRESTON.

The bill (S. 1201) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Preston was considered as in Committee on the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sarah A. Preston, widow of James F. Preston, late captain Company A, First Regiment Virginia Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of $12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN D. M'FADDEN.

The bill (S. 113) granting an increase of pension to John D. McFadden was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John D. McFadden, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT M. M'CORMICK.

The bill (S. 528) granting a pension to Robert M. McCormick was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Robert M. McCormick, invalid and dependent son of Robert M. McCormick, late captain Company G, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABRAHAM M. CORY.

The bill (S. 336) granting a pension to Abraham M. Cory was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "and," to strike out "Volunteer Infantry" and insert "Army;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Abraham M. Cory, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH T. CARPENTER.

The bill (S. 2082) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth T. Carpenter was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elizabeth T. Carpenter, widow of Gilbert S. Carpenter, late lieutenant-colonel Seventh Regiment United States Infantry and brigadier-general, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELEN M. BLANCHARD.

The bill (S. 1737) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Blanchard was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "fifteen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Helen M. Blanchard, widow of John A. Blanchard, late surgeon Forty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $15 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANGELINA HERNANDEZ.

The bill (S. 2143) granting an increase of pension to Angelina Hernandez was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Angelina Hernandez, widow of Ramon Hernandez, late of Captain Moseley's independent company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Seminole Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN M'KINNON, ALIAS JOHN MACK.

The bill (S. 1160) to correct the military record of John McKinnon, alias John Mack, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "discharge," to strike out "an honorable" and insert "a;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John McKinnon, alias John Mack, late of Company L, Sixteenth Pennsylvania Cavalry, and seaman on the U. S. S. North Carolina and U. S. S. Brooklyn, and to grant him a discharge from the military service of the United States: *Provided*, That no bounty, pay, or other emoluments shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AFFAIRS OF MOROCCO.

The resolution submitted by Mr. BACON on the 8th instant, requesting the President to furnish the Senate with copies of papers concerning holding a conference on matters relating to Morocco, etc., was announced as the last business on the Calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senate has done a very good day's work, and has practically completed the Calendar. I do not think that at this hour any Senator desires to enter into a debate upon anything that remains. Therefore I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 11, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10, 1906.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Henry L. Stimson, of the State of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, in the place of Henry L. Burnett, whose term expires on January 13, 1906.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Luther D. McGahan, of Minot, N. Dak., to be register of the land office at Minot, N. Dak., vice Robert C. Sanborn, resigned.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John Petterson, of McIntosh, Minn., to be receiver of public moneys at Crookston, Minn., vice August F. George, term expired.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Thacher T. Hallet, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Barnstable, in the State of Massachusetts. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander George L. Dyer, to be a captain in the Navy from the 30th day of September, 1905, vice Capt. James R. Selfridge, deceased.

Surg. James E. Gardner, to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 17th day of December, 1905, vice Medical Inspector David O. Lewis, deceased.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Prelate D. Barker to be postmaster at Mobile, in the county of Mobile and State of Alabama, in place of Prelate D. Barker. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1906.

Blevins S. Perdue to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Butler and State of Alabama, in place of Blevins S. Perdue. Incumbent's commission expires February 10, 1906.

William C. Starke to be postmaster at Troy, in the county of Pike and State of Alabama, in place of William C. Starke. Incumbent's commission expires February 10, 1906.

Walter T. Stewart to be postmaster at Sylacauga, in the county of Talladega and State of Alabama, in place of Sarah J. Hebson, resigned.

ALASKA.

Frank W. Swanton to be postmaster at Nome, in the Territory of Alaska, in place of Frank W. Swanton. Incumbent's commission expires January 21, 1906.

ARKANSAS.

William D. Foster to be postmaster at Gravette, in the county of Benton and State of Arkansas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

CALIFORNIA.

Edward H. Bautzer to be postmaster at San Pedro, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California, in place of Edward H. Bautzer. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1906.

John C. Boggs to be postmaster at Newcastle, in the county of Placer and State of California, in place of John C. Boggs. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1906.

Harvey S. Clark, jr., to be postmaster at Lodi, in the county of San Joaquin and State of California, in place of Harvey S. Clark, jr. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

Eugene Don to be postmaster at Santa Clara, in the county of Santa Clara and State of California, in place of Eugene Don. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

Walter J. Ford to be postmaster at Quincy, in the county of Plumas and State of California. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

William W. James to be postmaster at Monterey, in the county of Monterey and State of California, in place of William W. James. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

Archie G. Madson to be postmaster at Angels Camp, in the county of Calaveras and State of California, in place of Archie G. Madson. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

William Mullen to be postmaster at Mendocino, in the county of Mendocino and State of California. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

Samuel L. Smith to be postmaster at Nordhoff, in the county of Ventura and State of California. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

James H. Wamsley to be postmaster at Glendora, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California. Office became Presidential April 1, 1905.

COLORADO.

Frederick S. Bruner to be postmaster at Fruita, in the county of Mesa and State of Colorado. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

Walter S. Clark to be postmaster at Aspen, in the county of Pitkin and State of Colorado, in place of Walter S. Clark. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

William Knearl to be postmaster at Brush, in the county of Morgan and State of Colorado. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

William H. Wallace to be postmaster at Julesburg, in the county of Sedgwick and State of Colorado. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

CONNECTICUT.

Thomas W. Beaumont to be postmaster at Cromwell, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut, in place of Thomas W. Beaumont. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1906.

Joshua A. Fessenden to be postmaster at Stamford, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in place of Joshua A. Fessenden. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1906.

Charles S. Hall to be postmaster at Wallingford, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, in place of Charles S. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1906.

George H. Jackson to be postmaster at New Milford, in the county of Litchfield and State of Connecticut, in place of George H. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1906.

FLORIDA.

Walter F. Mickle to be postmaster at Fort Myers, in the county of Lee and State of Florida, in place of Olive E. Stout. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

ILLINOIS.

John C. Baker to be postmaster at Golconda, in the county of Pope and State of Illinois, in place of John C. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1905.

Joseph H. Braden to be postmaster at Rossville, in the county of Vermilion and State of Illinois, in place of Theodore E. Habel. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1905.

Cornelius M. Ogdon to be postmaster at Westville, in the county of Vermilion and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

INDIANA.

Elliott E. Barnard to be postmaster at Delphi, in the county of Carroll and State of Indiana, in place of Elliott E. Barnard. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

Edward H. Burns to be postmaster at Frankfort, in the county of Clinton and State of Indiana, in place of Andrew A. Laird. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

John G. Dunbar to be postmaster at Greencastle, in the county of Putnam and State of Indiana, in place of John G. Dunbar. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1906.

Charles M. Eisenbeiss to be postmaster at Elkhart, in the county of Elkhart and State of Indiana, in place of William H. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

Jasper N. Frist to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Vermilion and State of Indiana, in place of Jasper N. Frist. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

John W. Graham to be postmaster at Bloomfield, in the county of Greene and State of Indiana, in place of Joe E. Shryer. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1906.

John C. Gregg to be postmaster at Brazil, in the county of Clay and State of Indiana, in place of Harry D. Falls. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1906.

Lyman B. Holleman to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, in the county of Posey and State of Indiana, in place of Lyman B. Holleman. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

John W. Lough to be postmaster at Ladoga, in the county of Montgomery and State of Indiana, in place of W. M. Mills. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

Benjamin L. McFarlan to be postmaster at Rushville, in the county of Rush and State of Indiana, in place of Homer Havens. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

William P. Masters to be postmaster at Seymour, in the

county of Jackson and State of Indiana, in place of William P. Masters. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1906.

William O. Protsman to be postmaster at Vevay, in the county of Switzerland and State of Indiana, in place of William O. Protsman. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

Charles H. Reader to be postmaster at Corydon, in the county of Harrison and State of Indiana, in place of Thomas J. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1906.

Frederick Schrader to be postmaster at Batesville, in the county of Ripley and State of Indiana, in place of Donald McCallum. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1906.

B. W. S. Wiseman to be postmaster at Culver, in the county of Marshall and State of Indiana, in place of B. W. S. Wiseman. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

Absalum B. Allen to be postmaster at Okemah, in district No. 9, Indian Territory. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

L. W. Smith to be postmaster at Wewoka, in district No. 13, Indian Territory. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

Alva A. Taylor to be postmaster at Wapanucka, in District No. 23, Indian Territory. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

IOWA.

George R. Lochrie to be postmaster at Lorimor, in the county of Union and State of Iowa, in place of Jay M. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expires January 21, 1906.

John M. Lytle to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and State of Iowa, in place of James A. Cunningham, resigned.

Ellsworth E. Secor to be postmaster at Buffalo Center, in the county of Winnebago and State of Iowa, in place of Ellsworth E. Secor. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1905.

KANSAS.

Patrick H. Campbell to be postmaster at Alton, in the county of Osborne and State of Kansas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

John H. Vaughn to be postmaster at Garnett, in the county of Anderson and State of Kansas, in place of Winfield S. Bemis, resigned.

KENTUCKY.

James F. Taylor to be postmaster at Glasgow, in the county of Barren and State of Kentucky, in place of James F. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Fred L. Atkinson to be postmaster at Newburyport, in the county of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in place of Fred E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1906.

MICHIGAN.

Thomas H. Barnum to be postmaster at Iron River, in the county of Iron and State of Michigan, in place of William J. Blair. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

Henry W. Coburn to be postmaster at Escanaba, in the county of Delta and State of Michigan, in place of Matthew J. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1906.

Ross Leighton to be postmaster at Newberry, in the county of Luce and State of Michigan, in place of Charles Brebner, resigned.

Homer Warren to be postmaster at Detroit, in the county of Wayne and State of Michigan, in place of Freeman B. Dickerson. Incumbent's commission expires February 7, 1906.

MISSOURI.

Levi Alexander to be postmaster at Kahoka, in the county of Clark and State of Missouri, in place of James L. Greenlee, resigned.

James C. Baker to be postmaster at Ridgeway, in the county of Harrison and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

Samuel B. Cropper to be postmaster at Jamesport, in the county of Daviess and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

Samuel H. Elkins to be postmaster at Columbia, in the county of Boone and State of Missouri, in place of Samuel H. Elkins. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

Alfred Lowman to be postmaster at Smithville, in the county of Clay and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

John Marshall to be postmaster at Bonne Terre (late Bonneterre), in the county of St. Francois and State of Missouri, in place of John Marshall, to change name of office.

MONTANA.

Alonzo H. Foster to be postmaster at Boulder, in the county of Jefferson and State of Montana, in place of Alonzo H. Foster. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

NEBRASKA.

Mons Johnson to be postmaster at Valley, in the county of Douglas and State of Nebraska. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

NEW YORK.

Charles A. Brooks to be postmaster at Marathon, in the county of Cortland and State of New York, in place of Charles A. Brooks. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

Howard G. Dewey to be postmaster at Gloversville, in the county of Fulton and State of New York, in place of Willard N. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

Frank J. Enz to be postmaster at Ithaca, in the county of Tompkins and State of New York, in place of Frank J. Enz. Incumbent's commission expires January 21, 1906.

Mary R. Newlands to be postmaster at West Point, in the county of Orange and State of New York, in place of Mary R. Newlands. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Ann Z. Pearce to be postmaster at Selma, in the county of Johnston and State of North Carolina. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

OHIO.

John H. Stover to be postmaster at Waterville, in the county of Lucas and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1905.

OREGON.

W. P. Pennebaker to be postmaster at Woodburn, in the county of Marion and State of Oregon, in place of Walter L. Tooze. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1905.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Harry H. Hawkins to be postmaster at Spring Forge, in the county of York and State of Pennsylvania. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Thomas E. Husbands to be postmaster at Dillon, in the county of Marion and State of South Carolina, in place of Thomas E. Husbands. Incumbent's commission expires January 16, 1906.

Robinson P. Searson to be postmaster at Allendale, in the county of Barnwell and State of South Carolina. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

William A. Carter to be postmaster at Castlewood, in the county of Hamlin and State of South Dakota. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

TENNESSEE.

John C. Campbell to be postmaster at Johnson City, in the county of Washington and State of Tennessee, in place of John C. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

TEXAS.

J. A. Bowermon to be postmaster at Mansfield, in the county of Tarrant and State of Texas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

Marshall Smith to be postmaster at Brownwood, in the county of Brown and State of Texas, in place of Marshall Smith. Incumbent's commission expires January 28, 1906.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate January 10, 1906.

Second Lieut. Harry W. Bathiany, Third Infantry, to be first lieutenant from September 22, 1905 (subject to examination required by law), vice McCook, Second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Fred H. Turner, Twenty-third Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 4, 1905, vice Coleman, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edwin O. Saunders, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 6, 1905, vice Pond, Third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Walter Krueger, Thirtieth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 10, 1905, vice Merrill, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Beverly C. Daly, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 11, 1905, vice Wetherill, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Asa L. Singleton, Fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 24, 1905, vice Norwood, Twenty-third Infantry, resigned.

Second Lieut. Arthur L. Bump, Eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 29, 1905, vice Murphy, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Willis E. Mills, Ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 30, 1905, vice Baldwin, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Gilbert A. McElroy, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from October 30, 1905, vice Brandle, First Infantry, deceased.

Second Lieut. Harry W. Gregg, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from November 2, 1905, vice Shields, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Sylvester C. Loring, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be first lieutenant from November 11, 1905, vice Burr, Fifteenth Infantry, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 10, 1906.

GOVERNOR OF OKLAHOMA.

Frank Frantz, of Enid, Okla., to be governor of Oklahoma.

GOVERNOR OF NEW MEXICO.

Herbert J. Hagerman, of Roswell, N. Mex., to be governor of New Mexico.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Charles E. Wolverton, of Oregon, to be United States district judge for the district of Oregon.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Alpha E. Hoyt, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Sundance, Wyo.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Levi R. Davis, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Sundance, Wyo.

Robert R. Herron, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Lander, Wyo.

Nathaniel H. Alexander, of Alabama, to be receiver of public moneys at Montgomery, Ala.

Merris C. Barrow, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Douglas, Wyo.

Eugene B. Mather, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Buffalo, Wyo.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Frederick W. Daniels, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Buffalo, Wyo.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

James F. Scott to be postmaster at Ione, in the county of Amador and State of California.

CONNECTICUT.

George D. Carey to be postmaster at Sound Beach, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

IDAHO.

John F. Cook, jr., to be postmaster at Bonners Ferry, in the county of Kootenai and State of Idaho.

ILLINOIS.

Harold E. Chadwick to be postmaster at Ashton, in the county of Lee and State of Illinois.

Robert N. Chapman to be postmaster at Charleston, in the county of Coles and State of Illinois.

Frank C. Davidson to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Dewitt and State of Illinois.

William R. Jewell to be postmaster at Danville, in the county of Vermilion and State of Illinois.

Walter W. Lindley to be postmaster at Urbana, in the county Champaign and State of Illinois.

John J. Reeve to be postmaster at Jacksonville, in the county of Morgan and State of Illinois.

Ozias Riley to be postmaster at Champaign, in the county of Champaign and State of Illinois.

Joseph C. Weir to be postmaster at Rantoul, in the county of Champaign and State of Illinois.

Charles W. Warner to be postmaster at Hoopeston, in the county of Vermilion and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

William L. Bryan to be postmaster at Boonville, in the county of Warrick and State of Indiana.

William A. Dennerline to be postmaster at Aurora, in the county of Dearborn and State of Indiana.

Samuel S. Heath to be postmaster at Lebanon, in the county of Boone and State of Indiana.

James F. Lawson to be postmaster at Spencer, in the county of Owen and State of Indiana.

Morris B. Pote to be postmaster at New Harmony, in the county of Posey and State of Indiana.

IOWA.

William S. Browning to be postmaster at Winfield, in the county of Henry and State of Iowa.

Marion Bruce to be postmaster at Rolfe, in the county of Pocahontas and State of Iowa.

Harry McNamara to be postmaster at Tipton, in the county of Cedar and State of Iowa.

Charles M. Stevens to be postmaster at Williams, in the county of Hamilton and State of Iowa.

Francis Trunkey to be postmaster at Elma, in the county of Howard and State of Iowa.

KANSAS.

James M. Goff to be postmaster at Walnut, in the county of Crawford and State of Kansas.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Henry Converse to be postmaster at Rutland, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

Frank E. Nellis to be postmaster at Mount Clemens, in the county of Macomb and State of Michigan.

MISSOURI.

Frank M. Deggendorf to be postmaster at Potosi, in the county of Washington and State of Missouri.

NEW YORK.

Dwight H. Bruce to be postmaster at Syracuse, in the county of Onondaga and State of New York.

J. D. Denison to be postmaster at Greene, in the county of Chenango and State of New York.

Ellsworth Sweet to be postmaster at Waterloo, in the county of Seneca and State of New York.

Henry W. Wilcox to be postmaster at Deposit, in the county of Broome and State of New York.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Harry H. Roberts to be postmaster at Tower City, in the county of Cass and State of North Dakota.

John I. W. Durston to be postmaster at Bisbee, in the county of Towner and State of North Dakota.

OHIO.

Glenn H. Salkeld to be postmaster at Perry, in the county of Lake and State of Ohio.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Howard B. Frankenberry to be postmaster at Point Marion, in the county of Fayette and State of Pennsylvania.

WISCONSIN.

Royden J. Coon to be postmaster at Plainfield, in the county of Waushara and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *January 10, 1906.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COLD SPRINGS FISH HATCHERY, BULLOCHVILLE, GA.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11036) to provide additional land and provide additional buildings at the Cold Springs fish hatchery, Bullochville, Ga., and that the same be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. While the bill relates to a fish hatchery, in point of fact it refers to the subdividing of an appropriation already made in such manner as will effect the purpose for which the bill is intended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11036, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 2.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Elections No. 2 be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House, and to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill No. 3.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3—the Philippine tariff bill—with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be permitted time to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be given time to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, the pending measure has been so exhaustively and elaborately discussed by my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means who have preceded me that I would fain be excused from intruding myself upon the attention of this committee. It seems to me, however, that I owe it to myself that I should put on record the reasons that influence me to support this measure, and in doing so I shall endeavor to confine myself to the discussion of those questions which seem to me to be entirely relevant, and will endeavor to occupy as brief a time as possible. It will not be out of place for me to restate the question at issue.

The measure under discussion is "An act to amend an act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes." By its provisions all of the products of the Philippine Islands are admitted into the United States free of duty except sugar and tobacco, and upon these a duty is imposed equal to 25 per cent of the existing rates under what is known as the "Dingley Act." There is a further provision that after April 11, 1909, ten years after the exchange of the ratifications of the treaty of Paris, all Philippine products shall be admitted into the United States free of duty.

As the law now stands, Philippine sugar and tobacco pay duties equal to 75 per cent of the Dingley rates, so that this measure, if adopted, will reduce the rates of duty 50 per cent for three years. Prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of "the diamond rings" the full duties provided for by the Dingley Act were imposed and collected on the products of the Philippine Islands. In that case, however, the Supreme Court held that the Philippine Archipelago is not a foreign country, and as a consequence the Dingley rates did not apply. Following this decision the act was passed which imposes the present 75 per cent rate.

As the Philippine Islands are a part of the United States, there ought to be free trade with them both ways, and the bill provides for that in 1909. That, however, is not feasible at this time. In the first place, goods going from the United States into the Philippine Islands pay the same rate of duty as like goods from other countries, and this practice must continue until 1909, for the reason that under the treaty of Paris Spain is entitled to the same advantages in tariff duties on exports to the Philippine Islands that the United States enjoy for a period of ten years. In the second place the revenue to be derived from the duties now imposed on sugar and tobacco is necessary for the maintenance of the Philippine government. The revenue to be collected under the bill does not go into the Treasury of the United States but into the Philippine treasury.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. DALZELL. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that I may be allowed to proceed without interruption, and then I shall be very glad at the end to answer any questions which any gentleman may ask.

Whether the acquisition of the Philippine Islands by the United States was in the first place desirable is now a question of no possible moment. It is purely academic. By the treaty of Paris the islands became subject to our sovereignty and as much a part of our territory as Alaska, Porto Rico, or New Mexico. Nor is the question as to their ultimate fate a live question. It is admitted on all hands that no man can foresee the time when the Philippine people will be able to take care of themselves. In the meantime they must remain our wards.

The question is not as to what some future generation of our descendants shall in their day do with the Philippine Islands and their people. The question is, What shall we do with them? What shall we do with them now? The possible relation of the United States to the Philippine Islands a century hence rests in the realm of impossible conjecture. It is vain for us to deal in imaginings. We must take for granted that those who come after us will be faithful to their duty as up to this time we have been loyal to ours, and as I trust we shall remain loyal by the enactment of this just law in the interests of a suffering people who in the providence of God have been intrusted to and remain under our care. [Applause.]

Mr. McKinley said:

> The Philippines are ours, not to exploit, but to develop, to civilize, to educate, to train in the science of self-government. This is the path of duty which we must follow or be recreant to a mighty trust committed to us.

And we have been following in that path of duty. We have committed ourselves to the policy which makes these islands and their people a part of us. We have put down insurrection and granted amnesty. Our flag floats triumphant in the skies of the Orient. We have established civil government of the most enlightened character. There is no right or liberty known to ourselves, heirs of all the ages, except the right of trial by jury and to bear arms, that we have not given to them, and these rights have been withheld in their interest. The instructions of President McKinley to the Philippine Commission, which constitute the Philippine scheme of government, have evoked the highest praise from the lovers of liberty all the world over. That great state paper has been said to be—

> a constitution, a code judicial, a system of laws ready made, statutes administrative covering all the activities of a nation and meeting wants and solving problems innumerable, all rolled into one. It was a masterly summing up of the governing experience of the self-governing people of the world, adapted to and specially arranged for effective work in a given field.

Government has been administered pursuant to the President's instructions in all the islands, in their provinces and cities. Courts have been established; civil service inaugurated; rivers and harbors improved; light-houses established; the gold standard adopted; telegraphs built; roads and bridges projected, and, over and above all, schools provided; in a word, such an American policy adopted as commits us to its continuance to a successful issue. To abandon it now would not only be to prove ourselves recreant to a mighty trust, but would mean disaster and anarchy and bloodshed to the Filipinos. [Applause.]

Furthermore, by our legislation we have emphatically declared that they are part and parcel of us. We have extended to them our navigation laws. We have extended to them our immigration laws. We have extended to them our alien contract-labor laws. Do you mean to tell me that we shall confine them to our domestic policy, shall compel the carriage of their goods in American bottoms and at the same time refuse them the enjoyment of our markets? Surely, surely not. The Philippine Islands can not be at the same time both foreign and domestic. [Applause.] They must be either wholly foreign or wholly domestic. By the decision of our highest court, by the inauguration of a governmental policy more than once indorsed by the people of this country, and by our legislation, explicit in terms, we have declared the Philippine Islands to be wholly domestic. Under these circumstances a tariff can no more be justified on general principles between the Philippine Islands and the United States than between the United States and Porto Rico and between the United States and the Hawaiian Islands.

The gentleman from Colorado did me the honor yesterday to quote from a speech which I made upon the floor of this House during the Porto Rican controversy, and he did it for the purpose, he said, of showing that I had abandoned some doctrines to which I then adhered. I want to say to the gentleman from Colorado that the charge of inconsistency, which Emerson has characterized as the terror of feeble minds, has no terror for me. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is no man who will continue for any length of time in public life who will not at some time or other be charged with apparent inconsistency, but in this particular case I am guilty of no inconsistency. The great absorbing question that was agitating the American people when that speech was made was, Does the Constitution follow the flag? In the government of our insular possessions are we bound by the limitations of the Constitution? I strenuously maintained that we were not. The Supreme Court of the United States subsequently decided that we were not. To that doctrine I still adhere. In pointing out the consequences that would follow in case we were bound by the limitations of the Constitution, I said that we would be compelled to give free trade to Porto Rico and to the Philippines. We would be compelled to incorporate into the body of our citizenship 12,000,000 Malays and extend to them our navigation laws. I protested against the putting of our labor upon a plane with the half-savage labor of the Philippines. I still contend that if bound by the limitations of the Constitution all that I said then would be true, and I propose to demonstrate now that the enactment of this measure will not place the labor of the Philippines upon a plane with our farmers

nor affect a single dollar of a single American wage-earner's wage. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, what are the conditions that exist now as compared with the conditions that existed then? Now we have free trade with Porto Rico. We have extended to her the protection of the Dingley law. We have given her a Territorial form of government and admitted her to representation upon the floor of this House. Nay, more, we have a limited tariff law with the Philippine Islands. We have extended to them, as I have said, our navigation laws, our immigration laws, and our contract-labor laws.

We have given them a Territorial form of government. In a word, we have treated them, in so far as their condition would admit of it, precisely as we treat ourselves. Why? The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BONYNGE] said that I said in that speech, after recounting these things, that I called a halt. I did call a halt, but the people of the United States refused to respond. They said, "A pest upon your constitutional technicalities; the Constitution may not follow the flag, but justice and fair play do." [Applause on the Republican side.] They said, "Porto Rico is ours, she bears allegiance to our flag, and she shall be treated as our own." And then the press of this country rose in its might, without distinction of party, creed, or section, from ocean to ocean, from the Lakes to the Gulf, and with a persistence and with a bitterness unprecedented in all our political history, denounced us as violators of our plain duty. And yet our duty to Porto Rico then was no plainer than is our duty to the Philippines now. [Applause on the Republican side.] Then, as Representatives of the American people, as the recorders of their will, from that day to this, piece by piece we have enacted such legislation as they said it was our plain duty to enact. So much for that. So much for the charge against me of inconsistency.

What now is the necessity for this measure? It is twofold—to encourage the industries of the Philippine Islands and to furnish them with revenue. The policy that we have inaugurated in the Philippine Islands for their benefit is an expensive policy. It involves internal improvements of all kinds, but, as I said before, over and above all else it involves the establishment of schools. If we are to raise these people, if we are to make of them possible American citizens or even citizens of an independent Philippine Archipelago, they must be educated. There are now in our schools there 500,000 children, and there are in the islands 2,000,000 children of school age that ought to be provided for, and, my fellow Representatives, that must be provided for. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The greatest industry in the Philippine Islands is the raising of hemp. Of that they have a monopoly. Until recently one of their sources of revenue was an export duty thereon. That duty Congress, in the interest of our farmers, laborers, and cordage manufacturers, has recently removed, and to that extent crippled the Philippine treasury. It is believed that the revenue to be raised by this act will go far toward supplying that loss and that at the expiration of three years the internal-revenue system of the islands will be sufficiently perfected and adjusted to render the further collection of duties on sugar and tobacco unnecessary.

Now, in addition to what we have taken away from the Philippines they have had other troubles. They have been swept as to some of their industries, as it were, by the besom of destruction. This is especially true of the sugar industry. Let me read to you from the Philippine census:

> Progress in the development of the sugar industry reached its highest development in 1893. A decline set in from the year following, which continued until 1895, when there was a favorable reaction lasting two seasons. In 1897 the depression set in from which it has been unable to recover up to the present day. This depression is due to the vicissitudes agriculture has experienced in this country during the past few years, caused, first, by the competition of the beet sugar in the great centers of consumption; second, by the growth of hemp and cocoanut plantations, which have taken away a considerable number of laborers from sugar estates; third, by the continual fluctuations in the price of sugar, brought about by the financial crisis and the rate of exchange that resulted in the failure of many planters; and last, by the war, the rinderpest, cholera, the miasmatic fevers, famine, and the locusts, which brought ruin to many plantations and caused a complete depression in the cultivation of the cane in nearly all of the sugar-providing provinces.

Let me read to you further from the testimony of Mr. De la Rama, a sugar planter and a merchant in Iloilo. He says:

> Our situation at the present time is a very deplorable one. Seven years of calamities, with war and plagues, failures of crops, etc., have reduced us to a state of misery to such an extent that in many plantations of Negros and Panay the cultivation of sugar has been entirely abandoned. Owing to the low price secured by the farmer for his products during the past few years, a great many planters have been unable to meet their obligations and to-day are on the eve of losing their property. This situation has brought on the farmers the further misfortune of entirely losing their credit. They are unable to get credit any longer. It is impossible for us to hope to reestablish our credit with bankers and money lenders throughout the islands unless these gentlemen become convinced that the future of this industry in these islands is such as to secure to them the repayment of their loans. At present the situation is a very deplorable one. There are planters both in the island of Panay and in that of Negros, who, having the deeds of their property in their hands, apply to the money lenders and to the bankers for a loan, offering to secure the loan by mortgaging their entire property, and are unable to secure even sufficient money to attend to their most pressing personal wants.

That is the situation of your ward in the Philippine Archipelago. The practical question is, What are you going to do about it? Our answer is, Enact into law the pending bill, and in a measure, at least, restore to these people their credit and the means to continue their industry.

But just here we are met by the opposition of two American industries. The advocates of the sugar industry, especially the beet-sugar industry, and of the tobacco industry say the enactment of this measure will ruin both of their industries in the United States. Is their contention well taken——

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Will it be fair to ask what tobacco men are complaining?

Mr. DALZELL. Well, not the tobacco men from the section of the country in which the gentleman is interested, and, in fact, very few of them anywhere.

Is their contention well taken? I say most emphatically, no; and I say so after a careful, laborious, and impartial examination of the questions involved; and hardly an impartial examination either, because, as a protectionist, I approached the subject in the first instance with a decided leaning against the proposed legislation. A large amount of testimony was taken by the Committee on Ways and Means of persons representing all sides of the controversy. I agree with my friend from Colorado [Mr. BONYNGE] that many things might be proved from that testimony, but as every lawyer in the habit of weighing evidence knows, the competency of the witnesses, their means of knowledge, their natural bias, must all be taken into consideration in arriving at the truth. And I want to say that it was very apparent that the testimony of Government officers in the Philippines was very often given without opportunity for personal knowledge, oftentimes prematurely, and generally colored by a desire to make things in the islands appear to as great an advantage as possible.

I propose to examine the case first with respect to the interest of the sugar industry. It was conceded that under present conditions Philippine competition amounted to nothing. It is not the past or the present, but the future only that is feared. The Unied States is compelled to import each year in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 tons of sugar. The greatest quantity ever produced for export in the Philippines was 256,000 tons, and that in the year 1893. The exports for the years since the war are as follows; I speak in round numbers:

In 1899, 84,000 and odd tons, of which 21,000 came to the United States; 1900, 64,000 and odd tons, of which 2,000 and odd came to the United States. In 1901, 55,000—say 56,000 tons—of which 5,000 came to the United States; 1902, 97,000 tons, of which 5,000 came to the United States; 1903, 83,000 tons, of which 28,000 came to the United States, and 1904, 82,000, of which 25,000 came to the United States.

Now, it is perfectly plain that if the whole amount of the largest production of sugar in the Philippine Islands under such circumstances as I have indicated should come into the United States, it would not be a drop in the bucket compared with our production and our immense importations. Heretofore no sugar, as I have shown to you, of any consequence has come to the United States from the Philippine Islands, and the largest shipments were sent here on speculation. They are still in bond in New York, not taken out, because of the hope that they would get out under lower duties; and the bill before the House provides that that sugar, when removed for consumption, shall pay the same duties that the law prescribed when it came in.

I have shown you the present and the past. As to the future, I think that I can show that the fears of the advocates of our sugar industry are baseless, and that their position is founded on a misapprehension of the actual conditions. Let me illustrate. The most prominent and the most zealous advocate of beet sugar that appeared before the committee was Mr. Hathaway. He says:

> It is not for the present but for the future that we plead, and when the Philippine Commission specifies plainly and clearly that there are 50,000,000 acres of land in the Philippine Islands that are well adapted to sugar and tobacco, and when, in addition to that, they go forward still further and advocate that 25,000,000 acres of these lands be not sold, but given to capitalists who will go into these islands and develop the sugar plantations on those islands, and when the same Commission report specifies that each one of those acres can produce 5 tons of sugar, I reaffirm, gentlemen, that it is not the present but the future that we are looking to.

Well, my friends, there are a great many things in the reports of the Philippine Commission that experience has shown not to be

true. In the first place, there is no evidence that any acre of land in the Philippines is capable of producing 5 tons of sugar, and to say that there is is the purest speculation. And in the next place, I should insult your intelligence did I stop to argue to you that no Congress of the United States will ever give away for any purpose 25,000,000 acres of land. But even if it were so foolish and regardless of the rights of its constituents, the gift would be useless in the absence of labor, of which it is not denied that there is such a scarcity in the islands that there is barely sufficient to work the estates now in cultivation.

There are no 50,000,000 acres of land in the islands capable of raising sugar. The total area is estimated at 73,00,000 acres. To secure such cultivation as there is it has taken those people hundreds of years. There are 180,000 acres in sugar, 1,600,000 in rice, 80,000 in tobacco, 60,000 in sweet potatoes, 85,000 in plantains, 550,000 in hemp, 375,000 in cocoanuts, 267,000 in corn, an area not calculated in small farms raising the food of the people, and 50,000,000 acres of mountain and impenetrable jungle and forest, a large proportion inhabited by roaming savages.

Now, assuming the impossible, assuming that the forest lands would raise sugar—and no one knows whether they will or not—under laws that we have enacted, not an acre of them can be sold or leased until under licenses regularly issued, they shall be stripped of their timber, and that will not be in your day or mine or in that of your children or mine or your grandchildren or mine. What pure speculation and moonshine this is, furnished to you as the basis of sound legislation. Listen to the argument: Fifty million acres, 5 tons to the acre, 250,000,000 tons of sugar shortly to be ready for the market.

Why our sugar people have been continually appealing to us for time. "We have the beet lands," they say, "the machinery within reach, but it takes time to induce capital to invest, time to educate the laborer, time to develop the beet, time to improve the machinery; our industry must grow gradually with the increase of population and the improvement in methods," and yet in the same breath they have tumbled into the world's markets sugar from the forests of the Philippines to feed the world, as it were, by a divine nod.

Let me put the argument from the Philippine standpoint. There is enough land in Louisiana capable of raising sugar, not under cultivation for sugar, to supply the world with that product. Louisiana has multiplied her production by two in fifty years. The same may be said of the capacity of Cuba. Cuba has multiplied her production by three in twenty-five years. If the Philippines should do as well as Louisiana, they will have reached a production of something over 500,000 tons in fifty years from now. If the Philippines should do as well as Cuba, they will have reached a production of less than 900,000 tons in twenty-five years, and that is 300,000 tons less than we import from Cuba to-day. The world's consumption has multiplied by three in twenty-five years, and our consumption is increasing at the rate of 7 per cent per annum. The inconsequence of the argument of the opponents of this bill might be pursued ad nauseam.

Texas has sugar lands sufficient in area to supply all the sugar that the world consumes. Why does she not do it? We are assured by the Secretary of Agriculture and by the beet-sugar advocates that the United States has beet-sugar lands that if cultivated will supply home consumption and furnish a surplus for export.

The truth is that the area of sugar land in the Philippines is a matter of not the least consequence in the absence of capital and labor. During the six years of our occupancy has any American capital entered the Philippines to invest in sugar lands? Not a dollar. Mr. Hathaway says he was sent to the islands to ascertain whether he and those who sent him should invest in sugar lands. He claims to have made a thorough investigation, and on his return reported against any investment. He said furthermore that as a matter of choice he would rather invest, if at all, without this legislation than after its enactment. The sugar lands of Louisiana and Texas and the great West and Northwest lie at our own doors, in a land where capital is abundant and courageous, labor reasonably accessible and intelligent, where enterprise abounds, where there are railroads and churches and schoolhouses in the midst of an American civilization, surrounded by American homes. The Philippine archipelago is 8,000 miles across seas, where there is no capital, a scarcity of labor, unintelligent at that, where the people are many of them only half civilized, where there are no railroads, nor markets, where diseases are rampant, destroying both man and beast, and where prevail the medieval customs and the depressing civilization of hundreds of years of Spanish rule. I pray you, discreet American investor, answer me, in which place will you invest your money?

If I were to give him advice I would say to him, Go not to the Philippine Islands, where thou shalt be afraid for the terror by night and for the arrow that flieth by day; for the pestilence that walketh in darkness, and for the destruction that wasteth at noonday; but come with me. "I will take you on a journey to fair Colorado, where the sun shines the brightest, the sky is the clearest, the air is the purest, where all life is a continual joy from the rise of the early morning sun until it sinks below the snow-capped peaks of an eternal mountain range, the very treasure house of the nation's wealth." [Laughter and applause.]

Come with me and I will show you in Colorado beet-sugar lands as illimitable as the imagination of the opponents of this measure. [Laughter.] There you shall invest your capital, and you shall have your office in "the proud city of Denver, in the midst of its costly public edifices, its stately structures of mart and commerce, and you shall live in one of its palatial homes." [Great laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, even if capital could be secured, it would avail nothing without labor. It is conceded upon all hands—no man denies it—that labor is scarce in the Philippines—hardly sufficient for present needs. Governor Wright, testifying before the Senate committee, said:

> The sugar industry, in my opinion, can not be very largely developed in the Philippine Islands. Of course it can be increased considerably, but it can not be made a rival to other countries which produce sugar on a large scale so long as the present policy of the United States is continued as to the exclusion of the Chinese labor from that country. In other words, the native Filipino laborer is largely engaged in raising rice and food products, aside from sugar, and in gathering hemp and copra, and there is not a very great amount of labor there available for sugar raising on a large and profitable scale.

Senator BURROWS said:

> Then do I understand that owing to labor conditions the development of the sugar industry would be retarded?

Governor Wright responded:

> It would be slow.
> Senator BURROWS. And it would be necessary to admit cheap labor—Chinese labor—in order to make it profitable?
> Governor WRIGHT. Yes, sir.

And this introduces us to another bugaboo of the opponents of this bill. They are afraid of Chinese cooly labor. Well, gentlemen, there is no Chinese cooly labor in the sugar fields now. Whether there shall be or not is a matter that depends on you. You have extended the Chinese-exclusion law to the Philippines. You have been asked by the Philippine Commission to suspend its operation for a term of years, under safeguards that would insure the export of the Chinaman at the end of the term. You refused to do it. Are you going to repeal that law? Do you believe that any party, Republican or Democratic, when in power will repeal it? If not, it would seem as though the limit of sugar production in the Philippines had almost if not entirely been reached.

I do not propose to spend much time in the discussion of the question as to how cheaply sugar may be produced in the Philippines. It seems to me that its only importance in this discussion is in its relation to the matter of inducing capital to invest. Up to this time it has had no influence whatever in that direction.

Upon the question of cost there is a vast amount of evidence, as is usual in such cases, contradictory. There is the evidence of the beet-sugar men, which necessarily is nothing but hearsay; there is the evidence of Government officials embodied in Government reports, which is also to some extent hearsay, and is couched, as a rule, in glowing terms as to Philippine possibilities. Much is sought to be made by this kind of evidence, as, for instance, the statement of Governor Taft that "this is another place where the sugar of the world may be raised." But I ask you what sort of a foundation does that furnish on which to base legislation in the absence of facts and figures? I venture the assertion that no candid man with impartial mind can read this record who will not rise up from a study of that testimony and say that a fair deduction is that it costs 1.50 cents a pound to raise sugar in the Philippine Islands—that is to say, 1.50 cents a pound delivered at Iloilo, the sugar port of the islands.

I have here a statement, furnished by Messrs. Willett & Gray, the sugar experts of this country, who are recognized as authority upon all sides. It is the history of the unfortunate shipments that are now in bond in New York.

Philippine stock in New York, December 19, 1905, 38,048 tons; value when shipped (average), 2.14 cents a pound United States currency, free on board at Iloilo; 2.14 cents a pound bought on speculation when sugar was high; value December 19, 1905, 2.56 cents United States currency, at New York; value free on board at Iloilo, $1,823,640; duty at present rate, say, 75 per cent of 1.265, $808,900. Marine insurance, $50,150; freight, $190,240; storage, $50,000; fire insurance, $9,200; interest six

months, at 3 per cent, $60,000; cost December 19, 1905, $2,992,130; value December 19, 1905, $2,181,630; loss on the basis of 75 per cent of the Dingley bill, $810,500; loss on the basis of 25 per cent of the Dingley bill, $273,700.

Now, is there any American capitalist that in view of a statement like that is going to invest his money in the sugar industry of the Philippine Islands? Why, we had a great discussion in the committee as to the cost of these various items, and I have them here, furnished by Willett & Gray, in connection with this statement. Insurance, 0.0588; freight, 0.22; storage, 0.0586; fire insurance, 0.0107; so that the whole amounts to this, 0.3481. Now, beet sugar in Iloilo at 1.50, with 0.34 added in New York, amounts to 1.84; but sugar of the Philippine Islands is worth a cent a pound less than commercial sugar in New York, and that makes 2.84, and it costs a cent—whether it actually costs a cent or not to the parties refining, the seller of the sugar pays the cent for refined sugar, and that makes 3.84. Adding 25 per cent for duty, 33⅓ cents per hundred pounds, and you have 4.17, cost in New York for Philippine sugar, as against 3.90 in Michigan for Michigan sugar and 3.71 in Colorado for Colorado sugar.

But, furthermore, the beet-sugar witnesses before us had no calculation to give to us as to the profits of the by-products, which, of course, if realized upon would reduce the cost. Now, there is molasses, worth according to the testimony, from $2.80 to $3.50 a ton. There is alcohol, which, of course, belongs to the distiller. He may or he may not be a beet-sugar producer. Mr. Humphrey said that they had paid twelve hundred thousand dollars of internal-revenue taxes to the United States upon alcohol. Now, that means, at $1.10 a gallon, 1,100,000 gallons of alcohol, and at 34 cents a gallon, the price testified that was paid for it, it means from $330,000 to $340,000. Then, again, Mr. Hathaway told us there was a machine whereby the dry pulp might be utilized. He told us it sold at $14 a ton; that there was 5 per cent of dried pulp in the beet and 15 per cent of sugar, and the price of pulp, he said, was $14 a ton. A little calculation will show that that means 0.00208 for pulp for each pound of sugar, and for each hundred pounds 0.208. Now, according to Mr. Hathaway, they receive for their sugar 4.15 cents. Add to that the 0.208 and you have 4.358, or a profit at 3.90 for the sugar cost of 0.458 per hundred pounds; or, if we take Mr. Fordney's calculation of 4.50 for sugar and add to that 0.208, you have 4.708, or 0.808 profit per 100 pounds of sugar. Now, he said that they spent $9,780 in getting rid of the pulp. That then they went to work and erected a machine. It cost $67,000. As a result by means of it they saved the $9,780 that they had heretofore spent, and they made 6 per cent on their investment. Now, then, putting all these things together and arriving at the possible actual sugar cost, it will be apparent that the beet-sugar of this country is in no danger of competition with any possible Philippine sugar development within the next century.

But I regard this question as of minor importance, for the reason that the enactment of this measure can not injure the sugar producer, because it will not lower the price that he will receive for his product. That must be conceded. But if it were not, it is easy of proof. We consumed in this country in 1904, 2,700,000 tons, in round numbers, of sugar. We produced, including beet and cane and sugar from Hawaii and Porto Rico, about 990,000 tons, in round numbers. These figures are not exact, but they answer the purpose of my illustration. We had to import, therefore, 1,710,000 tons. Twelve hundred thousand tons of this came from Cuba and paid a duty of 80 per cent of the Dingley rates.

The remainder, 510,000 tons, came from elsewhere and paid the full Dingley rates. Under these circumstances what fixes the price of sugar? Is it not apparent that the sugar imported at the full rate of duty fixed the price? Is it not apparent that it will continue to fix the price so long as it continues to be imported; that when it ceases to be imported the sugar paying the 80 per cent duty will fix the price; that there never will be a price fixed by competition in our home market until home supply equals home demand? And when will that be? That will be when the United States, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, which now produce 990,000 tons and the Philippines which last year produced 84,000 tons, altogether 1,074,000 tons, shall produce the 3,000,000 tons that we consume annually, plus 7 per cent of an increase each year in consumption. Until that time no beet-sugar man or cane-sugar man in this country will receive a single solitary penny less for his sugar. [Applause on Republican side.]

Now, if that be true—and if it be not let some man stand up and challenge the statement—if that be true, answer me how any sugar industry in the United States is in any danger for a half century to come.

Oh, I know it will be answered that it will arrest the spread of the industry. Well, that is precisely what was said by these same gentlemen when they were opposing the Cuban reciprocity measure. And in the testimony taken before the Committee on Ways and Means recently it was said that not a single beet-sugar factory had been erected since the enactment of Cuban reciprocity. Mr. Hathaway, the star witness and the most zealous champion of the opposition, said so, and one of my colleagues from Michigan said that not a single factory had been erected in Michigan and that two had gone out of operation. I very much fear that the zeal of the gentlemen has had the effect of blinding their powers of observation.

I find some information on this point in a publication of the Agricultural Department entitled "Progress of the Beet-Sugar Industry in the United States in 1904." It is Report No. 80, of the Department of Agriculture. Page 97 of that report shows twelve locations where arrangements were complete for the establishment of factories and thirty-two other points where factories will probably be built.

The American Sugar Industry and Beet-Sugar Gazette—to use its own language, "the leading journal devoted to the interests of the American sugar producer"—under date December 5, 1905, shows that of the factories referred to in the pamphlet of the Agricultural Department the following have been built and are in actual operation:

Colorado: Lamar, with a daily slicing capacity of 400 tons of beets; Holly, with a daily capacity of 600 tons of beets; Sterling, with a daily capacity of 600 tons of beets.

Illinois: Riverdale, with a daily capacity of 350 tons of beets.

Michigan: Blissfield, with a daily capacity of 600 tons of beets.

Utah: Lewiston, with a daily capacity of 600 tons of beets.

Wisconsin: Menomonie, with a daily capacity of 500 tons of beets.

These have a total slicing capacity of 3,650 tons of beets daily.

This same journal of the same date shows further that there are now in process of erection for the campaign of 1906 the following:

California: Visalia, capacity 350 tons.

Wisconsin: Madison, capacity 600 tons.

Arizona: Glendale, capacity 800 tons.

Montana: Billings, capacity 1,200 tons.

Idaho: Vampa, capacity 600 tons.

Colorado: Brush, capacity 600 tons; Fort Morgan, capacity 600 tons.

These will have a total slicing capacity of 4,750 tons daily. So that the factories already built since the enactment of Cuban reciprocity and those in process of erection together have a capacity of 8,400 tons of beets daily.

Mr. FORDNEY. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. Is it not true that before the enactment of Cuban reciprocity we had 52 factories in operation in the United States and only have 54 now, and that there have been several factories torn down elsewhere that the gentleman does not mention?

Mr. DALZELL. I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, it is in connection with this statement.

Mr. DALZELL. I will come to that in a moment—the matter of the tearing down of factories. I am reading to you from an official document, and I think the gentleman will not deny that the daily capacity, by reason of factories already erected and in process of erection since Cuban reciprocity, is eighty-four hundred tons.

Now let me quote Mr. Hathaway. He says that the cost of putting up a sugar plant by any one of the three leading construction companies that put up those plants is $1,000 for each ton of daily capacity; that is, per ton of beets. If you put up a factory that will cut 600 tons of beets a day, it will cost you $600,000. So that it seems, notwithstanding the testimony before the committee, that since Cuban reciprocity there has gone into the beet-sugar industry in this country $8,400,000 of good American capital. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now just a word as to my friend's reference to the shutting down of factories in Michigan because of Cuban reciprocity. I come back again to this same little book, The Progress of the Beet-Sugar Industry in the United States, and I find the following:

In Michigan—

This is the official report of the Agricultural Department—

we find the most unfortunate records chargeable to the beet-sugar industry since its inception. These were the result of natural and economic causes. There was too much rush and not enough careful study of economic conditions in establishing the factories. Factory building was pushed beyond its resources. Too many plants were located in too small an area. Few of them received enough beets on that account. If sufficient time had elapsed, Michigan could have sustained all the fac-

tories she had built. As it was, some of them led a precarious existence. Two of them had been removed from the State, the one at Benton Harbor to Canada and the one at Kalamazoo to Chippewa Falls, Wis.

Then, after the explanation that the business had been entered upon too hastily, and when they could not secure beets, the report goes on to say:

The results of all this haste and enthusiasm was confusion, jealousy, and strife. Neither factory men nor farmers had had sufficient experience to guide them through the difficulties. The results were that two factories stopped building when nearly completed, two others have removed, and two or three more will probably do so.

I submit to you that I have proven that Cuban reciprocity has not interfered with the beet-sugar industry in this country and the investment of capital therein, but that every failure that has been referred to in the beet-sugar industry has been due to natural and economic causes.

Well, now, my friends, I am not here to contend that this bill will not increase sugar production in the Philippine Islands, because if it will not it is useless; but my contention is that the ultimate production will be limited and the growth will be slow.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will my friend permit a question at this point?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Was there any testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means to show that sugar had ever been made profitably in the Philippine Islands except upon the island of Negros?

Mr. DALZELL. Not a word.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Was there not testimony to show that as much perhaps as 50 per cent of the labor necessary to harvest that crop was imported from other islands?

Mr. DALZELL. It came from the island of Panay.

Mr. LONGWORTH. At least 50 per cent?

Mr. DALZELL. At least 50 per cent.

Now, I say that my contention is that the ultimate production will be small, comparatively, and the growth of the industry will be slow; and I want to quote here the testimony given by Mr. De la Rama, because I find that it is corroborated by the highest authority upon the beet-sugar industry in the United States. Mr. De la Rama says:

Even if we were to introduce modern methods of manufacture, by bringing in modern machinery, it would, in my opinion, take at least five years before we could get the plants properly established in these islands. I believe, furthermore, that it would take fifteen years longer to be able to get all conditions so favorable as to make a crop in the Philippine Islands which would aggregate 300,000 tons; so that, counting in the five years taken to construct modern machinery and the fifteen years that the industry would need to develop to the point of producing 300,000 tons, and we have twenty years as the period which would be required to reach that figure. It is estimated that the cost of machinery capable of producing 300,000 tons of sugar would be $20,000,000 gold. This, of course, must be considered as a mere estimate; but I consider that sum to be the cost of machinery necessary to produce 300,000 tons. If we take that as a basis in the length of time required before we could reach that production which I have above cited, the markets of the United States in the meantime would have a shortage of double what it now is, or 4,000,000 tons, and against that the 300,000 tons produced in the Philippine Islands would be of no consequence whatever.

So much for Mr. De la Rama, a sugar planter in the Philippine Islands.

Now, let me call your attention to the testimony of Mr. Oxnard, the president of the American Beet Sugar Association, the pioneer in that industry in this country and its most potential representative. Here is what he says:

Perhaps it may be well to draw attention to one or two features of the industry:

1. Its product is a staple of universal consumption and of the readiest sale.

2. The product is a finished article, the sugar being turned out refined and granulated, the manufacturer not being dependent upon the refiners' trust for his market.

3. Competition by home production is so remote as to be scarcely worth consideration. The United States is now compelled to import three-quarters of its consumption, and it would take at least 300 factories of a daily capacity of 500 tons of beets to produce present importation.

Regarding the future development and permanency of the beet-sugar industry in the United States, there can be absolutely no doubt for the following reasons:

Of the tropical countries which it is proposed to annex to the United States, Porto Rico is too small to cut any figure, and the Philippine Islands have not the necessary elements for the expansion of the sugar business sufficiently rapid to give any concern to those interested in the production of sugar from beets in this country for the next twenty-five years to come.

[Applause.]

And yet you are going to pour right into the markets of the world 250,000,000 tons of sugar, at the rate of 5 tons to the acre, from 50,000,000 acres of wild land in the Philippines!

The views thus expressed by Señor de la Rama and by Mr. Oxnard are in accordance with common sense; they are certainly in accordance with all human experience. Under the most favorable circumstances the growth of the sugar industry has been gradual and slow in our own country, in Cuba, in Hawaii, in Porto Rico. Its growth in Europe depended upon government bounties. What is to be expected of it under the unfavorable circumstances existing in the Philippine Islands, where methods are of the crudest, where machinery is lacking, where work animals are wanting, but especially where those absolute essentials to growth are wanting—capital and labor? In a word, the increased production in the Philippine Islands depends upon capital, intelligent labor, modern methods of cultivation, machinery, railroads, ordinary roads, boats, warehouses—all the accessories of modern industrialism and commerce—and the Philippine Islands have none of them.

In striking contrast with the outlook for the sugar industry in the Philippines is the outlook of that industry in the United States. As I have shown, capital is from time to time seeking investment therein, labor is learning more and more to adapt itself to sugar-beet culture, and year by year the cost of manufacture is being reduced. All experience teaches us the value of American genius by way of the invention of new processes. One of the beet-sugar advocates who appeared before our committee called attention to a machine which largely reduces the cost and multiplies the efficiency of labor in the beet field. By means of this machine beets are picked, topped, and thrown in orderly rows ready to be carried away.

But what I want particularly to call your attention to in this connection is a circular issued by Mr. Palmer, the secretary of the American Beet Sugar Association of the United States, and necessarily a high authority—a circular issued, mind you, not to obtain subscriptions to stock, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] asserted, but issued to his fellow-owners of beet-sugar factories in the United States, calling upon them to come down here and compel Congress to defeat this measure. Here is what he says:

I take it—

And this is significant—

I take it that further Philippine tariff reduction is likely to come in due course of time, but it should not come until the Philippines greatly raise their wage rate on sugar haciendas and become at least semi-civilized, and until the brains and capital already engaged in the home industry, and which will come to it under favorable circumstances if let alone, enable us to perfect the various improvements now under way.

Two years ago I wrote you at length concerning my suggestions of producing single-germ beet seed. The work was begun immediately by the Government and the first crop of seed from beets grown from 2,500 selected single-germ beet balls has just been harvested. I understand that 30 per cent of this seed came single germ and the expectation is that in four to six years more it will be an established thing, saving the farmers $6 per acre of actual labor, eliminating the hand work of thinning on hands and knees, and at least doubling the tonnage per acre on account of no injury being done to the remaining beets by hoeing out the superfluous ones, each plant standing 1 to 3 inches apart, depending upon how closely the seed is drilled in. If the sugar beets which the farmer now sells to the factory at an average price of $5 per ton cost him $3.50 per ton to produce, his crop grown from single-germ beet balls should not cost him to exceed $1.50 a ton.

The Government has taken charge of the scientific work on one of our beet-sugar seed farms in the State of Washington, and expects to be able to produce a strain of seed as high in sugar content as the best beets selected at the outset, which is 25 to 28 per cent. These mother beets should give factory beets of 23 per cent sugar, and, with a loss in extraction of 3 per cent, would enable the factory to turn out 400 pounds of granulated sugar per ton of beets. According to the Government report on the home-sugar industry for 1902, the average amount of sugar extracted per ton of beets was 221 pounds; hence this anticipated extra production of 170 pounds would nearly cut in two the present factory cost of producing sugar from American-grown beets.

Doctor Wiley, chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, Department of Agriculture, is to experiment this coming month with sugar "concrete," and, if successful, each factory, by increasing its investment 25 per cent, can operate three near-by "concrete" plants, shipping in the "concrete" to the main factory after the local campaign has been concluded and thus operating the year through and quadrupling its product, which would greatly lessen the cost of production.

Experiments are being made this year with an invention designed to remove the impurities of the juice at the outset instead of from the waste molasses after coming down through all the various processes, the inventor claiming that it will reduce the cost of a beet-sugar plant by 50 per cent, the labor to operate it by 33⅓ per cent, yield an average excess of 20 pounds of sugar per ton of beets, besides saving several valuable by-products.

All these matters lead to an eventual cost of production of granulated sugar from American-grown beets of something like 2 cents per pound, but it takes not only money and brains to perfect these improvements, but it takes time.

It takes time everywhere except in the Philippine Archipelago.

We can offer the Philippine Islands a perpetual market for nearly $200,000,000 worth of purely tropical products annually. But whatever magnitude their sugar industry may reach, those who put their money into it will some day be compelled to fight a battle royal with the educated scientific American farmer which will be costly for both and ruinous for one—

Now, mark it—

Never in the history of the world has the nervous energy of the Temperate Zone succumbed to the listless workers of the Tropics, and it remains to be seen whether or not the sugar industry is to furnish the exception.

Does Mr. Palmer believe that he has a monopoly of the knowledge that capital can not be invested in the Philippine Islands

with any reasonable hope of profit? Does he suppose that the American capitalist does not know that the nervous energy of the Temperate Zone will win always in a fight with the listless worker of the Tropics?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have shown that the opposition to this bill, so far as sugar is concerned, is built upon senseless fears and a misapprehension of existing conditions.

Now just a single word about tobacco. I have not given to that the study that I have to the other question, but it seems to me that if I were not to be accused of being discourteous I would be inclined to say that the claims of the tobacco men in connection with this bill are simply ridiculous. They say they have no fears for the present; that what they fear for is the future, just as in the other case, and they fear an indefinite expansion of the tobacco trade in the Philippine Islands. They assert that there are 50,000,000 acres in the Philippine Islands adapted to the culture of tobacco—the same 50,000,000 acres, my friends, that we have already planted in sugar. The illimitable expanse of tobacco territory and the illimitable expanse of sugar territory in the Philippine Islands are one and the same thing, and neither one of them has any existence in fact.

Mr. CASSEL. May I ask the gentleman a question? I do not want to interrupt him.

Mr. DALZELL. But the gentleman is interrupting.

Mr. CASSEL. The gentleman is speaking of the large area of tobacco lands in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Bijur testified that the tobacco lands of the Philippine Islands were without limit.

Mr. CASSEL. But in my speech of yesterday I did not say that.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, no; the gentleman has too much common sense.

Mr. CASSEL. I said 150,000 acres we were afraid of—less than 1 per cent of all the land in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. DALZELL. I know how my colleague is going to vote, and I think I know what he believes. [Laughter.] Now, the average production of tobacco in the Philippine Islands is 20,000,000 pounds, 2,000,000 pounds less than are produced in the district from which my colleague, who has just interrupted me, comes. Wrapper tobacco they have a very small proportion of in the Philippine Islands—not sufficient to supply the home market. The export leaf last year was 10,000,000 pounds, and not a single pound of it came to the United States, and the price of tobacco in the United States and like tobacco in the Philippine Islands is just about the same.

Of cigars they made 81,000,000, and we made seven and one-half billions. They exported to the United States last year $6,700 worth, and they exported to the world outside $1,000,000 worth. If it had not been for the Louisiana Exposition they would not have exported to this country even $6,700 worth.

Now, I am inclined to believe that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is right when he says:

> The bulk of cigars produced in the islands could not be sold in the American market at any price, and even if the Philippine cigar was admitted duty free into the United States it would not for a long time equal 1 per cent of our domestic trade.

I am inclined to believe with my colleague, Mr. HILL of Connecticut, who thoroughly understands this question and who represents a tobacco district, that it would not equal 1 per cent of the average annual increase in the consumption of cigars in the United States. The average annual increase for the past ten years in the production of cigars in the United States has been 337,753,188, or more than four times the entire export product of the Philippine Islands to all parts of the world last year, and one thousand nine hundred and fifty-five times as much as the entire importation into the United States from the Philippines last year.

> If it were possible—

Mr. HILL said, and I agree with him—

> If it were possible to change the course of their trade from the direction in which it has run since before our nation existed and turn their export product into our market, it would be like pouring a bucket of water into the sea, absolutely without effect.

So that it is manifest that all fear of competition with this great and growing industry in our country by making the tariff changes proposed by this bill is absurd and ridiculous.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I contend, and have argued, first, that we have committed ourselves to such policy in the Philippine Islands as prevents our abandonment of it now without dishonor to ourselves and ruin, anarchy, and bloodshed to the Filipino. Second, that the enactment of this bill into law will afford a measure of relief and inspire hope and confidence, and, third, that it will not injure any American industry.

Mr. Chairman, "the Philippines are ours, not to exploit but to develop, to civilize, to educate, to train in the science of self-government. This is the path of duty which we must follow or be recreant to a mighty trust committed to us."

Are we ready now to swerve from that path of duty and abandon the development, the civilization, and the education of the Filipinos? Are we ready to be recreant to the great trust committed to us? Are we ready to adopt the policy of scuttle advocated by the Democratic party on this floor, or shall we take up our burden like men and give these people, our wards, this "measure of justice," in the language of President Roosevelt, as an indication of the anxiety of the American people to help the Philippines in some way?

Shall we follow after our standard bearer, who is not only the President of the United States, but the great leader of the great Republican party, or shall we desert him? And if we do, what will our constituents say to us? It will not do to hide self-interest under the plea of loyalty to protection. Protection has no application as between different parts of the United States, and to say that it has is to give the lie to all your history. It will not do to sneer at sentiment. It may answer in this narrow forum, but it will not avail in that greater forum of the American people, a people that sprang to arms to avenge the sailors of the sunken *Maine* and spilt the blood of its sons in a war, not for glory or conquest, but for humanity and to make of Spain's downtrodden and oppressed colony a free republic. [Applause.]

The same inspiring sentiment calls to-day. Let us respond to it; nay, more, let us hearken to and heed the high resolve of him who being dead yet speaketh, "we will fulfill in the Philippines the obligations imposed by the triumphs of our Army and the treaty of peace, by international law, by the nation's sense of honor, and more than all by the rights, interests, and conditions of the Philippine people themselves." [Great applause.]

Mr. PUJO. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I regret exceedingly that we all can not agree with the conclusion of the able and eloquent gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], when he asserted to the House in his peroration that the adoption of this bill would not militate against any American interest.

Mr. Chairman, a great agricultural interest of this country is menaced should the bill under consideration become a law. I say menaced; it would be nearer the mark to say that the rice industry in the United States can be actually destroyed if the policy finding expression in the proposed legislation is adopted by this House.

Less than fifteen years ago there was practically no rice produced in this country. That which was produced was dependent entirely for its growth upon the rainfall, and those engaged in its production were called "Providence rice farmers."

To-day, in the States of Louisiana and Texas alone, it is no exaggeration to state that at least $30,000,000 is invested in the rice industry. Vast systems of irrigating canals have been constructed, some of them more than 20 miles in length. Great pumping plants have been installed to supply them with water necessary for the cultivation and growth of this plant. Rice culture has become one of the recognized important branches of agriculture in America, the direct result and effect of which has been to develop the country and to bring into cultivation hundreds of thousands of acres of land previously considered only available for pasturage.

The Supplement to the Crop Reporter, published by the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, in its issue of December, 1905, gives the following figures with reference to rice produced in the different sections of the United States, which I have reduced to pounds instead of bushels, as that is the way in which rice is handled upon the market:

State.	Acreage.	Production (pounds).
Louisiana	237,900	276,201,900
Texas	194,386	271,168,470
South Carolina	15,477	18,108,090
North Carolina	876	1,024,920
Florida	2,780	3,502,800
Alabama	1,526	2,060,100
Mississippi	1,143	1,234,440
Georgia	5,690	8,193,600
Arkansas	420	510,300
Total	460,198	582,004,620

Of this output we sold in the fiscal year 1905, to Porto Rico, 80,838,816 pounds for $2,508,724, and to Cuba, 34,976,414 pounds for $993,819.

These rices were of the cheaper grade, and were what is known in a commercial sense as broken rice.

Not one pound was shipped from the United States to the Philippine Islands.

In 1890 there was not a rice mill west of the Mississippi River. To-day there are 67, costing on an average $90,000 each, and aggregating an investment of $6,000,000.

According to the report just read from, there were 460,198 acres of land cultivated in rice during the season 1905—432,286 acres of which are in the States of Louisiana and Texas.[a] This land is worth, on an average, $30 an acre, or $13,805,940.

There are 80 canal plants, representing an investment of $8,000,000. The tools, teams, and implements necessary to carry on the rice-growing industry in Louisiana and Texas cost not less than $10 an acre, or more than $4,300,000.

These immense values, newly created by the energy and thrift of American citizens, contribute their quota of taxation in the various localities in which they are situated, thus assisting to maintain the school systems of our sections, the construction of roads and bridges, and in the general internal development of the country.

The lands adapted to rice culture can not be used for anything else, except possibly pasturage on a limited scale. In the event of the present uses to which they are put ceasing to be remunerative they will revert to their original state of worthlessness.

It costs to produce rice and prepare the same for market about 3 cents per pound in all States of the Union except Louisiana and Texas, where the average cost is 2½ cents per pound. The average wholesale price of clean rice is 3½ cents a pound.

Accepting the figures of the Department, to which I have referred above, we produced in the last calendar year about $13,000,000 worth of rice.

The bill under discussion contemplates and provides for absolute free trade in all products the growth of the Philippines with the exception of sugar and tobacco, upon which the tariff is reduced 25 per cent of the Dingley rates until the 11th of April, 1909, after which date all articles wholly the growth and product of the Philippine Islands coming into the United States are to be admitted free of duty.

The Philippine tariff bill approved on March 3, 1905, imposes a tariff duty from May 1, 1905, until January 1, 1907, of 60 cents per 100 kilos on unhusked rice, 75 cents per 100 kilos on husked rice, and $1.75 per 100 kilos on rice flour. After January 1, 1907, this duty is increased to 80 cents, $1, and $2, respectively, per 100 kilos.

Therefore the present rate of duty on rice imported into the Philippine Islands is 27 cents per 100 pounds on the unhusked and 34 cents per 100 pounds on the husked article.

The production and consumption of rice in the United States are about equal under normal conditions.

The production of rice in the Philippine Archipelago is much less than the consumption.

Statistics furnished by the Bureau of Insular Affairs show that 644,320,463 pounds of rice were produced for the fiscal year 1904 and 808,177,731 pounds in the fiscal year 1905.[b] The Bureau further states that the quantity of rice consumed in the islands in 1902 was 1,371,460,077 pounds, and that it is assumed that the consumption has been about the same each year since that time. From these figures it appears that the Philippine Islands consumed 563,282,346 pounds more than they produced.

The prevailing price for rice in the islands for the fiscal year 1905 was from 1.8 cents to 2 cents per pound. Consequently the Philippine Islands purchased last year $7,456,738 worth of rice, which paid a duty into the treasury of the islands of $1,311,496, likewise transportation charges, and was sold on the market at a profit for 1.9 cents per pound.

I insert here a statement from the Bureau of Insular Affairs showing the quantity in pounds and the duty paid on rice imported for the fiscal year 1905:

Importations of rice into the Philippine Islands during the fiscal year 1905.[c]

Imported from—	Pounds.	Value.	Duty.
France	220	$4	$1
Spain	42,639	2,046	101
Japan	16,032	392	38
British East Indies	40,551,991	583,901	92,335
Dutch East Indies	436,779	5,389	993
French East Indies	459,299,772	5,962,993	1,063,402
Siam	62,934,913	902,013	154,626
Total	563,282,346	7,456,738	1,311,496

[a] Letter from Department of Commerce and Labor of December 26, 1905.
[b] Letter from the Bureau of Insular Affairs of December 30, 1905.
[c] Statement furnished by Bureau of Insular Affairs on Jan. 6, 1906.

These figures show that the rice imported into the Philippine Islands was valued at 1.3 cents per pound. This included transportation charges and the duty. It was subsequently sold upon the market on the basis of 1.9 cents per pound, according to information furnished from the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

It follows that the market price of rice produced in the Philippine Islands likewise did not exceed 2 cents per pound.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what do these conditions disclose? They demonstrate the fact that the Philippine Islands can buy all of the rice required for their use at 2 cents per pound, including transportation and existing duty, which they import from Saigoon, in French Siam, and Rangoon, in British Burma, both of which countries are near the Philippine Islands.

Under the provisions of the present bill they could ship into the United States, at a cost of 0.4 of a cent per pound for transportation, their entire production of more than 808,000,000 pounds, and realize therefor not less than 3½ cents per pound, which would give the Filipino rice grower a margin of at least 1 cent per pound, equal to more than $8,080,000.

It is urged, however, by the advocates of this measure, that, as rice has to be imported into the Philippine Islands, it is idle to fear that they will ship their own product and buy elsewhere.

This does not follow by any means. A reference to the rice trade of Japan discloses the fact that that nation is the largest importer of rice in the world, notwithstanding the fact that it is also an exporter. In other words, the people of Japan buy from the East Indies the cheaper grades of rice and export their better quality.

I was unable to obtain the figures for 1904 and 1905, but those from 1901 to 1903, inclusive, show an exportation of more than $2,000,000 worth of rice annually and an importation, under normal conditions, of $6,500,000 per annum, and for the year 1903 of more than $25,000,000.

I will read here a statement of Japan's exports and imports of rice:

Exports of rice from and imports into Japan, 1901–3.

[Compiled from the Twentieth Statistical Report of the Department of Agriculture and Commerce, Japan, 1905.]

Calendar year.	Exports.		Imports.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Bushels.		*Bushels.*	
1901	2,583,770	$3,440,639	6,177,694	$5,915,721
1902	2,519,640	3,326,413	8,951,230	8,839,907
1903	1,632,665	2,470,020	24,144,320	25,876,216

Japan exported to the United States during the fiscal year 1905 12,668,790 pounds of rice, valued at $298,153, and of the inferior grades of rice, such as rice flour, rice meal, and broken rice, it exported to the United States 660,196 pounds, valued at $11,376.[a] The total importations of rice for consumption into the United States for the fiscal year 1905, including all grades, amounted to 102,059,864 pounds, or a value of $1,930,804.51.[b]

The mere statement of these facts is the strongest argument that can be made against the adoption of this measure from a Democratic point of view. The policy of the Democratic party, as I understand it, is to impose a tariff for revenue, and to so adjust it that the necessary revenue shall be raised from revenue-producing articles.

The adoption of this measure will remove duty from rice and reduce it upon sugar and tobacco, all of which are revenue-producing commodities.

In addition, the amendment of the minority stops, after declaring in favor of free trade. If this amendment is adopted we will be in this position, that all articles the product and growth of either country shall have equal rights in their respective ports without the payment of any duty, whereas the duty enforced for the Philippine Archipelago is much lower upon everything which it imports from other countries than the duty on the same imports into the United States.

The duty on uncleaned rice imported into the United States under the Dingley bill is $1.25 per 100 pounds, and the duty on the same grade of rice imported into the Philippines from the East Indies is 34 cents per 100 pounds, or a difference in favor of the Filipino of 91 cents per 100 pounds.

Mr. Chairman, I subscribe to the doctrine that taxation must be equal and uniform within the territory levying the tax. I further subscribe to the doctrine that, as representatives of the people, it is our duty to observe the limitations and carry out the provisions of the Constitution, and that the interpretation

[a] Statement furnished by the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor, on January 6, 1906.
[b] Table No. 15 of the Annual Report on Commerce and Navigation for 1905.

of that instrument by the Supreme Court of the United States is the law of the land and binding upon us.

Consequently, while it is true that the Philippine Islands are territorially a part of the United States, the court declared that Congress had the right to impose on articles coming from that country a tariff or not, as it saw fit, thus deciding the question to be one of governmental policy, with which the courts could not interfere.

No objection then being presented by the mandates of the Constitution, we ought, in the enactment of laws, carry out the principles for which both parties stand—that is, equal rights before the law for every citizen of the United States.

But instead of doing that, this bill grants to the Philippines the right to buy their goods from other countries at rates much lower than we buy from the same countries and then to send their products into the United States with the same liberty that they could be sent from the State of Louisiana to any other State and to enjoy the same protection which it is claimed the people of the United States have under the present law.

Mr. Chairman, believing, as I do, that under the Constitution the Philippines are a part of the territory of the United States, I have no objection to absolute and unrestrained free trade between them and the United States, but I insist that they shall not enter our markets under more favorable conditions than we in this country have the right to enjoy, and that the tariff laws applying to California, Maine, Louisiana, or Massachusetts shall apply with equal force to the Philippines.

Now, then, we are presented with this question: If it is right for us to have our rate of taxation equal and uniform throughout every part of our country, why should we favor the Filipino at the expense of the American citizen? If the government there is running behind, if it has not sufficient revenue to support itself and to educate its people, why not make appropriations out of the Treasury, fairly and squarely, to support them if they are unable to support themselves?

Mr. Chairman, I differ, with a great deal of respect, from the learned gentlemen on our side who have submitted to this House a substitute, which seems to be incomplete, because it does not go far enough. We are asked by the substitute offered by the Democrats on the committee to vote for free trade between this country and the Philippines. To stop there is not Democratic. It is Democratic as far as it goes, but it ought to go further. It ought to apply the laws of the United States to the Philippine Archipelago. I believe in the enactment of laws which recognize the equal rights of all men before the law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will it interrupt the gentleman to ask him a question? Is it not true that we can not apply the Dingley tariff rates, or any other tariff rates, under our customs laws in general, around the Philippine Islands until the 11th day of April, 1909, by reason of the treaty with Spain?

Mr. PUJO. Well, I do not so understand it. I understand, under the treaty with Spain, that we are to give her the same advantage in the Philippine Islands that we enjoy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And for that very reason we can not have it until the 11th day of April, 1909.

Mr. PUJO. Then, if the gentleman from Missouri looks at it that way, it is possible he is absolutely correct. But I do not think that the Dingley bill will be an advantage to the Filipino.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think it is a curse to the whole American people.

Mr. PUJO. That may be true, but what I contend for is that the laws should apply equally. I do not believe in free trade. We have no income-tax law upon the statute books of this country, and we are bound to raise between seven and eight hundred millions of dollars annually for the support of this Government, and we are compelled to raise the money by duties on imports and by internal-revenue taxes.

I believe the policy of the Democratic party to be that the necessary funds to maintain the Government should be raised by a tax on revenue-producing articles.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to say further that I can not reconcile the position of the Democratic party upon this amendment—that is, the position of the minority of the committee reporting the bill—for the reason that it does not give equality before the law. If the gentleman from Missouri be correct, that the laws of the United States can not be applied to the Philippine Archipelago until the 11th of April, 1909, we at least, if we are to carry out the proper policy of our party, should insist that they go into effect and operation then. As I construe the bill, it threatens to tear down an industry which, in Texas and Louisiana, produces annually more than $12,000,000 worth of an article of food used generally by the people, and permits rice from the Philippine Islands to be shipped into the United States free of duty at a profit of a cent a pound.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. PUJO. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would the gentleman from Louisiana be willing to take, for the continental United States, the duty on rice now levied on rice coming into the Philippine Islands?

Mr. PUJO. If it were a duty proportionate to the duty imposed on other articles in the United States from which a revenue is derived. I am not willing to have particular interests in my State singled out to be discriminated against. The rice growers of Louisiana are willing, in a revision of the tariff which shall be general, to stand a diminution in proportion to the reduction of duties on other interests in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the gentleman to say he wanted an equality of duty by raising the duty on rice imported into the Philippine Islands, so that it would be as high as the duty on rice imported into the balance of the United States.

Mr. PUJO. The gentleman understands it entirely wrong.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought the gentleman wanted the Dingley rate extended to rice imported into the Philippine Islands.

Mr. PUJO. I want the law of the land to encircle the Philippine Archipelago just the same as it does the State of Louisiana. If the rate of duty on rice coming into the United States should be reduced to 1 mill per pound I would still be in favor of the principle, provided it applied uniformly to all its territorial possessions. It is not the amount of the percentage that makes the principle.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As a matter of fact, the Dingley bill is the existing law now.

Mr. PUJO. So I understand it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And, if the gentleman would have equality, he would have the rate of duty upon rice imported into the Philippine Islands fixed at the rate now existing in the Dingley bill?

Mr. PUJO. That would be the result.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That would be the result. Now, would the gentleman be willing to equalize the other way, by reducing the rate of duty fixed on rice imported into the continental United States to the rate fixed upon rice imported into the Philippines?

Mr. PUJO. Provided such a reduction would be proportionate to reductions on every other interest in the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One other question.

Mr. PUJO. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think the gentleman means that, because it might leave the impression that he wished a horizontal reduction. The gentleman does not mean that he would be unwilling to reduce the rate upon any article unless there was an equal horizontal ad valorem cut in the duty on all other articles?

Mr. PUJO. No; I mean that in the event of a reduction of the tariff we should take revenue-producing articles, make up our budget of expenses, and endeavor to raise enough money to have it equalized upon all products brought into this country, so that this Government could be properly administered and its internal development continued. If protection should incidentally result from such revision, very well. But I do not want to see the interests of my section of the country discriminated against.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was what I wanted the gentleman to explain. I think the gentleman and I agree perfectly. What the gentleman wants is a tariff levied at the maximum revenue point without any regard to protection. If it incidentally protects, all right; if it incidentally does not protect, all right; but you want the duty fixed at the maximum revenue point?

Mr. PUJO. The maximum revenue point, having regard to the proper internal development of our country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course.

Mr. PUJO. Now, Mr. Chairman, this digression has led me away to some extent from the thread of my remarks, but I believe that in a general way I have practically expressed my views upon this question. I realize that perhaps I have not made the matter as plain to some of my friends upon the other side as I would have liked to do; but I believe that when they come to look into this question, being good American citizens, as they are, they will not inflict an injury upon and do a great wrong to the people of the South by insisting upon the adoption of this bill.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PUJO. Yes.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. I want to learn something about this rice industry. In point of fact, is the rice produced in the Philippine Islands of an inferior quality to that produced in Louisiana?

Mr. PUJO. I am glad the gentleman has asked that ques-

tion. Rice is practically of the same quality all over the world. The different grades result from the milling. When the hull is taken off the rice by the milling process, or the old-fashioned mortar process, some of the beans break in a great many pieces and some remain whole. In other words, a barrel of rough rice, weighing 162 pounds, when milled will produce 100 pounds of clean rice. Of that there will be 40 pounds called head rice, worth 4½ and 5 cents a pound. The remainder will be broken rice, constituting the lower grades. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] the other day, in speaking of inferior grades, probably conveyed to this House the idea that different qualities of rice were cultivated, which I do not understand to be correct. It is only when a field has been cultivated a great number of years and the yield becomes impreguated, as you might say, with red rice, that a grade is produced which is considered inferior.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. In the early part of the gentleman's remarks I understood him to say that Japan, while a great exporter of rice, was also a great importer and consumer of rice, and that the Japanese exported high-priced rice and imported a cheap quality of rice. Is that merely due to the cutting or breaking of the grain or is it a different grade of rice?

Mr. PUJO. No; it is due to the different grades or classification after the milling or husking has taken place. There are different grades, due to the milling and husking, as I have stated, from the full white bean to broken rice, rice meal and rice flour, but there are not different grades as it is grown, although there are different varieties.

Mr. Chairman, the rice producers of the United States do not ask any special favors at the hands of the Government, but they feel that they should not be discriminated against. All that is asked is that a Filipino shall not be given any advantage over an American.

It is urged in justification of this legislation that revenue is necessary for the maintenance of those islands, and that, as they are compelled to import rice, the duty thereon should be low in order not to press too heavily upon them.

Conceding the correctness of this premise, it does not follow that a law should be passed which would enable speculators to buy rice produced in the Philippine Islands for a price not exceeding 2 cents a pound, and to ship the same to the United States at an additional cost not to exceed four-tenths cent per pound, and thus drive the American rice producer out of the market, injuring his interests, and ruining his investments. Rice produced in the Philippine Islands can be bought there and delivered at the city of New York for a less sum than it will cost the American rice grower to produce it and to deliver it to the market generally.

It is obvious, if this be true, that this great industry, which is yet only in its formative stages, will be struck down and languish until the injury inflicted by this legislation may be repaired by its repeal.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of common observation that the love of money in the United States and the love of its accumulation is so great that no opportunity to enter profitable speculation will be overlooked. It may be true that there are no capitalists in the Philippine Islands who will undertake to exploit this field, but there is capital in abundance in the United States aggressively searching for quick and large returns. No greater inducement could be offered than that which would present itself should this bill be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I am entirely persuaded that the Philippine Archipelago is a part of the United States, and should be so treated. It should have absolute free trade with every part of the United States and her other dependencies, but at the same time the law which applies to this country should be applied to the Philippine Islands.

For these reasons I can not obtain my consent to support this bill, for I fear that the rice industry of this country may be struck down by it.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LACEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I must beg the indulgence of the Members of the House for the brief time I shall take in attempting to talk on the pending bill. However, from the wide scope of the debate here, it is sometimes difficult for us to understand what the particular issue is we are talking about and what we are expected to talk about when we discuss this measure. We have gone over almost all the phases of the tariff on tobacco, of beet-sugar culture, of the raising of corn, of the raising and feeding and marketing of cattle, and so forth—all supposed to be pertinent to the question as to whether we shall extend to the Philippine Islands free trade in everything save tobacco and sugar. But this has only tempted me to talk a little, not exclusively upon the tariff question, but on the bill, if you please, and I certainly will keep within the range of somebody's talk within the last few days. [Laughter.]

I never made a purely tariff speech in my life and I will not try to make one now. About twenty-five years ago in this Hall I made what is now fulfilled prophecy in a speech less than ten minutes in length. I prophesied then that the only way to get rid of the college professor's theories about tariff and free trade was to try free trade in this country, and then we would have an object lesson that would educate the people of all classes here so completely that theoretic arguments would have little avail.

Now, I am very sorry to be embarrassed in attempting to make this speech, because I must differ from all parties apparently on this floor; that is, at least, the leaders of them. We have the two great parties represented by distinguished, able men, agreeing upon one thing, one proposition as the basis of their ultimate joint support of this bill. It belongs to the small things. It is the day of littleness. The leaders, Republican and Democratic, and their followers, have adopted the principle of the maxim of the law, de minimis non curat lex—the law pays no attention to small things. A western judge gave a free translation to that maxim and said that it meant, "the law goes with head and tail up." [Laughter.] So I say that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Mississippi go together, "head and tail up," because they can support this bill for the reason, on the one hand, that there is not enough of free trade in it to hurt, and on the other hand that there is not enough of unconstitutionality and robbery in it to hurt upon that side. [Laughter.] This I want to say, parting, if I do, from my friend on the question of policy, that I want to minimize my action in whatever opposition I shall make to this bill by reading a little from the RECORD.

During an address on the 4th of this month, toward the close of that three hours and forty-five-minute speech by the distinguished chairman [Mr. PAYNE] of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. BONYNGE asked a question. I read:

Now, do I understand the gentleman to argue that there will be no benefit to the Filipinos by this reduction of duty?
Mr. PAYNE. I am doubtful about the benefit to the Filipinos.
Mr. BONYNGE. Regardless of whether it benefits the Filipino or not.
Mr. PAYNE. Well, it will benefit them in this way: It will give them courage. There is some sentiment in it. They believe it will help them.

I am always in favor, Mr. Chairman, of giving people courage, and I am not averse to sentiment, but I do not believe it is worth while for this Congress of the United States to undertake to pass a law merely because the Filipinos are deceived into the belief it will do them some good when it will not. [Applause on the Republican side.] But I read that clause, Mr. Chairman, to have it appear to my brethren that the small, if any, good that is hoped by the author of the bill is my excuse for believing it will not do any serious harm if not passed. De minimus. [Laughter and applause.]

We are not going to part company with those Republicans who support free trade on this bill. We may, for the present, shed a tear, but we love them so much that we will woo them back with us, and they will be found standing up here at an early date claiming that from the beginning of their existence they were stand-patters on the question of protection in the United States. We will welcome them home. I am not now ready to say to them, as did Ruth to her mother-in-law, Naomi—"Whither thou goest I will go," etc.

Now, there has been a great deal said incidentally by the Democratic free traders supporting this measure in the way of assaults upon the Republican party for its protective policy in the past. I have listened here and elsewhere to these assaults, coming from respectable sources, indicating through the years of protection that we of the Republican party have been a band of worse than lawless highway robbers; that we have stolen from everybody on every hand all that was possible to lay our hands on. We have been denounced as robbers in national Democratic platforms and all that, to say nothing of doing it in violation of the Constitution; but let me say that in this, too, I have some consolation, because with all our robbery we enter the year 1906 in a particularly good condition in these United States. I will ask the Clerk, to save me a little, to read what Henry Clews says happened in the last year of Republican protective robbery. I will ask that he will read the part marked.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, *January 2, 1906.*

The year just closed has been one of extraordinary business activity. It opened in the spirit of doubt; it closes in a spirit of almost danger-

ous optimism. In both volume and profit the trade of the past year has been much the largest ever experienced—farmer, miner, mechanic, merchant, and financier each having had their full share of the proceeds. In short, our national prosperity during the past year has far exceeded all previous records.

The most striking fact in the situation has been the farmer's remarkable prosperity. He is preeminently the principal factor in the national business activity of to-day. The country has been favored by a series of successful harvests, but that of 1905 surpassed all. Secretary Wilson, of the Department of Agriculture, estimated the wealth produced on American farms this year at $6,415,000,000, which is $256,000,000 greater than 1904 and $498,000,000 in excess of 1903. Corn reached the highest production and value on record. Hay proved a large and profitable crop. The cotton crop, though short, is unusually profitable, and our wheat crop surpasses the record in value.

In other respects the year has been a profitable one to our agricultural classes, and Secretary Wilson estimates that as a result of five years' continuous good crops, and also to more intelligent methods of agriculture, the value of farms has increased 33.5 per cent, an amount approximately equal to $6,133,000,000. In consequence of this wonderful progress the American farmer, as a rule, is now not only out of debt but has a good balance in the bank. He is, therefore, a much larger buyer of the necessities and luxuries of life than ever before, and this fact is chiefly responsible for the present unusual prosperity of the West and South. The importance of this great accretion to national wealth will be appreciated when it is remembered that, if our agricultural products are correctly valued at $6,415,000,000, this sum is equal to almost $80 per annum to every man, woman, and child in the country. In one year American farmers have secured an amount of wealth equal to the entire capital stock of the American railroads and nearly ten times their net earnings. Such growth is simply astonishing.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I will not stop to comment upon this only to repeat again that with about eight years of protection under that law that is denounced as being so terrible in its operation we have brought the people of this country into a condition such as just described. Some people claim that that law has made individuals too rich. Grant that, Mr. Chairman, but it remains the fact that leaving them out of view the American people through all the classes are better off financially, better housed, better clothed, better fed, less in debt, and their children are more generally at school now than at any other time in the history of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Chairman, I may make mistakes about names, but I heard a gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] a day or two ago anticipate this talk about prosperity by that old, time-worn argument we have had ringing in our ears for at least the generation to which I belong. He told this House in rather excellent language and with a degree of earnestness that was commendable that it was not true that the good times and prosperity of the farmer and mechanic were attributable to Republican protective laws. He said it was due to Almighty God; that the Creator of the Universe had given us broad and rich fields and forests and opportunities and all that, and that prosperity had thus come.

Where was the Creator in the days of the Wilson-Gorman Act, when people walked, praying for work, the streets, almost maniacs, in all the great centers of business and commerce of this country? [Applause on the Republican side.] Soup houses grew up, notwithstanding the Creator's great things were then all about us. But I said this was rather an old argument. Prior to the 1st day of January, 1879, I heard upon the floor of this House, for two weeks, the most eloquent men the country ever produced, the most distinguished of that day or earlier—I do not compare them with the present statesmen here [laughter]—describe here the horrors that were to befall the people of this country when the day and hour came for resumption. They depicted the destruction and devastation, the poverty and bankruptcy, the shoeless children, etc., that would follow it; they painted pictures here that made us all feel sad, but when resumption came on that memorable New Year's day, it came as gentle as snow falls from the clouds, and prosperity budded out anew from it. Then came that cry, "Oh, the Republican party claims credit for resumption."

A distinguished Senator of my State said that the Republican party had nothing to do with it; that Providence brought it about. Good crops in this country and floods along the Danube and in other parts of Europe that destroyed their crops made resumption possible. So the Almighty got credit and condemnation both at once for bringing about resumption. More recently in the great national Democratic convention at St. Louis it was attempted to be demonstrated, as I understand from the reading of the speeches that were made there, that the gold standard was not established in this country by the Republican party, notwithstanding the law which it put on the statute books (March 4, 1900), in spite of the Democracy, fixing 25.8 grains nine-tenths fine of gold as a unit of standard. They told us on the stump in 1904 everywhere that Almighty God fixed the gold standard, because in the creation of the world He deposited a superabundance of gold in the mountains and in the valleys and in the bowels of the earth, where the miners had found it, and that was the way gold resumption came.

Now, I did not think anything strange of the gentleman from Massachusetts undertaking to say that protection had nothing to do with the good times, because he was only following the old argument. But, Mr. Chairman, reverently I say it, I am happy that my party advocates the things that the Almighty sees fit to work out and accomplish completely. [Applause on the Republican side.] And it seems that ought to be glory enough for us. And it may be said that the Democratic party, with the many things that it has had on its banner and under which it has gone down to defeat in the last fifty years, at least has been singularly unfortunate that the Almighty was not with them.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this bill is taken up by some whom we call "protective-tariff Republicans" as an indication that we are about to enter upon a matter of tariff revision. They say we have enough of free trade in the bill, and we have cut down the duty on tobacco and sugar, and that shows a symptom on the part of the stand-patter protectionists that we are going to revise the tariff. It is well to understand as we go along exactly what this bill is, because we have had but little said about it for some days. The bill provides for free trade in the introduction to this country of purely Philippine goods; the products of tobacco and sugar must be 25 per cent of the duties imposed on foreign imports under the Dingley law. The present duty on goods imported from the Philippines is 75 per cent of the Dingley tariff of 1897. The claim is that the bill can do no harm, and we heard the argument the other day and to-day, too, that it could do no harm, and as it is said it will do the Filipino people no good, then we say, let it go by. Such a bill is not worth our consideration. I want, in this connection, to call attention, if I can put my fingers upon it, to a further position of the Democracy here on this bill. It is found in the views of the minority of the Ways and Means Committee. They are not primarily in favor of this bill, but only in the way I first mentioned. I read from the minority views:

> In justice to both the Filipinos and ourselves they should be considered as altogether American or altogether foreign.

The distinguished gentlemen do not seem to be willing in that place to say which they want. They are more specific in the next line:

> So long as we retain them we favor the establishment and maintenance of free trade betwixt them and the United States.

From some of the talk I have heard here I gather there are Democrats who believe the Philippines are a part of the United States, but here the views of the minority indicate that they are not and ought to have free trade established by law betwixt them and the United States. I will read another sentence:

> The party which we in part represent desires to get rid of them at the earliest practicable moment, and we welcome the dissatisfaction of the hitherto legislatively favored classes, growing out of the competition of the products of Philippine labor with our own products in our own market as a possible moving cause to governmental divorce between the Philippine Archipelago and the balance of the United States.

In this clause the minority of the Ways and Means Committee seem to couple them in as a part of the United States. But it strikes me as somewhat peculiar that they have a sort of welling-up hope, as expressed here, that in time, some way or other, there will be enough dissatisfaction gathering around these Philippine Islands to lead to letting them go without regard to methods or conditions. I refer to this merely to show the inconsistency. The minority will vote, however, for a bill to secure the Philippine Islands free trade with the balance of the domain of the United States, thus putting those people on record in favor of free trade in these islands.

I notice from the remarks made yesterday and to-day that there is not entire unanimity on the other side of the House; but I pass that over that I may go along a little further. This party of Democracy that we are dealing with was once a great party. It was one of power and strength and patriotism; later on it became a party of some efficacy as a party of opposition; to-day it seems from all the indications that it has gone down to a third stage, and has become a mere party of criticism. Where next?

But we have some friends, Democrats and Republicans, that have told us some things about Massachusetts. Massachusetts has always been a great State, and the gentleman from Massachusetts yesterday told us the reason, and honestly, why it could not be in favor of protection. It seems to have gotten beyond the pale of production, and if that is so—and it is not, on examination of their statistics—but if it were so, I should not blame the people of the State of Massachusetts for being for free trade. Every man in the United States who does nothing and produces nothing is a natural free trader. [Laughter and applause.] And every man in this country who produces something for himself and for others is a man who wants to have some protection for himself, and in his generosity, for his neighbors also. [Renewed applause.]

Our Republican Massachusetts friends seem to have been scared over the recent Democratic platform, which demanded a revision of the tariff to the extent of having free hides, free coal, free lumber, and free iron ore. While over in Rhode Island, so handy that they can hardly be distinguished, the Democracy in 1905 went them one better, and added free wool. Now it is noticeable that these people stopped there. They never put anything on the free list, or suggested putting on the free list anything that they produced themselves. [Laughter and applause.] Even these Massachusetts free-trade Democrats subscribed in 1904 to the doctrine of the national Democratic party, that protection was a robbery and unconstitutional. They did not rest with that. But they scared some of our Republican friends up there. They elected Hon. W. L. Douglas—I believe those are the right initials—governor in 1904, and the newspapers told us the reason why they elected him. They said that the potential speech that made him governor was one to the effect that he made shoes and sold them for $3.50 a pair, and if they would take the duty off hides, he would sell them for $3. Well, of course, Massachusetts went Democratic on that. [Laughter and applause.] I looked into the question to see how liberal Mr. Douglas was. The highest estimate that I could find that the duty on hides would make in the cost of the leather in a pair of Douglas shoes was a fraction under 2¼ cents. [Laughter.]

Mr. Douglas in his indignation against protection added to the $3 the 2¼ cents that the leather had cost him in addition, and then put 47¾ on that as profit over and above. [Renewed laughter and applause.] He must be a generous sort of fellow to do that. That is not all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. KEIFER. Yes; I will do that.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. The gentleman wants to be fair, I know.

Mr. KEIFER. I always try to be fair.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I would not interrupt the gentleman, if I did not know that he was misquoting ex-Governor Douglas's speech.

Mr. KEIFER. I was not quoting his speech, but just stating a fact. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I beg to differ with the gentleman entirely in the idea that he is making a statement of fact——

Mr. KEIFER. I did not yield to the gentleman to make a speech; he can answer me when I get through.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. What he did say was that he would sell shoes for 50 cents a pair less if the tariff was taken off of hides and leather and all shoe findings. If so, he could sell them for $3 a pair.

Mr. KEIFER. That is a case for applying the doctrine of de minimus; he might have added to it leather. He himself admits that it would not add much to the cost of the shoes. So that that answers the question. That leaves Mr. Douglas in the delightful condition that I understand he put himself in when he came here recently, as I am informed, when he said if they would take the duty off he would be glad to do this thing I have spoken of. He would sacrifice the 47¾ cents if he could get rid of the robbery of 2¼ cents. [Laughter.] He must be in the situation of that freed slave of North Carolina who lived in a hut in the woods and was in the habit of taking—I do not care to call it stealing—from his old master's flock sufficient hogs to put up his winter's meat. His old master got religion and went to him and said: "Now, I want you to be good and to quit stealing my fat hogs, and I will help you to quit. I will give you some pigs and you can slop them and raise your own." The negro said: "Not slop enough." Then the old master said: "I will give you six fat hogs in the fall, and you can put up your own pork." Then Uncle Ned said: "That sounds reasonable and fair, and I guess I will accept the proposition, but I am losing a mighty sight of pork." [Great laughter and applause.]

So I think Mr. Douglas would be losing a mighty sight of pork on that transaction.

Well, my friend Governor Curtis Guild, jr., got scared, as my friend over here yesterday [Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts] was scared. He was down here talking to the President about their fright in Massachusetts. Massachusetts is not all the United States. He wrote a letter and somebody read part of it here the other day, in which he told the President that if he and the candidate with him for lieutenant-governor had not taken to the woods and professed to be for tariff revision they would have got licked out of their boots this last year. That is the effect of it. Governor Guild is a brave fellow. He was a good soldier, as I can personally testify, and I hope he will make as good a governor of Massachusetts as he made an inspector-general of camps in Florida, Georgia, and Cuba; but he will have to be revised a little on the tariff question. [Laughter.]

Now, we are here dealing with a great many interesting things. The other Massachusetts man (Mr. SULLIVAN, I believe)—and I am so much of a "kid" here that I may make mistakes as to names [laughter]—in his very eloquent speech, when he was worked up to a little pitch by somebody interrupting, as they are in the habit sometimes of doing here when a gentleman is making a speech, something was said about the laborers, and he tiptoed beautifully and said, "I think the American farm laborers and mechanics are abundantly able to take care of themselves." Why not? I agree to that proposition; but I do not agree with it at all if you are going to have a power somewhere in the country to decree that the laborer of this country shall not take care of himself here, but shall be put in competition with the pauper labor of other countries of the world. [Applause.] If you let them alone they can take care of themselves, but if you insist on that proposition—that comes from some great sympathizing philanthropist, somebody who had gotten higher than belongs to common humanity, who had passed into a stage of Christian civilization never reached before—that is a different thing. There are some free traders who insist upon the claim that the way to get prosperity in this country, to get people in foreign lands to buy of us, is to quit producing at home and turn our laborers out and go there and buy of them. [Applause.]

That is a central idea of Democratic free trade. They say, "How can you expect European countries—Germany, France, England, Russia, and Italy—to come and buy goods of you here in your country unless you go over there first and buy of them?" Let us look at that question backward. Was anybody ever such a fool in England, France, Germany, or any other country in the world as to say, "The right way to get these rich Americans over in the United States to come and buy our goods is to go over and buy theirs first?" Why, they never thought of that. They are old stagers, and they do not think that is the way to do it. Now, I have not time to run this out at all, but another proposition is that there is danger that they will not buy what we raise.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] appealed for free trade for his people. Why, I know some of those people out there. I suggest that a market for his people and for others in the Missouri and Mississippi valleys, at Kansas City, St. Joe, Omaha, St. Louis, or Chicago, is worth ten thousand times more than a market among poor-paid people over along the Danube in Europe. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. KEIFER. Yes; but I do not want to get into a controversy with the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want to participate in a controversy. I want to ask one question.

Mr. KEIFER. Go ahead.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it turns out that the American people can not consume all the products of the farms, all that we raise in the United States, would it not be wise to undertake to increase the foreign market for that surplus product?

Mr. KEIFER. Oh, yes; that is a plain question. I do not want to get into a controversy with the distinguished and learned gentleman from Missouri. I know I am too young to go into that sort of an affair and come out safely. [Laughter.]

I listened to the gentleman's learning the other day with admiration. I recollect he made a pretty accurate quotation from Rabelais, written in the fifteenth century and recopied in Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy in the sixteenth century. [Laughter.] I can not give the quotation as the gentleman did, but as I recollect it, it was:

> When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
> When the devil got well, the devil a monk was he.

A great many liberties have been taken with that stanza. One of the more modern of them runs:

> When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
> When the devil got well, the devil of a monk was he.

[Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks that is really any answer to the question?

Mr. KEIFER. Does the gentleman from Missouri think it is? I agree with him. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think it was a fine piece of pleasantry.

Mr. KEIFER. Thank you.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I want to know is if we can not consume our surplus farm products of the United States,

would it not be wise to enter into some reciprocal relations with the hungry nations of the earth whereby we might increase the sale of our products to them?

Mr. KEIFER. Yes; that is all right. I will come to that question of reciprocity that the gentleman and his party have so recently been converted to, very soon. [Laughter.] But let me say as a further partial answer that one thing is certain—I do not believe that the gentleman from Missouri will dispute this—that no people of any country in the world ever came to the United States and bought a pound of meat, a bushel of wheat, or a bushel of corn, or a barrel of flour, and took it over to their own country for consumption unless they were short themselves. They never bought anything that they could produce at home, and they never will; but they will buy of us that surplus that the gentleman is rightfully seeking to get rid of, whenever they have to have it, and not until then. [Applause.]

A few years ago something happened to the rye crop on the steppes of Russia and along the Danube and all through that German and Austrian country, and they had no rye. They use it for making bread. They had to have rye. We were raising out in our country, and in the gentleman's country in Missouri, as a sort of incident to farm products, where all the farmers you know, desiring a spring pasture, raise a little rye, not expecting to make anything out of its sale. It was worth 40 or 50 cents a bushel. When they wanted it for rye bread in Europe they sent over to the United States by cablegram to know whether we could furnish it. Well, there was a great hunting around of granaries and barns and stacks to get all the rye there was in the West. We sold that rye—all that could be scraped together—for a dollar to a dollar and a half a bushel. It was then our surplus, and we got rid of it because they had to have it. When their own crop grew we had to go back and plant it as we did before—for a little spring pasture, sometimes for feed.

I will not have time to talk about this matter of consumption, but I refer to the fact that it is amply demonstrated that this country can only be prosperous when we build up industries side by side with the farm and the plantation.

I live in a good agricultural country. I am not going to engage in any flight of oratory or any flowery talk about how the sun shines in central Ohio in my district or on my people, but we can raise as many bushels of corn to the acre, on an average, and likewise wheat and oats and things of that kind as anywhere else in the world. There are five counties in my district. There is no very large city within them. We have several small cities, and I live in one that has a population of about 40,000.

It is a fact shown on close investigation that we are not able to raise in my district enough agricultural products to feed us, and you will find that is the case in many places. We have to import many things. Am I to go out and say to my people: "Here, get out of these shops, get out of the International Harvester shop, get out of the great Turbine Wheel shop, get out of the American Seeding Machine shop, and let us go and buy such things as you make over in Europe, in order that they may be induced to come here and buy our farm products?" Everybody knows it is supremely absurd to suppose that a poorly paid people in a foreign country will pay us for our products of the farm, whether grain or meat, anything like as well as our own people will pay at home. Transportation is against them, and their poverty is against them. I could draw pictures, but I know I should not be indulged to talk long.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have time to complete his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may have sufficient time to complete his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I am thankful to the gentleman from Missouri and to the House. The theory of buying where one can buy the cheapest and selling where the highest price can be obtained is a captivating one, though in practice it is found to be wrong. We must often create a market for getting people employment, and thus create a market better than would otherwise arise.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, after this indulgence that the thing that the Democracy seems to me is now, and has long been confronted with, is one capable of being stated so that it will demonstrate its absurdity, and I therefore say that the Democrats here and elsewhere will require more persuasive argument and eloquence than its distinguished leaders possess to convice the people of this country that the free traders are the true guardians of their welfare and happiness. It will be impossible to make the plain, common-sense people of this country believe that with the Democratic party in power and under their free-trade management the farmers would get a high price for eggs, butter, and the like, while the city consumers could at the same time buy the same articles very cheaply; that cattle would bring to the farmer a high price and beef still be cheap in the market stalls; that wheat would bring a dollar and upward a bushel and bread could be sold two loaves for a nickel; that the machinists could receive $5 a day to do skilled work, while skilled labor should only be performed at home, save in competition with pauper wages abroad; in short, the foolish theory is that the manufacturer could pay high wages with or without manufacturing at home, and the farmer could get high prices for his products from those at home, who have little or no work and consequently nothing to buy with; that poorly paid people in foreign countries can pay the same for the farmer's or manufacturer's products, cost of transportation added, that our own people can pay when employed at high wages. Paradoxical as all this seems, it is the problem the theorist free trader is trying to maintain.

Now, my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and some others have arraigned the Republicans on this side of the House, and perhaps the party generally, for inconsistencies in connection with some views of Republicans. Mr. Blaine was mentioned, and others. It would be rather hard on some of us to hold us to any very strict line of consistency with all Republican leaders, dead and alive.

I know when there were those who staggered a little under the idea that this country was to be built up into prosperity by a protective tariff. I have witnessed some of that as well as my friend from Missouri. I know we had people at one time who thought that this country would get along and compete with the pauper people of Europe without aid, but it did not, and it can not now. The error that has crept in with a great many people of all parties when they come to view the question of the tariff is that if you will reduce the duty that that will only reduce, pro tanto, the price to the consumer. Take this illustration of hides that these Massachusetts people have been frightened so much about. They say to take off the 15 per cent, I believe, duty on raw hides would only cut down the price to the cattle raiser to that extent on his hides. This proposition is worthy of consideration. I will give you this as my illustration. If you take the duty off hides and you invite the hides from the Argentine Republic and from the plains of South America and have them brought in as they are generally—as freight on sailing vessels—and they have no duty against them they will soon bring hides enough to absorb the market and the hide market of the West will be what it was a few years ago.

I know in regions not far beyond the western border of Missouri where they did not stop to take the hide off the animals. They fed them during the period of the Wilson-Gorman Act—sometimes cattle, and even horses—to the hogs, hides and all. They were not worth skinning. That happened in Colorado. It happened in many regions in Kansas, my friend here says. I know it did in western Nebraska. Now, that is the trouble. You destroy the industry that is protected altogether. Why, they say in Rhode Island they want wool on the free list. We have had it. What was the consequence? They thought wool would go down in price a little and we would still have the same number of sheep and the same quantity of wool as before. If the duty on wool was now taken off our people would do as they did some few years ago—give their sheep away to people who would take them, and in many instances they killed and buried them rather than take care of them at all. This was the case in central Ohio and other places in the West. That is the difficulty we have under free wool——

Mr. CAPRON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. KEIFER. Certainly.

Mr. CAPRON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that in Rhode Island they desired to have coal upon the free list?

Mr. KEIFER. Wool.

Mr. CAPRON. Now, the gentleman mistakes Rhode Island, because it is so small, for Massachusetts. Rhode Island does not want wool upon the free list. It does not ask it and never has.

Mr. KEIFER. You misunderstood me to this extent. The Rhode Island Democratic platform of 1905 added wool to the list that was made up in Massachusetts.

Mr. CAPRON. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I can understand anything from that source. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KEIFER. But we are coming to this question of consistency. There are a lot of things about consistency that will

hardly pay to take the time to review. Democracy consistent on the tariff? Well, yes and no. We have some marvelous history on that subject. The first startling thing that came from leading Democracy was in the year 1832. The Vice-President of the United States, John C. Calhoun, left the chair and went to South Carolina, and there induced his State to declare nullification against the laws of the United States because a mild protective tariff was put upon goods that were being imported into Charleston Harbor. Unconstitutional was the cry then as now.

After some rather pointed, emphatic, and certainly patriotic talk from one Andrew Jackson, who happened to be then President of the United States, this nullification ceased, and the great leader of Democracy resigned the office of Vice-President of the United States and went back to the Senate as Senator from his State. About the first thing he did after getting there was to vote for a tariff law varying but little from the one he had just declared was unconstitutional.

But that was a long way back. Let us not go into much of that. Something was said about the great tariff law that Dallas voted for, and gave the casting vote as Vice-President of the United States, in 1846, I believe. My recollection is that Congress did not pass any tariff law then of any important kind, and that Dallas simply distinguished himself then because he violated the pledge he made as candidate for Vice-President and before he was elected, when on a tie vote in the Senate he voted to repeal the tariff act of 1842. I am a young man [laughter], yet I can recollect that in 1844 the Democratic cry rang throughout the North as it was emblazoned upon the banners of Democracy, "Polk, Dallas, and the tariff of 1842."

But let us get along a little further. Let us come up to 1883. I had something to do with the passage of a tariff bill which became a law on March 3, 1883. The Democrats denounced that act as unconstitutional throughout. It was denounced in every way.

I heard the distinguished men from North and South on the other side of the House then talk against the unconstitutionality of the act, and they denounced some of us for favoring it, because we would be perjuring ourselves. And some of them, when we were going over the bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, voted to increase the duty on some things. I remember one was sumac. The Representative over there, from about Lynchburg, Va., wanted to raise the duty on that, for it was then about the only product of that region, now, happily, changed. Another Representative, who had made a long constitutional argument against this bill, voted to have a high duty put upon roasted, shelled peanuts, so that there would not be any competition with the peanuts raised in Tennessee. But that, too, was a day of small things. They could vote thus then, and now we have the same principle applied.

But we are talking about consistency. Blaine led his party to defeat in 1884, and after that we had a new régime. The act of 1883 did not have a fair trial. The Democracy did not enforce and work it out and it was repealed and another passed, called the "McKinley Act," of October 1, 1890. And this McKinley Act was in turn repealed by the Wilson-Gorman Act, of August 27, 1894.

Now, it will be remembered that the McKinley Act, of October 1, 1890, had the first appearance of reciprocity legislation that ever came to the Congress of the United States. It was a suggestion perhaps of Mr. Blaine, but it had gotten into the act of 1890. Well, Democrats were not very consistent about that, because they brought about some litigation, and the case went to the Supreme Court. It is called Field *v.* Clark. It will be found in the 143 United States Supreme Court Reports, page 697. The question there was whether reciprocity was constitutional. Justice Lamar, of Mississippi, writing a dissenting opinion, pronounced it unconstitutional, and Chief Justice Fuller concurred.

Some of the other judges dodged a little on it, and said the question did not arise fairly; but so far as we got the views of Democrats of the court, it was that the reciprocity section of the act was unconstitutional. But that is a small matter, maybe.

In 1894 the Democratic party passed what is called the "Wilson-Gorman tariff bill," and its seventy-first section repealed, in express terms, all the reciprocity there was in the prior McKinley Act, stating that everything that was done or attempted to be done in enforcing it that was inconsistent with the act of 1894 should be held null and void. So there is the legislative record.

Well, there was a little history right along there. The Democratic platform of 1888 was perhaps the most memorable on the tariff question we have ever had. If it had been practicable I would be pleased to have favored it. See what it was:

We, the Democratic party of the United States—

I put the heading—

resolve that we are in favor of cheapening the cost of living and increasing the price of the farmer's product.

[Laughter.]

By Jove, I am inclined to agree to that. But how can we cheapen the cost of bread, meat, eggs, and poultry to the consumer and at the same time increase the "price of the farmer's product?"

That was the national Democratic platform of 1888 on the tariff. It has been a remarkable party in new things. When I first entered politics the thing that struck me most, in 1876, was the wonderful facility of the Democratic party in settling great political questions, scientific as well. In its national platform of 1876, where Tilden was nominated, they tried to out-Herod Herod in condemning the Chinese. They resolved as ethnologists "That the Chinese race did not spring from Adam." [Laughter.] All remember it. The language, more precisely, you will see, was:

Resolved, That the Chinese race did not spring from the same parent stock that we did.

[Laughter.]

Now, I have always had a respect for a party that can settle a question, and it seems to have settled that one.

Let us look further. In 1892 we had a Democratic platform, and the chief plank of the national Democratic platform was a denunciation of protection as a fraud and unconstitutional.

Now as to reciprocity that my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] talked about. The Democratic party had another resolution on the subject of reciprocity. I would like to read part of it if I can turn to it without too much delay. I have found it. I read—listen, gentlemen:

We denounce the sham of reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges by pretending to establish closer trade relations with a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products.

They had just before that declared that the tariff was a fraud.

Now let us see—I must hurry along—if I can not find another place where reciprocity is mentioned. I am reading, Mr. Chairman, a part of the platform of 1904 of the national Democratic party. First, this:

We denounce protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few.

I read now on reciprocity from the same platform. Remember in 1892 it was declared a sham and a jugglery to cheat the agriculturists, and that it had been legislated out of our statute books by a Democratic Congress. Conversion seems to have come to the Democratic party on reciprocity almost as suddenly as it did to Saul of Tarsus on his way to Damascus.

We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada and with the peoples of other countries where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, and mining or commerce.

Here Democracy indorses the doctrine of reciprocity for the first. Strangely, Mr. Chairman, it seems to think reciprocity had become constitutional or at least that it would be innocent to follow it. I agree if you will put free trade and reciprocity side by side you will have no reciprocity at all.

There is no such thing as reciprocity without a tariff duty, so the Democracy stands for absolute free trade and then wants to trade that off for some sort of reciprocity with some country in the world. That is an innocent kind of reciprocity. This is the history of the matter with some little things left out. It is not very consistent, but these gentlemen are going to vote for this bill because it only has a little robbery in it, and there is not much room for reciprocity that could be based on that.

Now, I ought to be through, but I will talk a moment longer. While this thing was going on about the tariff, and reciprocity was declared to be the basic principle of Democracy in 1904, we had an election. A very excellent gentleman, a distinguished judge of New York (Mr. Parker), led the Democratic party. Indeed he somehow or other found that it was necessary not only for him to lead it, but to tell them that they did not know anything about certain subjects at all, as after they had unanimously voted a platform on the money question he told them that they were all wrong, and they took it back. Now, the election came. The people of this country, the kind I speak for—the farmer, the machinist, the mechanic, the laborer—took some interest in that election, and Mr. Roosevelt was elected President of the United States by a plurality of 2,549,331. Somebody said something about standing by the President on this tariff question. I should like to have the Clerk read a marked extract from what the President says on the question, and how it is to be dealt with if we are going to have revision; and if there is anybody who ought to listen to this it is the gentlemen from the State of Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

There is more need of stability than of the attempt to attain an ideal perfection in the methods of raising revenue; and the shock and

strain to the business world certain to attend any serious change in these methods render such change inadvisable unless for grave reasons. It is not possible to lay down any general rule by which to determine the moment when the reasons for will outweigh the reasons against such a change. Much must depend, not merely on the needs, but on the desires, of the people as a whole; for needs and desires are not necessarily identical. Of course no change can be made on lines beneficial to, or desired by, one section or one State only. There must be something like a general agreement among the citizens of the several States, as represented in the Congress, that the change is needed and desired in the interest of the people as a whole; and there should then be a sincere, intelligent, and disinterested effort to make it in such shape as will combine, so far as possible, the maximum of good to the people at large with the minimum of necessary disregard for the special interests of localities or classes.

Mr. KEIFER. I will not stop to make any comment upon that. Something has been said here in the course of the debate about the Philippines and their being interested in this bill, but it has been so little, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. PAYNE] claims so little is to come from this bill, if it should become a law, that it requires very little time to be taken by me. I want to say a word about sugar. More than $150,000,000 worth of sugar is imported into the United States annually. A great deal of it comes from Germany—beet sugar—and beet sugar comes from various other countries. Now, I do not know what may be the ultimate outcome about the matter of raising sugar in the Philippines, but if it is a matter of sentiment, and we are going to pass this bill for the Filipinos for that reason—I do not know that they are so very sentimental—but it may be a matter of sentiment on the part of our people who have money that they would put into the beet-sugar factories and into the farms but for the menace of free sugar. There is a great deal of learning in this matter of farming. I notice my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] talked about the farmer and the cost of farm products, and of corn especially, the other day with a great deal of glibness. I do not think I could afford to come in conflict with the gentleman about that, but my testimony would be that he is greatly mistaken in some things.

He said, in effect, that it took about two bushels and a half of corn to plant an acre of corn; in other words, that it took a dollar's worth of 40-cent shelled corn to plant an acre. Well, if I had been called as a witness, with my knowledge of western farming, I would have said the cost of seed corn to an acre in the gentleman's district, and in Missouri and Kansas, averaged less than 5 cents per acre.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not at all certain but that what the gentleman from Ohio says is more nearly correct than the statement I made as a general proposition, but I was putting it at the highest point. I do not want to take the gentleman's time now——

Mr. KEIFER. Oh, go ahead.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. By some kind of a roping-in process that I have never understood there are people at Shenandoah, Iowa, in Colonel HEPBURN'S district, who sell seed corn for $2 a bushel. I never knew how they managed it, but I know they do it.

Mr. KEIFER. I have looked into that question, but I do not think the gentleman's constituents buy that corn. [Laughter.] I know they do not where I am interested, and I am a farmer in the West.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So am I.

Mr. KEIFER. I understand. We are both farmers. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If my constituents and the corn raisers of Missouri would take my advice they would never buy a bushel of seed corn in Iowa while the world stands. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEIFER. I tried to introduce a new seed corn into Nebraska, and I came very near being excluded from ever going back there again. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to finish my statement. I would advise them never to buy a bushel of seed corn in Iowa, because we can raise as good seed corn in Missouri as they can raise anywhere, and you can raise as good seed corn in Ohio as there is anywhere.

Mr. KEIFER. But it does not cost more than about 5 cents per acre for seed corn. One bushel of shelled corn will plant in the usual way from 8 to 10 acres.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think you are more nearly correct about the average price than I was.

Mr. LACEY. Let me say to my friend from Ohio that the corn there in Missouri all runs to cobs and they work them up into pipes. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They make about a half a million dollars a year out of corncob pipes in the district I live in. It is one of the greatest industries there.

Mr. LACEY. And no corn on the cobs. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is as much corn on the cob as there is in any county in the State of Iowa, and first-class corn, too.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KEIFER. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What I was about to say has lost its merit by delay. When the two gentlemen were supporting each other in the statements that they were farmers, I wanted to say that they do not either of them look the part. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You are correct.

Mr. KEIFER. I like the compliment, but I think there are slick fellows in my district who look better than I do and they are farmers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], I will say that I think we look fully as much like farmers as we do like statesmen. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEIFER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to give a little bit of experience that I have had in the beet-sugar raising. I do not belong to the people that are interested in raising beets for sugar, but I want to illustrate how we wise people talk about raising beets for sugar. I have investigated that question to the last degree. I do not think we can ever successfully raise sugar beets and manufacture them into sugar in Ohio. I went to Grand Island, Nebr., a few years ago and was bent on learning the cost of raising beets for the purpose of making sugar. After getting there I went over on the Platte River in beet-sugar land, and went into a field, where I found a man riding around in an open buggy giving directions about the harvesting of his crop. It was just harvest time. I said to him, "Do you know anything about the cost of growing beets?" "Yes," he said, "I know all about it. I raised these beets."

I noticed that he was a good deal better dressed than I am, or the gentleman from Missouri, and he had a fine horse, with ribbons in the bridle, and so on. He was driving along and there were men and women there topping the beets, and others were loading them into the cart to be carried to the factory. I said, "What does it cost to raise these beets?" "Well," he said, "I pay $5 an acre for the lease of this ground, so much for the seed, so much for preparing the ground, so much for planting, so much for thinning—not 'suckering,' as was stated here the other day—and then so much for cultivation, and then what you see going on here now, and it all amounts to about $45 an acre." I said, "How many tons of beets do you get?" He said, "Nine." I said, "What do you get at the mill?" He said, "$5 a ton." So you see that he was coming out plumb even. I went along further in the gloaming of the evening and came out at a field and saw a little stubby, red-headed, Teutonic-German-like fellow—like the one my friend, Mr. CLARK, described and claimed to be the other day—and he had a flock behind him, consisting of a wife and several children, so modest that they scurried off into the brush as I came up. I asked him who owned the beet field that he came out of, and he said he owned it himself. I said, "What does it cost to cultivate and raise an acre of beets." He said, "$5." I thought the difference was only $40 between the two, and I would look into it a little.

He was evidently a man of truth. I questioned him, and he said he paid cash for the seed, and complained that somebody had put up a job on him, and he had to pay too much. He talked about some other expenses, such as for hands to help thin out the beets. I asked him who did the balance of the work. He said he and the old woman and the children. They did $40 of the work on an acre. He had about 60 acres of beets. He said they would average about 12 tons to the acre, and it would cost him about $5 an acre to raise them. Mr. Chairman, all these farmers—not such as we have here—never count their own work in estimating the cost of raising corn or other things of that kind.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of doing in this country all that is necessary through legislation, even higher protection than we have now, if you please. I am in favor of going on and on in this beet culture or this beet-sugar manufacture until we are independent of the whole world on the subject. [Applause.] We have better sugar lands, we have more of them in this great Northwest than there is in any other country in the world. You may minimize the region for growing sugar in the Philippine Islands; you may limit them in Cuba, but you can hardly limit them in the great Northwest. I know we are not a beet-sugar country where I live. We have tried the experiment, and I, like my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. DALZELL, think many of these factories failed, and are bound to fail, because of natural causes.

Why, they understand it. Beets must be raised where there is much sunshine in the fall of the year. I will illustrate. The Oxnards were engaged in raising beets at Grand Island, in Nebraska, and one year they prepared to make a larger quantity

of beet sugar than usual, because the season had been such that the beets had grown double the usual size, and everything looked prosperous, and yet after a week or two trial they shut down their mill and did not make sugar at all that year to any great extent. Why, they had a great overgrown sugar beet that had been raised with plenty of rain all the season to make it grow in size, with little sunshine, as it happened, throughout the year, and there wasn't sucrose enough in the beet to be worth making it into sugar at all. Scientifically I can not explain it, but if you have only 10 per cent of sucrose in the beet there is an acid or virus of some kind in the same beet that in the process of manufacture consumes that 10 per cent of sucrose. If you have 11 or 12 per cent, you can make sugar and get the per cent above the 10. If it is 14 per cent it is rich, and that is the philosophy of it as nearly as I can give it.

If you go into New York and build your mills, you are liable to have too little sunshine most years, and the beets will not be worth harvesting for the purpose of making sugar. I was amused at the statement, I believe, of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] about these by-products—the waste material—the pulp of the beet—selling at $14 a ton. I looked into that also, and I can tell you it will not sell for 14 cents a ton at any of the sugar mills out West, because it is not worth anything. It is nice looking, but it is so poor it will not even rot. [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. If my friend will allow me, a sugar producer in Michigan testified before our committee that it sold out there at $14 a ton.

Mr. KEIFER. He cheated somebody, then, certainly, because the Armours went out near Grand Island and put up an establishment to use this pulp and they spent a great deal of money, and when I was there there were ricks of it nearly a quarter of a mile long which had been there for over three years, and there was not anyone who would buy it. The only way it was used at all was to mix rough ground corn or other stuff with it and in that way make it palatable. It contains no substance, and stock would starve on it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. KEIFER. Certainly.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman says the pulp sold at $14 a ton. Now, does it not take from 10 to 12 tons of green stuff to make a ton of dry pulp?

Mr. KEIFER. That is all right, but the pulp is not worth anything when green.

Mr. FORDNEY. No; not a cent.

Mr. KEIFER. I am glad to have your testimony.

Now I must close, leaving the tobacco question untouched. Others have, however, said enough on it.

I want to say a word about this matter of the Philippines belonging to us. There has been a whole lot of talk about that. The old Democratic doctrine was that the Territories did not belong to the United States—that the Constitution did not extend over them. In the Thirtieth Congress, as I recollect it, in 1848–49, John C. Calhoun induced Senator Walker, of Wisconsin, to introduce an amendment to an appropriation bill in the Senate, providing that the Constitution of the United States should be extended so as to cover the Territories of the United States. The exact language used was "to extend the Constitution of the United States to the Territories." This led to a six weeks' debate in the Senate, and the Senate agreed to the amendment, but it failed in the House. The doctrine of Democracy was that the Constitution did not cover the Territories, but the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dred Scot case somewhat limited that doctrine and said that the Constitution of the United States (in the syllabi of the case, which will be found in 19 Howard) did apply to territory that belonged, at the time the Government was formed, to the original thirteen States, but not to any territory acquired afterwards. I do not know whether this is Democratic doctrine now or not, but that was the doctrine of Chief Justice Taney and a majority of the Supreme Court of the United States when that case was decided, March 6, 1857.

The third section of the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have power to make all needful rules and regulations for the government of the territory and other property of the United States, putting territory and other property all in the class of property. That is a sufficient guaranty that we may deal with this territory as we please. If it is our property, we may deal with it as we please, and there is nothing unconstitutional in legislating for one territory different from another. We have done that all through the history of the country. The ordinance of 1787, though passed by the old Continental Congress before the Constitution was adopted, extended certain things to the territory northwest of the Ohio, and that ordinance was reenacted by the First Congress of the United States for fear it would not be operative, under the Constitution; and then we had other territory that was brought under government with an opposite policy. So we have been running all the time all through the history of this country, and I think we may now legislate for the Philippines by giving free trade or protection, one or the other. I have no trouble with the constitutional question as to that. But I must close. I do not believe that there is enough of sentiment in this bill to justify anybody voting for it. I believe it is dangerous as a precedent.

I am not at all sure but what the argument that is made here, that it would not be immediately injurious, is a sound one, but I do not like such arguments and I do not like such experiments. I do not believe, myself, that any good result will come from its passage, or any disadvantage result from its defeat. We can wait a little longer. We are approaching the ten-year limit—April 11, 1909. We can see whether these people are to be civilized or not. I know I do not know as much about these Filipinos as those gentlemen who traveled across the sea to witness them, but the next best thing I could do to get some learning on this subject was to go to the Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis. I went up on the hill and there saw some of the Filipino people. I never was so much amused in my life as I was when on getting there I found standing upon a granite rock, or some kind of a stone, a Negrito, or Igorrote, or a head-hunter in his natural habilaments singing—"My country, 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty; of thee I sing," etc. [Applause and laughter.]

There I had the living example. A little incident happened. I was looking around to see who was watching this demonstration of love of country by this peculiar fellow. I saw a lady, Miss Dawes, from Massachusetts. I had not seen her for a score of years. She had tears glistening in her eyes and she was laughing at the same time. I had seen her under other circumstances. I remembered then that she came here to the Hall of this House one morning before it met in session and went before the Appropriations Committee, that was almost adamant at that time, when the great Randall was the chairman of it, and she converted the members of that committee into sympathizing people in a speech of fifteen minutes, and we came in here and asked the House to appropriate $50,000 at that woman's instance, to be used to send a relief expedition toward the North Pole to hunt up the Greely party, supposed to be up there some place. And the expedition was sent, and it arrived there just in time. A day longer would have been too late. It was in time to snatch Greely and those of his party which still survived from death to life. Well, here was this same woman out there, looking at the tropical products, not the arctic.

Now, I do not believe, my friends in the Republican party, that we are going to be torn up or divided very long on our side, and I think they will not be on the other. We will soon be together. We will line up. There are times when there are stragglers from a great army that is moving forward, but when there is great work to do—when the battle is on—its ranks will close up and all will stand together. We will stand together for that protection that has brought so much of good, so much of civilization, so much of greatness to this great Republic of ours. I thank the House. [Loud applause.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of a letter which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Georgia Cotton Oil Company (cotton-seed oil, cake, meal, linters, and hulls)—R. F. Munro, president; R. S. Pattillo, vice-president, Atlanta, Ga.; George E. Strupper, manager, Muscogee Mill.]

COLUMBUS, GA., *December 14, 1905.*

Hon. W. C. ADAMSON, M. C., *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We request that you give your careful consideration to the very important question of the prohibitory tariff that is being imposed by certain European countries, which are adding oppressive duties upon American products going to their countries, and especially on our main product and the South's great product—cotton-seed oil. We call your special attention to the proposed Austro-Hungarian tariff, which is likely to go into effect in February, 1906, which will be prohibitory on any cotton-seed oil being shipped from this country to them, and if this tariff does go into effect it will absolutely destroy a market amounting to some millions of dollars for cotton-seed oil alone.

The new German tariff also raises the duty on cotton-seed oil 25 per cent, and it seems that there is an agitation in France and Italy looking into putting an increased tariff on our product of cotton-seed oil.

It seems that these countries are imposing this tariff because our American tariff on products from their countries is unreasonably high, and we very much favor a reasonable reciprocal concession in our tariff.

We come to you with this matter because it will do a great injustice to the South if a ready market can not be found for our product—cotton-seed oil—at all times. Therefore we ask your careful consideration and request that you do everything possible toward preventing foreign markets from practically closing their doors against cotton-seed oil.

Thanking you in advance for any assistance you can render us in this matter, we remain,

Yours, truly, GEO. E. STRUPPER, *Manager.*

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for its attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. DIXON] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, it would have been a much easier matter for me personally to have remained passive during this debate and to have quietly acquiesced in that which appears to be the will of the entire Democratic membership of this House, with possibly two or three exceptions, and that which, I am sorry to say, will probably be the recorded vote, but not the deliberate judgment, of the majority of the Members on this side of the Chamber. But, in justice to myself, as it is given me to see the right, and in fairness to that part of our common country which I alone have the honor to represent on the floor of this House, I would be recreant to that which I at least conceive to be my duty were I not to raise my voice in protest against the passage of this bill as it now stands.

With a change of one vote in the Committee on Ways and Means and this bill, as it now reads, would have never been reported.

So far as I have heard, either in this debate or in private conversation with my fellow-Members, I have heard no reason advanced that the passage of the bill would result in any material benefit to the people of the United States.

It is not even claimed by its advocates that it will in any way cheapen the cost of refined sugar to the people of the United States, nor that it will, by so much as one penny, increase the revenue that is so sorely needed at this time.

In the outset, I want to say that, except so far as the commodities of the Philippine Islands are concerned that do not come into competition with products of our own farms and factories, I have no objection to their importation into the United States duty free; but in as far as these competitive products, produced by the labor of a semicivilized people, at a wage of from 15 to 30 cents per day, I am opposed to their free competition with the products of our own people.

In saying this I want to be fair enough to also say that I do not believe the admission, free of duty, into this country of Philippine sugar and tobacco will annihilate those industries in the United States, but I do believe their free admission is a step in the wrong direction and one not called for by present conditions or any moral obligation on the part of the people of the United States to the inhabitants of the Philippines.

The occurrences of the past week during the progress of this debate have appeared most peculiar to that portion of the membership of this House who with the opening of the Fifty-ninth Congress had just graduated from the "kindergarten class" of the Fifty-eighth Congress. Those of us who during those two years have sat so patiently at the feet of the Gamaliels on this side of the Chamber and learned the lesson from their lips that it was better for us to sometimes curb our own individual conviction, so as to allow it to coincide with the combined wisdom of more experienced gentlemen—the men whom Colonel HEPBURN in the early part of this session referred to as "white-buttoned mandarins" [laughter]—on this side of the Chamber; to those of us who have listened to the admonitions of these gentlemen, admonishing us from time to time to "stand pat," who taught us anew the principles of the Republican party, find it difficult to understand the present condition of things.

When the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, that eminent gentleman whom we all respect, and whom we all listened to with great interest in his two hours' explanation of this bill as to why it should pass, from the standpoint of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; when we heard his speech and heard from the other side of the Hall the applause which came from those gentlemen there; when we heard words of praise that fell from the lips of that great free-trade champion, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the gentleman who a year or two ago in this Chamber delivered his celebrated philippic in advocacy of tearing down the custom-houses of the country—when we heard these things, gentlemen, some of us began to wonder where we were drifting.

I heard the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] the other day in a two hours' speech in defense of this bill, and I confess it was interesting and sometimes it was eloquent, and when he had concluded I want to say, in all frankness, that I felt like exclaiming, "Almost thou persuadest me to become a Filipino." [Laughter.] But when the spell of his eloquence had passed, and I began to regain my normal condition, I could not help but wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether or not, as a Member of the American Congress, I was participating in a "Committee of the Whole House having under consideration the present state of the Union" or whether I was in attendance on a Filipino missionary society. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the applause that came from the Democratic side of the House in response to those speeches from these distinguished gentlemen might have tickled the fancy of those who delivered them, they might have recognized in that applause "the voice of Jacob;" but to me, gentlemen, as I saw it, it was the same hairy hands of that same old free-trade Democratic "Esau" [laughter] who for the past fifty years has led the assault on the Republican policy of protection to American labor and industry from the pauper-paid labor of foreign countries. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to listen intelligently to the speeches that have been delivered on the floor of this House in favor of this bill and those which have been delivered in opposition to it; I have read most of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee; I have in conversation with my fellow-Members tried to learn somewhat of the reasons which actuated them in voting for or against the bill. I think I am frank and honest in stating the question that so far as the arguments advanced in support of the bill from the Democratic side of the House are concerned they have been based on the one argument alone that the Democratic party is in favor of free trade with all countries—why not the Philippine Islands? Sometimes you have sugar-coated that doctrine a little bit in order to make it have a little bit better taste in the mouths of the people in certain parts of the country, but the actual doctrine so oft proclaimed by you in this House and in your platforms has always been that the Democratic party of this country stands for free trade.

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACON. You say that the Democratic party is in favor of free trade. Will you please quote one single declaration in any of its national platforms in favor of free trade?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Let me suggest that the Democratic national platform declared, "All forms of protection are robbery of the many for the benefit of the few." [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MACON. It does not say free trade. The Democratic party in its platform has uniformly said it was in favor of a tariff for revenue only.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have quoted the words of your platform of 1892.

Mr. MACON. But it does not say free trade.

Mr. GROSVENOR. "All forms of protection."

Mr. MACON. "Protection," yes; but that does not mean free trade by any manner of means.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman will have a hard job to make anybody understand it any other way.

Mr. MACON. And you will have a hard job making anybody with sense believe that it is free trade. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. I thank the gentlemen for the very entertaining discussion that has just taken place in my time. I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] for calling the gentleman's attention to the declaration of the last national platform of the Democratic party.

Mr. MACON. Do you assume that that is an answer to my question?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. I will say to the gentleman who has just addressed me that I heard one of your distinguished champions, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], I think it was, who said on the floor of this House that he was in favor of tearing down the custom-houses. If I mistake not, I heard the gentleman from New York, Mr. BOURKE COCKRAN, in the last session of the Fifty-eighth Congress, reiterate on this floor that he would "tear them down from turret to foundation stone." [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, whether that be the brand of Democracy that the gentleman is answering for I do not know, but when CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, and BOURKE COCKRAN, of New York, unite in saying that this one thing is a genuine Democratic proposition, I, as a Republican, would naturally accept it as true. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MACON. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I will say that while I have a high regard for the gentleman from Missouri and a little less but not quite so high regard for the gentleman from New York [laughter], I want to call attention to the fact that the Democracy of this great nation does not recognize the utterances of either of these gentlemen as being the enunciation of the party.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. I would ask the gentleman whether he accepts as genuine Democratic doctrine the utterances of the

Democratic national platform adopted at St. Louis last year, which declares that "all protection is robbery?"

Mr. MACON. Well, it is robbery in a sense; yes, sir. [Laughter on the Republican side.] It is robbery in this sense, that it takes from one without his consent something to protect some one else in the building up of himself or his business. It impoverishes the one to a certain extent and enriches the other, which, in my judgment, is wrong.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Then, I will reply to the gentleman by saying that I heard the very distinguished leader of the Democratic party in this House [Mr. WILLIAMS] on yesterday, in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] as to the relative degree of larceny involved in a protective tariff, illustrating it by saying that the present tariff bill, which we have under discussion, was petty larceny, because it only provided for a 25 per cent protection so far as the products of the Philippines were concerned, while the present tariff between the United States and the Philippine Islands was grand larceny, because it provided for a 75 per cent tariff between the Philippines and the United States. Therefore, so far as the Democratic leader in this House is concerned, he considers a protective tariff either petty or grand larceny, depending on the degree of protection involved.

Mr. MACON. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is here and is able to take care of himself. So I will let him answer for himself. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman will do me the justice to remember—because it was only yesterday and it does not require a very great effort of memory—that the tariff we talked about was a tariff between one part of the United States and another part of the United States, and had no reference to the general tariff law of the United States at all. Now, if the gentleman will yield to me just one moment further, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] has quoted what he says is the utterance of a Democratic platform that "all forms of protection are robbery." He can not find any Democratic platform or Democratic utterance saying that all forms of tariff taxation are robbery. The Democracy contends that a tariff imposed for the purpose of collecting duties to carry on a government, not only economically but effectively, is not only a constitutional tax, but may be a very just one, and assuredly neither the gentleman from Montana nor anyone else will contend for one moment that there can be any such a thing as free trade in the United States. The gentleman must admit, as everybody does admit——

Mr. DIXON of Montana. If the gentleman will ask me a question I will answer it. I do not want the gentleman to make a speech in my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am merely correcting a statement made by the gentleman about what he calls a statement made by myself. That was why I asked him to let me interrupt him, not to ask him a question.

Now, the Supreme Court of the United States having decided that an income tax is not constitutional, and it being necessary that this Government should be run by some form of taxation, a tariff for revenue is neither robbery nor is it unconstitutional, and even the utterance that all forms of protection are robbery is not an utterance in favor of free trade.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Then if it was not for the purpose of raising revenue for the use of the Government, I understand the gentleman would be in favor of free trade between all countries of the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman even in that would not be altogether fair, because I might consider it even then proper and right and equitable and easy to raise a part of the revenue by a tariff.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Then I would say to the gentleman that he does not agree with the doctrine of Democracy preached by Hon. BOURKE COCKRAN, of New York, or Hon. CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think I do.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I started to say, before I was interrupted by the questions from the other side of the House, that the argument of our Democratic friends in favor of supporting this bill is because it is a step in the direction of free trade, which, sugar-coated, as explained by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], is what I conceive to be the logical Democratic doctrine; and they have welcomed some of the gentlemen who have spoken in favor of the bill on this side of the House as having advanced a step toward a position heretofore occupied by them. And when I heard this exchange of courtesies between these brigadier-generals of this body, the men whom I have seen heretofore meet on many a hard-fought field of battle, I could not help but wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether or not they were forging their political swords into the pruning hooks and plowshares of a political peace.

The argument advanced by the gentlemen on this side of the Chamber has been to the effect that it is purely a question of sentiment. They have argued that we have extended free trade to Porto Rico, that we have extended it to the Sandwich Islands, and therefore our plain "moral duty" was also to extend it to the people of the Philippine Islands. So far as I am concerned, I can not possibly conceive but that that argument is a fallacious one. The island of Porto Rico lies at the very door of our eastern ports. The Sandwich Islands lie at the door of our western ports. They are a part of this Republic, geographically, strategically, and as a matter of the permanent national defense. The Philippine Islands are not. They can not be and never will be a permanent part of this Republic. They are ours temporarily as the resultant circumstance of war. This Congress has never recognized the fact that they stood in the same relation to the people of the United States as do Porto Rico and the Sandwich Islands. We have expressly declared in our legislation that they rest on an entirely different proposition from Porto Rico and the Sandwich Islands. We have never placed them in the same category with reference to the tariff laws. The bill under contemplation does not place them on the same plane as Porto Rico and the Sandwich Islands.

Congress has recognized our permanent possession and occupancy of Porto Rico and the Sandwich Islands by placing them within the operation of our own tariff laws. The Philippines, on the contrary, are operating under a separate tariff of their own that is in no manner akin to the spirit of our own tariff laws.

Some gentleman has argued during this debate that we should enact this legislation as our portion of "the white man's burden." We already have enough of a burden in trying to assimilate the mass of humanity that is yearly landing at the ports of our eastern shore without undertaking the experiment of making American citizens of an alien people living on the opposite side of the globe.

We have heard much in this debate of "our plain duty."

To me the path of "our plain duty" in this matter is not in the least obscure. I was once taught the scriptural admonition that he that provided not for his own household is worse than an infidel. This axiom transposed into modern, everyday English would read, "The Member of the American Congress who would sacrifice the material well-being of his own race and people to engage in a philanthropic crusade among an unwilling lot of semicivilized people in the Philippine Islands had better first learn the lesson that true charity always begins at home," and that "our plain duty" in this case is first toward the people of our own country.

Mr. Chairman, I have here in my hand a statement issued by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, which, I believe, is not to be released until to-morrow, giving certain data in regard to the sugar importation into the United States. It says that we are yearly importing into this country about $150,000,000 of raw sugar every year.

This great Republic, with every possible resource at its command, with all favorable conditions for production at home, has advanced to a point where every other article of commerce used in everyday life, except some productions of tropical islands, is already produced by the people of the United States. Ten years ago the people of this country began an experiment in the growth of the sugar beet. To-day Austria, Germany, France, and Belgium, and practically every country of continental Europe, produces its own sugar-beet supply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have time to complete his remarks.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I can not consent to that. How much more time does the gentleman want?

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Oh, I think fifteen minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Montana be extended fifteen minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Now, Mr. Chairman, I started to say that to-day the experiments carried on in this country regarding the production of beet sugar have passed the experimental stage. To-day we are producing 300,000 tons of beet

sugar annually, and at the same ratio of increase for the next ten years as in the past ten years we will be producing every pound consumed by the people of this country. There are certain peculiar conditions existing in the United States for the production of our own entire supply of sugar. In the Rocky Mountain region, which has been referred to in this debate by my friend from Colorado as what was formerly known as "the Great American Desert," there exists, Mr. Chairman, a peculiarly favorable condition for the production of twice the amount of sugar that this country could possibly consume.

The trouble heretofore has been, Mr. Chairman, that in that irrigated portion of the West there has not existed a sufficient amount of irrigated land at any one especial point to insure from year to year a permanent and continuous supply of the sugar beet for the successful operation of beet-sugar factories.

Three years ago, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, Congress enacted the national irrigation act, which, and I do not exaggerate, meant more for the development of the country than any single measure ever enacted into law by the American Congress. The people of the East are just beginning to realize the economical revolution that this beneficent legislation is beginning to work.

The area of irrigated lands under the present authorized Government canals in the State of Montana alone, which do not constitute one-tenth of the area that will be covered when the scheme shall have been finally worked out, will produce 600,000 tons of sugar every year, and that is not taking into account the area already under irrigation by private enterprise.

It is already demonstrated by the Department of Agriculture that the saccharine matter contained in the sugar beet is in direct proportion to the cool, even temperature in which it is grown and the high latitude that gives the longer period of daylight for the formation of sugar in the growing plant.

The National Irrigation Congress, which met at Ogden in 1903, realized the importance of this new industry in conjunction with the rapid development of irrigation in the West by unanimously adopting the following resolution:

Whereas the culture of sugar beets is already one of the most important industries of the arid West; and

Whereas our home market now requires the annual importation of over $100,000,000 worth of this commodity, the most natural product that can be produced under irrigation and shipped in great quantities to our large centers of eastern population; and

Whereas under the national irrigation act the culture of beets will afford our greatest quick-money crop; and

Whereas it is being urged that the United States Congress further stimulate the sugar industry of the Philippine Islands by reducing our tax upon Philippine sugar, by increasing the present limit of 2,500 acres, which individual corporations can now hold to 25,000 acres, and by the introduction of contract cooly Chinese labor: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby protest against the enactment of any legislation which will tend to arrest the full development of the American sugar industry by extending further concessions to the employers of cheap Asiatic labor; that we are unalterably opposed to the introduction of contract cooly labor wherever the American flag floats, and that legislative agitation or attacks on the sugar interests of this country should cease, to the end that this great industry may develop in common with all our other great industries.

And again, in 1904, at El Paso, Tex., they unanimously adopted the following:

It is the sense of this congress that the irrigated lands of the arid and semiarid West are demonstrated to be admirably adapted to the production of beet sugar, and therefore we favor such national legislation as will tend to encourage that industry on such lands.

The late Professor Powell, of the Smithsonian, estimated that there was arid land enough in the West, and water enough to irrigate it, that when developed would ultimately support a population of 70,000,000 people.

In the State of Montana alone we now have five sugar-beet factories in contemplation, and the money has already been subscribed for three of them.

This bill does not mean cheaper refined sugar to our own people. The sugar trust is the only one who will benefit by its provisions here at home. It only means that we are voting a subsidy, indirectly, of $35 per ton to the Philippine sugar planter at the expense of our own farmers here at home. It only means that we are, so far as the production of the Philippine Islands go, placing our farmers in direct competition with the peon 15-cent laborer there.

We have heard much in this debate from the gentlemen who are urging the passage of the bill of the languishing conditions of the sugar and tobacco business in the islands.

There was much testimony submitted before the Ways and Means Committee relative to the cost of producing raw sugar there.

I have here some direct testimony of my own to offer in support of our contention that the "poor Philippine sugar planter" is not in such desperate straits as some of the gentlemen would have us believe.

In talking with an army officer the other day, who was stationed in the Philippines with the Sixth Infantry in 1899, he gave me some very interesting facts relative to sugar culture there. His name is Major Torrey, now on special detail at the War College here, and an officer of very distinguished merit.

Major Torrey tells me that in 1899 he was stationed with his command on the island of Negros and while there became rather intimately acquainted with one Dom Pedro Yulo, a large sugar planter of that island. He was a native Viscayan and owned a plantation of some 12,000 acres, comprising some thirty-two separate haciendas; that becoming interested in the sugar business as carried on by Señor Yolo, Major Torrey asked him concerning the cost of producing same and the average profits from year to year. At the Major's request Señor Yolo wrote down in his notebook the following memorandum in his own handwriting. Here it is:

	Pesos.
250 acres of second-class land, including fixtures	20,000
This amount of land will produce on an average of 4,000 piculs (133⅓ pounds) of sugar, at 4 pesos per picul, worth	16,000
For expense of producing 4,000 piculs, at 2.25 pesos per picul	9,000
For duty and expense in selling at Iloilo	2,000
For repairs and depreciation of plant	1,000
Interest on investment of 20,000 pesos, at 6 per cent	1,200
Total cost	13,000

Leaving a balance for profit of 2,800 pesos, or 14 per cent net profit on investment after paying interest charges and cost of production.

Surely an industry that is paying a total profit of 20 per cent per annum is not in desperate need of such measure of radical relief as is proposed in this bill by giving it what will amount to an actual bounty of $35 per ton on the raw sugar produced there, and that at the competitive expense to our own growers of sugar beets in the West.

You gentlemen remember the cry that went up here in the East twenty years ago, when the Republican Congress proposed to put a prohibitive tariff on the further importation of tin plate and plate glass. You remember the howl that went up also from the gentlemen occupying the other side of this Chamber. The tin-plate and plate-glass industry at that time had not yet advanced to the permanent state, as has the beet industry of the West, and yet during that twenty years, notwithstanding the opposition of the Democratic party, the beneficent legislation of the Republican party in placing that tariff upon those then foreign products has resulted in building up those industries in the East until to-day every dollar's worth of those articles of commerce are produced here at home.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the West stood shoulder to shoulder with the East when that assault was made upon your industry, and we are now asking that you do not desert us in the time of our need. [Applause on the Republican side.]

While I reiterate that I do not believe that the enactment of this law will mean the extermination of the beet-sugar industry, I would again reiterate that it is a step in the wrong direction. And I venture to assert that if this bill carried with it as great a threatened menace to the iron, glass, and woolen-goods industries of the East, it would never have seen the light of day in this House.

I want to read this extract from an article by a gentleman who was once the idol of this House, as distinguished a statesman, I apprehend, as ever sat in this Chamber. It is almost prophetic of the question that we are discussing now. In an article written by him for the North American Review in December, 1902, ex-Speaker Reed used the following language:

For the Republicans to desert the beet-sugar interests is to desert the farmer in the one conspicuous and clear case where his industry is fostered. Under the tariff as it now is all the sugar needed for this country can be made by the people of this country. This is in accord with our system. It is a part of our system and should not be abandoned until the rest of it is abandoned. When we throw our markets open to the world in all things, then it will be time to do it on sugar.

While I fully appreciate the kind feelings that actuate those who want to extend a helping hand to the Filipino, it is a good deal like the president of that New York insurance company, who, in explaining to the investigating committee why his company had gone into foreign countries after life-insurance business when the business gained there was at a tremendous loss to the policy holders here at home, explained that in his view of the matter modern life insurance was a philanthropic institution for the benefit of all mankind. Yet that explanation did not explain to the policy holders here at home. They were not yet ready to extend the operations of the Golden Rule so far away from home.

As I see this matter, "our plain duty," so eloquently expounded by the chairman of the committee, is to our own people first, to the other fellow afterwards.

Mr. Chairman, a few words and I am through. We can all afford to be free traders, gentlemen, when the other fellow's

industry is at stake and not our own. Our Democratic friends referred to by Mr. KEIFER this afternoon—the gentleman from Tennessee, who wanted his peanuts protected, and the gentleman from Virginia, or somewhere else, who wanted sumac protected—is a pretty good example of the Democratic policy of free trade, intermingled with the policy of protection "to our own industry;" but we can all afford to be free traders so long as it only affects the other fellow.

It is like Josh Billings's patriotism, when he stood ready to sacrifice all of his wife's relations to save the Union. But I warn you gentlemen that you can not pull one brick out of the wall without endangering the whole structure. You gentlemen in the East can not demand free wool and free hides and free sugar and expect the people of the West not to administer the same medicine in return. Sometimes, gentlemen, from a spirit of self-interest, we may be willing to sacrifice the industries of a far-off section of the country that we are not personally interested in in order to save certain things advocated by ourselves; but I can not see, gentlemen, how anyone on earth is to be benefited by the passage of this bill, except it be the men who control the sugar trust. Pass this bill and it will result in diminishing our own revenue, result in placing the sugar raised by Philippine sugar growers in competition with our own, and the ultimate result will be that the men who control the sugar trust will naturally find it to their interest to produce sugar there with the 15-cent labor of the Philippine Islands—I will not say enough sugar to supply this country, for I do not know—but certainly hundreds of thousands of tons of sugar to be brought in direct competition with that produced by the farmers of our own country.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I know that I sincerely want to be a loyal, patriotic American citizen. I have sometimes taken I trust pardonable pride in the fact that I had sprung from a line of American ancestors that traced their lineage into the very dawn of colonial history. I doubt not that since that May morning, nearly eight years ago, when Dewey's guns had forever silenced the Spanish power in Manila Bay until now, I have engaged in as vehement declaration against "hauling the flag down" as anyone here present.

I sincerely hope and trust that some of us may be unduly exercised over the result of this threatened legislation. I hope it is more of a threatened menace than a real one. Still, weighing my words carefully, I now assert that in the final event that this proposed legislation should prove the slow strangulation or prohibitive of the further development of that which I believe will become one of the great industries of the Republic and of such vital moment to that portion of the country that I immediately represent, then, in that event, rather than be loaded down with such an incubus, reserving the coal and naval stations necessary for the proper protection of our commercial and naval interests in the Orient, I would gladly see Old Glory come fluttering down from every flagstaff in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely, honestly, earnestly hope that the bill will not pass in its present form. [Applause.]

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced a resolution for an investigation of the recent violent expulsion of an American mother from the White House offices and grounds by executive officials and employees while she was seeking an audience with the President of the United States. This resolution s inot privileged, and unless the Committee on Rules, to which is was referred, reports it I shall be powerless to secure its consideration. The incident which inspired this resolution recalled the darkest ages of the world. A lady of evident culture and refinement, an American mother, sought an audience with the President of the United States. She had every reason to feel that her cause would have just consideration from the man whose overwhelming popularity is largely due to his reverence of motherhood. She had every reason to believe that this sentiment would have been reflected in the conduct of the officials who surround him. Be this as it may, she had a right as an American citizen to seek redress of what she deemed a wrong, and if she was in error either as to the justice of her cause or as to the source from which relief might be obtained, she was entitled ot courteous information. She was told that she could not see the Presiednt. Thinking that perhaps the President for the moment was engaged, and not being familiar with the rules regarding visits to the President, she announced that she would wait.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the discussion of the resolution introduced and pending before the committee, and not reported, is hardly a proper subject at this time and not germane in any way to this question.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it is germane to the bill, and I will tell the gentleman why. I object to this tariff which erects a Chinese wall around the White House as well as around the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While I favor as great an exportation of commodities as we can have, I object to the forcible exportation of American women who have personal business at the White House. Now, Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman will let me proceed; I will not take up very much time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Does the gentleman think it a proper subject of discussion? I have made the suggestion; if he thinks it proper to arraign the President and his household, well let him go ahead.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What the country is arraigning is the spectacle of this woman's expulsion from the White House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have just made the suggestion to you.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the President had heard the growl of a bear or the howl of a wolf, he would have been on the scene immediately, but the wail of a woman fell on unresponsive ears.

Her ejectment was ordered and the indication of force overcame her sensitive temperament and naturally frightened her almost into hysteria. Then ensued an unequal struggle between this helpless and unoffending woman and powerful guards, in which she was barbarously handled. They dragged her across the muddy pavements, her clothing torn, her body bruised, and hurried her to the house of detention under an imputation of insanity, which was found to be so absurd that she was immediately released.

These unwarrantable and unnecessary brutalities demand investigation and merit censure. As for myself, the memory of my departed mother would not permit me to rest until I had given expression to my indignation. Unless Congress takes some action we will soon witness in a free republic a condition where citizens can not approach the President they have created without fear of bodily harm from arbitrary subordinates. In the name of American womanhood and American motherhood I protest against this outrageous action. It is a distinct lowering of the standards of American manhood. It is a violation of the sentiment that lies at the base of American civilization, American liberty, and American progress—the reverence of woman. Without this sentiment the Government is an empty pageantry and the flag a lie. The lady should have been permitted to remain. She would doubtless have left of her own volition if the situation had been politely and properly explained. The presence of an American mother honors any place, although it be the audience chamber of the President of the United States. [Applause.] When the President steps into the presence of an American mother he is before his superior. This action of his subordinates should be investigated. Sir, it is impossible in words to measure the sacredness of motherhood. It is the sweetest note in the great anthem the ages chant to God, and the radiance of His infinite mercy is reflected in a mother's smiles, a mother's tears, a mother's prayers, a mother's love.

A mother's love,
If there be one thing pure,
Where all else besides is sullied,
That can endure
When all things else have passed away,
If there be aught
Surpassing human deed, or word, or thought,
It is a mother's love.

[Applause.]

Not until the tired hands that supported the cares of infancy and ministered to the developing years have been folded forever, not until the tired eyes grown dim and weary with the anxious vigilance of countless hours and endless days and nights that seemed eternal have closed in pallid death do we begin to grasp the depth and tenderness of this mother love.

If Congress, composed of American fathers, nusbands, brothers, permits this incident to go unrebuked it will add a passive and cowardly approval of this violation of the most sacred principle of American life. [Applause.] The reverence of woman is the supreme mark of civilization. The ultimate destiny of the Republic is in her control, for the whispers of the mother become the thunders of the law. The world was ever happiest when woman was most free. In all the channels of human activity, in all the records of human martyrdom, self-sacrifice, and valor her example is unapproached by man. We need but mention the loyalty of Artemisia to the memory of Mausolus, the devotion of Margaret Roper to Sir Thomas More, the affection of Eleanor for Edward, the heroism of Lucy Hutchinson in the castle of Newark, the daring of Catherine Herman at the siege of Ostend, the fortitude of Lady Russell, the elo-

quence of Cornelia, the constancy of Madame Lavergne. The discovery of the American continent, on which have been wrought out the elemental problems of representative government, of practical science, and of every form of progress, the very existence of the American Republic, is due primarily to a woman.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the bill. I dislike to deprive the Democratic party of this new issue, but still I must insist that it is not germane to the discussion of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is raised, and if it is insisted on the Chair will have to rule upon it.

Mr. PAYNE. I insist upon it, or I should not have made it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion, and finds himself sustained by former rulings, that in Committee of the Whole House a Member must confine himself to the subject, but it has been universally held that in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union a Member need not confine himself to the bill or subject under debate. [Applause on the Democratic side].

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say that there are many rulings in that book to the contrary; that Members must confine themselves to the bill under discussion, whether in Committee of the Whole House or in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and it has been repeatedly so held.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not find any case in which a Member in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union has been required in general debate to confine himself to the bill under discussion.

Mr. PAYNE. I have held that myself. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will add that, as may be found in paragraph 885 of the Parliamentary Precedents of the House, on February 23, 1849, the question was squarely before the House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the Chairman, Mr. Hugh White, of New York, "held that, according to the universal usage, when the House was in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union all manner of matter was debated." An appeal was taken and the Chair was sustained. There has never been a contrary ruling from that time until the present day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Chair finds that according to paragraph 888, the House then being in Committee of the Whole House, not on the state of the Union, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] made a ruling that in that committee Members were confined to a discussion of the pending matter. It is, of course, so held in the House; but in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, in general debate, under the unbroken precedents of the last fifty years or more, the ruling has been uniform that all manner of matter may be debated. Of course there are other ways in which a gentleman having the floor may violate rules and be out of order, but the Chair is unable to sustain the point as to germaneness. The point would be good in Committee of the Whole, but not in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union while general debate is in progress.

Mr. PAYNE. Under the ruling of the Chair, the Democratic party will have an opportunity to discuss the new issue they have discovered.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But, Mr. Chairman, this is a nonpartisan question. My resolution provides for Republican and Democratic representatives upon the committee. I would favor a majority of Republicans upon that committee. Republicans are American citizens as well as Democrats. There is absolutely no division, for whether we are Democrats or Republicans we honor women.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman had as facts what he states in his speech, does he not think it would be better to present them in the police court than in the House of Representatives?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, sir; a discussion of the dignity of the American woman is not out of place in the House of Representatives or anywhere else, and to suggest the police court is to cast a reflection upon the subject. I regret that the gentleman has endeavored to prevent a discussion of this character, a subject which we all meet with perfect unanimity.

I shall not say very much further on this subject. I said that the very existence of the American Republic was due primarily to a woman. If Isabella had not risked her personal fortune in support of the strange, almost fantastic, project of Columbus, no ships would have ever left the Spanish shore. And it is especially fitting that in a country which so largely owes its being and its progress to a woman's courage, the love of woman should signalize the sublimest attribute of its people. The mothers of the race should be the objects of its most unselfish devotion. They are the basis of the home; the support of industry; the hope of government; the crown of law. Their gentle ministrations have in every age uplifted honor, illumined life, sustained ambition, adorned success, and lightened sorrow. They give to society its surest guard; to progress its swiftest wing; to humanity its purest jewel. And the American mother is earth's highest type of purity and perfection. Above all the monarchs and titled dignitaries of all the courts of history I place the American mother, whose empire is the American home. Out of respect and reverence for her I trust that my resolution will be adopted. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to occupy a moment or two before yielding for the purpose of rising.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Ohio give way for a moment until the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. GRANGER]?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I have welcomed the introduction of this bill and the discussion it has aroused, not so much from any results which I anticipate from its passage (for I am not sanguine that its results will be especially marked in the revival of commerce in the Philippines, any more than I fear the results upon any industry in America), but rather, sir, because I believe this bill is a substantial recognition of the duty this Government assumed when it seized the Philippine Islands, a duty none the less binding because the Supreme Court has decided that it is not an obligation. If it should lead, Mr. Chairman, to a strong and successful movement to sever the strictly artificial ties which bind us to those far-off islands, I should rejoice all the more. But I welcome the bill even more, Mr. Chairman, because it has given opportunity upon the floor of this House for a discussion of the tariff, a discussion which will not down, a discussion which only reflects the growing discontent which I believe exists among the people of this country with the present Dingley rates. I welcome it if for nothing else because it has resulted in the true statements on the Republican side of the House of the relative values of low-priced and high-priced labor. That of itself is worth all the time this House has spent on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed one moment more. I understand that while I was absent from the floor of the House to-day the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] referred to the demand of the people of my State for free wool, and I also am told by my colleague from Rhode Island that he stated to the gentleman from Ohio that there was no demand for free wool in Rhode Island.

I understand that the gentleman spoke for his portion of Rhode Island. I wish to say here that there are two Members from Rhode Island on the floor of this House and that one of them has made a successful campaign twice in the State on the issue of free wool, so that there must be some demand for free wool in the State of Rhode Island.

This is a bill, Mr. Chairman, which, at least on its face, seems to be the result of that "aroused public conscience and higher sense of ethical conduct," the necessity for which was but recently urged upon us by the President. Our friends of the majority have been suddenly impressed that something must be done for the Philippines. They have, after five years of comparatively peaceful possession, during which time we have subjected our wards to a treatment differing only slightly from that accorded foreign nations—after five years, I say, of such possession they have discovered that as the islands are part and parcel of the territory of the United States it is inconsistent to treat them as though they were foreigners, and so it is proposed to take them around to the back door—not yet to the open front door, but to the back door, so to speak—to be given not the real position of children in the family, but just that of stepchildren, with a promise that if later on, after they have grown old enough and big enough and strong enough to support themselves and not be any expense to the mother, then the bars may all be taken down and they may be acknowledged as part and parcel of the family.

I was especially pleased, Mr. Chairman, at the reason given by the able and distinguished gentleman from New York as to why this step had not been taken before. It was, he said, because the little brown men "had not been good enough." "We postponed it until they got upon their good behavior," he said, as though the way to pacify a people struggling for their independence and to content them with the new rule was to deny them the application of a principle of government which he says has been admitted since the adoption of the Constitution. It might occur to some, Mr. Chairman, that a way to gain the confidence of a new people strange to our ways might have been to have shown them at once the advantage of being a part of

the United States, and not to have violated one of the fundamental principles of the Government in our efforts to force our rule upon them. They had, alas for them, while suffering from the yoke of Spain, had their thoughts turned to the greatest instance in history of a great colonial uprising, and had studied so closely the history of the American war of independence that they also determined to be free and independent, and that they would not longer allow the rule of a country across the seas, although closely allied to them by ties of common speech, religion, and social intercourse. When they found, sir, that their hope was destroyed, that those to whom they had learned to look as the great example to liberty-loving people all over the world had themselves taken the place of the power they would overthrow, is it surprising that for a time the old struggle, the old aspiration, the old longing for liberty, remained? And even allowing for the moment (what I do not believe) that it was our duty to force our rule, the rule of a foreign state, upon them, yet does it seem really befitting a great nation, bent upon a great philanthropic duty, to punish such a people by denying them the only logical consistent treatment to which the position we had thrust upon them entitled them?

It was a curious anticlimax, Mr. Chairman, that a war entered into to free one struggling colony from the yoke of Spain should have resulted in placing the yoke of the liberator upon another struggling Spanish colony.

It will be readily recalled, Mr. Chairman, that a distinguished member of the late President McKinley's Cabinet referred to our exploitation of the Philippines as an opportunity for "philanthropy and 5 per cent to go hand in hand." Alas, Mr. Chairman, if we are to believe the report accompanying the bill and the evidence taken before the Ways and Means Committee and before the gentlemen who visited the Philippines last summer, 5 per cent and philanthropy have parted company, and there seems to be real reason to doubt whether they really ever reached the archipelago. According to the statement of the report upon this bill 3½ per cent is all that American capital can expect in those islands to-day, and American capital is not seeking investment at 3½ per cent 3,000 miles from home in a broken-down Asiatic colony.

I do not intend in the limited time at my disposal to-day to enter into any detailed description of the present condition in that island, but it is perhaps sufficient simply to refer to the glowing pictures which were painted of the opportunity for American enterprise when a United States official at Manila could write home (in 1898): "I hope for an influx this year of 10,000 ambitious young Americans, and all can live here well and become rich." Why, Mr. Chairman, those islands have become the graveyard of thousands of such hopes. It appears that from September, 1898, to May, 1904, a total of about 5,000 American individuals and firms were licensed to trade in Manila, and that to-day only about 750 remain. The mortality among these American business houses is not less than 80 per cent, and if we deduct the number engaged in the liquor traffic (183) and those whose business is entirely with soldiers and American civil officials the number becomes less than 500, an insignificant number.

It is admitted on all hands that the condition of these islands is indeed pitiable to-day. Mr. McLeod, representing the Manila Chamber of Commerce, described last summer the commerce of the islands as in a state of collapse. "The worst crisis ever known in the annals of Philippine history," Mr. McLeod describes it. The devastation of a long-drawn-out and bloody war left ruined fields and villages and deprived the islands of thousands of men in the very prime of life who were needed to build up what our policy of beneficent assimilation had destroyed. The war had been followed, as is so often the case, by years of bad crops and by dire disease. The beasts of burden so humorously described by the gentleman from New York had been destroyed not only by disease, but as a war measure by our troops; fields had lain fallow; machinery, rude and crude at the best, had been even more unfitted for use by months of idleness, until at length even the apathy of the majority of the House is awakened and a remedy is sought. It is, they say, to be found in the bill now before the House.

The report of the committee and the opening address of its distinguished chairman recite the views with which we are familiar from the papers and testimony of Secretary Taft; views which the committee adopted and, partially at least, proposes to put into operation. We are not ready, say the majority of the committee, to give the islands free trade with the United States, but we will let down the bars partially, trusting that during the next three years the financial condition of the islands will sufficiently improve to allow of absolute free trade by 1909. Let us look for a few moments, Mr. Chairman, at this gift to the Filipino. The old adage that a gift horse must not be looked in the mouth does not apply to the giver. We are anxious, so we say, to enlarge the market for Philippine sugar and tobacco. It is conceded that it is sorely needed. With this end in view the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means propose to reduce the Dingley tariff rates on sugar and tobacco by 75 per cent, but conscious, as they are, that any attempt to touch the Dingley rates (save to raise them) will result in strong opposition from their own side they say, in effect, "But do not be disturbed; this reduction is simply for appearance only. It can not affect any industry in the United States, because the import of neither of these products will be increased by this change." Why, the gentleman from New York, in his opening remarks, says, with characteristic frankness:

> Now, Mr. Chairman, what will be the effect of the passage of this bill * * * upon the sugar industry in the Philippine Islands? I do not believe that it is going to give them a market in the United States. I do not believe it is relief enough to help them here; at least I am very much in doubt about it.

He goes on to prove, and does prove very satisfactorily, I believe, that Philippine sugar can not be put down in New York in competition with that of our own growth and that of Cuba, Hawaii, and Porto Rico. No help, then, is to be expected to the Philippines from this quarter, because there will be no market for it; but the gentleman sagely and wisely remarks, following the report of the committee, that it will stimulate the market in China and Japan. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the testimony taken last summer before the Members of the House, it was stated that while China and Japan would purchase Philippine sugar, yet so long as there was no market for it in the United States and while there was no real demand for it elsewhere the merchants of China could practically fix the price of the Philippine product, and that they did so, to the great loss of the Philippine producer.

And now, Mr. Chairman, our friends propose to stimulate their eastern market; they propose to stimulate the price in China. How? By pretending to create a market for Philippine sugar here in America, while in reality there is to be no market. And the simple-minded Chinese merchant is to be so impressed by this new market that he will at once raise his bid for Philippine sugar. It is a pretty scheme, is it not, Mr. Chairman? And those who know at all the astute Chinese merchant will not wonder how it will work. The report and the claims of the committee for the bill in their efforts to allay alarm prove too much. If the effects of the bill are as inappreciable as claimed, it will do no good. It is a gold brick, Mr. Chairman, intended to allay the suspicions which have been aroused, the discontent which is growing over our indefinite and costly and unsuccessful occupation of those islands. It is a pure case of Buncombe, of a promise made of none effect, of a mountain laboring and bringing forth a mouse.

The bill which the minority of the committee will present as an amendment to this bill will not, in my opinion, do much more for the islands than the one under consideration, but it has the great advantage that it squarely faces the issue; that it will, if adopted, put an end to our farcical colonial policy by which we differentiate between our insular possessions, and make fish of one and fowl of another. It puts the Philippines in the same class as Hawaii and Porto Rico. It ceases to treat them as foreign territory while at the same time insisting that they are under our flag for an indefinite period of time.

The only argument urged by the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means against taking down the tariff bars between the United States and the Philippine Islands and treating them as we do our other insular possessions—Hawaii and Porto Rico—is the loss of revenue to the insular government from the repeal of the import duty on goods taken into the islands, an amount at the most not to exceed $1,400,000 a year for the next three years. That sum, however, I believe to be largely excessive. The import duties from Spain into the islands amount to about $600,000 a year, and it is argued that under article 4 of the treaty of Paris, by which it was agreed that "the United States will for the term of ten years from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty admit Spanish ships and merchandise to the ports of the Philippine Islands on the same terms as ships and merchandise of the United States," would in the event of the repeal of all duties between the United States and the islands, in each direction, admit ipso facto all Spanish goods free of duty. But, Mr. Chairman, this position can not be maintained by Spain unless she also gives to the products of the islands the same free entrance that the United States will give under the substitute bill. The admission of American merchandise into the Philippines would be accompanied by an admission of Philippine merchandise free of duty into the United States, and to entitle Spain to the admission of her goods free in the islands she must adopt the "same terms"

as those on which the goods of the United States are admitted—that is, a free interchange on both sides. If it is argued that Spain would do this, it is only necessary to point out that Spain is tied up by treaty with nearly every country of Europe by the "most favored nation" clause, and could not take this step without granting equal privilege to every other nation.

We have, then, nothing to fear from loss of import duties on Spanish goods, and the estimated loss is therefore reduced to $800,000, but this can not be estimated as a yearly deficit of that amount in the island revenues. If the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is correct in his statement, the income of the internal revenues of the islands is increasing at such a rate that at the expiration of the next three years it will be equal to the import duties now received from the United States and Spain; that is, some $1,400,000 per annum. If the islands continue to receive, sir, the duties on Spanish goods, the deficit will not be three times the amount received from the United States.

But, Mr. Chairman, is it not possible that the result of this loss of revenue from imports into the islands from the United States may be some economy in the cost of the administration of the government we have set up in the Philippines? We talk so much of the benefit of American rule in the islands, of the schools we have established, of the harbor we have created in the port of Manila, of the roads we have built, of the buildings we have erected for housing our officials that we are apt to lose sight of the fact that all this has been paid for by the Filipinos themselves out of their own diminished funds, and that it includes the entire salary list of the American officials, of whom four alone receive a sum aggregating $65,500 per annum.

I don't think I exaggerate when I say that the administration of the Philippine Islands, under rule of the United States, is the most costly colonial government in existence. Mr. McLeod, in his testimony before the visiting Congressmen last summer, stated that the salary list of the islands to-day is greater than the entire Spanish budget for the last year of Spain's rule. But I desire to call the attention of the House to a statement in regard to the expenses made by a man familiar for many years with the cost of colonial government, and I read from Ireland's The Far Eastern Tropics (p. 226):

> With an export trade of $32,000,000, the Philippine Islands are called upon to pay $12,500,000 for the expense of the insular government; in other words, every $100 worth of produce exported from the islands costs the General Government $40. If to this we add $2,500,000 collected in the islands for municipal and provincial government, the ratio of expenditure on Government account to value of exports is raised to 46 per cent.
>
> That a country should have to pay 46 per cent of the value of its total industrial product, excluding a comparatively insignificant internal trade in local produce, for the privilege of being governed, is obviously absurd; and although a dependent tropical government is always expensive, from the fact that the administration is very much better than could arise naturally as a product of native activity, that of the Philippines is much more expensive than it should be.
>
> Comparing the cost of government, on the basis adopted above, with that of five British dependencies in various parts of the Tropics—Ceylon, Barbados, British Guiana, Trinidad, and the Federated Malay States—the average is 27 per cent, as against 46 per cent in the Philippines.

Secretary Taft, in his speech at Montpelier, Vt., August 26, 1904, said:

> Judge Parker, the candidate of the party, falls into the error of saying that the Philippines cost us $650,000,000, when by no possible calculation can their cost be made to exceed $250,000,000 down to the present time.

Secretary Taft thus admits the expenditure upon the Philippine Islands for the five years previous to the date of his utterance was about $50,000,000 per annum. Judge Parker charges that the expenditure was about $130,000,000 per annum. Secretary Taft nor Judge Parker give itemized statements of account. It is fair to say, then, that the expense of the Philippine Islands to the United States lies between $50,000,000 and $130,000,000 per annum, or an average of about $75,000,000 per annum. During that time, according to the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs for 1904, the insular revenues, amounting to about $65,000,000, were also expended. The insular revenues and expenditures seem to be an unknown quantity in this argument. Mr. PAYNE states that the revenue can not stand free trade for tobacco and sugar, but he does not state what the revenues are. The Report of the Philippine Commission, three immense volumes, two-thirds of which is made up of entirely useless matter, does not state them. The only itemized statement that I have been able to find is the report of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, above referred to, for the five years—1899 to 1904. The total expenditures are there placed at about $60,000,000, or about $12,000,000 per annum. This excludes the expense of the Army of the United States; also the insular salary and expense fund to cover the cost of transportation to Manila, which, according to the report referred to, amounted to $63,555. Nor does it include the bond issues authorized for railroads and for the purchase of the friar lands.

Specimens of the Philippine Commission salaries.

Luke E. Wright, civil governor	$15,000
Luke E. Wright, president, in addition	5,000
Dean C. Worcester, secretary of interior	10,500
Dean C. Worcester, member, in addition	5,000
Henry C. Ide, secretary of finance	10,500
Henry C. Ide, member, in addition	5,000
James F. Smith, secretary public instruction	10,500
James F. Smith, member, in addition	5,000
A. W. Ferguson, executive secretary	7,500
Total	74,000

Besides a salary list of 117 closely printed pages of employees, numbering several thousand.

We have tried the impossible, Mr. Chairman; we have tried to "hurry the East;" we have tried to turn into "hustling" Yankees an oriental race that had for three centuries been under the molding hand of the slowest, most conservative country in Europe. Let our Commission go a little slowly out there; let them set their own house in order and cease to pay to Americans brought there with no knowledge of the islands or familiarity with eastern colonial methods salaries three times those paid to educated Filipinos for the same work; let them cease to strive to make the little Filipinos cry for "flannel petticoats and moral pocket handkerchiefs," and perhaps they may be able to run the islands somewhere near what it costs Great Britain for similar work, and then there would be no deficit from loss of import duties.

But, Mr. Chairman, even if the minority bill is rejected, as I presume it will be, yet, sir, I shall support the present bill, as a recognition of the right position which the country should assume toward these islands and so long as we shall continue to hold them. God grant that the day may come when we shall recognize for them the same rights which we so long ago demanded successfully for ourselves against the very same argument of unfitness for self-government which we now hear from the other side. I believe, sir, that the people of this country are coming to the conclusion which I saw the other day had been reached by Commissioner Schurman, that "a bad government of the islands by the Filipinos is better than a good government of them by anyone else," because, sir, I believe that is true of every people. I believe that self-government can only be worked out by letting a people govern themselves. But I do not believe, sir, that it is necessary that there should be bad government in the Philippines. I believe that the resolution introduced by my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS], as well as the one introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], points the way to a stable form of self-government of the Philippine Islands by the Filipinos, and the relief of the United States from this "Old Man of the Sea" burden, which has been from the beginning a source of financial loss which we shall never make good, a constant menace to our security at home, as the defense of the islands in case of war would hopelessly divide our Navy; but, more than all, Mr. Chairman, a standing contradiction of the fundamental principle on which our country rests, the inherent right of self-government.

Such a change of sentiment is not too much to express. Changes of sentiment are coming somewhat quickly nowadays. I confess, sir, that I never expected to hear from the leader on the other side of the House a frank avowal of the Democratic doctrine that low-priced labor is not necessarily cheap labor; that labor is cheap or dear depends entirely upon what it can produce. Why, Mr. Chairman, that has been Democratic doctrine from the beginning; it has been enunciated from this side of the House for more years than any man in it has lived. The lowest priced labor is generally the dearest. And now, Mr. Chairman, the day has come when the leader of the Republican majority of the House stands at his place and says:

> They talk about cheap labor. Why, labor is worth what it will do; what it is sufficient for.

And then he goes on to state what no Democrat will deny, that dollar a day labor in Louisiana or two-dollar a day labor in Michigan will produce more and is therefore cheaper than 30 cents a day labor in the Philippines. It is what we have all been contending for on this side of the House when you have talked about bringing American labor into competition with the "pauper labor" of Europe. We have told you that American labor is worth more, because the American laborer is more intelligent, more industrious, more ambitious, takes more readily to new ideas and new methods, and can therefore produce more, and that higher wages paid to him are cheaper than lower wages paid abroad. We welcome the gentleman from New York to the ranks of the tariff reformers. But, Mr. Chairman, not only from the gentleman from New York, but from other gentlemen on the other side we have heard good Democratic

doctrine. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], in speaking of the special legislation for the beet-sugar people of Colorado and Michigan and a few other States, speaks of it as a "charity." It is a charity, Mr. Chairman, if that can be charity which consists of taking from the pockets of the whole people and bestowing it upon a few, but it is the foundation principle of the ultraprotection policy to which the Republican party stands committed, and the result is exactly as the gentleman from Illinois stated. You give it as a "charity" for temporary use and the recipients soon call it a right and can not find language strong enough to denounce you when you insist upon some rights for the rest of the people. That is good Democratic doctrine, Mr. Chairman, and we welcome it wherever it comes from. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPRON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in one sentence that I am glad for the first time to learn that my colleague from Rhode Island has made a campaign with free wool for an issue. Nobody in Rhode Island ever heard of it before. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I was not unaware of the rules of the House applicable to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when I made the point of order, which I did not press, against the course that the young gentleman from Texas was taking. But I did it, and made the point of order, for the purpose of calling his attention in a sort of mild and fatherly kind of a protest against the course that he was taking, thinking and hoping that in his own interests he would waive any further denunciation of the President and permit the women of the world, made notorious and famous and delightful in history, song, and poetry, to have stood on the laurels that they have already won until a future day.

The gentleman from Texas has introduced a resolution into this House demanding an investigation of the unfortunate affair that is said to have occurred at the office of the White House, and that resolution is pending before the proper committee of the House. It asks for the facts in the case, and I had supposed that upon the mere suggestion the gentleman would have seen fit to wait for the facts until that resolution could be brought into the House and properly acted upon, if it ever is acted upon, and then the facts be developed.

In this connection I am going to say that I know of no difference between the propriety of conduct in the management of the President's office and the President's house and that of the humblest citizen of the District of Columbia. I do not believe that the American Congress is a police court or has anything to do with the question of disorderly conduct of any attaché or employee that may be in the neighborhood of the White House. I do not believe that any condition has arisen where the husband of this woman can not take the proper steps to vindicate her. I am not one of those who believe that a sensation should be sent abroad to the world denouncing and assailing the honor and integrity and character of the American administration of government by any haphazard remarks of this character.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3—the Philippine tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for your consideration, certain papers which should have accompanied my message of January 8, 1906, but which were omitted on account of delay in printing.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1906.*

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. RIXEY was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of James Downs, Forty-seventh Congress, no adverse report having been made there on.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Postmaster-General submitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the postal service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the House resolution (H. Res. 117) requesting the Attorney-General to furnish information relative to criminal prosecutions in re the Northern Securities case, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 163); which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEARRE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3127) providing for the holding of Federal court at Grand Island, Nebr., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 164); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 10953, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 142) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of the legal representatives of William A. Henderson, deceased, accompanied by a report (No. 160); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 10952, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. 143) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of W. C. Waldrop, accompanied by report (No. 161); which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1179) granting a pension to Thomas Picket, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 162); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOGG, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1056) granting a pension to Galen S. Clevenger, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 165); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1809) granting a pension to Lena McNabb, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 166); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3245) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Smith, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 167); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3575) granting an increase of pension to Silas B. Hovious, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 168); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4176) granting an increase of pension to Michael Mohan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 169); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4177) granting a pension to Susan H. Chadsey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 170);

which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4216) granting an increase of pension to Robert Boon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 171); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4740) granting an increase of pension to Ransom L. Logan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 172); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6116) granting a pension to John Gainsback, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 173); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6518) granting an increase of pension to James M. Long, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 174); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7878) granting an increase of pension to Ann Betts, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 175); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8659) granting an increase of pension to James Powers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 176); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8689) granting a pension to Frank P. Haas, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 177); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8832) granting a pension to William F. Heed, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 178); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9130) granting an increase of pension to John Brinkley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 179); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10352) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Boush, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 180); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6166) granting a pension to Else C. Isachsen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 181); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAMAR: A bill (H. R. 11263) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the navigable waters of St. Andrews Bay—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 11264) to authorize the commencement and conduct of legal proceedings under the direction of the Attorney-General—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 11265) providing that the isthmian canal be constructed by the Engineer Department of the United States Army, under the direction, supervision, and control of the Isthmian Canal Commission, and that the work of constructing the canal be done by contract—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 11266) for an appropriation for enlarging the Government building at Jackson, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 11267) to revive and amend "An act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of frauds in insurrectionary districts within the United States," and acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11268) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Indians of the Colville Reservation, in Washington, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 11269) to fix the compensation of United States commissioners residing on the Rio Grande border between the United States and Mexico—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 11270) to construct and place a light-ship off Point Judith, R. I.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 11271) to compel common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to own their own equipments, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 11272) providing for a detailed survey of Guyandotte River, in West Virginia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 11273) to incorporate the National German-American Alliance—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 11274) to provide free mail transmission in the presentation for payment of executed vouchers for pension—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 11275) increasing the penalty for certain offenses in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 11276) to amend the homestead laws of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 11277) to amend section 49 of an act entitled "An act to reduce the revenue and equalize duties on imports, and for other purposes," approved October 1, 1890, and section 68 of the act of August 27, 1894, entitled "An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILEY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 11278) authorizing the extension of Bancroft place, between Twenty-fourth street and Massachusetts avenue—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEE, from the Committee on War Claims: A resolution (H. Res. 142) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 10953—to the Private Calendar.

Also, from the same committee, a resolution (H. Res. 143) referring to the Court of Claims the bill H. R. 10952—to the Private Calendar.

By Mr. BEDE: A resolution (H. Res. 145) that A. Lucas, L. W. Pulies, Robert Coates, and Albert Scott, cloakroom men, be classified as skilled laborers—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A resolution (H. Res. 146) authorizing Mr. L. P. Spinner to paint eighteen oil portraits of ex-Speakers—to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 11279) to remove the charge of absence without leave from the military record of Oscar O. Bowen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 11280) granting a pension to David S. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11281) granting an increase of pension to William A. Tyler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11282) granting an increase of pension to William D. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11283) for the relief of Harriett M. Crank—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11284) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Ruark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11285) granting an increase of pension to William Kirkpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11286) granting an increase of pension to Fred Am—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11287) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hensley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11288) granting an increase of pension to James L. Goodman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11289) granting an increase of pension to William Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11290) granting a pension to Charles May—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11291) granting a pension to Robert Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11292) granting a pension to Christena Burton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11293) granting a pension to Mary Goodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11294) granting a pension to William A. Vice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11295) granting a pension to Charles C. Huff—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11296) granting a pension to Harriett Diamond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11297) granting a pension to David McGinnis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11298) granting a pension to Martha J. Withrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11299) granting a pension to James M. Mallale—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11300) granting a pension to Charles Kennan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12301) granting an increase of pension to L. B. Sparks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 11302) granting an increase of pension to John R. Cotton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11303) granting a pension to Joseph Matthews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: A bill (H. R. 11304) granting an increase of pension to William L. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11305) granting a pension to Katherine McIntyre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11306) granting an increase of pension to John C. Parkinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 11307) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 11308) granting a pension to Henry Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11309) for the relief of the heirs of Sim Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 11310) granting a pension to Emma Aldred—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON (by request): A bill (H. R. 11311) to restore to the active list of the Navy the name of Homer Lycurgus Law—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 11312) to correct the military record of John J. Troxell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11313) to correct the military record of Lanson Zane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11314) to correct the military record of Eli Metcalf—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11315) granting an increase of pension to Silas S. Hiner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11316) granting an increase of pension to George B. Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11317) granting a pension to William M. Love—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11318) granting a pension to Sarah E. Helpman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11319) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Weaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11320) granting an increase of pension to Adam Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 11321) for the relief of J. A. Gallaher, administrator of the estate of Joseph H. Gallaher, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 11322) granting an increase of pension to Luther H. Starkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 11323) for the relief of Julius A. Nemitz, of Oshkosh, Wis.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 11324) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. MacGowan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11325) granting an increase of pension to Jerusha H. Wiles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11326) granting an increase of pension to Alvin W. Avery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11327) granting an increase of pension to Nelson L. Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11328) granting an increase of pension to Philip Twining—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11329) granting a pension to Whitmore Sullivan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 11330) to correct the naval record of Andrew Keefe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELD: A bill (H. R. 11331) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Rowan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11332) granting an increase of pension to William F. Kenner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 11333) granting a pension to George W. Speer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11334) granting an increase of pension to John M. Steel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 11335) granting a pension to Thomas J. Chandler—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11336) to correct the military record of John C. Kapp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11337) to correct the military record of Charles Chaney—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11338) to correct the military record of John Peter Kronmiller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11339) to correct the military record of Labon Blair—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11340) granting a pension to John H. Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11341) for the relief of E. B. Caldwell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 11342) granting a pension to Silas Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11343) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Bolen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11344) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smithers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11345) granting an increase of pension to J. F. Kempton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 11346) to complete the military record of Adolphus Erwin Wells—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 11347) granting an increase of pension to John E. Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11348) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia Vernon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 11349) for the relief of Hiram B. Crowell and William H. Jones—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11350) for the relief of John L. Burt, administrator of Mrs. Susan Burt—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 11351) granting a pension to Mary Colcord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 11352) granting a pension to Ella V. Hamel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELIHER: A bill (H. R. 11353) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Woodworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11354) granting an increase of pension to E. Bradford Gay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11355) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus S. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11356) granting an increase of pension to Frank Lovely—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11357) granting a pension to Simon Shea—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11358) granting a pension to James F. Gerry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11359) to remove the charges of desertion and fraudulent enlistment against Robert Conroy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 11360) granting a pension to John Sylvester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11361) granting a pension to Thomas A. Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11362) granting a pension to Nicholas A. Bovee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11363) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11364) granting an increase of pension to Richard Allbery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11365) granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 11366) for the relief of the estate of Wiliam B. Todd, deceased—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 11367) granting an increase of pension to Manning Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLEPPER: A bill (H. R. 11368) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11369) granting a pension to Patrick Deneen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11370) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Griffin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 11371) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Wharton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 11372) for the relief of John M. Johnson, administrator of Daniel J. Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 11373) granting an increase of pension to George A. Foster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11374) granting an increase of pension to Fanny L. Conine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11375) to place Pendleton G. Watmough upon the retired list of the Navy as lieutenant-commander—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 11376) to resubmit the claim of David H. Hilderbrand to the Court of Claims with instruction to enter judgment and return same to Congress—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11377) to pay the heirs of D. F. Lansing the sum of $15,000 for services rendered and supplies furnished to the Bool Dam Indians of California—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 11378) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint George M. Chandler a second lieutenant in the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 11379) granting an increase of pension to Martin H. Black—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11380) granting an increase of pension to Angeline Baldwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11381) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Hartsough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11382) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Cochran—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11383) granting an increase of pension to Rudolph Burkhart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 11384) granting an increase of pension to Silas McFowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11385) granting an increase of pension to George Halock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11386) granting an increase of pension to Samuel V. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11387) granting an increase of pension to James M. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11388) granting an increase of pension to Konrad Schleicher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11389) granting an increase of pension to William H. Grandaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11390) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Cullers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11391) granting a pension to John Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11392) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11393) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. P. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11394) granting an increase of pension to William O'Keefe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11395) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Stewart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11396) granting a pension to George W. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11397) granting a pension to Annie M. George—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11398) granting a pension to Susan Cleveland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11399) to correct the muster of Albert W. Keller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 11400) granting an increase of pension to Frank Cart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11401) granting an increase of pension to William Kling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11402) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Layser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11403) granting an increase of pension to David E. Longsdorf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11404) granting an increase of pension to William Lukens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11405) granting an increase of pension to John R. Meredith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11406) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Meredith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11407) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca M. Missemer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11408) granting an increase of pension to George W. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11409) granting an increase of pension to Josiah H. Seabold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11410) granting a pension to Emma Handshaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11411) granting a pension to Martin P. Schaffner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11412) to correct the military record of Philip B. Beidel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11413) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Reuben Seiler—to the Committee on Mlitary Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11414) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Keys—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 11415) granting an increase of pension to Victoria Bishop—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE: A bill (H. R. 11416) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Belk—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 11417) granting an increase of pension to Amanda J. Cowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11418) granting an increase of pension to William H. Teeling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11419) granting an increase of pension to James E. Fulton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11420) granting an increase of pension to Elijah S. Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11421) granting an increase of pension to James E. Wentworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11422) granting an increase of pension to George B. True—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11423) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Hooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11424) granting an increase of pension to Stephen W. Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11425) granting an increase of pension to John Kearney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11426) granting an increase of pension to Theodore B. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11427) granting an increase of pension to Warren L. Whitney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11428) granting a pension to Celestia M. Sawyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11429) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Clifford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11430) granting a pension to Ephraim L. Chadburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 11431) for the relief of the estate of Mary A. Mededith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11432) for the relief of Washington West—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11433) for the relief of the estate of John R. Temple, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11434) for the relief of M. W. Stewart—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11435) for the relief of the estate of Martha Keller and Jacob Keller, both deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 11436) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Tubbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11437) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McCann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11438) granting a pension to Ann E. Blank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11439) granting a pension to Sabina O'Donnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 11440) for the relief of Franklin S. Cowan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11441) granting an increase of pension to Abram B. Stoner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11442) granting an increase of pension to Harman H. Hurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIBLEY: A bill (H. R. 11443) granting an increase of pension to John Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11444) granting an increase of pension to Jackson McCoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11445) granting an increase of pension to F. M. Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11446) granting an increase of pension to Charles Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11447) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Van Naten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11448) granting an increase of pension to Lavinia Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11449) granting a pension to Andrew Highbarger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11450) to grant an honorable discharge to Morgan Combs, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11451) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Boyle, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 11452) granting a pension to William Bunnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11453) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Croom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11454) granting an increase of pension to William Bunnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11455) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Hanes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11456) granting an increase of pension to De Witt C. Ridenour—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11457) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Van Matre—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11458) granting an increase of pension to Elkanah Ball—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11459) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Levi—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11460) granting an increase of pension to John W. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11461) granting an increase of pension to Joseph O'Neal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11462) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Sink—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11463) granting an increase of pension to John Markley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11464) granting an increase of pension to John Newlands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11465) to remove the charge of desertion against Lindley Beaumont—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 11466) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Heald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELBORN: A bill (H. R. 11467) granting a pension to D. E. W. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11468) granting a pension to John Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11469) granting a pension to William K. Whittaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11470) granting a pension to Ozias Hawkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11471) granting a pension to John H. Priestley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11472) granting a pension to Thomas Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11473) granting a pension to Overton C. Hern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11474) granting a pension to Samuel H. Gott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11475) granting a pension to John Gerdts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11476) granting a pension to Andrew S. Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11477) granting a pension to Nicholas Potter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11478) granting a pension to George W. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11479) granting a pension to Joseph J. Bodenhamer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11480) granting a pension to Fielding W. Means—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11481) for the relief of the Flat Creek Baptist Church, of Pettis County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11482) restoring the name of Sophrona Pursley to the pension rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 11483) granting a pension to Maria Niles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11484) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A resolution (H. Res. 110) directing the Clerk of the House to pay to Butler B. Hare a certain sum of money—Committee on Accounts discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 1449) for the relief of the estate of Brig. Gen. Wager Swayne—Committee on Accounts discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8896) to cancel charge of $26.26 against Lieut. John W. Ward—Committee on Accounts discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 9215) authorizing the reopening and readjustment of the accounts of Maj. Thomas Dewees—Committee on Accounts discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 8607) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Haire—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1951) to refer to the Court of Claims the war claims of the State of California—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 9530) granting a pension to Catherine Casey—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6962) granting an increase of pension to Richard Phillips, jr.—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the International Reform Bureau, B. B. Bassett, secretary, asking that the McCumber-Sperry bill be referred to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic instead of the Committee on Military Affairs—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Resolution Council, No. 6, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of John L. Beveridge et al., Volunteer Army of the United States, for a retired list of volunteer generals in the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Eureka Council, No. 38, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the Missouri Branch of the National German-American Alliance, in favor of reciprocal trade with Germany—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James B. Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: Petition of the Pilots' Association of Brunswick, Ga.; the Board of Pilot Commissioners of Brunswick, Ga.; the Commissioners of Roads and Revenues of Glynn County, Ga., and the Board of Trade of Brunswick, Ga., against discrimination against American sailing vessels in the coasting trade—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROWNE: Protest of farmers of Medford, Wis., against any reduction of import duty on sugar from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Thomas Rowan, of Brazos County, Tex., asking an increase of pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jacob C. Barkley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William L. Spencer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Michael Nessline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Wilcox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Horace Hounsom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Katherine McIntire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Eureka Council, No. 38, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Pittsburg Post-Office Clerks' Beneficial Association, favoring new classification bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Levi Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petition of German Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, for an amendment of the oleomargarine law of 1886—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Western Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., against spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CURRIER: Petition of the Prescott Piano Company, of Concord, N. H., against revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FIELD: Petition of soldiers of the Mexican war, for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the National German Association of America, for a reciprocity treaty between the United States and Germany—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, for bill (S. 1345) to reorganize the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of the Minnesota Fine Arts Association, for removal of duties on works of art—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of A. C. Bartlett, of Chicago, against joint statehood for Arizona and New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Thiebes-Stierlin Company, of Rockford, Ill., against tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the general assembly of Indiana for an auditorium in the national soldiers' cemetery at New Albany, Ind.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of John L. Beveredge, of the Volunteer Army of the United States, for a retired list of civil war volunteer generals—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the State Federation of Pennsylvania Women, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the State Federation of Pennsylvana Women, for enforcement of pure-food laws and national legislation on the subject—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the State Federation of Women, against the Mormon hierarchy and REED SMOOT's continuance as Senator—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of Highcliff Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GUDGER: Resolution of the Trades League of Philadelphia, asking legislation admitting certain classes of Chinese to this country as now applies to travelers from any other country—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Cannonville Council, No. 25; Cullusoga Council, No. 158; Lyons Council, No. 143; Virginia Springs Council; Bostic Council, No. 171; Cliffside Council, No. 136; French Broad Council; Henrietta Council, No. 61; Modock Council; Andrews Council, and Old Fort Council, No. 141, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of citizens of Paw Paw, Mich., against duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Henry M. Sheldon et al., asking for adoption of Gallinger amendment to the statehood bill—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HEDGE: Petition of manufacturers of Burlington, Iowa, against taxing domestic alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of citizens of Waco, Tex., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HUGHES: Petition of citizens of West Virginia, asking further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of Ben Miller Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JENKINS: Remonstrance of 16 citizens of Rice Lake, Wis., against reduction of import duty on sugar from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Papers in support of Abigail Townsend's pension claim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: Petition of Jordan Council, No. 746, and Star Lodge Council, No. 68, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Allentown, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of the Jacoby Furniture Company, of York, Pa., against tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE: Petition of John M. Johnson, administrator of Daniel Johnson, deceased, to have claim referred to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: Resolution of Council No. 29, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Swansea, S. C., asking restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Coles County, Ill., for the establishment of better commercial relations with Germany and France—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of the Middletown Machine Company and the New Era Gas Engine Company, against denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of West Manchester Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics; citizens of Dayton, Ohio; Branch No. 426, N. A. L. C., and citizens of Hamilton, Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of citizens of Hamilton and Dayton, and Branch No. 426, N. A. L. C., of Hamilton, Ohio, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of farmers and tobacco growers of Montgomery County, Ohio, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petition of Cumberland Valley Medical Association, for reorganization of the Army Medical Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Annville Council, No. 954; Elizabethville Council, No. 992; Star of Hope Council, No. 954; Mechanicsburg Council, No. 597; Royalton Council, No. 140; Steelton Council, No. 162, and Wiconisco Council, No. 57, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Washington Camp, No. 454, of Loyalton; Washington Camp, No. 54, of Williamstown, and Council No. 674, of Shippensburg, Patriotic Order Sons of America; Fredericksburg Lodge, No. 353, Independent Order of Odd Fellows; citizens of Fredericksburg, Myerstown, Shippensburg, and Harrisburg; Elizabethville Council and Steelton Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, all in Pennsylvania, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of the National Malleable Castings Company and the Long Knight Lumber Company, against tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAGE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Lizzie Belk, of Monroe, N. C.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Albert M. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, favoring an amendment of section 12 of the adminis-

tration act of June 10, 1890—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, favoring a bill for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of J. J. Robinson and others, of Bloomsburg, Pa., in favor of the Calderhead bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. E. Streak and others, in favor of restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Washington Chapter, No. 139, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Stevens Point, Pa., asking further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: Petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Easton, Pa., for the Hepburn-Dolliver bill regarding sale of liquor—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania State College, for extension of agricultural experiment stations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the General Synod of the Reformed Church of America, for abolition of Mormonism—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Southern Press Association, of New Orleans, for Federal control of quarantine—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Belfast, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Easton, Pa., against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the adjutant-general of Pennsylvania, favoring bills H. R. 1736 and S. 1442—to the Committee on the Militia.

Also, petition of C. L. Long, for action on the bill granting statehood to the State of Sequoyah—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring a reciprocity treaty with Germany—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., against spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Union, No. 466, of Easton, Pa., against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Knights of Malta, No. 135, of Lehighton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Easton Division, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Easton, Pa., favoring bills H. R. 7041 and S. 4092—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Owen S. Swartz and 11 others, of Lehighton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Onoko Lodge, No. 211, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, for bills H. R. 7041 and S. 4092—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Easton, Pa., for the McCumber-Sperry bill—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Easton, Pa., for separate statehood for the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of C. K. Ai, president of the Chinese Society of Honolulu, Hawaii, against wrongs suffered by Chinese in Hawaii—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill for relief of S. A. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Peter O. Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry C. Shaver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Sebastian S. Kissinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 397, of Ionia, Mich., against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of the Farmers' Union of Comanche County, Okla., for the opening of pasture reserve Indian lands in said county—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Cattle Growers' Association of Arizona, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petition of citizens of Winona, Minn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Good—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VAN WINKLE: Petition of citizens of New Jersey and Hudson Lodge, Knights of Pythias, of Jersey City, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEEMS: Petition of Martins Ferry Council, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Levi I. Shipman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petitions of Eureka Council, No. 54, of Hamilton Square; Woonasosa Tribe, No. 170; Washington Camp, No. 14, Patriotic Order Sons of America; Feldsboro Council, No. 52, of Bordentown; Washington Camp, No. 77, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Trenton; Anthony Wayne Council No. 159, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Newark; North Star Camp, No. 222, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Trenton; Nutley Council, No. 286, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Palmyra Camp, No. 23, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Palmyra, and Painters and Decorators' Union, No. 21, of Trenton, all in New Jersey, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *January 11, 1906.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, AND ELEVATOR RAILWAY COMPANY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, and Elevator Railway Company for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1905; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the Florists and Gardeners' Club, of Providence, R. I., praying for the admission of basic-slag meal free of duty; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Newport Horticultural Society, of Rhode Island, praying that increased appropriations be made for the support of agricultural experiment stations; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of White Pine Council, No. 8, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Whitepine, W. Va., and a petition of Burton Council, No. 74, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Burton, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration and for the revision of the laws governing naturalization; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the public affairs committee of the Commercial Club of Duluth, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment of a board of engineers to investigate and recommend a remedy whereby the loss of life and property may be reduced in the harbor of that city; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 98, Cigar Makers' International Union, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented a petition of Local Council No. 62, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Holcomb, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LONG presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Udall, Kans., remonstrating against the repeal of the present anti-

canteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Department of the Potomac, Grand Army of the Republic, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a temporary home in the District of Columbia for ex-soldiers and sailors in the late wars; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Belvue, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian and Oklahoma Territories when admitted to statehood; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of the Palmetto Club, of Daytona, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate child labor in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to restore the original names of streets in Columbia and Washington Heights, in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HEMENWAY presented a petition of Delaware Council, No. 4, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Muncie, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a revision of the naturalization laws of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the State board of health of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of the legislature of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation opening to homestead settlement lands in the Chippewa Indian Reservation in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, by an act of Congress introduced by our Senator NELSON, entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians," a treaty was made with said Indians whereby they were to select lands for homes and the remainder of their reservations were to be opened for actual settlers, at $1.25 per acre and five years' residence, the timber being first sold, which has been done; and

Whereas by subsequent legislation 225,000 acres of said cut-over lands were reserved for experiment in forestry, without compensation to the Indians; and

Whereas such lands surround the allotments taken by the Indians and render them valueless, thus defeating the purposes of the Nelson Act, which was to help them, educate them, and make them self-supporting. Land without roads, schools, churches, and towns, and no way to get them, is worthless; and

Whereas the State owns about 145,000 acres of land located within said tract, which is depreciated in value for the same reasons; and

Whereas the reservation of so much land fit for settlement is an injury, not only to that part of the State, but to the commercial interests of the whole State, the land reserved being already crossed by two railroads: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is requested to enact a law to open said lands to settlement by actual settlers, conformably to the Nelson Act.

Resolved further, That our Senators and Representatives are requested to urge this matter upon Congress.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state is instructed to send copies of these resolutions to our Senators and Representatives and to the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior.

STATE OF MINNESOTA, *Department of State:*

I, P. E. Hanson, secretary of state in and for the State of Minnesota, hereby certify that the hereto-attached copy of a resolution is a true and correct copy of a joint resolution adopted by the senate and house of representatives of the State of Minnesota on the 4th day of April, A. D. 1905.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed, at the capitol, in St. Paul, this 6th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1905.

[SEAL.] P. E. HANSON, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of the Minnesota Good Roads Association, praying for the passage of the so-called "Brownlow good-roads bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Crow Wing County, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made providing for the lowering of Pelican Lake in order to give proper drainage to the township of Pelican, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FRYE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 27) to amend section 4463 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the complement of crews of vessels, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1007) to repeal section 4136 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the admission to registry of repaired foreign wrecks, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 540) to establish an additional land district in the State of Montana, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 741) for the relief of Rev. Charles Wright; and

A bill (S. 742) for the relief of Samuel J. Brown and Susan F. Brown.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2280) making an appropriation and providing for the construction of a United States revenue cutter for service in the harbor of San Francisco, State of California, reported it with an amendment to the title.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2281) providing for the construction of a vessel of the first class for the Revenue-Cutter Service, to be stationed with headquarters at Honolulu, Hawaii; and

A bill (S. 2282) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Halfmoon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, California.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2278) to construct a tender for the engineer service of the twelfth light-house district; and

A bill (S. 2657) to construct a tender for the use of the light-house inspector of the twelfth light-house district.

Mr. CRANE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 281) to provide for the construction and equipment of a revenue cutter for service in Narragansett Bay and adjacent waters, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. WETMORE on December 20, 1905, directing the Secretary of War to cause a survey at the harbor of refuge, Block Island, Rhode Island, to be made, reported it without amendment.

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 311) regulating the settlement of the accounts between the United States and the several States relative to the disposition of the public lands, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MALLORY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by Mr. FULTON on January 4, 1906, authorizing the Secretary of War to cause a survey to be made of Coos Bay and bar, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2354) to authorize the construction of dams and power stations on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2397) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota,' approved January 14, 1889," so as to create a State forest reserve, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2785) to authorize the sale of down timber and hay on the ten sections of land in the former Chippewa of the Mississippi Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota, reserved from sale or settlement in accordance with the provisions of the act of January 14, 1889, as amended, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1358) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of additional light-house districts, approved July 26, 1886, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 954) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 37) to fix the allowances and percentages of the collector at the port of Portsmouth, N. H., reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the

bill (S. 2770) for the erection of a keeper's dwelling to be attached to the light-station at the Stonington Breakwater, Connecticut, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PILES, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 924) to establish a light-house and fog-signal station at the entrance to Bellingham Bay, State of Washington, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2068) to increase the limit of cost of the fog signal at the light and fog-signal station at Battery Point, Pugent Sound, State of Washington, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 926) to authorize the construction of two steam vessels for the Revenue-Cutter Service for duty on Puget Sound, Washington;

A bill (S. 929) to establish a dwelling for keeper of fog signal at Robinson Point, State of Washington; and

A bill (S. 925) for the construction of a steam vessel for the Revenue-Cutter Service for duty in the district of Puget Sound.

Mr. CLAY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 16) directing to be made a preliminary examination and survey of Savannah River from Savannah, Ga., to Petersburg, Ga., improving the navigation of said river, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 259) for a light-house at Cape Arago, Oregon, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FULTON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 952) to authorize a patent to be issued to Stephen Teichner for certain lands therein described, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 2968) granting a pension to George W. Hale; which was read twice by its title, and reported to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming introduced a bill (S. 2969) to authorize the Attorney-General and certain other officers of the Department of Justice and special assistants and counsel to begin and conduct legal proceedings in any courts of the United States, and before any commission or commissioner or quasi judicial body created under the laws of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2970) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Keith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLEE introduced a bill (S. 2971) granting an increase of pension to H. O. Bennum; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 2972) granting an increase of pension to James W. Wheeler; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 2973) granting an increase of pension to Minard Van Patten; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2974) for the relief of Richard Riggles; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HEMENWAY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 2975) granting a pension to Mary Z. Miller;

A bill (S. 2976) granting a pension to Rosalia A. Partridge;

A bill (S. 2977) granting an increase of pension to David B. Neafus;

A bill (S. 2978) granting an increase of pension to Eli W. Knowles;

A bill (S. 2979) granting an increase of pension to Sadie Krusenklaus;

A bill (S. 2980) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. McConnell;

A bill (S. 2981) granting an increase of pension to Eli W. Knowles;

A bill (S. 2982) granting an increase of pension to Junius Abbott;

A bill (S. 2983) granting an increase of pension to George D. Phillipy;

A bill (S. 2984) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Stoker;

A bill (S. 2985) granting an increase of pension to George W. Bodenhamer; and

A bill (S. 2986) granting a pension to Elizabeth Broadhead.

Mr. HEMENWAY introduced a bill (S. 2987) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Nathan Mendenhall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2988) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Larkin T. Robinson, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2989) to renew and extend certain letters patent; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2990) granting a pension to Semantha M. Hunt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2991) granting an increase of pension to Edwin J. Barber; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LATIMER introduced a bill (S. 2992) for the relief of Michael B. Ryan, son and administrator de bonis non of John S. Ryan, deceased, late of Charleston, S. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 2993) to ratify an agreement with the Yankton Sioux Indians of South Dakota, and making an appropriation to carry the same into effect; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 2994) granting an increase of pension to David Harvey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2995) granting an increase of pension to William W. Gilbert; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 2996) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase 80 acres of land, more or less, from Karl A. Torgerson and Charles E. Heyn, for the benefit of certain allottees of the Grande Ronde Indian Reservation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2997) granting a pension to Fredericka Johnson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2998) granting an increase of pension to Josias R. King; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 2999) authorizing the extension of Monroe street NE.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (S. 3000) providing for the survey and disposition of certain lands bordering on Milk River, in the northern portion of the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 3001) granting an increase of pension to Juliet A. Bainbridge Hoff; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEARIN introduced a bill (S. 3002) to correct the military record of Thomas J. Mathews and remove the charge of desertion; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BACON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 3003) for the relief of the heirs of Elias Weaver; and

A bill (S. 3004) for the relief of George H. Hogan.

Mr. ANKENY introduced a bill (S. 3005) to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Indians of the Colville Reservation, in Washington, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 3006) to appoint an additional judge for the third division of the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO THE INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CLAPP submitted an amendment relative to the cancellation of the patent issued December 31, 1901, in the name of James Longhat, Wichita allottee, No. 582, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment authorizing the issuance of fee-simple patents to Louis Dick and certain other Indian allottees for lands heretofore allotted to them, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Are there concurrent or other resolutions? [A pause.] If not, the morning business is closed.

NATIONAL BOARD OF CORPORATIONS.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that some Senators have indicated a desire to address the Senate on the measure under consideration yesterday, known as the "pure-food bill," I shall not ask at this time that that measure be taken up. I desire to call up from the table Senate bill 2398 and submit a few remarks before the bill goes to the committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the title of the bill be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the title of the bill.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2398) to create the National Board of Corporations and to provide for the regulation thereby of corporations engaged in interstate, territorial, district, or insular possession business.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, when a surgeon contemplates the performance of an operation that may jeopardize the life of the patient, the first thing to be done is to secure and determine the proper conditions surrounding the operation and the patient. The Senate has been proposing through measures that have been submitted to it to deal with the question of fixing the rates of transportation upon railroads and other public carriers. It seems to me that before entering upon that great question we should determine the status of the corporations which are to be the subject of the legislation. I have therefore prepared, and propose to ask for its reference to the proper committee after making some remarks upon it, a bill directed to that subject. The basis of proper and fair charges for transportation must always be considered in the light of the relation which the carrier bears to the investment, to the expense incurred, and to the business relation between it and those with whom it is to do business.

Under conditions that have long existed, corporations have paid but little attention to this question, and they are not now in a condition of business health to enable them to deal with themselves or to enable us to deal with them in determining the question. Before we take hold of this patient and lay it upon the table for the purpose of adjusting its difficulties we must know that it is in good business health. We want to know, first, upon what the corporation is based.

If it is based upon a proposition to do business without capital we want to know that, because corporations may have assets other than property assets. Their assets may consist in the performance of a duty that does not involve the ownership of property. Another class of corporations may count as their assets the fixed, substantial investment in property that is entitled, under the recognized law of right and justice, to the privilege of earning a fair remuneration to those who have made the investment.

Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced and which is now upon the table provides, first, for the creation of a tribunal within the existing Government which shall supervise and determine the status of the corporations. It proposes to exercise no control over them other than such control as is necessary to enable them to determine those facts.

I provides, in substance, that no corporation shall engage in interstate business except it pass the scrutiny of a board of corporations, that board to consist of five members under and within the jurisdiction, primarily, of the Department of Commerce and Labor, four of the members of the board to be appointed by the President and their appointment to be ratified by the Senate, and the fifth member to be the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. It provides that this board shall be authorized to inquire into the business status of all corporations engaging in interstate business, for the purpose of determining the character of the corporation, the nature of the business that it proposes to engage in, and the relation which the capital of that corporation or the capitalization of it bears to its assets.

It also provides that the corporations engaged in such business shall not engage in certain other business. For instance, it provides that corporations engaged as common carriers shall not be the owners of coal mines or other public utilities except to the extent of their own necessities; that they shall not control these public utilities in competition with private ownership or other ownership than that of the transportation company.

The wisdom of that restriction was apparent only a few years since in the great coal strike. It is apparent every day in the States upon the Pacific coast, where certain railroad companies own large areas of coal lands and will not, under any circumstances, make freight rates to any other owners of coal lands that would enable them to compete with the business of the railroads or those interested in the railroad companies as dealers in coal.

This bill provides also for the segregation of the common carrier from industrial pursuits which would enable the common carrier to control the market as against private enterprise and investment.

Of course it contains something of the element of restriction as to the scope of business in which a corporation may engage, but under existing conditions it has become absolutely necessary that the common carriers of the country should confine their operations and their control to the business for which they were primarily organized, and that they should not be allowed, through the great financial combinations that are represented by common carriers, to become practically the exclusive owners of public utilities.

It has been suggested that you can not restrain the right of individuals to engage in as many different kinds of business as they may like. That is true. But we can place the condition of restraint upon any corporation, which is an artificial person, doing business of an interstate character. We can place any restriction upon it we may see fit, because the Constitution has given us that right in express terms.

This bill provides also that insurance companies shall be insurance companies and nothing else; that they shall not be a combination of insurance companies, banks, trust companies, railroad owners, and coal miners, because the very nature of life insurance especially is such as to constitute those who represent the insured trustees of a most sacred trust.

While it is true that under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Paul *v.* Virginia and other cases that have reaffirmed that doctrine the insurance business is not and can not be held to be interstate commerce, this bill by its provisions does not undertake to control the business of insurance as interstate commerce, but it does undertake to say that an insurance company that does not come to the board of corporations with a clean bill of health, according to the restrictions of this measure, shall not be entitled to the use of the mails of the United States.

Whether that will be a complete remedy or not, whether that will solve the difficulty or not, is to be determined. It will at least be one step in that direction, and I am inclined to believe that the insurance companies will purge themselves of the objectionable features which have been urged against them rather than be debarred from the use of the United States mails.

As is expressed in this bill, I do not believe that in the insurance business those in whose hands this trust rests should be engaged in the use of the money of the insured paid into the treasury in the shape of premiums for the purpose of banking, of maintaining trust companies, back-door loaning institutions, or any other enterprise that results in such conditions as have been disclosed by the investigation recently carried on in the State of New York. I believe the insurance companies should exist as insurance companies pure and simple; that they should be regulated and governed by such rules and such restrictions as, while maintaining an ample margin to meet every possible business emergency, would prevent them from indulging in speculation, from coming to the assistance of desperate speculators and manipulators of the stock markets, and would prevent them from becoming partners in financial deals in Wall street or elsewhere.

The institution commonly known as "Wall street," which is simply a gambling club over on the Hudson River, has assumed the right to dictate the financial policy of this country. Whenever the legislation, either enacted or proposed, does not suit them they meet us with a threat that "unless you do certain things within a certain time and enact certain legislation we will wreck the country financially." Fortunately the time when they can carry out that threat has passed for this country, but there was a time when they were able to do it. It is just possible that conditions might arise under which they could do it again. I do not believe that they will; but they remind me, in the threat that was issued a few days since and is still being discussed daily in the press, of the small boy I knew when I was a small boy. When his mother would punish him his only deterrent was to shout, "I will tear my coat! I will tear my coat!" So we have it from Wall street that "if you do not legislate so as to make the currency of the country more flexible, according to our ideas and along the lines which we suggest, we will bring a panic upon this country."

First, they have sought to control, and in a large measure

have succeeded in controlling, through the financial combinations to which I have referred, an unnatural and unholy proportion of the money of the country. They have collected together money by hundreds of millions of dollars, and by the little combination of a coterie of men whose only responsibility in life is to gamble upon the chance of what somebody else may do, they can bring about what is known as "a stress in the money market;" they can make a threat of ruin to the country that will affect the prosperity of the citizens from one ocean to the other.

That condition should not exist. It exists in a measure because of the very evils against which this bill is directed—inflated values, fictitious capitalization based upon small property or none—that enable them to give a fictitious value to a debenture or a stock and send it upon the market and by the process of juggling keep it in the air as a juggler keeps in the air a light ball when balanced upon the ends of his fingers.

Those are the conditions against which this bill is directed; and I say while it undertakes to provide a remedy for the overcapitalization of corporations, while it undertakes to provide that no corporation shall engage in interstate business except that it shall pass through this board of corporations and obtain a clean bill of financial health, and that until they have the license which that board is authorized to give them they may not engage in interstate commerce at all, it does not undertake to prescribe the same restrictions for insurance companies for the reasons I have already stated—that insurance is not and can not be interstate commerce; but it can say that an insurance company which upon its face is not or does not show that it is free from the restrictions of the bill and which can not satisfy the board that it has complied with the provisions of the bill shall not use the mails of the United States.

The bill provides that a corporation, before it can receive a license to do an interstate business, shall show to the satisfaction of the board that it has not entered into a combination for the purpose of securing rebates; that it has not entered into a pooling arrangement which would amount to a trust to the detriment of the people. Whatever kind of a corporation it may be, it must show those things. It must show that its capitalization is proportionate to its property holdings. It must show that it is solvent. When it does, it will have no difficulty in receiving a license to do business as a corporation doing interstate business. But until it does that it can not do interstate business.

The bill provides that if any corporation shall refuse or fail to comply with the provisions which give it a legal and proper standing it may be treated as a bankrupt and a derelict in the business world, and that its business may be wound up as the courts wind up the business of a bankrupt concern. That is the method of dealing with them.

I do not desire to enter into any more extended consideration of this bill at this time. I commend it to the wisdom and consideration of the committee to which it will naturally go. I desired, as I sent it out of this body, to speak these few words on its behalf, as I may or may not have another opportunity of discussing the measure; but I am quite sure that the committee to which the bill will be referred will give it the respectful consideration to which it is entitled. With that statement I ask, unless some other Senator desires to say something about the bill, that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be so referred, in the absence of objection.

SABINE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, on yesterday I made a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 2159) authorizing the Jasper and Eastern Railway Company, its successors and assigns, to construct and operate a railroad bridge across the Sabine River, in the States of Texas and Louisiana, had been passed, in order that I might hear some interested parties as to the effect on the bill of certain Senate amendments. Having received a satisfactory reply from those parties, I now withdraw the motion to reconsider.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas withdraws the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill named by him was passed. The bill, therefore, stands passed.

BUREAU OF INSURANCE.

Mr. SPOONER. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to move that the Interstate Commerce Committee, to whom was referred Senate bill 173, be discharged from its further consideration, and that the bill be referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the nature of the bill?

Mr. SPOONER. I was about to explain the purpose of the bill. It is a bill to establish a bureau in the Department of Commerce and Labor, to be called the "Bureau of Insurance," with the usual elaborations of such measures. I do not want to discuss the subject. The consideration of its constitutionality has been submitted heretofore by the Senate to the Judiciary Committee, and all bills upon that subject are desired to be referred to that committee, until it shall have reported on the question of constitutional law involved.

Mr. ALDRICH. The chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce is absent, but I assume that that committee will have no objection to being discharged from the consideration of the bill, as the subject-matter has been referred by the Senate to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SPOONER. I am much obliged to the Senator from Rhode Island for his suggestion, but I have no doubt that the Senate, having ordered this reference, would complete it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin moves that the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 173) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish the Department of Commerce and Labor," approved February 14, 1903, being chapter 552 of the United States Statutes, enacted by the Fifty-seventh Congress, be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The question is on that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as there does not seem to be any very pressing business now pending, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be laid before the Senate, simply to enable me to offer some amendments to the bill, which I am instructed to offer by the Committee on Commerce, with a view to having the bill reprinted after the amendments shall have been adopted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit the Chair first to lay before the Senate a message from the President of the United States?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for your consideration certain papers which should have accompanied my message of January 8, 1906, but which were omitted on account of delay in printing.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 10, 1906.*

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The message will be printed and referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to inquire of the Chair what is the character of the papers referred to in the message? I think the RECORD ought to show something in regard to that.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The message is accompanied by a letter of the Secretary of War to the President concerning charges against the Isthmian Canal Commission contained in an article in the Independent, a weekly publication. The message of the President, with the letter of the Secretary of War, will be referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, in the absence of objection.

Mr. ALLISON. And be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The order to print will be made, in the absence of objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, I will renew the request I made a few moments ago.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be laid before the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, before that is done I desire to inquire whether the article written by Mr. Bigelow, printed in the Independent, is included in the letter of the Secretary of War, to which article his letter is a reply?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The document is quite extensive, but the Chair is informed that the article to which the Senator refers is not included.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask, then, Mr. President, that the article entitled "Our mismanagement at Panama," written by Mr. Poultney Bigelow, and published in the Independent between pages 9 and 21, inclusive, be also printed as a Senate document to accompany the letter of the Secretary of War.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas requests that the article published in the Independent, entitled "Our Mismanagement at Panama, by Poultney Bigelow, M. A.," be printed as a public document. Is there objection?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether there is any communication from the President or from the

Secretary of War which specifically mentions this article? We certainly can not undertake to print as public documents all the sensational literature which is being issued because somebody happens to be mentioned. I do not know whether either the Secretary of War or the President has specifically mentioned the article referred to. I hope they have not; but if they have I suppose the Senator from Texas would have the right to have the article referred to printed.

Mr. CULBERSON. Does the Senator deny that the Secretary of War covers the article specifically?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not know anything about it. I have not enough familiarity with it to know whether he does or not.

Mr. CULBERSON. There is no question that he does.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The letter which accompanies the President's message does refer to the article mentioned by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. ALDRICH. Very well, then.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understand that there is now upon the Vice-President's desk a communication from the Secretary of War, which should have come in with the message, but was delayed, which covers the point made in the article referred to, if I am correctly informed. I therefore suggest that the article and the reply of the Secretary of War be printed together.

Mr. CULBERSON. That is precisely my request, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. The report of the Secretary of War has not yet been laid before the Senate.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, it has been.

Mr. LODGE. I beg the Senator's pardon; I had not noticed that.

Mr. CULBERSON. My request is precisely that which has just been made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not so understand.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The letter of the Secretary of War was laid before the Senate in connection with the message of the President of the United States. Without objection, the article mentioned by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] will be printed as a public document.

Mr. CULBERSON. Together with the answer of the Secretary of War.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In connection with the answer of the Secretary of War. The Chair hears no objection, and the order is made.

Mr. TELLER. I want to make an inquiry. Some days ago we received from the President a message, which was published in the RECORD. It has always been customary to have messages of that kind also published as a document. I have made inquiry several times, but up to the present I am informed that it has not been published. I should like to inquire of some Senator regarding that.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator refer to the Panama message?

Mr. TELLER. I do.

Mr. LODGE. It is the first thing in this volume [exhibiting], which is on the desks of Senators.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I will say that it has been the custom to print such a message as a separate document, and I think the practice to which I have referred ought to be continued.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think such messages have always been printed separately.

Mr. TELLER. I want to inquire of some Senator if that usage, which has prevailed ever since I have been here, has been dropped; and if so, whether it is accidental or intentional? It is not sufficient to publish a message from the President in some other document. It should also be published, I think, in justice to the Executive, in the manner that such messages have always been published.

Mr. CULBERSON. I suggest to the Senator from Colorado that this whole volume [exhibiting], as I understand, constitutes the President's message. The message proper is in the front of the volume, and the other papers follow after it as exhibits to that message.

Mr. HALE. That is the very point that I was going to suggest. All the papers that go with the message are published with it and make the document. I do not think the custom has been to publish the message alone, separate and distinct from the papers that accompany it, but they make really, as the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] has said, one document, and that is, as I suppose, this document on our desks.

Mr. TELLER. This is not such a document as is usually published. This is the report of the Isthmian Canal Commission for the year ending December 1, 1905. Of course, there are some things contained in the document besides the report.

This is not very material, Mr. President, except that it has always been the custom to publish the message in the way I have indicated, so that if one wants to look at the message he can get it at the document room and can examine it. These messages should be published just as we publish the annual message of the President. I think the old practice ought to be continued. I know the message is included in this document which I have on my table, but I do not want every time I desire to examine a message, whether it be the annual message of the President or a special message, to have to consult such a large document as this. Of course, this is a matter of no great consequence, but this is certainly a departure from the usual custom.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask what is the order of business, Mr. President?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has asked unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid before the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Before that is done I desire to submit a point of order to the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

AFFAIRS OF MOROCCO.

Mr. BACON. I rise, Mr. President, as a matter of order, to make the point of order that the resolution introduced by me and which was before the Senate on the day before yesterday, requesting certain information from the President of the United States relative to the appointment of delegates to the Moroccan conference is the business now in order. Unless the presiding officer is prepared to rule that the point is well taken, I desire to be heard briefly in support of the point of order.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator kindly state just what is his point of order?

Mr. BACON. The point of order is that the resolution introduced by myself asking for certain information from the President of the United States relative to the appointment of delegates to the conference to consider Moroccan affairs is now in order. That is my point of order.

Mr. ALDRICH. Under what rule?

Mr. BACON. I am going on to state it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BACON. Yes; for a question.

Mr. LODGE. I merely want to say on the point of order——

Mr. BACON. I desire to say something myself on the point of order.

Mr. LODGE. I make the point of order that the resolution can not be taken up except by motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will hold that the resolution of the Senator from Georgia is upon the Calendar and can only be taken up on motion or by unanimous consent.

Mr. BACON. I ask the Chair not to so rule until I can have the opportunity to present my reasons in support of the point.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the learned and distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] makes the point of order upon the point of order that the resolution can only be taken up on motion. The Senator may be correct, but, if so, it is not in accordance with the view which I have heretofore taken as to the right of a Senator to make a point of order. A point of order is a matter of the highest privilege, and can be made at any time, without motion, upon the initiative of a single Senator; and it is then for the Senate to determine, or for the presiding officer to determine, whether the point of order is well taken.

There is, Mr. President, no rule, so far as I have been able to find, to the effect that when a resolution has once been taken up by the Senate, if it is not disposed of on that day, it shall go to the Calendar. If there is any rule to that effect I have, after diligent search, been unable to find it, and I find upon inquiry of the officers of the Senate, more familiar with the rules than I am, that it is true, so far as their knowledge goes, that there is no rule which sends a resolution to the Calendar after it has been once before the Senate. As a result of the best investigation that I have been able to give it, that is simply a matter of practice and not a matter of rule. The rule, Mr. President, with reference to resolutions, is found on page 14 of the Rules of the Senate; and without reading all of that rule, which is

divided into 5 separate paragraphs, I will read only the first and the last.

1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for one day. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. 23.)

That refers to the introduction, but it has no relation to this particular resolution, because it was introduced without objection.

Then, as to the disposition of such a resolution, the fifth paragraph of Rule XIV is probably the one which will have more direct application. That paragraph reads:

5. All resolutions shall lie over one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct. (Jefferson's Manual, sec. 25.)

That was the course taken in reference to this resolution. Upon the second day, in accordance with the contemplation of that rule, the resolution was called up for action.

Now, Mr. President, in the absence of a rule, we have been proceeding under what is recognized as a practice, which is that when a resolution has been taken up and has been under discussion and consideration by the Senate, it shall thereafter go to the Calendar upon the conclusion of that day's proceedings in the morning hour.

Now, sir, the proposition which I make in connection with my point of order is this: That there is no rule, in the first place, as already stated, which would carry the resolution to the Calendar, and, in the second place, that, according to the principle of the practice, recognizing the practice as a correct one, the resolution does not legitimately go to the Calendar under the circumstances of this case. In order to properly present that suggestion, it is necessary to advert to the object of the practice in order to see whether or not, under the principle which actuates such object, this resolution has properly gone to the Calendar, or whether it is now properly before the Senate, or in a position to be before the Senate for consideration in the morning hour.

The evident object of the practice which has grown up of considering resolutions in the morning hour—there is no rule which says that a resolution shall be considered in the morning hour, so far as I can find—the evident object of it is to give opportunity for freedom of debate, for freedom for the consideration of any matter of importance which may be so considered by any one Senator, and not that, before he shall be allowed to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate and present it for the consideration not only of the Senate but for the information and consideration of the public, he shall have to depend upon the acquiescence and the consent of a majority of the body. The object of debate, and free debate, in the Senate is not simply to affect the action of Senators, but to let the people of the country know what is being done by officers of the Government in carrying on the affairs of the Government.

Mr. President, it is one of the most important and valuable and distinguishing features of this body as a deliberative body that whereas in other deliberative bodies it is frequently found, if it not the general rule, that consideration of any matter can only be had by the consent of the presiding officer or of the majority of the body, in this body this distinguishing and important feature gives a Senator an opportunity to be heard upon any question he deems of importance, even though there be no other single Senator in the body who agrees with him in that particular. And this is a right not only of the Senator, but one in which the public has a most valuable interest. In order that that may not be abused, in order that there may not be the consumption of too much time by any one Senator in the presentation of a matter which might be deemed by him important, while there might not be a concurrence of others with him in that particular, the practice has grown up of limiting the consideration of these matters to the first morning hour after the time it was taken up. But the great distinguishing feature of the principle and the reason of the practice remains, that there shall be opportunity for the presentation of the subject-matter and its discussion, although for the reason stated there is in the practice this limitation upon it. And any procedure by which this right to discussion of a resolution is denied or practically destroyed is a violation of the spirit and intent of the rule. If a procedure is allowed by which, when anyone is not willing to have his acts or some other person's acts discussed, the Senate can be put behind closed doors and the time taken up with discussing the question of secrecy, then the right of freedom of debate and freedom of official criticism is entirely destroyed in the Senate except by the permission of the majority.

Mr. HALE. Now, let me ask the Senator a question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I believe I see what the Senator has in mind, that a single Senator shall have the right to present his views in his own way, without being taken from the floor by a majority.

Mr. BACON. No; I did not say that.

Mr. HALE. Well, does the Senator think that that privilege of a single Senator to introduce a resolution and to speak upon it should be indefinite and without limitation, and that every morning hour, as it comes around, should be taken by the Senator who has introduced a resolution, and thereby occupy all the time of morning hour after morning hour, and thus confiscate the morning hour for weeks or months?

The rule—I will not say the rule, for the Senator is right about it; it is the practice—the object, end, and aim of the practice is that the Senator shall have his day in court. His resolution goes over on objection. The next day he has an hour and can discuss it, and then the invariable practice—and I do not know how we could do business without that practice—is that it shall go to the Calendar and be subject to the majority of the Senate. Otherwise—I do not want to repeat myself—day after day and week after week one Senator would occupy the morning hour and confiscate it. Does the Senator from Georgia think one Senator ought to have the right to do that?

Mr. BACON. If the Senator has concluded, I will answer his question.

Mr. HALE. I have.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, no one in this Chamber is better capacitated to offer an opinion which could safely be followed as a guide by the Senate than the honorable Senator from Maine, who, by his long experience here, his diligent attention to business, and his well-recognized ability has acquired a familiarity with our proceedings, and has a discriminating judgment, which lead him to correct conclusions; but, unfortunately, the Senator from Maine anticipated me before I had stated my proposition. He assumed that I intended to state a proposition which is entirely foreign to my intention, and directed both his argument and his inquiry to something which I do not contemplate.

Now, if with that statement the Senator will permit me to proceed, he will perceive that I did not in any manner propose to infringe upon the well-guarded practice of the Senate to which he has alluded and the unfortunate consequences of the infraction which he has so forcibly stated.

I was illustrating, or endeavoring to do so, the principle upon which the practice is based, and I was calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that that rule of practice was based upon the great distinguishing feature which characterizes this body, of freedom of debate, and not only of freedom of debate, but of giving the opportunity to a minority, even though that minority may be confined to one person, of being heard, even though no other Senator in the Chamber might agree with him—certainly a most valuable part of what we consider to be the distinguishing characteristic of this body. The point I was going to make was not, as anticipated by the learned and distinguished Senator from Maine, that a Senator would be entitled not only to be heard on one day or on two days, but on every day of the session; the point that I was going to make was that this resolution had never had any opportunity of one day. That is the point I propose to make.

Mr. President, I can not, of course, allude to anything which occurred in secret session. I can speak of what occurred in the open session. I say I can not allude to anything that occurred in secret session. I can not so far as to narrate any distinct occurrence. I can only allude to it so far as is necessary to support the point which I make. In the open session on the second day when this resolution was called up, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in accordance with a rule of the Senate and in accordance with his right, moved that the resolution be considered in secret session of the Senate, and that having been seconded by the honorable Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], the presiding officer properly, under the rule, directed that the galleries be cleared and the doors be closed and that the matter should thereafter proceed in secret.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia allow me to make a suggestion to him?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. MORGAN. I would suggest to the Senator that the full situation has not been stated. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] had his resolution before the Senate in regular form to be considered on its merits. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] moved to refer it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BACON. He said he would, but he did not move it.

Mr. LODGE. I dislike to interrupt the Senator from Georgia. I never made that motion.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator said he was going to make it.

Mr. LODGE. Ah! I said I would make it if the Senator from Georgia did not care to discuss the matter. He did care to discuss it, and I never made the motion.

Mr. MORGAN. Then the resolution was before the Senate without any motion at all, except on the question of its adoption. Then it was that on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts, seconded by the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senate went into secret legislative session. What took place there nobody is at liberty to say. Yet we all know what took place, and we know that no final disposition was made of the resolution. It is back in the Senate.

Mr. President, the action of the Senate in taking up the resolution and considering it is at least a continuous action beyond the hiatus that has taken place, about which nobody has a right to speak. If the Senator will allow me to make a suggestion, otherwise it is in the power of any two Senators on this floor, in respect to this rule about secret legislative session, to put an absolute check upon any Senator who chooses to rise in this body to make a remark.

Mr. BACON. The point I make is in direct accord with the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama. The point I make is that, so far as the record discloses, there has never been a consideration of this resolution, and I challenge any Senator to give to the Senate any evidence of the fact that the resolution has ever been considered by the Senate. The resolution stands exactly in the same attitude as if when it was called up, before its consideration was entered upon and before any discussion was had, something else, never mind what, had intervened which removed it from the consideration of the Senate. I assert it as a fact that neither then nor any other time has this resolution been considered by the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. Or removed from its consideration.

Mr. BACON. Or removed from its consideration. If there were a rigid rule, or even if it were in accordance with the practice of the Senate or in harmony with the principle of that practice, that when a resolution was called up and had ever been declared in order, it should not be considered thereafter on any subsequent day, even though it had never been considered, then, it seems to me, there might be at least some objection to the correctness of the point of order which I make. But with the practice being simply that there shall be a consideration of a resolution, and that any resolution introduced by a Senator, although it may not be considered on the first day, shall have the right of consideration, and when the fact exists that it never has had that consideration, I say that in accordance with the principle, according to the rule and the principle, it is now in order, because it has never had its day in court; and I challenge any Senator to say that either under one circumstance or any other circumstance this resolution has ever been discussed or has been before the body for discussion.

Mr. President, what are the facts? The facts, as I was proceeding to state at the time when the Senator from Alabama interrupted me, were that when the resolution was laid before the Senate for consideration, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] moved that the Senate consider the question in secret session. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] seconded the motion. When the Senate went into secret session, for what purpose did it go into secret session? Did it go into secret session to consider this resolution? The rule does not say so. The rule says that the doors shall be immediately closed, and that the Senate shall decide behind closed doors whether it will consider the matter in secret session. The motion of the Senator from Massachusetts was that the doors should be closed for the purpose prescribed in the rule, to wit, for the Senate to determine in secret session whether it would consider the resolution in secret session. That was all. It went no further. That is the rule; and I am not at liberty to say what vote was taken in secret session. But so far as this record discloses, so far as the record of the proceedings of the Senate shows, that is the extent to which the Senate has ever gone; and I challenge any Senator to say whether the Senate at any time ever went any further than to consider the single question whether or not the resolution should be considered behind closed doors.

Mr. President, that is the attitude, that is the position, and when the resolution came up for consideration it was not considered, it was not discussed, but in obedience to a rule, the Senate went into secret session for the purpose of determining whether or not the matter should be considered in secret session, and there is no evidence that it ever determined to consider it in secret session, or that it ever was considered in secret session.

Mr. ALDRICH. How could there be?

Mr. BACON. I challenge any Senator here to say it ever was considered in secret session.

Mr. ALDRICH. I challenge the Senator from Georgia to say it was not.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Rhode Island will recognize my right to say it was not, I will say it very promptly.

Mr. ALDRICH. One statement or the other may be made with equal propriety.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish to ask the Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Indiana will pardon me. I will yield as soon as I reply to the Senator from Rhode Island. I can not reply to both at the same time, or I would with great pleasure extend my courtesy to that limit.

The Senator from Rhode Island asks me if I am prepared to say that the resolution was not considered in secret session. I reply to him that I can not say, and I can not say it because of my obligation; but I reply that the affirmative must appear to the Senate, either here in open session or in secret session, under such circumstances as it may determine, that there has been consideration of the resolution by the Senate in order to remove it from the consideration of the Senate, to take away from it its right to consideration and to put it upon the Calendar.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

Mr. BACON. Pardon me.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. BACON. No; I am not. If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, I will yield to him with the greatest of pleasure, as I always do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very good.

Mr. BACON. But I can not reply to two at once.

The facts known to the Senate, the facts as appearing to the Senate, the facts upon which the open Senate must act in open Senate, if it acts in open Senate, are that when this matter was up for discussion it was not discussed, that it was not considered, that no motion was made relative thereto, but that the question was raised, not that it should be considered in secret session, but the question was raised that the Senate should go into secret session for the purpose of determining whether or not the resolution would be considered in secret session, and that, so far as the open session of the Senate goes, is the limit of the action of the Senate.

Now, if the rule had permitted the Senate before going into secret session to determine that question in public, and the Senate had determined that it would go into secret session for that purpose, it would be a different case. But the Senate did not go into secret session for the purpose of considering the resolution. It went into secret session, under the rule, for the purpose of determining whether it would consider the resolution in secret session, and so far as the RECORD goes the sole question considered by the Senate in secret session was whether or not it would consider the resolution in secret session.

Now I will hear the Senator from Indiana with much pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

Mr. MORGAN. I rise to a question of privilege. We can not explain this situation to each other and discuss it in open session. Something took place in secret session that we have not any right to refer to here at all. I therefore move that the further consideration of the question now before the Senate be had in secret legislative session of the Senate, if I can get a second.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will not make that motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there a second?

Mr. PETTUS. I second the motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is a second, and the Chair directs that the galleries be cleared and the doors closed.

The doors were thereupon closed.

During the proceedings with closed doors, the Vice-President overruled the question of order raised by Mr. BACON, and decided that the resolution submitted by him on the 8th instant had been laid before the Senate on the 9th instant under the uniform rule and practice, and that the Senate had closed its doors on the motion to consider it in secret session, and having had its day in court, under the rule it had been placed on the Calendar, and could only be taken up for consideration upon motion or by unanimous consent.

After two hours and forty-five minutes with closed doors, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 15, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11, 1906.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT.

Frederick S. Nave, of Arizona, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona, to which position he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, in the place of Eugene A. Tucker, resigned.

Mr. Nave's first nomination to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Arizona, dated December 4, 1905, was withdrawn on December 6, 1905.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

George W. Cobb, of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for the district of Albemarle, in the State of North Carolina. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Arthur L. Conger, Eighteenth Infantry, to be captain from November 29, 1905, vice Berry, Twenty-ninth Infantry, dismissed.

First Lieut. James B. Kemper, Sixth Infantry, to be captain from December 25, 1905, vice Wilson, Second Infantry, deceased.

First Lieut. John W. Barnes, Eighteenth Infantry, to be captain from December 28, 1905, vice Alvord, Twenty-fifth Infantry, resigned (line commission only).

First Lieut. Isaac A. Saxton, Twenty-third Infantry, to be captain from January 2, 1906, vice Dalton, Twenty-sixth Infantry, detailed as quartermaster.

First Lieut. George E. Thorne, Twelfth Infantry, to be captain from January 4, 1906, vice Keene, Twenty-fourth Infantry, retired from active service.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Charles Booth to be postmaster at Prattville, in the county of Autauga and State of Alabama, in place of Charles Booth. Incumbent's commission expires January 20, 1906.

CALIFORNIA.

George Schmidt to be postmaster at Berkeley, in the county of Alameda and State of California, in place of George Schmidt. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1905.

GEORGIA.

James F. Overstreet to be postmaster at Douglas, in the county of Coffee and State of Georgia, in place of William Touchton, resigned.

ILLINOIS.

Jacob A. Bohrer to be postmaster at Bloomington, in the county of McLean and State of Illinois, in place of Jacob A. Bohrer. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1905.

William F. Calhoun to be postmaster at Decatur, in the county of Macon and State of Illinois, in place of William F. Calhoun. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

Abraham L. Cox to be postmaster at Elizabeth, in the county of Jo Daviess and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

George N. Mason to be postmaster at Erie, in the county of Whiteside and State of Illinois, in place of George N. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1905.

INDIANA.

James Edwards to be postmaster at Mitchell, in the county of Lawrence and State of Indiana, in plac of Joseph W. Dale. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1906.

IOWA.

Lyman Beers to be postmaster at Gilmore City, in the county of Pocahontas and State of Iowa, in place of Frank J. Tishenbanner, resigned.

KANSAS.

William Chapman to be postmaster at Mound Valley, in the county of Labette and State of Kansas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

MICHIGAN.

James H. Hudson to be postmaster at Merrill, in the county of Saginaw and State of Michigan. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

Le Roy C. Hunter to be postmaster at Saranac, in the county of Ionia and State of Michigan, in place of Sarah J. Fitzgibbons, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI.

Emma Morris to be postmaster at Ittabena, in the county of Leflore and State of Mississippi. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

NEBRASKA.

William P. Freeman to be postmaster at Auburn, in the county of Nemaha and State of Nebraska, in place of Bessie Leach, resigned.

NEVADA.

L. L. Mushett to be postmaster at Tonopah (late Butler), in the county of Nye and State of Nevada, in place of William W. Booth, resigned.

OHIO.

William S. Parlett to be postmaster at Dillonvale, in the county of Jefferson and State of Ohio, in place of Herbert Harrison, removed.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Johnson D. Neely to be postmaster at Derry (late Derry Station), in the county of Westmoreland and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Johnson D. Neely, to change name of office.

TEXAS.

William P. Cochran to be postmaster at Marble Falls, in the county of Burnet and State of Texas. Office became Presidential October 1, 1905.

Samuel J. Hott to be postmaster at St. Jo, in the county of Montague and State of Texas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1906.

VERMONT.

Raymond C. Ransom to be postmaster at Castleton, in the county of Rutland and State of Vermont, in place of Albert L. Ransom, resigned.

WASHINGTON.

John P. McGlinn to be postmaster at La Conner, in the county of Skagit and State of Washington, in place of Joseph P. Brewster, resigned.

WISCONSIN.

Mary A. McAskill to be postmaster at Glidden, in the county of Ashland and State of Wisconsin, in place of M. W. McAskill, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 11, 1906.

CONSUL-GENERAL.

John Edward Jones, of the District of Columbia, now consul at Dalny, Manchuria, to be consul-general of the United States at Dalny, Manchuria.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION AND CONSUL-GENERAL.

Hoffman Philip, of New York, now consul-general at Tangier, to be secretary of the legation and consul-general of the United States at Tangier, Morocco.

CONSULS.

Bertil M. Rasmusen, of Iowa, to be consul of the United States at Stavanger, Norway.

Herbert R. Wright, of Iowa, to be consul of the United States at Utilla, Honduras.

Henry A. Barber, of Maryland, to be consul of the United States at Puerto Plata, Dominican Republic.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Edwin Lee Jones, a citizen of the Territory of New Mexico, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 6th day of January, 1906.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Francis H. Sherman to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

Ensign Bayard T. Bulmer to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905, having completed three years' service in his present grade.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Bayard T. Bulmer to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1905.

To be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of February, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Charles Belknap, jr.
Fred H. Poteet.
Webb R. Raudenbush.
Butler Y. Rhodes.
Charles E. Smith.

P. A. Surg. John E. Page to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 20th day of April, 1904.

P. A. Surg. William H. Bell to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 20th day of May, 1905.

Asst. Surg. Earle M. Brown to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 8th day of May, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

Asst. Surg. John F. Murphy to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 18th day of May, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

Asst. Surg. Morton W. Baker to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 10th day of July, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

Asst. Surg. James H. Holloway to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 26th day of September, 1905, upon the completion of three years' service in his present grade.

Gunner Charles B. Babson to be a chief gunner in the Navy, from the 27th day of April, 1904, having completed six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the "Navy personnel act," approved March 3, 1899, as amended by the act of April 27, 1904.

Carpenter Joseph M. Simms to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1905, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the "Navy personnel act," approved March 3, 1899, as amended by the act of April 27, 1904.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

To be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of December, 1905, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Logan Tucker, a citizen of Illinois.

Charles C. McReynolds, a noncommissioned officer of the Marine Corps.

John E. Semmes, a citizen of Maryland.

Charles F. B. Price, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

Edward W. Burruss to be postmaster at Holly Grove, in the county of Monroe and State of Arkansas.

NEW YORK.

Dayton H. Whipple to be postmaster at Altamont, in the county of Albany and State of New York.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *January 11, 1906.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) relating to the contingent expenses of the House of Representatives.

Resolved, etc., That the appropriation made for the miscellaneous items of the contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1906 is hereby made available for the payment of salaries and labor heretofore or hereafter specifically ordered by the House of Representatives of the present Congress, in addition to the purposes for which said appropriation is otherwise available.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TAWNEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SUBSTITUTE PENSION DAY.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Tuesday of next week be substituted for Friday, to-morrow, for the special order for the consideration of pension bills. I understand the gentleman from New Hampshire does not object to that.

Mr. SULLOWAY. There is no objection, Mr. Speaker, as for as I am aware.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I will say the day immediately following the final vote on the Philippine tariff bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the day following the vote upon the Philippine tariff bill be substituted for Friday of this week under the special order. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, is it certain that they are going to get that day now?

Mr. PAYNE. I say the day following the final vote upon the Philippine tariff bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it certain they are going to have that day you name?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3, and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be closed at the final rising of the committee on Saturday of this week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate on House bill No. 3 be closed Saturday next at the adjournment of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York as to whether he has consulted with Mr. WILLIAMS, who is not on the floor at this moment?

Mr. PAYNE. I have not had an opportunity to consult with Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would ask the gentleman to let his request go over until Mr. WILLIAMS is on the floor, because he is the leader on this side.

Mr. PAYNE. I will withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker, but I may renew it subsequently, and I want to give notice unless this request is granted immediately after the reading of the Journal on Monday I shall move that general debate on this bill be closed. I now ask for a vote upon the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3, the Philippine tariff bill, Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who had the floor and gave way for a motion that the committee rise last evening, reserving the balance of his time, is entitled to the floor this morning.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio, who now has the floor, my colleague, shall be allowed to continue and conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that his colleague from the same State be permitted to continue until he shall have concluded his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I am conscious of the fact that an unusual length of time has been consumed by a number of gentlemen who have preceded me, and while I was anxious to have the consent of the House, which has been so generously given to me, I, nevertheless, will curtail my remarks as far as possible, conscious that I shall not occupy an unreasonable length of time if I succeed in making myself fairly understood to the audience. I shall not, Mr. Chairman, go over the ground that has been so well traveled by those who have preceded me. The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee placed before the House with absolute frankness and with exhaustive detail all the real provisions and purposes of the bill, and, with all due respect to the gentlemen who have contested upon the other side of this question, I will not repeat nor add anything to the able speech of the opening Member, nor yet to the elaborate and perfect presentation made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. Chairman, the questions which have arisen along the pathway upon which we have traveled since the memorable year 1898 have been logical in their origin, logical in their development, and logical in the presentation that they make of the questions here to-day. When a nation goes to war by the deliberate act of the war-making power, that nation assumes all the natural and probable matters and things that grow out of the condition of war which they have created. The American people went to war under peculiar circumstances. Occupying the position which I did upon this floor; occupying the position that I did with relation to the then administration of the executive office of the Government; believing, as I did, that the war with Spain was not necessary; believing, as I did, that everything we fought for would have been and could have been easily, or ultimately, at least, attained without war, I stood with the President and with the majority of the Republicans on this floor and did all in my pwer to delay the declaration of war, with the hope that war need not come. Every demand that was made by the McKinley Administration, every demand made upon Spain by the United States through its diplomacy was yielded until we came to the single remaining question, namely: Would Spain finally, in view of the position which the people of the United States had taken, withdraw from the island of Cuba and grant independence to her people? The American people had so far committed themselves to the affirmative of that question that it seemed impossible that we could yield that demand, and Spain, compromising

step by step, yielding first this concession and then that concession, finally, I believe—and that is what history will say—was on the point of crowning the Republican Administration of this country with the glory of the achievement of free Cuba without war, when the accident, or casualty, or whatever you may call it—the destruction of the *Maine* in Habana Harbor—precipitated war, with all its consequences.

Every step taken, from the declaration of war down to the present time, has been the logical and inevitable result of that war, and the American people have no more right now to shrink from a responsibility which that great catastrophe brought to their doors than would the American people at that time have dared to shrink from the duty of war when our ultimatum was presented and rejected by Spain. Not alone, Mr. Chairman, these necessary, logical, and inevitable results, not alone all of them, but the action of both political parties, from the beginning of the war down until a certain period of time, placed upon the American people the duty which the majority on this floor is to-day trying to discharge. I do not care to turn aside here and point out that the time came when the American people might well have called a halt in the progress of events that were driving us to where we are now. The time was when ultimately, and under our Constitution, the American people through their representatives in the Senate of the United States were called upon to say whether they would not only ratify all that had passd, but take all the responsibility that should come in the future. And both parties assumed that responsibility, and so urgent was it, so pressing was it, that the great leader of the Democratic party of that day, and, I may say, of to-day, came to Washington. I say leader of the Democratic party, for while he is absent he is not forgotten, and while he may suffer defeat the spirit of Bryan permeates the Democratic party to-day as no Democrat has ever permeated the spirit of the Democratic party since the grave closed over old Andrew Jackson. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You might as well meet things as they are. I am going to meet them exactly as my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who would be less powerful if he were more inclined to turn corners and avoid responsibilities than he is. It is the frankness of the man and the courage of the man that makes him dangerous in a controversy. So great was the emergency that that great leader of the Democratic party stripped himself of the ornaments and decorations of the high military office that he held and made haste by limited trains to arrive in Washington and appeal to the Democrats in the Senate to ratify that convention. And it was ratified. Without his aid it could not have been. And he secured the indorsement of the whole Democratic party for the action which he took in securing the ratification of that treaty by being again overwhelmingly nominated in 1900 for President and overwhelmingly defeated shortly afterwards.

The nomination of Mr. Bryan in 1900 was a distinct, formal, and sweeping indorsement of his record in war and peace, and while a majority of the Democratic Senators voted for this ratification, yet the whole party joined in its indorsement of Bryan, and thereby assumed the responsibility, as they will always have to assume it, for an equal participation in the ratification of the treaty of Paris.

So we come now to a discussion of the duty that is cast upon us by the terms of the treaty of Paris. That is all there is to it. Who stands here to-day undertaking to say that they have a right to say as American citizens, as statesmen, as members of the legislative department, that the action of this Government through its legally constituted authorities ought not to have been taken, and that therefore you will put an impediment in the way of the discharge of our duty herein?

Mr. Chairman, so much upon this question. I shall not discuss the question of what is to be done with the Philippines. There comes to my mind, when I think of that topic, this suggestion always: The American people never did a mean thing on earth; they never did a cowardly thing; they never disgraced themselves; they never tarnished the American flag; they never threw discredit upon the integrity, honor, uprightness, and intelligence of the American people as looked at by all the nations of the world, and what American will begin in this year of grace, or in any other year that lies ahead of us? That is my position. I assume the burden of the white man or the black man or the brown man, or any other man, when going forward to the discharge of my duty, laid upon me legitimately and by proper authority of the people of my country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have reached the point where a Republican Administration, after a long and painful study and careful consideration of every fact involved, with full knowledge of all the interests of the Philippine Islands, with a full, intelligent knowledge of the effect of this legislation upon the people of the United States, comes at the beginning of the second session of Congress, when this question has been submitted, and calls upon the assemblage here to stand by the Administration and see to it that its purposes in this behalf are not defeated.

What would be the effect of defeat now of this Administration measure? If we shall get any Democratic votes in favor of the passage of this bill, I shall not thank them for those votes, for they will be given to us upon a pretended reason that I repudiate; and if a man comes to me and offers me a pecuniary favor because he says I am too fair to own my own wrong, I reject his proposition; and if a Democrat comes to me and says that he proposes to vote for this bill because it is a step toward free trade, I reject his proposition, and say to him, "You can ride in the Jim Crow car if you want to; I don't want you in the first-class coach in which I ride." [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask you what would be the chance of passing this bill through the House without some Democratic votes over here?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think they would be very good.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If all Democrats vote against it?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You better begin ciphering on the insurrectos over there then. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not cipher. I have a mighty reliance upon the Republican majority of the House of Representatives. I have great confidence in the intelligence and patriotism of my colleagues, and when brought face to face with the situation, even after the powerful arguments that have been offered here in opposition to this bill, I believe that the gentleman who votes against this bill will do it against his own better judgment and because of an impelling power which I will refer to briefly and shortly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That impelling power is the power of the machine of this House.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I said he who voted against the bill would do so because of an impelling power. You have got the impelling power at the wrong end of the boat. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a gentleman in this House that has greater faith and confidence in the American doctrine of protection than I have. I do not boast of a designation by which I am sometimes designated, as a "stand-patter." The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said that we got that term from some disreputable source. He seems to have gone us one or two better in the course of his very able speech the other day and quoted from an authority quite as disreputable, the poker table.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I "raised" you. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. He "raised" us; I do not know what that means [renewed laughter]; but I will try to "see" what there is in the proposition. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. WILSON. You will "call" him, will you?

Mr. GROSVENOR. But, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a time yet when I would stand for every item and defend every item in the schedules of any tariff bill that I ever saw. I never saw the time when I claimed that all the items were consistent in every schedule of any tariff bill.

It is necessary and inevitable that with the long list of articles covered by the various schedules of the tariff bill there should be conditions that involve concessions and compromises and yielding of opinions and all that, and then again come the changes in business. Take the Dingley bill itself, passed in 1897, nearly nine years ago, and necessarily business conditions, conditions of production, conditions of markets, and conditions of the method of manufacture have all conspired to make some items of that bill suggestive of the propriety of changes when the proper time shall come and under proper circumstances.

If I should die before this term ends, and somebody should want to speak a good word for me, I want him to say that I boasted on the floor of the House that no man could find a time in the twenty years of my service when I had been absolutely consistent upon all these and kindred questions in all the details of my action in any two years of that time. [Laughter.] I indorse and adopt the statement in Lord Brougham's speech in the British House of Lords on a subject involving such a question as is here.

At the end of the Napoleonic war England was led to put a stop to the licenses granted under the intercourse act for importing provisions in foreign bottoms. The United States re-

taliated by shutting her ports against all vessels coming from ports from whence her vessels were excluded. In his speech on manufacturing distress, March 13, 1817, commenting on the fact that whatever may have been the good policy of the navigation law, it was unwise to adhere to its enactments a century after the cause for them had ceased to exist, Lord Brougham said as follows:

Here is a striking specimen of that obstinate, perverse system that refuses to vary with the alteration of circumstances; that will not accommodate itself to the progress of events, or follow the course of times and seasons, but clings superstitiously to what is now inapplicable, though it may once have been important, as if time were standing still and history were not the record of unceasing change.

We live, Mr. Chairman, in a period of time when conditions are changing, when conditions are driving legislation and executive action, when new questions are to be decided and new important results to grow out of them, when new elements are entering in, and he who can not meet the growing exigencies of a country and of times like these is not fit to be trusted by the American people. Consistency may become stubborn adherence to a record which needs to be changed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it will not interrupt the gentleman, he has just stated that he is not wedded to any particular tariff schedule, that he does not object to amending or revising or adjusting certain ones.

I should like to ask him which one of those tariff schedules he is willing to go in with us and revise? We might all get together—all of us "tariff reformers."

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman is very ingenious, and always puts words into the mouth of his opponent that his opponent did not use. I said I never was wedded to all of the items of a tariff bill. Is that saying that I am ready now to enter into some kind of a revision of the tariff?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Which schedules of the Dingley tariff are you not wedded to? We want to get the chance for revision.

Mr. GROSVENOR. When you put yourself in the attitude of being entitled to call on me for details I will furnish them to you. That time has not come yet. [Laughter.]

So, Mr. Chairman, I am ready to vote for this bill from the standpoint of a "stand-patter." I would not vote for this bill if it would be injurious, in my judgment, to a great industry in this country. I am not complaining of the gentlemen who are so earnestly and so honestly standing for what they believe to be resistance to an attack upon a great industry of theirs. I admire the pluck, the courage, and everything else except the intelligence of the gentlemen who are doing this. [Laughter.] I differ with them about the facts. I was here when we had the Porto Rican trouble. I was here when we had the Cuban trouble. Why, all the prophets, from Jeremiah—who, I believe, is one of the major prophets—down to the least among the minor prophets, never uttered one-tenth part of the prophetic declarations that were uttered by gentlemen on this floor as to the sad effects that were to come to this country from the Porto Rican tariff and afterwards from the Cuban reciprocity bill. And yet here we are, living in the most prosperous hour of the most prosperous year that this country or any other country ever saw, and I can prove it even by the speech of the governor of Massachusetts, who can shout one minute and shed tears the next—shout for the grand prosperity of Massachusetts, and then cry over a cent and a quarter additional cost on a pair of shoes. [Laughter.]

I am not going any further. I have said already that I accept as conclusive and unanswerable the speech made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and mere prophetic declarations of these gentlemen will not swerve me from that belief. Why, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say a great deal about the details of the food upon which we have been fed upon this occasion.

I listened to the testimony of a very able, careful, shrewd witness, who traveled all over certain portions of the Philippine Islands in the interest of the beet-sugar people of this country. He was there when the Taft party was there. We did not see him. It was said he was sick in a hospital; but he came home loaded with a wonderful amount of facts, as he called them. Now, if you will take his testimony—and they rely upon it more than all the rest they have on the other side of this question—you will find that there is not one word of the testimony of Mr. Hathaway that would not be ruled out as incompetent in any justice's court in the United States. He has not given you a single fact that is worth anything that he does not emphatically say is hearsay. He tells you that he met somebody at such a place, and that person told him so-and-so. There was a Commission in the islands taking testimony, and those gentlemen might all have been called there and have testified and been cross-examined, but we never heard of one of them. But at last we discovered the vulnerable point in Hathaway's testimony. He had Munchausen reports from all over the islands of the tremendous quantity of sugar that could be raised per acre, the very great cheapness with which it could be produced, and finally we discovered that when he made his appearance in those islands he gave notice to the people, or let it be understood, that he represented a vast capital of money in the United States that was over there to buy sugar lands, and if there is any people on earth that can paint a picture of future prosperity it is the Filipino sugar raisers.

Mr. FORDNEY. May I interrupt the gentleman? What information was there in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee that Mr. Hathaway made any such investigation?

Mr. GROSVENOR. It was not very strong evidence, but he stated it in my hearing. [Laughter.] He said so in his own testimony.

Mr. FORDNEY. It was not printed in the hearings.

Mr. GROSVENOR. He admitted that he went there and represented himself to be in the interests of gentlemen that would probably, if he made a favorable report, invest largely in sugar lands in the Philippine Islands. My friend will not deny that.

Mr. DALZELL. If my colleague will allow me, he so stated, and that when he came home he made a report to his people against the investment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; he came home with all that florid statement that he heard and was wise and shrewd enough to say to his people, "We don't want to buy any of that land;" and I would say the same thing. Well, so much for that. I have heard this testimony, observed what I could, and I will round up on this question in a very few words. I do not believe that the passage of this bill, even if it had absolute free trade in it in sugar and tobacco, would come anywhere near in ten years' time compensating for the growth of consumption of sugar and tobacco in the United States.

I noticed the other day that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who does not seem to be in his seat, made some very strong remarks about anybody who was silly enough to believe or be affected by the absurd story that though the Philippine producer of sugar and tobacco would not bring his product into this market, yet the passage of this bill would be a benefit to him.

I may not have the intelligence of the gentleman from Wyoming, and he shall be at liberty to single me out as one of the men out of the class that he branded. He can have me. I was puzzled a little just as he was, only I did not decide the question so promptly as he did, and I did not call anybody a fool for believing differently from what I did. I was worried about this proposition. Finally here came a very intelligent man. I asked a good many other questions of the same sort, but here was evidently a man who understood everything connected with the raising, marketing, and selling of sugar of the Philippine Islands. He was a well-educated man, a man who spoke finely—he did not speak in any language that I understood, but he spoke well—and when his language was interpreted, as it was, it was very fine language, even after it had been subjected to the interpretation which was made rapidly as he spoke. I said to him, "You state, in the first place, that if this law should pass, nevertheless you will not send your products to the United States?" "That is what I said." "In the next place, you say it will greatly benefit the people of the Philippine Islands to have this law passed?" "That is what I say." "Now," I said, "will you kindly make it manifest to me, so that I can understand, how you can bring that about?" He went very patiently, but calmly and pleasantly, to work and reached this result: He said, "Our sugar market is in China and Japan"—and I might say to the gentleman from Wyoming that every man with ordinary understanding knows that, but I won't apply that language to him or anybody else. In this world we do not carry heavy commodities 10,000 miles when the best market with the least competition in it in all the world lies within 1,500 miles.

Mr. MONDELL (who had just come upon the floor). Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not heard what the gentleman said in regard to myself, except the last remark, but I think the gentleman just said that anyone who had any sense—and, of course, I must be included in that category—knew that the market for the sugar of the Philippine Islands was in China and Japan.

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; I am trying to answer your proposition, that the statement that the repeal of the Dingley tariff on sugar would not crowd the American market. I have entered upon the job of making it apparent to you, if possible, and at

least I hope to reach the point so that the next time the gentleman speaks of men who believe as I do the gentleman will modify the language he puts into his speech.

Mr. MONDELL. Then the gentleman from Ohio did not say, as I understood him to say, that the market for the Philippine sugar was in China and Japan?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; I did say so.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, why do they ask us to give them an advantage of $1.20 on the basis of muscovado sugar in our market from other tropical sugars if the market is not here, but in China or Japan?

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman had come in a little earlier or had stayed out a little later I would have done that. [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. Will my colleague allow me a moment?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. DALZELL. There is not a pound of muscovado sugar coming from the Philippine Islands. It is all molasses sugar, and if the gentleman from Wyoming bases his statement on that proposition he bases it on a thing that does not exist.

Mr. MONDELL. I use the word "muscovado," because it is a word largely used in commerce, but I could have used the word "molasses" equally as well. It would have been quite as proper. What I did say applies to molasses sugar. I was simply referring to the fact the average duty on Philippine sugar, call it what you may, in the markets of the United States without any rebate or reduction is $1.20 a hundred, and if their market is in China, why do they ask a reduction of $1.20 a hundred in our markets?

Mr. DALZELL. There is a fundamental difference between muscovado sugar and the sugar that comes from the Philippines.

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to the gentleman, as far as my argument is concerned, it is entirely immaterial.

Mr. DALZELL. I do not think it is.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I have taken infinite pains to make that the one plain proposition of my whole speech, and I did it for the sole purpose of enlightening the gentleman from Wyoming. I said he was not here, and I regretted it, but I had to make it, and now he has spoiled all I have said and will not understand what I say hereafter. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. I will say, Mr. Chairman, I will not unless the gentleman is a little more clear in his statements hereafter than he has been up to this time.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have been very clear, but he did not hear it. Now, let me restate this proposition. I asked this very intelligent gentleman—I will not go into the details now about the language and his wide fund of knowledge—I said to him: "You say now you want this tariff taken off in the interest of the sugar raiser of the Philippine Islands, and yet in the next breath you say if it is taken off nevertheless you will not go there with your commodity." Now, then, I just reached that point. I will now go on. Of course everybody knows who knows anything about it, and my friend from Wyoming knows a good deal about it, knows the sugar that is sold in China and Japan is almost exclusively unrefined sugar. There is not a great business in refining sugar in the Orient. Conditions are not favorable to the refining of sugar. There is an attempt at refining in two large institutions in Hongkong, but the great body of the sugar that is raised in the Philippine Islands or anywhere else in the Orient is sold in China and Japan as "brown sugar," as we would call it, or "raw sugar," as the trade would call it. Now, then, the merchant of China comes to the city of Iloilo, and conscious of his power he makes this statement: "I want so many tons of raw sugar and I will give you so much a ton for it." Now, then, what are the elements that stand to either compel the merchants of Iloilo to sell that sugar or to refuse to sell it? He takes his pencil and begins to figure, first the freight to New York, then loading at Iloilo, then a cent and upward duty on the sugar in New York, and the Chinaman has figured it out just as closely as the Filipino has. He knows just exactly how much duty will have to be paid in New York; he knows just exactly how much freight will have to be paid and insurance and everything else of that character, and he makes his figures accordingly, and he makes his proposition to the Filipino commission merchant, or whatever he may be, and that merchant has no other market, I say to the gentleman from Wyoming, and therefore he must sell his sugar with the impediment of our tariff standing in the way.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Unless the gentleman wants to ask me something I do not think he ought to cut into my argument by attempting to answer it now.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman does not care to yield——

Mr. GROSVENOR. If you think I have not now made it plain.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the gentleman to say the Filipino had no other market except the markets of China and Japan. Of course he has the market of the world, as the Java planter and the Borneo planter has, and has he not also under the present reduction an advantage of nearly $7 a ton on the 88 cents that he now pays on the average?

Mr. GROSVENOR. He has that advantage.

Mr. MONDELL. And is not that more than the effort to give them an insurance?

Mr. GROSVENOR. That may be, but yet the remaining unrepealed portion of the duty stands in his way just exactly as much.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not caring what weight all this has. I have tried to show that the Filipino merchant is interested to the extent of our tariff because it stands against the price he can obtain for his sugar, no matter where he attempts to sell it. So much for that.

I will not say anything about tobacco. I represent a State that has a large tobacco interest in it, and if I thought the poor miserable stuff that is produced in the archipelago of the Philippines would come into competition so as to injure the tobacco of my State I would be sorry for the tobacco of my State. There is not a pound of that Manila tobacco that can be sold in the Cincinnati markets at any price whatever. There is not a raiser of tobacco in the Miami Valley that would turn aside for one moment to consider taking that tobacco by the ton if it were given to him.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would the gentleman send a box of the average Manila cigars to a constituent of his whose vote he wanted?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would; but I would do it in this way: I would say, first, "My friend, I do not smoke; therefore I do not know anything about these. If these are not fit to smoke, you can use them as curiosities." In that way I might be tempted to do it, but I would not send a box to the skilled gentleman, my colleague, whose good taste and accuracy of judgment in these matters are proverbial, who has addressed me just now.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is, if you wanted to maintain his friendship?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; and I certainly value it very highly.

Well, Mr. Chairman, so much for this question. I do not mean alone the Cabinet, I do not mean alone the Senate or the House of Representatives when I say I do not wish to see the Administration balked in its purposes toward the Philippine Islands. I mean that I am not willing to see the onward progress that the Republican party has made in the discharge of its sworn duty to the Philippine Islands broken down and turned back and chaos reigning where there ought to be harmony and unity of action. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The present Administration of the Government has been industrious, intelligent, and patriotic, following up the line of administrative action laid down by the McKinley Administration in the early days of our administration of this important duty. There was no man in the United States who could have been selected who would have been better fitted for the position than the distinguished gentleman, William H. Taft, and if ever a man devoted himself intelligently, devotedly, and unselfishly to the accomplishment of a great purpose that man was Taft. Standing by the interests of his own country and the Administration which he represented, he nevertheless so administered his high office as to challenge and receive the approval, admiration, and affection of the Filipino people. In our excursions through the islands it was marvelous to witness the enthusiastic admiration that the common people had for Taft. Taft is an American, a Republican, and a strong supporter of the principles and policies of the Republican party, and yet he comes here zealous in support of this bill and comes here as a representative of the Republican party and a representative in the highest degree of the best sentiment of the American people.

Now, then, a very few words about the Filipino. I do not expect to be here at the time, but I want to say to the gentlemen that the hardest things that have been said about the future of the Philippine Islands, the talk about the degraded people, their stupidity, their ignorance, their poverty, their barbarism, all of the most eloquent language that has ever been used during the whole of these past years pale into insignificance as compared with the description that Daniel Webster gave of all the people in the great territory we acquired from Mexico and upon which stands the great State of California and the Territories

of New Mexico and Arizona. I quote from Mr. Webster's speech in Congress:

There are some things one can argue against with temper and submit to, if overruled, without mortification. There are other things that seem to affect one's consciousness of being a sensible man and to imply a disposition to impose upon his common sense. And of this class of topics, or pretensions, I have never heard of anything more ridiculous in itself, more absurd, and more affrontive to all sober judgment than the cry that we are getting indemnity by the acquisition of New Mexico and California. I hold they are not worth a dollar; and we pay for them vast sums of money.

Go back, you gentlemen who think you can foretell things, and think you can see ahead of them, and read what the great leaders of sentiment in the Senate and House of Representatives said when the question of ratifying the treaty with France by which we acquired the Louisiana purchase came. You will find that they were limited in their scope to the Allegheny Mountains, and they did not believe that God himself would ever have anything to do with anybody that did not live on this side of the mountains, and I am afraid that some of them are in the same boat to-day [laughter], as I will attempt to show you after a little.

When the nation's claims to the Oregon country were under consideration, a distinguished United States Senator, Mr. McDuffie, said:

What is the nature of the country? Why, as I understand it, 700 miles this side of the Rocky Mountains is uninhabitable—a region where rain seldom falls, a barren, sandy soil, mountainous, totally impassable. Well, now, what are we going to do in this case? How are you going to employ steam? Have you made anything like an estimate of the cost of a railroad from here to the Columbia? Why, the wealth of the Indies would be insufficient. Of what use will this be for agricultural purposes? Why, I would not for that purpose give a pinch of snuff for the whole territory. I thank God for His mercy in placing the Rocky Mountains there.

And when the purchase of Alaska was contemplated, Benjamin F. Butler, a Representative from Massachusetts, declared:

If we are to pay for Russia's friendship this amount, I desire to give her the $7,200,000 and let her keep Alaska. * * * I have no doubt that any time within the last twenty years we could have had Alaska for the asking. I have heard it was so stated in the Cabinets of two Presidents, provided we would have taken it as a gift. But no man, except one insane enough to buy the earthquakes in St. Thomas and the ice fields in Greenland, could be found to agree to any other terms for its acquisition to the country.

I believe that the Philippine Islands will become one of the greatest jewels in the crown of American achievement. Mr. Chairman, a people domestic, orderly, well behaved, willing to work, temperate in their habits, and sending under these conditions more than half a million of children to the English schools in those islands, rapidly adjusting themselves to American customs, to American law, to American purposes, who people that rich country—not all tobacco land, not all sugar land, not all abacá land, but a country competent to support the whole population and raise products to be sent abroad—a people that will thus adjust themselves to American customs and American conditions is a people not to be treated in the manner that the Philippine people are being treated by some of our statesmen. It may be a long time. Well, this country is going to last a long time. This country will have obligations to the people of the Philippines when the youngest Member of this House is dead and his grandchildren are in Congress.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not the optimistic view which the gentleman expresses, and with which I agree, relative to the Filipinos and their possibilities, the view that all the gentlemen have taken who have opposed the bill? And is it not true that the other view of the Filipinos, the view that pictures him as impossible of improvement and his country impossible of development, the view that has been taken by the gentlemen who are for the bill?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The argument of the gentleman, to the man who is utterly selfish and feels no obligation to God or man or duty, is a strong argument. It does not have any effect upon me whatever. I owe an obligation to a source that is higher.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman owe a higher obligation to the Filipinos than to the people of the United States?

Mr. GROSVENOR. To the Almighty above any human being; and when I believe He has laid a duty on me, I will try to discharge it if I may in so doing do harm to nobody else.

Now we are getting into a field of operation in which I do not think either one of us has been famous up to this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, at this fortunate or unfortunate time, as it may be, in the history of our country, the Democratic party on this floor, through its most fearless and able champion—of course I need not say I refer to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]—comes here and seeks to stir up trouble about the tariff question; and I am going to refer to one or two of the propositions he made the other day. I give him notice now that if he ever again attempts to assault the memory of James G. Blaine I shall rise up in condemnation of him. I am going to give him the fullest opportunity to apologize after my speech is finished [laughter]; and if he does not do it, I give him notice he must never read that extract from Blaine's book on the tariff of 1846 without reading a whole lot more with it. Mr. Blaine wrote a book. He wrote the facts of history on events, events that he had witnessed and events that he had not witnessed; and I have never yet heard anybody charge him with unfairness, especially in the first volume of his writings. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] undertook to bring Mr. Blaine into court to testify so as to impeach the Republican platform of 1904. He indicted the platform, and he made some remarks more or less complimentary to the supposed author of the platform, a distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, when he proposed to assail it. Now I am going to quote the platform exactly; I am going to say to you that he got the idea of that platform from a speech that was made a number of years ago in the Senate of the United States by Senator Harry Davis, of West Virginia, in which he said, in substance, he had lived a long time, that he had studied the tariff question, and he always noticed that when we had a high tariff we had prosperity, and when we had a low tariff we had adversity; and Mr. LODGE, a wonderful historian, who looks into all the publications, had discovered, I assume, Mr. Davis's speech, and he incorporated it in substance and effect into the platform upon which Roosevelt was nominated for President. The substantial effect of that platform is that whenever we have had low tariff it has done harm, and whenever we had a high tariff we have had good times. Now, I am going to make a few brief remarks for the benefit of the gentleman from Missouri, and in the first place I am going to put his witness on the stand, and I am going to quote the whole of that witness's testimony.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say in ordinary fairness that the gentleman from Ohio ought to quote all the sentence.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am going to quote it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, if that is your text, you ought to state what it is; no preacher is allowed to suppress an essential part of the sentence of his text that he is going to preach from.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And no man ought to read one paragraph of a man's statement before a court and then leave out another one.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, Mr. Chairman, there is not a man who ever practiced law twelve months in his life——

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have practiced longer than that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You have practiced longer than that—that does not invariably use that portion of the witness's statement on the other side that best suits his own case and leaves the other out if he wants to. [Laughter.] That's the rule laid down in the books, and it is a sensible rule. Now, if the gentleman does not know what that sentence in the Republican platform is, I will quote it to him verbatim.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have sent for it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad you have.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am very proud of it. Now, then, what Mr. Blaine wrote is a very good statement of facts, but before I read the paragraph to which I have referred, I want to say that another gentleman—doubtless by error of knowledge—I can not make that apology for my friend from Missouri—undertook to assail Mr. Blaine upon the same proposition, no less a personage than Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Blaine made an answer to Mr. Gladstone, which I am going to read. It will be found in the North American Review, in a debate between those two great men, who are both dead.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want to interrupt you, but I want to protest against your assuming that I assailed Blaine. I did not do anything of the sort.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am not saying that you did.

Now, I want to give the gentleman the language of the platform of the Republican party, so that we can start square, and I say to him that it is in effect the same declaration that was made by Mr. Davis when he was a Senator:

A Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a Republican tariff by business prosperity.

There we are.

Now—

Says Mr. Blaine, about the tariff of 1846, which seems to be the sole oasis in the desert of Democratic tariff making—

one of the most suggestive experiments of that kind—

Which is a tariff for revenue—

had its origin in the tariff to which I have just referred, passed in 1846, in apparent harmony with England's newly declared financial policy.

At that moment a Southern President [Mr. Polk] and a Southern Secretary of the Treasury [Mr. Robert J. Walker] were far more interested in expanding the area of slave territory than in advancing home manufactures, and were especially eager to make commercial exchanges with Europe on the somewhat difficult basis of cotton at high prices and returning fabrics at low prices.

Under ordinary circumstances the free-trade tariff of 1846 would have promptly fallen under popular reprobation and been doomed to speedy repeal. But it had a singular history, and for a time was generally acquiesced in, even attaining in many sections a certain degree of popularity. Never did any other tariff meet with so many and so great aids of an adventitious character to sustain it as did this enactment of 1846. Our war with Mexico began just as the duties were lowered, and the consequence was the disbursement of more than $100,000,000 in a way that reached all localities and favorably affected all interests. This was a great sum of money for that period, and for the years 1846, 1847, and 1848 it considerably more than doubled the ordinary outlay of the Government. In the middle of this period the Irish famine occurred and called for an immense export of breadstuffs at high prices. The discovery of gold in California the succeeding year flushed the channels of business as never before by rapidly enlarging the circulation of coin in all parts of the country. Before this outpouring of gold had ceased the three great nations of Europe, as precedence was reckoned at that time—England, France, and Russia—entered upon the Crimean war. The export of manufactures from England and France was checked; the breadstuffs of Russia were blocked and could not reach the markets of the world. An extraordinary stimulus was thus given to all forms of trade in the United States. For ten years—1846 to 1856—these adventitious aids came in regular succession and exerted their powerful influence upon the prosperity of the country.

The withdrawal or termination of these influences, by a treaty of peace in Europe and by the surcease of gold from California, placed the tariff of 1846 where a real test of its merits or its demerits could be made. It was everywhere asked with apprehension and anxiety, Will this free-trade tariff now develop and sustain the business of the country as firmly and securely as it has been developed and sustained by protection? The answer was made in the ensuing year by a widespread financial panic.

I sometimes differ with my friend about the proper use of the word "panic," and I have had a great many very nice discussions with him as to whether panic and hard times mean the same thing. I say we can have a panic and not hard times, and we can have hard times and have no panic. Here we had a panic that came immediately after these adventitious matters had passed away.

The answer was made in the ensuing year by a widespread financial panic, which involved the ruin of thousands, including proportionately as many in the South as in the North, leaving the country disordered and distressed in all the avenues of trade. The disastrous results of this tariff upon the permanent industries of the country are described in President Buchanan's well-remembered message communicated to Congress after the panic.

Mr. Buchanan was a Democrat, the last Democratic President but one, I say. Doubtless my friend would hesitate, but he would be inclined to say that Buchanan was the last Democratic President this country had. This is what Mr. Buchanan said:

With unsurpassed plenty in all the elements of national wealth our manufacturers have suspended, our public works are retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds are abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers are thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

This testimony as to the result of a free-trade tariff is all the more forcible from the fact that Mr. Buchanan, as a member of President Polk's Cabinet, had consented to the abandonment of protection, which in his earlier career he had earnestly supported.

And a large amount more, showing that while Mr. Blaine admitted the ten years of prosperity, he always pointed out that there was a special reason for it, and always pointed out that when these adventitious supports fell away the crash came.

Now, here is what my friend [Mr. CLARK of Missouri] quoted, and if I have said that I thought he was unfair I certainly did not mean that, for he is the fairest man ever I had a controversy with. A man who knows as much as he does can afford to be fair. Here is what he said, and he read this, and I had heard it so often that I could almost repeat it by heart, but I never could get the documents to answer it until now:

The Whig victory of 1848 was not sufficiently decisive to warrant any attempt, even had there been desire, to change the tariff. General Taylor had been elected without subscribing to a platform or pledging himself to a specific measure, and he was therefore in a position to resist and reject appeals of the ordinary partisan character. Moreover, the tariff of 1846 was yielding abundant revenue, and the business of the country was in a flourishing condition at the time his Administration was organized. Money became very abundant after the year 1849, large enterprises were undertaken, speculation was prevalent, and for a considerable period the prosperity of the country was general and apparently genuine. After 1852 the Democrats had almost undisputed control of the Government, and had gradually become a free-trade party. The principles embodied in the tariff of 1846 seemed for the time to be so entirely vindicated and approved that resistance to it ceased, not only among the people, but among the protective economists, and even among the manufacturers to a large extent. So general was this acquiescence that in 1856 a protective tariff was not suggested or even hinted by any one of the three parties which presented Presidential candidates.

Now, then, right over on the other page, against this statement of Mr. Blaine, right in the same chapter, is this:

The one excuse given for urging the passage of the act of 1857——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the gentleman unnecessarily, but I want to ask him if the tariff of 1857 did not cut the tariff rates lower than the Walker revenue tariff?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; it did, and I will show you the effect of it:

The one excuse given for urging the passage of the act of 1857 was that under the tariff of 1846 the revenues had become excessive, and the income of the Government must be reduced.

To-day you hear the Democratic doctrinaire—and my friend from Missouri was in that line of battle in the last Congress—say that inasmuch as we were threatened with a deficit in the Treasury we should have to lower the tariff in order to replenish the Treasury.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He says that the Walker tariff produced more revenue than was needed, but in 1857, by common consent of all parties, it was reduced unfortunately below the correct revenue point. I never have been in favor of cutting it below the revenue point. I am not now, because I want abundant revenue.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But while it stood at the revenue point it destroyed the industries of the country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If that is so, I want to ask you why the Whigs and Know-nothings and Democrats altogether joined on a proposition to cut the tariff lower than it was by the Walker tariff bill of 1846?

Mr. GROSVENOR. We were in an experimental stage then.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; the truth is we were in a prosperous stage and wanted to get rid of some of the surplus, but they put it too low.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I cite President Buchanan against the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He was in his dotage. I don't care a straw what he said. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I was not in my dotage. I was just admitted to practice law in 1857, and the hardest time that I ever saw in the United States of America was then.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the gentleman. This panic of 1857 came on after the tariff bill of 1857 was passed on the 3d day of March?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is, after the repeal of the Walker tariff bill?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That message was sent in in December, 1857, after the panic.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will see that those dates are made absolutely correct:

But it was soon found to be a most expensive mode of reaching that end. The first and most important result flowing from the new act was a large increase in importations and a very heavy drain in consequence upon the reserved specie of the country to pay the balance which the reduced shipments of agricultural products failed to meet.

In the autumn of 1857—

That was before the passage of the tariff law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was nine months after the passage.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is right—

In the autumn of 1857, half a year after the passage of the tariff act, a disastrous financial panic swept over the country, prostrating for the time all departments of business in about the same degree. The agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing interests were alike and equally involved. The distress for a time was severe and widespread. The stagnation which ensued was discouraging and long continued, making the years from 1857 to 1860 extremely dull and dispiriting in business circles throughout the Union. The country was not exhausted and depleted as it was after the panic of 1837, but the business community had no courage, energy was paralyzed, and new enterprises were at a standstill.

That is what Mr. Blaine says, and I read it in his interest.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question right here. I ask the gentleman as a lawyer if that statement I read from Mr. Blaine is not a plain statement of facts by a historian which he felt called on in the cause of truth to say, and if what the gentleman has read from Blaine in addition to what I read is not a special plea of a protectionist to bolster up protection by reason of his love of protection?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I decline to support any such proposition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will suggest at this point that I will put into the RECORD at this part of my speech conclusive and unanswerable evidence that from the foundation of this Government every change of the tariff from higher to a lower tariff has brought more or less disaster upon the country, and I will put it there in the form of facts and figures that the gentleman from Missouri will not be able to answer, and therefore I conclude upon this proposition that the Republican platform of 1904, emanating from whatever source it may have emanated, is abso-

lutely true, and is backed up by the concurrent evidence of the history of my country.

The documents which I here and now present I present with a deliberate challenge to the gentlemen on the other side of this question to assail the statements made and to show by historical proof that the statements are not correct. At the risk of being prolix and tedious, I think this matter is of the highest importance at this time, and the student of American commercial and financial history will find a wide and ever-interesting study as he goes through the record of the past to acquire wisdom for the discharge of his duty in the present.

The writer and compiler of these facts, Mr. Francis Curtis, is pretty well known to the people of this country, and I think I risk nothing in saying that his statement until contradicted will carry weight.

WHEN SHALL WE REVISE THE TARIFF?

(By Francis Curtis.)

It is manifestly due to those so-called tariff revisionists, both within and without the party, who are advocating an immediate change that those who oppose any change for the present should answer their query, "When shall we revise the tariff?"

First, a review of former revisions should be both profitable and instructive.

No material and complete revision of our first tariff of 1789 was made until 1812, when it was enacted:

"That an additional duty of 100 per cent upon the permanent duties now imposed by law upon goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States shall be levied and collected upon all goods, wares, and merchandise which shall, from and after the passing of this act, be imported into the United States from any foreign port or place."

And it was further enacted:

"That this act shall continue in force so long as the United States shall be engaged in war with Great Britain and until the expiration of one year after the conclusion of peace, and no longer: *Provided, however*, That the additional duties laid by this act shall be collected on all such goods, wares, and merchandise as shall have been previously imported."

This was the only complete revision of the tariff that has taken place in our history on account of war. The increase in tariff rates, coupled with the prohibitions of nonintercourse, threw us on our resources and resulted in the establishment of many new industries, which, in spite of the ravages of war, brought immense increase of national wealth and business activity. In a special message to Congress, February 20, 1815, President Madison asked—

"Deliberate consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufactures which have sprung into existence and attained an unparalleled maturity throughout the United States during the period of the European wars."

TARIFF ACT OF 1812.

The tariff act of 1812 provided for its own termination, which would have come without any legislation on February 17, 1816, one year after the treaty of Ghent was ratified. It was feared that the duties existing before the war would not afford sufficient protection to our newly established industries, and it was pretty well agreed on all sides that those duties should be increased. First, the act of 1812 was continued until June 30, 1816.

It was undoubtedly the purpose of the Members of the Fourteenth Congress to give us in the law of 1816 a thoroughly protective tariff, and yet it proved a failure, not because the principle upon which it was based was not protective in character, but because the spirit of industrialism which then prevailed in the mother country was such as to overcome with an inundation of goods the effects of protection which were not protective, simply because duties were not made high enough. In other words, moderate protection was no protection at all, and when England resolved to flood our country with her great accumulation of goods of all kinds, our tariff did not prove a sufficient barrier.

Our present revisionists would do well to study with great care the conditions and the results of that period of our history. For eight years we suffered as only a nation can suffer when she buys her goods from abroad and her own artisans are idle and unproductive. It was during this period that the tariff question as a great national policy came to the front in our politics and was most thoroughly debated, not only in both Houses of Congress but by the press and on the platform and through numberless pamphlets and speeches made throughout the country.

The result was a new tariff in 1824, which was intended to be, and which proved to be, thoroughly protective in character, and in the words of President McKinley: "The nation was quickened into new life, and the entire country under the tariff moved on to higher triumphs in industrial progress, and to a higher and better destiny for all of its people."

REVISION IN 1828.

So satisfactory was this tariff that it was still further revised in 1828, and higher duties substituted to such a degree that by its enemies it was called the "tariff of abominations," and its enactment marked the beginning of the secession spirit at the South, which led to nullification in 1832 and rebellion in 1861. In fact, it was the tariff of 1828 which brought about a sectional division which has not since been eradicated. Daniel Webster, the free trader of the early part of the century, seeing the benefits which accrued from the protective tariff of 1824, became himself one of the stanchest advocates of protection, because he saw that it was a benefit to the whole country, while John C. Calhoun, who had been a protectionist while Webster was a free trader, now believing that free trade would be better for his State and section, and jealous of the growing power of the North because of protection, became an ardent free trader.

The time spent in revising the tariff into the law of 1816 was thirty-nine days of actual consideration by both Houses of Congress and the President.

A considerable portion of the Sixteenth Congress, which began in December, 1819, was given up to a tariff controversy, but without legislation. The discussion was, however, productive of good.

FAILURE TO REVISE UPWARD.

As the country was now aroused to the necessity of a tariff which would put an end to foreign competition, the failure to revise the tariff in 1820 was a most severe disappointment to the protectionists throughout the country. Mr. Niles cites the case of a paper in Kentucky, the Lexington Public Inquirer, which at the failure of the bill came out with a black border and column rules, saying:

"Mourn, O ye sons and daughters of Kentucky! O ye inhabitants of the United States, put on sackcloth and ashes, for the great enemy of your independence has prevailed. You must still remain prostrate. Your agricultural productions must lie and rot on your hands."

Meetings were now held in various parts of the country, and memorials from all sides were presented to Congress. The Seventeenth Congress contented itself with resolutions, but no tariff legislation followed. The Eighteenth Congress, however, which met in December, 1823, took the matter up almost immediately. A bill was reported on January 9, 1824, and a discussion began on February 10. It passed on the 16th of April. The Senate began its consideration on the 28th of April and passed it on the 13th of May, it being signed by the President on May 25, having been debated and passed and approved in less than five months.

The Twentieth Congress met in December, 1827, and the new tariff bill was brought in on the last day of January following. It occupied the time of the House and the Senate about four months.

The so-called modified tariff of 1832 was not by any means a thorough revision, but simply contained amendments to the act of 1828. The compromise tariff of 1833 was, however, an entirely new measure, and was the result of conciliation to meet the demands of southern leaders. The enactment of the amendments to the tariff of 1828, which became known as the tariff of 1832, occupied but a few months, and was immediately followed by nullification.

COMPROMISE TARIFF OF 1832.

On the assembling of the Twenty-second Congress in December, 1832, the questions of nullification and the tariff were, of course, uppermost. A bill was reported on the 27th of December and discussion began on the 5th of January. On the 11th of February Mr. Clay gave notice in the Senate that he should on the next day ask leave to introduce a bill to modify the various acts imposing duties on imports. It was then that the basis of the compromise tariff was presented, and it must be remembered that it was presented by the father and founder of the American system of protection, as exemplified in the acts of 1824 and 1828. But Mr. Clay loved his country better than a section, and he believed that through compromise and conciliation he might save the Union, expecting that there would be found a way to protect our industries after the Union had been saved.

In the House of Representatives the so-called "Verplanck" bill had been for several weeks under debate, but the House was evidently waiting to see what the Senate would do, and the debates dragged along most wearily. On February 25, two days after the bill had passed the Senate, it was substituted in the House for the bill there pending, and it was approved by the President on March 21. But a few weeks had transpired in its discussion and enactment. In fact, up to this time three or four months at the longest was required for the framing and discussion and passage of a tariff law. Moreover, at no time could the tariff itself up to this period be called a paramount issue. Since 1820 the slavery question had been at the front, and the tariff question was always secondary. Even in the debate over the compromise of 1833 it was felt that the compromise itself was but a means toward an end—namely, the adjustment of the slavery question for the time being, if not for several years to come. The protectionists of the North preferred peace before all things and sacrificed the material interests of the country in order that peace might prevail.

The fiscal year 1834 then was entered upon with the prospect of constantly decreasing duties until all should be wiped out but 20 per cent by 1842. The crash came in 1837, and the worst panic and business depression which the country had yet known followed.

TARIFF OF 1842.

In 1840 the Democrats in their platform condemned protection and indorsed practical free trade, while the Whigs, although they adopted no platform, presented as their candidate William Henry Harrison, who was a strong protectionist. Mr. Harrison was elected, and with him John Tyler as Vice-President. Not only were these candidates successful, but a decided protectionist majority was elected to the next Congress. This Congress did not meet till December, 1841. Several attempts had been made to change the tariff of 1833, but none had been successful, and when the Twenty-seventh Congress was called together by President Harrison to meet in extraordinary session, May 31, 1841, although Mr. Harrison had been succeeded by Mr. Tyler, the condition of the Treasury was such as to require immediate attention. The last reduction under the tariff of 1833 had not yet taken place. Mr. Tyler, who had been professedly a protectionist while he was a candidate, now became hostile to his party interest and gave warning that the compromise act should not be altered except under urgent necessity.

The new tariff bill was not taken up in the House until the 24th of July and was debated less than a week. It was delayed in the Senate until the 27th of August and was passed almost immediately on the 31st. Here it will be seen that it required but little more than a month to enact a tariff law which was really a complete revision, and which took the place of a tariff then in operation. This law, although hastily constructed and passed, was by far the most elaborate bill which the country had known up to that time. It was made up of schedules consistently arranged and the specific duties were equitably imposed on both raw material and finished product.

TARIFF OF 1846.

The tariff of 1846 was framed by the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert J. Walker, of Mississippi. Mr. Walker was a pronounced free trader, and took the very first opportunity which his new position allowed him to start the machinery for the repeal of the tariff of 1842. Under that tariff the country had been exceedingly prosperous since its adoption. Hope revived and industry throughout the country felt a new impulse. The prosperity of the country continued, and, in addition to the increased business activity, the act of 1842 was also a good revenue raiser; in fact, the law was successful in every respect, and there was no reason whatever for its repeal on the ground of helping either industry or labor or the revenue. The reason lay far back of that, and was much the same as the reason for nullification in 1832. The President, who had received the votes of Pennsylvania, and therefore had been elected because he was thought to be a protectionist, at once fell in with the Southern leaders, whose tool he became, and in his message to Congress advocated a change in the existing tariff laws. His Secretary of the Treasury went much further, and in his annual report, dated December 3, 1845, gave to Congress one of the most famous tariff documents ever promulgated in this country. All students of the tariff should read this paper of Secretary Walker, although it can only be referred to here.

The Congress which met in December, 1845, organized in the House by the election of John W. Davis, of Indiana, a free trader, as Speaker, who appointed a Committee of Ways and Means consisting of six Democrats, five of whom were free traders, and three Whigs. A bill was not reported for some time, in fact, not until the middle of April, and it was not considered in Committee of the Whole until the middle of June. The bill was passed by the House on July 3, was placed before the Senate on July 13, and passed on July 28. The final vote on its passage in the Senate is one of historical interest, resulting in a tie, when the Vice-President, Mr. Dallas, elected because he was supposed to be a protectionist, cast the deciding vote with the free traders, making the passage of the bill a possibility.

ELEVEN YEARS OF FREE TRADE.

This tariff of 1846, or the Walker tariff, as it was called, remained practically unchanged for eleven years. A discussion of the merits of the bill, of the changes brought about by its adoption, and the result upon the industries of the country would require volumes and must not be attempted here. It may simply be stated that, abandoning all academic discussion upon the subject, accepting no editorial utterances, but confining ourselves to the news columns of the periodicals of the time, it brought idleness and poverty such as has seldom been known during any business depression of this country; and yet, in spite of this result, made especially apparent during the last few years of the life of the law, in 1857 the tariff was still further reduced, bringing a panic and further destruction of very many of our industries. It has been said that the vote in favor of the tariff of 1857 included many New England Members of Congress and many otherwise known as "protectionists." This is true, for the one reason that the President and Senate were absolutely against the North, and that even the House was Democratic on every issue except the slavery question. The northern manufacturers were not able to get protection for their finished product, and, in despair, they voted for a removal of the duty from the raw material of their goods, which in itself would give them a small measure of protection. The bill was debated from August, 1856, until its adoption on the last of February, 1857, again over six months being occupied in the passage of a bill which was not really a complete revision, but only amendments to another law.

The tariff of 1846, together with its offspring, the tariff of 1857, were in operation for a longer period of time than any other tariff in our history. It was also the longest continuous period of free trade which we have experienced since the foundation of the Government. Its trial was lengthy and thorough, and the result was disaster and ruin. The tariff question, however, was at the time a secondary question in politics and general interest throughout the country. The slavery question was paramount, and became so acute in 1854 that a new party was born, resolved to check the further extension of the slave power beyond the territory of the South. This party, known as the Republican party, did not at first make any attempt at an impossible solution of the tariff question In fact, it was not until the Thirty-sixth Congress, which met in December, 1859, that they had a controlling number of members in either House of Congress. In the House, after eight weeks' balloting, William Pennington, of New Jersey, a Republican, was chosen Speaker.

FIRST REPUBLICAN TARIFF LAW.

Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, was selected as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which at once framed a tariff law upon thorough protection lines, both for the purpose of raising revenue to meet the necessary expenses of the Government and to protect our labor and industries. This bill passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 105 to 64 on May 11, 1860. When it reached the Democratic Senate, however, it was held up, and would never have been heard of again in that Congress had not several southern Senators resigned their seats in the early part of 1861. After some debate the bill was passed by the Senate on February 20 of that year by a vote of 25 to 14, and it was signed by President Buchanan on March 2. Of this bill and its effect the Annual Encyclopedia for 1861 said:

"A revenue law affording uncommon protection to manufactures was enacted. This was proposed not for the purpose of husbanding the resources of the country in anticipation of approaching strife, but chiefly as a great party measure, and to secure an increase of prosperity to this great national interest. It has proved to be the wisest measure adopted during the session. It immediately checked the importation of foreign manufactures, secured the reduction of the debt of the country to other nations, caused a large importation of specie in payment of exports, and thereby enabled the citizens to advance loans to the Government in its most pressing hour."

This was the first measure enacted by the Republican party, and since the enactment of the Morrill law in 1861, which was framed and enacted solely for the purpose of revenue and protection, the Republican party has steadfastly and continuously advocated and adopted tariffs that have given protection to our labor and industries, and sufficient revenue, together with the internal revenue, to meet the necessary expenses of the Government.

TARIFF BECOMES PARAMOUNT.

With perhaps the exception of the tariff of 1824, there was no time in the history of the country previous to 1880 when the tariff could be called the paramount issue in any election or discussion. Even in 1833, when the compromise tariff was enacted, it was but a portion of the greater issue of disunion. From that time until 1861 slavery and its extension, secession and rebellion so far overshadowed all other questions that, although at times most acrimoniously debated, none ever rose to the dignity of a paramount issue. Following the enactment of the Morrill tariff, and along with the several amendments made necessary by the war and by the condition of the country following the war, the war itself and reconstruction succeeded by our financial adjustments far overshadowed the tariff question.

In 1867 attention was given to the wool and woolen interests, and the increased duty resulted most favorably to those industries. The same was true of the amendments of 1870, which gave great impetus to our iron and steel industries, and especially to the manufacture of steel rails, upon which a specific duty of $28 per ton was placed.

DOWNWARD REVISION IN 1872.

In 1872, however, the reformers and revisionists thought it time for a general reduction, and to appease their clamor a horizontal cut of 10 per cent was made. The panic of 1873 followed, due in part to this reduction. The 10 per cent reduction was repealed in 1875, to the benefit of all industries.

Protection from 1861 up to 1880 had produced sufficient revenue not only to carry on the necessary expenses of the Government, but to enable us to year after year reduce the great debt which had piled up during the civil war. Our industries were flourishing, our country was developing both in manufactures and agriculture, our great railroads were being built, and our coast and lake commerce increased at rapid strides; and yet, in spite of this great prosperity, in spite of the greatest industrial advance and increase of wealth which ever came to any nation in the same space of time, it was found in the campaign of 1880 and the years following that there was a desire on the part of a large number of our people to revise the tariff, and revision then meant, as it does now, reduction.

"FRIENDLY" REVISION IN 1883.

This question was an issue of the campaign of 1880, and although the Republicans and Protectionists won, the desire for revision would not down, and in 1882 so general was the cry that President Arthur in response appointed the famous tariff commission, whose recommendations were largely adopted by Congress, and the so-called "Commission law" of 1883 was framed and adopted.

The report of the commission was presented to the Forty-seventh Congress at its second session, in December, 1882, and the law reached the President for his signature on March 3, 1883. If we include the time spent by the commission in its hearings and preparation of its report, we may charge nearly a whole year of time to the preparation and enactment of the tariff law of 1883. This law remained unchanged until the McKinley tariff of 1890, although during the years intervening the tariff question could be called not only the paramount question in politics and general discussion, but practically the only question.

The election of Mr. Cleveland in 1884 gave new hopes to the so-called "reformers" of the United States, now being encouraged by the free traders of Great Britain, and in 1887 Mr. Cleveland in his message to Congress of that year devoted himself solely to the tariff question, advocating the doctrines set forth by the Cobden Club and the various free trade and reform elements of the United States. The result was the introduction of the Mills bill, a most iniquitous measure, which consumed months of debate in both House and Senate, although it was known that the bill could not possibly become a law. But the message of Mr. Cleveland and the debate upon the Mills bill again led to the tariff discusison during the Presidential campaign of 1888, when Mr. Cleveland was defeated by Mr. Harrison, and a Republican and protectionist House of Representatives was elected to join with the Republican Senate in framing an entirely new tariff law to supersede the one then in operation.

UPWARD REVISION IN 1890.

The Fifty-first Congress met on December 2, 1889, and the House organized by the election of Thomas B. Reed as Speaker, who a week after appointed William McKinley, of Ohio, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. President Harrison in his message had recommended a revision of the tariff law, and the Ways and Means Committee entered at once upon the preparation of a complete and comprehensive bill. Even with a good working majority in both Houses of Congress, and with a desire to have a new law at the earliest possible day, the McKinley bill did not reach the President until October 1, upon which day it also went into operation. Nearly ten months were spent in its construction, debate, and enactment. But this law was apparently condemned by the people two years afterwards, when they again elected Mr. Cleveland to the Presidency, in 1892, and with him a Congress Democratic in both branches. Although the platform and candidates were pledged to an immediate reform of the tariff and to the enactment of a free-trade law, yet it was August 27, 1894, before the tariff bill became a law, and then without the President's signature. It took the Democratic party nearly a year and a half to prepare and agree upon a tariff law, which when framed and amended and finally passed was not satisfactory to a single Member of either House of Congress, nor to the President, who would neither veto nor sign it. The effect of this law is too recent and too well-known to be more than alluded to here.

FREE-TRADE REVISION IN 1894.

Never before, perhaps, in the history of our country was the anticipation of legislation so keen as in the case of the Democratic tariff law of 1894. Immediately after the election of Mr. Cleveland in 1892, and with him the assurance that both Houses of Congress would be Democratic, the country awoke to the situation and began at once to prepare for it. It was not known what kind of a tariff law would be put on our statute books, but it was known that duties would be reduced all along the line, and that we would have practical free trade for many, if not all, of our industries. The panic which had accompanied previous reductions of the tariff did not wait for the actual occurrence of the reduction of duties. Capitalists, manufacturers, and merchants all knew from previous experience what was to be expected, and so the panic came at once, and continued as long as the tariff continued. Fortunately, the people came to the rescue in the next election, and gave us a Republican House of Representatives, while in 1896 Mr. McKinley was elected, and with him a good majority in both branches of the National Legislature. Again anticipation acted before realization, and just as soon as the commercial and financial interests of the country were assured of protection being restored hope returned and the busy wheels commenced to revolve and employment gave place to idleness, so that when the Dingley law went into operation, on July 24, 1897, after six months spent in its preparation, debate, and enactment, the country was prepared for the busy and prosperous years which followed, and which have continued until the present time.

AVERAGE TIME SPENT IN TARIFF REVISION.

Our tariff history shows, in the first place, that on an average from six to twelve months are required for the preparation, hearing, debate, and enactment of a tariff law. We have also spent many months of hearings and debates on bills which have not been enacted into law. It is always a period of the greatest suspense to all industrial and commercial interests, and this suspense has affected business in the past according as to whether the tariff under debate was to be revised upward or downward. We need not go back to our early history for illustrations of this effect, as they were not so keen during the first half of our history, when the tariff question was not the uppermost subject for discussion, and when industrial development constituted but a small fraction of its present tremendous proportions, as has been the case during the last generation. A knowledge that the tariff will be reduced or increased has much the same effect as does the actual reduction or increase itself. This has been notably the case with regard to our last two laws, the so-called "Wilson-Gorman law" of 1894 and the "Dingley law" of 1897, both of which repealed the tariff then in operation. Till the enactment of the law of 1890 we have had no instance since 1861 of one law entirely replacing another. The various laws during and immediately after that law, the laws of

1867, 1870, and 1872, and even the Commission law of 1883, were amendatory rather than repealing, and so the entire country was not so much concerned as those engaged in industries which were known to be under consideration. But in 1892 and 1893, when it was known that our whole protective principle would be overturned and substituted by a law having for its basis free trade, our people were naturally apprehensive and prepared for the worst; in other words, they prepared for an inundation of foreign goods which would replace our own manufactures.

In 1896 the feeling was exactly the reverse. It was then known that the period of free trade would soon be followed by the enactment of a protective law, and that our own industries and labor would soon have sufficient protection against the competition of foreign mills in Europe and throughout the world.

DISASTER HAS INVARIABLY ATTENDED REDUCTIONS.

The history of our tariff laws shows, too, that in every instance without exception since the foundation of the Government where the existing tariff or any part of it has been reduced there have followed disastrous consequences in all or a part of our industries. There has not been a single exception—not one. On the other hand, it can be said that in every instance where the tariff has been increased as a whole or upon single industries those industries and the commercial prosperity of the country at large have been increased and continued so long as that higher tariff itself continued. This, too, can be laid down as a rule without a single exception.

It must be admitted that during our history there have been reasons for a change in our tariff laws unconnected with the wants of our labor and industries. This has been the question of revenue. Here, again, we have never been in agreement, a portion of our people believing that low duties would bring large revenues. The opposite, however, has been the case. For a time, it is true, low duties might mean a large increase of importations and consequent increase in duties, but as our own idleness and low wages meant a loss of purchasing power, then importations must fall off and duties as well.

It was said that the reason for the lowering of the duties in 1857 was because of our redundant Treasury, and yet our redundant Treasury was not due to the receipt of customs under the Walker tariff, but to the receipts from the sales of public lands; but under the reduced duties of 1857 the revenue fell, as it did before and has since, under purely revenue laws, while, on the contrary, under our protective tariffs our revenues have almost invariably been more than sufficient to meet the necessary expenses of the Government and to decrease our national debt. In fact, one of the reasons for the propaganda of the reformers from 1880 to 1890 was because our revenues were so large as to become almost a menace to good government.

Our history, then, shows that wherever we have reduced the tariff, whether reduction has been brought about by our free traders or by protectionists, it has been more or less disastrous. This was the case in 1816, 1872, and 1883, when the tariff was supposed to be revised by its friends. In 1890, on the contrary, when it was revised by its friends, but when the rates were increased, the results were beneficial, and the years 1891 and 1892, under the operation of this law, were the most prosperous in our history up to that time, the assertions of Democratic orators and free traders to the contrary notwithstanding.

Important tariff revisions.

Law of—	Reason for revision.	Time consumed.[a]	Nature of change.	Result.
1812	War	No debate	Rates doubled	Beneficial
1816	To provide new rates after repeal of war duties.	39 days	Moderate protection.	Disastrous
1824	Ruinous condition of industries.	4½ months	Substantial increase.	Beneficial
1823	To increase prosperity	4 months	Further increase	Do.
1832	Conciliation	6 months	Decrease	Injurious
1833	Compromise to save the Union.	2 months	do	Disastrous
1842	To save our industries	5 months	Increase	Beneficial
1846	To satisfy the Southern free traders.	3½ months	Free trade and ad valorem duties.	Ruinous
1857	To decrease the revenue and still further satisfy the South.	6 months	Further decrease	Bankruptcy
1861	First Republican tariff for revenue and protection.	11 months	Increase	Beneficial
1861 1862 1863 1864 1865	To meet requirements of war.	Passed promptly.	General increases	Do.
1867	To help wool and woolen industries.	7 months	Upward changes	Do.
1870	To establish new industries, especially iron and steel.	4 months	$28 per ton on steel rails.	Do.
1872	To conciliate "reformers."	3 months	10 per cent reduction.	Injurious
1875	To correct act of 1872	1 month	Repeal of 10 per cent reduction.	Beneficial
1883	To conciliate revisionists	2 months	Reduction and increased free list.	Injurious
1890	To meet existing conditions.	5½ months	Increase and specific rates.	Beneficial
1894	To try free trade	8 months	Large reduction, free wool, etc.	Ruinous
1897	To provide revenue and to protect our failing industries.	5 months	Substantial increase.	Beneficial

[a] This is the time of actual debate and passage, exclusive of time spent in agitation, hearings, and preparation.

Thus it will appear and will be sustained by proof as strong as proof of Holy Writ that the declaration of Senator Harry Davis in the Senate of the United States many years ago and the statement made by the platform of the Republican party was in spirit and in letter absolutely true not only in substance and effect, but in the details and fullness of statement. It is the imperishable record of more than one hundred and twenty-five years that the American people prosper under high tariffs and suffer under low tariffs, and that accounts for the fact that the Democratic party has been so utterly unable to command the popular sentiment of the American people. Their victories have come when, taking advantage of an opportunity of some character, they have carried away the public mind from the discussion of the tariff question.

And now one further point for the benefit of the gentleman. I take a special interest in this point for he has driven it at me so many times, and I have quailed under it, and I am delighted that at length I am able to meet and turn back the shaft of his wit and argument. He came, he says, pretty near catching somebody here the other day, who, not knowing that the President of the United States in his younger days wrote a eulogy of Mr. Benton—he came very near saying that the writer of that paragraph was a free trader. I denied that. I had heard a great deal about Mr. Benton, and I remembered something about the salt tax. Now, let us see what the statement of the gentleman from Missouri is. He says that Mr. Benton procured the repeal of the salt tax. He will never make that statement again while he lives. He will put a modification to that that will be very significant and very effective. He says that the President, writing of Benton, said Benton did right, or words to that effect, and I said I agreed with Benton and I agreed with the President, and I did that rather hastily. Now, I come to say I offer three cheers for old Tom Benton, who stood away back in 1828 right on the platform and under the crowning principles of the Republican stand-patter of to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] Let us see. There was no salt manufactured in the United States of any considerable importance, but there was a great trade in meats and fish shipped abroad, and the regulation of the traffic required that the meat of the United States should be packed in what Benton called "alum" salt, which was a foreign product—none of it produced in the United States then and none of it ever produced in the United States since so far as I know. It was salt for the fishermen of New England, because it was to them a source of a great deal of trouble and annoyance that they must pack their foreign-trade fish and meats in a salt that was not produced in the United States, and therefore when we put a tariff on all salt, which we have now in the United States, it of course affected them unfavorably. Now, I will not trouble you to read at any great length what Mr. Benton says about it, but I cite page 154 of the first volume of Benton's Twenty Years in Congress, or thirty years was it——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Thirty years.

Mr. GROSVENOR—

Act of 1790 increases the bounty in lieu of drawback to 10 cents a barrel on pickled fish and salted provisions and 10 cents a quintal on dried fish, the duty on salt being then raised to 12 cents a bushel.

Now, that is honestly attacking the entire salt tariff. That was not wise, because there was an infant industry in American salt, and so gentlemen representing the exporters of American meat and so Mr. Benton attacked the whole of it and failed to repeal the tariff on salt corresponding to American salt.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then your three cheers for Benton which you offered a while ago had a string to them?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Not at all. I will show you. He starts out with a beautiful eulogy about salt. He says it was taxing an article that God had made and we had to have. Now, Mr. Benton gives nine reasons why he urged the repeal of the salt tax and states directly that he failed to get his repeal so far as the American article was concerned, but he did not fail of getting the tariff taken off alum salt, which we did not produce in the United States, and he states the reason why on page 157, and in that statement he stands precisely where the Republican tariff men stand to-day—a tariff upon things that we produce in this country and free trade in the things that we do not produce in this country, so he cheapened the cost of salt 12 cents a bushel to the man who was compelled to buy the foreign salt and vindicated his correctness at that early period of time as a true and faithful supporter of the Republican idea of protective tariff. I may say under the present law while it is true we have a tariff upon this foreign salt we have a rebate for all of it that is used in the export of fish and meat.

Mr. PAYNE. And always have had under Republican laws.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks it is right for the New Englanders to have free salt for their fish? That is practically what it comes to. Why is it not fair for the meat producer of the Mississippi Valley to have free salt for their cured meat?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman has got a wrong state of facts. He has not got any such question to encounter. The New Englander has no free salt for his fish unless he exports it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The Mississippi Valley man has free salt for his meat if he exports it. Both stand equal.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How long has that been?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Always. I would advise the gentleman to get the A B C primer on this question and study it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am trying to do so.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am coming to another question, and this does not involve the gentleman from Missouri, so far as I know. It is said, and it is said in circles of the utmost respectability, that the Dingley tariff bill was made by the Republican party, but largely as the handiwork of Mr. Dingley, with certain provisions in it, placed there for the purpose of being used for reciprocal tariff with foreign people, and it has been said within a week in one of the most respectable papers in the country, for the hundredth time, no doubt, that Mr. Dingley told somebody that he had put into the tariff a series of high rates for the purpose of using them for reciprocity. Mr. Dingley is dead. If there was one man in this House during the last years of his life whom I honored and admired above any of the others it was Nelson Dingley. And I am going to make a statement, and I am going to make it with some considerable positiveness. I was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means when that bill was framed. I was a member of the Ways and Means Committee, a sort of volunteer organization, that worked all the winter of 1896–97 in the Cochran Hotel making that bill. I was a Member of the House when the bill was discussed and passed. I was a member of the committee of conference that sat for ten days and tried to agree, and finally did agree, with the Senate upon this bill. Mr. Dingley told me on one occasion—and there is another gentleman, at this time not in the House, to whom Mr. Dingley made the same statement—that he had consented to a compromise upon a single schedule of the Dingley tariff bill for a reason which he gave and which I am going to give to you; and then I am going to challenge the world at large to produce one living man that ever heard Dingley say anything different than that. There is a long discussion over this question of sugar, and I am glad it has come up here and that it is pertinent to the discussion which I am making. No man was more anxious to promote the interests of the beet-sugar men than was Mr. Dingley, and during the whole of that contest his heart was in the battle for this new industry. Without the action of Dingley and the men who made that tariff there would not be a beet-sugar factory in the United States to-day. He was the man who made it possible for the beet-sugar growth that we have had in this country; and I am going to read from his own language to show you that he understood he was doing the best that could be done for the industry at the time.

Now, the question was a question of differential; and I might say if I was elsewhere than in the House of Representatives we came very near having a very bitter condition of things growing out of the discussion of what ought to be the differential between raw sugar and refined sugar. What is the differential, my beet-sugar friends? Why, it is that which stands between you and bankruptcy.

You talk about joining the Democrats on the other side of the House to repeal the differential. Some day you may happen to do that, and the Senate may take you, as the representatives of this great industry, as in earnest about it and agree to the proposition of the House, and when you do, it will not be twenty-four hours until a petition in bankruptcy will be filed by every beet-sugar factory in the United States. What is it? We say there shall be a certain tariff put upon raw sugar. That does not affect you only indirectly. Then we say, in order to countervail the prices that the American sugar trust can sell this sugar at, we will put the differential upon refined sugar, and you get the benefit of it. Now, you want to break up the sugar trust, do you not, by repealing the differential? Why, you are both under the same umbrella. You are exactly alike in interest. The destruction of one is the destruction of the other. Take off the differential and let the two-thirds of the products of the world in refined sugar come into this country free of duty, or with as low a duty as upon raw sugar, and you will be wiped out. It is the differential that protects you, and yet you would think to hear some of these gentlemen talk that the Republican party was the enemy of this sugar, and that we had abandoned you to the wiles and torments of the sugar trust.

Now, let me go further. After this controversy has raged for quite a while—and there are no less than eight of the gentlemen who were present on that occasion still living—Mr. Dingley held a conference at the hotel, in which a long interview was held between himself and a member of the sugar trust at that time. He is not connected with it now.

I was present during the whole of that long, hot afternoon, and next morning Mr. Dingley said to me, "I think the best we can do will be to consent to the compromise that was offered us last night (or yesterday), for," he said, "they seemed determined to insist upon it." That was the differential. "They seemed determined upon it, and we shall want a pretty high tariff on sugar in order that we may enter into reciprocity with Cuba or Spain or South American countries that produce sugar."

Now, that was Mr. Dingley's statement. He made it to Mr. DOLLIVER afterwards, and I have the authority of Mr. DOLLIVER, given to me yesterday, to quote him, so that I am backed by the statement of Mr. DOLLIVER in the statement which I make, that the view expressed by Mr. Dingley as to any other articles especially selected for reciprocity were put into the Dingley tariff bill in the form of the articles themselves that were to be the subject of reciprocity.

Why, Mr. Chairman, do you think Mr. Dingley was that character of man that he would in the first place specifically name the articles, as he did, as you will find them in the Dingley law, which he enumerated that might be used at a certain reduction, and yet had it in his mind or made an utterance that he had purposely placed high rates here in order that he might put them down for reciprocal purposes?

Now, so much for the Dingley incident, except that I want to read to you what Mr. Dingley thought he had accomplished. On page 2707 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Fifty-fifth Congress Mr. Dingley said:

> The House differential between raw and refined sugar and the general features of the House schedule have been preserved, and the Senate amendment increasing the differential to one-fifth and reducing the duties one-tenth on sugars of 87° and below (which would have made a difference of thirteen-hundredths between 88° and 87° sugar) have been rejected in conference. In deference to the wishes of those interested in beet-sugar production, the Senate rate of 1.95 on refined sugar has been retained as an encouragement to that industry, but the duty on raw sugar has been increased seven and a half one-hundredths, precisely the same as the increase on the refined, so as to leave the differential between the raw and refined at the initial point of 100° the same as in the House bill, and secure so much additional revenue.
>
> To meet the objection that the House bill provided for larger equivalent ad valorem duties on the lower than on the higher grades of sugar, the conference agreement commences with 75° at ninety-five one-hundredths of a cent instead of 1 cent, and then raises the duty on each degree of raw sugar from three one-hundredths to three and a half one-hundredths, so that when the one hundredth degree is reached the duty will be 1.82½ and the duty on refined 1.95, leaving the 12½ differential between raw and refined sugars of 100° test, as it stood in the schedule which passed the House.
>
> Under the bill as it passed the House the duty on raw sugar of 100° purity would be 1.75, and the duty on refined 1.87½, leaving twelve and a half hundredths differential at this point. Under the conference schedule the duty on raw sugar of 100° purity would be 1.82½, and the duty upon refined sugar 1.95, leaving the differential at this point precisely the same, 12½ cents per hundred, in both schedules.
>
> By this arrangement the revenue will be increased about two and a half million dollars on the sugar schedule, because the increased duty has been placed not simply on refined sugar (as proposed by the Senate), but also upon raw sugars, the point where revenue will be received; and those who are endeavoring to develop the production of beet sugar in this country will have seven and a half hundredths greater protection than they would have had under the bill as it passed the House, but the differential as between refined and raw sugars will remain precisely the same at the 100° point.

Showing that this very Dingley law was fought over and fought for, and ultimately sustained and passed by the great author of the bill for the express purpose of rescuing and supporting the growing industry of sugar. Now, gentlemen have been standing here on the floor and talking about joining the Democrats and repealing the differential. When you do that and destruction has come to this industry, and the evil effects of your votes are felt, you may go home to your constituency; you can select your burial places and your tombstones, and you may put this inscription on them: "Traitor! Fool!" Laughter.] You can not go back on an industry of that character for spite; you can not undertake to talk to the people in that sort of way, or the people of this country will very shortly take your attitude and say that you do not value the present condition while you seek to destroy the industry you claim to defend. You will not do any such thing.

One other topic, and then I am through with this long speech. It is said that Germany will not trade with us. I am going to put into my speech a statement showing that Germany's trade to-day is better with us than ever before, and——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are not our exports to Germany at the present time, and even for the last three or four months, greatly increased from the very fact that that tariff there is going into effect in March? Is that not a fair conclusion?

Mr. GROSVENOR. There may be an inference of that kind drawn from the situation. The Germans are a pretty shrewd people, and they buy where they can buy the cheapest and best. I have no fears that they are going to be troublesome to us; and if they were, I am one of the kind of American fellows that believe that we should take care of ourselves and let other people take care of themselves, if they see fit to do so. That is my doctrine. [Applause.]

Here is a newspaper clipping which I vouch for as containing the exact official figures of our trade with Germany. They speak in louder tones than the cry of the fearful. It must be borne in mind that the more prosperous times are the larger the consumption of breadstuffs among the American people, and the fact that our breadstuff exports to Germany have fallen off only indicates the value of our home market:

TRADE WITH GERMANY—THAT COUNTRY SECOND AMONG OUR FOREIGN CUSTOMERS—IMPORTS FROM THERE WERE $118,000,000 AND EXPORTS $194,000,000—BREADSTUFFS FELL OFF.

Trade between the United States and Germany, whose commercial relations are now the subject of negotiations between the two Governments, aggregated in the fiscal year 1905 over $300,000,000.

A report issued by the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor says:

"The imports from Germany were $118,000,000 in value, and exceeded imports from that country in any earlier year. The exports to Germany were $194,000,000 in value, and exceeded our exports to that country in any earlier year except 1904, in which the total was a little over $214,000,000, this decrease in 1905, compared with 1904, having occurred in raw cotton, and being altogether due to a fall in price, since the quantity in 1905 was greater than in 1904. Imports from Germany increased $37,000,000 in the period from 1895 to 1905, and exports to that country increased $102,000,000 in the same time.

GERMANY STANDS SECOND.

"Germany stands second in the order of magnitude of our trade with foreign countries both as to imports and exports.

"Manufactures are the bulk of the $118,000,000 worth of merchandise imported from Germany. These manufactures include cotton goods, about $14,000,000 in value; chemicals, drugs, and dyes, $15,000,000; iron and steel manufactures, about $4,000,000; leather manufactures, $3,000,000; silk manufactures, about $5,000,000; manufactures of fibers, about $3,000,000; woolen goods, $3,000,000; paper, and manufactures thereof, over $3,000,000, and toys, $4,000,000.

"Raw cotton is by far the largest single item in our exports to Germany, amounting in 1905 to $87,000,000 in value, as compared with exports of $43,000,000 in value in 1895. The increase, however, is due in part to the general advance in the price of cotton. Lard exports to Germany in 1905 amounted to practically $15,000,000. Exports of provisions of all classes, including lard, amounted to $21,000,000, against about $13,000,000 in 1895.

BREADSTUFFS FALL OFF.

"Breadstuffs form a less important factor in our trade with Germany than formerly, owing to the great falling off in the quantity which the United States is now able to spare to the outside world. Of wheat, for example, our exports to Germany, which amounted to more than 10,000,000 bushels in 1901, and practically 20,000,000 in 1902, fell to fourteen and one-half millions in 1903, seven and one-half millions in 1904, and 100,040 bushels in 1905, the value in 1905 being but $84,760. Flour shows also a considerable decline, but corn showed marked increase, its total export to Germany being over $9,000,000 in value.

"In manufactures, especially copper, mineral oil, leather, scientific instruments, and certain manufactures of iron and steel our exports to Germany show a steady growth. The value of copper ingots, bars, and plates exported from the United States to Germany amounted to over $14,000,000, against a little more than one and one-half millions in 1895, the record year; kerosene, eight and one-half million, against four and three-quarter millions in 1895; leather, one and one-half million dollars, against over a million in 1900; cotton-seed oil, practically one and one-half million dollars, and oil cake, five and three-quarter millions, against less than $1,000,000, and less than two and one-half millions, respectively, a decade ago. Imports from Germany formed, in 1905, 10.7 per cent of the total importations into the United States, and exports to that country, in the same year, 12.8 per cent of the total exports of the country. Germany's figures show that imports from the United States in 1904 formed 14.8 per cent of her total imports, and that exports to the United States formed 9.5 per cent of her exports."

But, in the language of Patrick Henry, as nearly as I can remember it, "In the midst of all this rejoicing there comes up a wail from Massachusetts." [Laughter.]

The best trade we ever had in the world is now. Wealth is accumulating beyond the dreams of anybody. Every man who wants a job has got a job and is at work, and his wages have increased in the last ten years more than 30 per cent. The cost of his living has been increased, too. And who get the cost of his living? My friend from Connecticut over there was worrying about the tobacco worms of the Connecticut Valley. His farmer friends that he so ably and truthfully represents are getting the differentials between the former cost of the workingman's living and the cost of his living to-day.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. By the grace of Mr. Dingley, assisted by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. By the grace of God, if you please, and of Mr. Dingley. I do not care how you fix it. But now here comes Massachusetts. I am sorry for Massachusetts. I wish I could do something to cheer her up. I want to know what kind of people they have down there. That is in New England, you know. I was born in New England and I am proud of the fact, and I thought New England was in pretty good shape.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. New England is proud of the gentleman.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am very much obliged. Now, I hold in my hand two copies of the Boston Herald of two several dates, six months apart—one in July and the other in January. I shall not weary your patience now, but I am going to put in my printed remarks a few exuberant extracts from the statement of the Boston Herald, a free-trade, occasionally Democratic, occasionally any other kind of a "cratic" newspaper that they have in Boston. I do not think I could fairly say that it is a party newspaper, but I believe it usually supports the Democratic ticket. I do not think it would misrepresent on that account. It is a strong, able, and fair paper. I find here, among other things, something which happens to come in just in point on this question of the tariff on hides. I quote from the heading:

Boston great leather center; only second to London as a market for this product; reaches out for raw material to every part of the world; Massachusetts' commanding position; improvements new machinery have introduced.

Then at a later point in the same article they speak of exports of leather and manufactures thereof from the United States during the calendar year 1904, which amounted to $35,000,000, as against $23,000,000 from the United Kingdom; and during the first quarter of the calendar year 1905 the exports of these articles from the United States amounted to $9,000,000, as against $6,000,000 from the United Kingdom. Then it goes on to speak of the amount of leather that they export.

Now, where do they get their hides? It tells here. They get them from all over the world. It sounds like a Peter Parley's geography that I studied when I was a boy to read the places where Boston reaches out and gets hold of hides of every description. Fine grades of Persian sheep and goats—Turkey sends goatskins, and the whole Asiatic continent exports to this market a great variety of goat and sheep skins. Russia sends an enormous supply of colt skins, one house alone importing over a million hides. Good Mohammedans slaughter colts for meat, and so the hide is made an article of commerce, and it goes right into Boston. Now, what happens? Boston makes it into leather of all kinds; and there is a statement here showing the tremendous exports of this leather, not only manufactured in the greatest home and beehive of manufacturers in all the world, but they send abroad enormous shiploads of manufactured leather. Do they pay any duty on that? They get it abroad and they bring it in, but they get a drawback of 99 per cent, and they are growling here about one cent and a half additional tax on hides. Why, Mr. Chairman, the very birds that sing in the trees of Boston Common attune their melodious voices to the refrain of the protective tariff. There is not a stone in the monuments that grace the beautiful city of Boston that is not the product of a protective tariff. If I was to select one place above all others that has levied contributions in the form of tariff duties upon all mankind, I would locate that place in the city of Boston and in the State of Massachusetts. [Applause on the Republican side.] They have grown rich and powerful, the greatest merchants in the world, the greatest manufacturers in the world, and one third of all their wealth has come since the Dingley bill was placed upon the statute books. And in this great morning of glory, when we are all happy, we hear the voice of John Hook hoarsely crying through the American camp, "Hides! Hides!" [Laughter.]

In the Boston Herald of Sunday, July 16, last, we have the following statement:

Up to the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century the business of Boston was almost entirely commercial in its character. Its wealthy and successful merchants were shipowners and importers, but at about that time the business of manufacture received an impetus and those Boston merchants who had been importers of merchandise from England and France and from the countries bordering on the Mediterranean and Baltic seas began entering upon the work of domestic production.

And then appears this statement, speaking of the distances of the sources of raw material in certain manufactures from Boston, or from Massachusetts, perhaps:

This has been very noticeable in the manufacture of steel and iron, many concerns engaged in the manufacture of the heavier products having moved away, but, notwithstanding this, the iron and steel industry has shown a marked increase in Massachusetts, both in the number of persons employed and the value of its products, although the number of concerns decreased from fifteen to eight during the ten years preceding 1900. On the other hand, there was an increase of nearly 1,000 in the number of persons employed, and the value of products increased from $11,201,149 to $13,491,159, or 20.4 per cent. The increase has come almost exclusively in the manufacture of fine tools and delicate instruments.

Here, let it be said, that this branch of industry in iron and steel is heavily protected by the Dingley bill.

Then follows this:

New England makes the greater part of the spindles and looms used in the cotton mills in the country, and almost as great a proportion of the machinery used in the woolen mills.

Here, again, comes the protection which makes that industry highly profitable. Speaking of the industries of Massachusetts, they say:

In its twenty-one leading industries, including 5,570 establishments, or 19.1 per cent of the total number in the State, there is an invested capital of $578,812,222, giving employment to 332,232 wage-earners, and paying in wages $143,868,269.

The textile industry, which is the most important of all these, has experienced a change in recent years. Massachusetts has for some years led all other States in the manufacture of worsted goods, and within ten years the worsted has exceeded the manufacture of woolen goods. There has been a wonderful increase in the amount of machinery and spindles in the worsted mills, and the manner in which this State has gone ahead in this direction is shown by the fact that while the increase in spindles in the worsted mills of the United States as a whole has been 81.6 per cent, in Massachusetts it has reached 110 per cent.

Here, again, is the schedule of the Dingley bill; woolens and worsteds highly protected, and strangely enough, Mr. Chairman, no man has risen on the floor of this House nor stated in the campaign in Massachusetts, so far as I have heard—certainly no Republican—that he demanded a reduction in the tariff on woolen manufactures and worsted goods. Now comes this:

Massachusetts leads the country in a number of important industries, and the manufacture of boots and shoes is one of the most interesting. Figures already given show the magnitude of the business, but these do not include the totals of some of the allied industries, such as boots and shoes cut stock, which show an increase in the value of products of $2,315,272. The rival centers in this industry are Brockton, Lynn, and Haverhill. Cincinnati is fourth in rank in the shoe cities of the United States, and Brockton's products in 1900 exceeded those of the Ohio city by $11,055,973, or 125.8 per cent.

In the issue of the Boston Herald of Sunday, December 31, 1905, we find this:

BOOTS AND SHOES.

The factory manufacture of boots and shoes ranks, according to the last census report, as second among the industries of the State, with 640 establishments, 58,645 wage-earners, and products valued at $117,115,243. In 1890 there were 1,057 establishments, 67,374 wage-earners, and products valued at $116,387,900. In 1900 Massachusetts ranked first in the United States in the factory manufacture of boots and shoes—a rank it had held for many years. It manufactured 44.9 per cent of the total value of the factory boot and shoe products of the United States, while the State second in rank, New York, turned out only 9.8 per cent of these products.

Speaking of the relative growth in Massachusetts of the boot and shoe business, we have the following:

Although since 1850 Massachusetts has held her own, with about 45 per cent of the total production of boots and shoes in this country, the business has increased enormously throughout the other States. In 1850 the value of the total production in this country was $54,815,948, and of this Massachusetts had $24,102,366, or 44 per cent of all. In 1890 the value of the total production in the United States was $220,649,358, and of this Massachusetts had $116,387,900, or 52 per cent. In 1900 the total value of these products was $261,028,580, and of this Massachusetts's share was 45 per cent

Thus you see, Mr. Chairman, that the highly educated, thoroughly competent, wise business men of Massachusetts stay with an industry that puts into their hands at this time 45 per cent of the total manufacture of the boots and shoes of this country and the ever-increasing percentage.

Now, about leather. I quote again from the Boston Herald of December 31 last:

Cowhide leather is cheaper than calf and it has several finishes and grades. Cowhide is the leather for the millions. It supplies the need of the man or woman who wants a heavy shoe made of durable leather. Cowhide is still made with the bark oil, and there has been no change in recent years in the method of tanning it. The demand for this kind of leather has not been affected by changes in the market for other leathers. Much of it is exported to England.

Boston's business in sole leather is larger than that in cowhides, and has been variously estimated at from $25,000,000 to $40,000,000 a year. The sole-leather headquarters of the country is here. Like cowhides, sole leather is still tanned by the old-fashioned bark process. As in other heavy leathers, Boston does a heavy business in export of sole leather. But in leather Boston has found its best market in this country. Foreign trade has not been put aside, but there has been little need of making vigorous attempts to secure it. Germany and other countries are now buying American leathers, as do South America and Mexico.

Bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that upon every pound of this leather the duty paid upon the raw material of hide is refunded in the finished product of the leather to the exporter.

Exports of leather and manufactures thereof from the United States during the calendar year 1904 amounted to $35,000,000, as against $23,000,000 from the United Kingdom, and during the first quarter of the present calendar year those from the United States amounted to $9,128,837, as against $6,425,911 from the United Kingdom. Of the exports from the United Kingdom of leather, amounting during 1904 to $23,146,383, the larger portion was unwrought leather, tanned or dressed, the exports of which amounted to $8,320,000; the next largest item was boots and shoes.

Of our own exportation of leather, it is in various forms. The principal articles for the calendar year of 1904 were largely unworked leather. The United States leads all countries in its leather exports and in the amount consumed at home. And Boston is the center of the market.

In the recent address of Governor Guild, with pardonable pride it is said, he called attention to the high commercial and industrial rank of his State.

We are met in no mean city—

Said he.

This is the second seaport in the United States. Both exports and imports exceed those of last year.

Continuing proudly, as it is said, in praise of his State, he used the following language:

Massachusetts, fourth from the foot in area, is seventh from the top in population, fourth from the top in the annual value of her manufactures, and third from the top in the annual amount paid in wages. Measured by assessed valuation of the property in her borders Massachusetts is exceeded by but two States. Fourth from the foot in area, Massachusetts is third from the top in wealth.

The annual value of the manufactured products of Massachusetts increased by but $175,173,033 between 1885 and 1895. It increased by $300,267,558 between 1895 and 1905. The total value of goods made in Massachusetts was $1,150,074,860 in 1905. The increase in the value of the annual product of cotton goods from 1885 to 1895 was $32,190,463. From 1895 to 1905, in spite of southern competition, it was $38,949,280. The increase in our wool and worsted products between 1885 and 1895 was $7,400,533. Between 1895 and 1905 it was $50,581,514. The increase in our shoe product between 1885 and 1895 was $7,405,548. Between 1895 and 1905 it was $70,271,966.

On October 31 the total amount on deposit in our savings banks was, in 1885, $274,998,412; in 1895, $439,269,861; and in 1905, $662,808,312. The increase in the last decade was greater by over $58,000,000 than in the decade that preceded it. In 1885 the average deposit for each person of population was $141.64; in 1895, $175.69, and in 1905, $220.67. The gain in deposits per capita in the last decade was greater by nearly a third than the gain in the preceding decade.

From a recent report of the shoe and boot business in Massachusetts, dated as will be seen:

EASTERN SHOE TRADE—SHOWS A HEAVY INCREASE OF BUSINESS COMPARED WITH LAST YEAR.

[Special dispatch to the Enquirer.]

BOSTON, *January 14, 1906.*

The Boston boot and shoe market has taken on an active appearance. Shoe manufacturers are rushing to their full capacity, in most instances on spring goods. The majority have a large volume of orders booked, and as buyers increased their purchases from 10 to 40 per cent over those of a year ago manufacturers do not look for any large volume of supplementary business. As these shoes begin to be shipped out, and as the wearing season approaches, however, manufacturers look for some new business.

The shipments for the past week have amounted to 96,736 cases, as compared with 85,671 cases during the corresponding period a year ago, showing a gain of 11,065 cases. The shipments to Cincinnati were 3,318 cases, to Cleveland 939 cases, to Columbus 1,039 cases, to Milwaukee 847 cases, to St. Louis 13,028 cases, and to New Orleans 2,531 cases.

The leather market has shown more activity this week than for some time. Shoe manufacturers are showing samples for next fall and, feeling that prices of leather will be no lower, are placing orders for supplies for future delivery. This demand is taking up some of the surplus of heavy weights that was beginning to be seen. New orders of fair volume for immediate delivery are also reported and at full prices. Calf leathers are very strong in price and offerings are not large. All tanners are badly taxed to make deliveries on old contracts, owing to the short supply offering. The strong demand for patent-leather shoes keeps all grades of patent leather closely sold up, and also creates a strong demand for mat calf for toppings.

Side leathers are in better call. Satin is beginning to attract more call from abroad. Kangaroo side is in good demand and tanners owe large lots on old contracts. Glazed kid is in active demand and dealers report that they are getting an advance on some grades. The call for sheep leather is very fair at firm prices.

The hide market is quiet. Western buffs are held at 13 to 13¼ cents. Bids of 13 cents for No. 1 Ohio buffs are refused. Extremes are quiet at 13¼ cents. Southern green salted hides are in large offering at 12 to 12¼ cents, but the demand is dull. Calfskins are scarce and in good demand. Foreigns are in smaller offering than for months.

This was a most splendid statement of the situation. Now, I turn from a governor happy to a governor misled, and Governor Guild adds to the glowing description just stated the following wail:

Through the conventions of her two great parties, through her general court and governor, Massachusetts has already demanded from the National Government the immediate construction of a tariff framed to meet the lines of modern competition. Massachusetts asks the removal of such duties as are now needless; the reduction of such duties as were once just, but are now excessive, and the development not of our commerce alone, but of the commerce of the United States by more friendly trade treaties with other nations.

And this, too, when he shows that our shoe products increased only $7,405,548 in the single year, and adds that during the past decade the increase has been $70,271,966.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. I will ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that under a Republican tariff the Sandwich Glass Works, the Suffolk and New England Glass Company, the great furniture factories of Cambridge, the South Boston Iron Works, the Norway Iron Works, and the Gilmore Rolling Mills, of Cambridge, all went out of existence?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; I am not aware of that; but I am aware——

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. Then I am glad to increase the gentleman's store of knowledge.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But I am aware that at Pittsburg and Wheeling and all up and down the Monongahela River, and everywhere else where iron works and glass works are carried on upon proper principles, they have grown rich, and enormously so, under this very tariff law; and if you have a condition of things where your raw material can not be transported from the Allegheny Mountains, why wind up, as a matter of course, buy Government bonds, so you need not pay any duty, or go down there and operate where business is good.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. If we had had free raw material, these iron works and glass works would have stayed in Massachusetts.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not yield, Mr. Chairman, for the gentleman to make a speech. I do not want to seem discourteous to the gentleman and I will reply to what he has said. They would not have had any glass works, they would not have had any market for the iron, they would not have had any market for the glass, but they would have been where they were in 1857 if it had not been for the Dingley tariff law. My friend is not so ingenuous as to attempt to claim that even under the Wilson bill the prosperity in New England was like the prosperity now.

Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts. The works I have spoken about were established in the early part of the nineteenth century, and they all went out under the high tariff.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I presume that their system of manufacture was such that under the improved conditions it made them useless and put them out of business.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not want the gentleman from Tennessee to cut me off from the answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he favors the reciprocity features of the Dingley tariff bill?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, that is an academical study. Let us devote a whole day to that. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Did not the gentleman from Ohio vote for that feature of the Dingley tariff bill?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; I voted for the Dingley tariff bill. I was not proud of that feature then, and I was glad to see it go out.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman favor its reenactment?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Because I do not want to interfere with this flood tide of prosperity. [Laughter.] I do not want to go to throwing chunks into it. I went down to the State of Tennessee and there I met my friend on his native heath, like Macgregor, and where he sat was the head of the table [laughter], and I do not want to interfere with the prosperity there that my friend will always testify to when he is not making a political speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. One other question. Does not the gentleman remember that when we were framing the Dingley tariff bill thirteen nations of the world protested against it as being unfair to the foreign markets, and that if it was enacted they would retaliate, and, as a matter of fact, have not they retaliated more or less?

Mr. GROSVENOR. If they have, I hope they will keep it up right along. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Have they not retaliated?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not think so.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Has not England put up the tax on tobacco in retaliation?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Have we grown any the poorer for it?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman from Ohio wants ship subsidies to encourage the hauling of our produce to foreign markets.

Mr. GROSVENOR. We don't want to haul off all of it; just a little. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the gentleman from Tennessee and myself can be put into a very small compass. He is living on his prophetic genius for evils to come; I am reveling in the joys of the present. [Great laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; the gentleman from Ohio is always reveling; he is always at home under any circumstances. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us get back to Boston. I appeal to Boston and Massachusetts to stand firm. I want to give them some simple advice that Dickens puts into the mouth of one of his characters. I won't undertake to name him for a certainty, but I think it was Captain Cuttle, who advised little Walter, with tears in his eyes, in a most affectionate way, "Never go back on them as brought you up by hand." [Great laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman from Ohio permit an interruption there?

Mr. GROSVENOR. In a second. Therefore I appeal to Massachusetts and to Boston and all New England to never go back on them as brought them up by hand. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman admit that New England has been brought up by hand through Government aid?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; under God and the Republican party. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to recognize the unusual magnanimity of the gentleman from Ohio—unusual for him—in naming God this once as the senior member of the firm. [Great laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, a word in conclusion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I don't want to interrupt the gentleman's peroration——

Mr. GROSVENOR. I haven't any peroration. I don't make them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the gentleman is through with Massachusetts and the Republican tariff reformers——

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; I am through with Massachusetts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask a question about this salt business. I want to get it straight in the RECORD.

I understood you to say that the Massachusetts and New England fish are cured with imported salt?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I understand so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is in the bill.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not certify to that, but that is my understanding—for exportation purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And they have a drawback on that equal to the whole tariff on salt?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, the meat raisers have a drawback on foreign salt if they use it, but, as a matter of fact, they do not use foreign salt.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is their misfortune.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; it is not their misfortune. Here is a question I want to ask you. If the New England fishermen use imported salt in packing their fish and get a drawback on it, and the American meat producer uses American salt in curing his meat on which there is no drawback, then does not that give the Massachusetts people and the rest of the New Englanders an absolute advantage over your people and my people and the people of the Mississippi Valley who raise meat? That can not be waived by the A B C business.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman from Ohio allow me to read that clause of the Dingley Act?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will be glad to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. PAYNE. It is paragraph 284, which reads as follows:

Salt in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, 12 cents per 100 pounds; in bulk, 8 cents per 100 hundred pounds: *Provided*, That imported salt in bond may be used in curing fish taken by vessels licensed to engage in the fisheries, and in curing fish on the shores of the navigable waters of the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; and upon proof that the salt has been used for either of the purposes stated in this proviso, the duties on the same shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That exporters of meats, whether packed or smoked, which have been cured in the United States with imported salt, shall, upon satisfactory proof, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, that such meats shall have been cured with imported salt, have refunded to them from the Treasury the duties paid on the salt so used in curing such exported meats, in amounts not less than $100.

That same provision in substance was in the McKinley law, and was knocked out in the Wilson law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York before he sits down——

Mr. PAYNE. I could get up if the gentleman from Ohio will yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think we had better have it out on the salt question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If it is true, and it is true, that the New England fish are cured by imported salt on which we have a drawback to the amount of the tariff that they paid, provided it is exported, and the American meat producer cured his meat with American salt on which there is no drawback, where is the advantage he gets by any drawback? Is not that language about the western meat raisers' drawbacks on imported salt, which they do not use, put into that bill as a mere makeweight in order to confuse the public mind and cover up the advantage which New England gets from the exported salt which the other does not get?

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman when this

clause was put in the Dingley bill there was a statement that meat packers did use this salt, and I have always understood they did use foreign salt and get the drawback. If they declined to use it and did not take advantage of the law, of course we can not compel them and do not compel them, but they did not have under the law any more advantage for fish than they did for meat.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the salt question is settled, I will go on.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask either the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], it does not make any difference which, does not this tariff on foreign salt put up the price of American salt?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think it does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do you think the meat raisers of the Mississippi Valley are big enough fools to go to the Atlantic coast and import salt from foreign markets to cure their meat when Kansas and that whole country out there is rammed chock full of American salt, where all you have to do is to dig it out of the ground in carload lots?

Mr. PAYNE. I will say to my friend from Missouri when I was a boy on the farm my father always considered it necessary to have Turks Island salt to cure his meat with. Whether that condition has changed now or not I do not know.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is three-quarters of a century ago. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. I am much obliged to the gentleman; I confess to half a century, but three-quarters of a century I decline.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, before I conclude, let me finish this salt question.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Let me make one remark. I would like to say to the gentleman who has been talking about salt that the reason the factories of the Mississippi Valley use American salt instead of importing salt and getting the benefit of the rebate is because the American salt is so much cheaper they can not afford to use the other.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is not the reason. It is because the American salt lies at their very doors, and that makes it cheaper. It saves freight charges. There are whole counties in Kansas underlaid by salt hundreds of feet deep, and all you have to do is to quarry it out, as easily as you can quarry marble in the State of Vermont.

Mr. PAYNE. If it had not been for protection it would not have got in there.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why not? There is not a country on God's earth that can compete with Kansas in the production of salt.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, Mr. Chairman, when I was a boy——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was about a century ago. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR (continuing). I remember going with my father in an ox-cart conveyance nearly 30 miles to trade wheat for salt. That was in good old Democratic times. It was in 1846 or 1848, or somewhere along there. We bought a barrel of salt containing 5 bushels and gave for that 12 bushels of wheat. To-day, in the district in which I live, you can buy a barrel of better salt than that was, in good cooperage, for 65 cents. Now, if the gentleman wants to make a fuss about salt, I advise him to estimate as nearly as possible how much salt it will take to be the equivalent of the tariff on one hide, and go into a compromise to repeal the duty on the hide and on the salt and see how he would come out.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman from Ohio state, with the great reputation which he has at stake, that this reduction in the price of salt, what he has stated it was when he was a boy down to the present low rate, has been produced by the tariff, and that new machinery and the appliances and the new methods of production of salt have had no effect in reducing the price of salt?

Mr. GROSVENOR. There is not a great deal of machinery involved in the making of salt, but there are scientific improvements very greatly used. The production of salt was never important until the tariff stimulated the men engaged in the industry, and then I confess it has gone away beyond the effect of any protective tariff, and the present duty on salt is totally immaterial so far as the cost of salt is concerned, in my judgment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit one more question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to ask him whether the operation of a drawback is not always to enable the American manufacturer of the article concerning which there is a drawback for raw material to sell cheaper to the foreign consumer than to the American consumer? Is not that its necessary result?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The question of its purpose and of its result are two different propositions. It certainly has something to do with getting rid of the difference between the delivery at the place of manufacture and freight to the place of foreign delivery.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. In other words, does not it make the article cheaper to the foreign consumer, freight left out of consideration, free on board at the place of shipment, than it does to the home consumer?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No doubt.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, that being the case, will the gentleman tell me what becomes of the old time-honored and well-beloved Republican principle that a tariff is a tax on the foreigner?

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is too profound a proposition for so short a time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This seems to be a tax on the home man and a bonus to the foreigner.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The object of the rebate on raw material brought into this country, manufactured and exported, is in order to give the laborer a cheaper raw material than possibly he could get at home. It is done wholly and entirely in the interest of the labor of the United States, and does not benefit the manufacturer, so far as I can see, in any degree whatever.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will proceed with about two minutes of my speech, and then I will be through.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great question. This is a question that will reach out into the future; it is a question that is important in the present. It has been confided by the people of the United States to the disposition of the Republican party, and there is no member of the Republican party—I say it with profound respect for every one of you—there is no member of the Republican party that in his individual capacity knows more about what ought to be done than does the Republican party as an aggregation of statesmen and patriotic men; and I appeal to the Republicans on this side of the House to stand together as one man and not permit ourselves to be raided by the sophistry of Democratic disorganization. The Republican party has never failed in one of its great enterprises, and time will fail me to take them up one by one to prove to you that from its birth in 1853, all along the line of its magnificent pathway, it has never undertaken to do anything in politics, in civilization, in business, or any question of any other character that in the long run it did not achieve the result for which it started. This is not a time, in the very heyday of the glory of the country, to disrupt the Republican party because of slight differences of opinion upon minor questions of policy. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to another of those well-known Republican speeches upon the tariff question which illustrate the aptness of the Latin adage, "Qui ambulat in tenebris, nescit quo vadit." Whoever walks in the shadows is ignorant beforehand of the point at which he is coming out. The closing part of that speech illustrated the fact that when a tariff bill fails it benefits the American people. The object in imposing a tariff is to raise the price of the article upon which it is imposed. If the tariff be imposed for protection, whenever it fails to do that, then the object of the protectionist has failed, and then the protectionist in due course of time comes before the American Congress and boasts of its failure as one of the blessings of protectionism.

The gentleman has just shown that American salt is so much cheaper than foreign salt that American meat curers use it all the time. He has proved that the object in laying a protective tariff upon salt has failed, and then the gentleman congratulates the country upon the benefits which were derived for the consumers from cheap salt.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if a man were to attempt to dam up a stream and were to discover afterwards that the stream had dug itself a new channel around the dam with a current as strong as ever, and were to come in and boast that he had created an additional current, he would stand in just about the attitude that the gentleman stands.

Mr. Chairman, let us get our bearings. I want to talk about these particular bills. What is the choice of the House to-day when it comes to the question of fixing the commercial relations between the Philippine Islands and continental United States or the balance of the United States? We stand with a majority bill before us, and I am glad to welcome as its advocates among the Democratic following in this House the Agamemnon of the Republican party, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]; old Ulysses himself, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], and young Achilles, perhaps with a vulnerable heel, but nothing else vulnerable about him, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. [Laughter.] The gentleman

from Colorado was right when he said these gentlemen even in advocating their own bills were following in Democratic footsteps. We have been for years trying to drive the Republican party to the very position which this majority bill now expresses, and what strikes me as curious is that there are some few men upon this side of the Chamber who, when we have succeeded in bringing them to that position, want us now to quit driving because they are about to do what we have been trying to make them do for years. One proposition before the House is the majority bill. What is it? It is a recognition of the Democratic claim that all parts of the common domain of the United States ought to have free trade with one another. The majority bill recognizes free trade now in every product except two, and then it says that on and after a certain day in 1909 we shall have free trade between these two separate parts of the common domain of the United States in all products, these two products included.

That is one bill before you. It recognizes the Democratic principle of the relation that ought to exist between the Federal Government and a remote province, colony, appendage, territory, appurtenant appendage—I care not what you call it—a domain under the flag of the United States. It is Democratic because Democracy is Americanism, and Americanism had its birth in the assertion of the principle that the mother country had no right to make one set of laws for Englishmen in England and another set of laws for Englishmen in America; that Great Britain had no right to make discriminations against her own subjects in America in favor of her own subjects in the mother country. It is Democratic for that reason.

It is Democratic for another reason. Leaving out of question the relationship that ought to exist between different parts of the common domain, it recognizes the grand old Democratic principle that the freer you can make commercial relations between the different congeries of the human race the better for commerce, the better for mutual enrichment and the greater benefit you have conferred upon all, especially the wage-earner. Why, Republicans in this debate speak of a reduction of tariff upon American goods going into the Philippines as "a benefit to the Filipino." So it is, but that is Democratic talk. My friend, the gentleman from New York, amongst others, says this, and yet if the Republican theory be correct then the higher tariff you can put upon American goods going into the Philippines the better for the Filipinos.

How glad I was the other day to hear my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] elucidating and clarifying the good old Democratic doctrine that cheap labor is not always low-priced labor, that a man may be hired very cheaply per diem, per week, or per month, and yet his labor may be a very dear labor, because it is dearer per yard, per pound, or per bale of product. But, Mr. Chairman, whenever a Republican intellect, being an American intellect, can for the time being divorce itself from some special interest or partisan purpose it immediately begins to clarify itself, and it begins to understand a whole lot of things that it either theretofore has not understood or else concerning which its possessor has pretended not to understand.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the majority bill here is one thing, the minority bill is another, and unlike the majority bill, the minority bill goes the full logical length and is the consistent voice of the minority. The majority bill is not the consistent voice of the majority. Well do I remember when we had this same question up in connection with Porto Rico that a great Republican President, well-bred gentleman that he was, uttered the words that "manifest justice" and "plain duty" required that we should give Porto Rico free trade with the balance of the United States. And well do I remember the time, not long after that, when the cohorts of tobacco and of sugar and of rice and of Heaven knows what else crowded upon the city of Washington that a different voice came, not so publicly, from the surroundings of the same personage. Well do I remember that there was a bill about to be produced from the Committee on Ways and Means giving the balance of the United States free trade with Porto Rico, a bill about to be reported by the leader of the Republican side, the chairman of that great committee. Well do I remember that a little bit after that, when the cohorts had won their way to the Republican heart, as they usually somehow do, that a bill was introduced by the same gentleman to fix duties upon articles coming from Porto Rico, and then well do I remember that, having forgotten about our "plain duty" and "manifest justice," as far as that bill was concerned, some months afterwards the same voice of consistent Republicanism came in with another bill finally giving free trade with Porto Rico. And during all that time the grand old historic party, select though few it may have been in various Congresses, has stood upon the historic American doctrine that it is not right for any mother country to float its flag, inscribed with the pretenses of its liberties and privileges, over a people without giving them the common benefits of the Government under which they live. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have done the same thing about the Philippines. We have tried to drive you in every minority report as near the position that we now occupy as we could. We have driven you now to where you say that in 1909, anyway, you are going to be with us all over, and that now you are with us except in two spots, a sugar spot and a tobacconized spot. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, there is another bill before this House, and that is the present law, the present tariff existing between Porto Rico and the Philippines. It is on the statute books, but it is as much before us for reenactment as if it were to-day for the first time propounded. Let no Democrat deceive himself. You can not vote so as to avoid the truth of the old law and common-sense maxim that "every man is responsible for the natural and necessary consequences of his own conduct." The man who votes against the substitute bill, or after the substitute bill shall have been voted down, if it shall be—and I heartily hope that it shall not be—the man who votes against the majority bill after that is not only voting against something, but he is voting for something. He is voting for the existing tariff between the United States and the Philippines and between the Philippines and the United States. He is consciously and deliberately voting for its reenacting as his choice, rather than for its disenactment or repeal.

When his conscience concerning the constitutionality is so delicate that he can not swallow a rate of 25 per cent of the Dingley rate upon tobacco and sugar, even though it be a remnant after reduction and even though all duties on all other articles be repealed, he will have to go back and explain how that same delicate conscience could swallow all of the present existing tariff rates between these two parts of the common domain. He can not plead any doctrinaire excuse. He has got to plead before common-sense people in a forum of common sense, and their inquiry will be: "Did you not know when you voted against the bill that you were voting for the existing law, and if your objection to the bill was that it is unconstitutional in two respects, to wit, as to sugar and tobacco, how can you justify yourself in voting for a bill that was unconstitutional in every respect?" [Applause.]

If a great, big, strong fellow, like my friend, Mr. RUCKER, of Missouri, were to come up to me some night and poke a pistol at my head—and in his particular case I think his fist would be sufficient—and say, "JOHN WILLIAMS, you have got $100 in your pocket, and I want it," and I surrendering to the sight of the blue metal of the pistol barrel, what would be thought if my friend the other gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] should come up about that time with power to help me, if seeking to use his influence with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] to give me back my money—all of it—after talking with him a while and getting the consent of Mr. RUCKER to give me back $75 of my money, Mr. RUCKER pleading, whether falsely or not, that he "really had need of the other $25"—what would be thought of it if my friend Mr. CLARK said, "Well, RUCKER, I can not stand by that sort of an agreement, because if I stand here as a witness to your keeping $25 of the money of JOHN WILLIAMS, I am a party to the original robbery—particeps criminis in the entire affair." [Laughter.]

Now, that is the question before this House. The gentleman from Colorado was right when he said that both of these bills are Democratic. One—ours—is altogether so. The other—that of the majority—is really altogether so. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] was right when he said both of these bills are Democratic. I am glad to see, now and then, a Republican Administration having a lucid interval and recommending good old American doctrine born in the throes of the American Revolution to the American people. [Applause.]

I am glad to see the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] applaud the sentiment that the American President ought to recommend good old American doctrine to the American people, [laughter], that American doctrine having already been stigmatized or complimented by him as Democratic in its character.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] did not go quite far enough back. He might have gone back to the Porto Rican bill; he might have gone back to the first bill upon the question of commercial relations with the Philippines. I do not want to discuss that now. Here is one thing that I do want to say in connection with this question: I do not believe that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in connection with these insular cases was good law until, of course, after it had been made, when it does become good law, whatever else bad—ethics or whatnot—there may be in it.

A decision of the Supreme Court does not change the right of a case; it does not change the ethics of the case. If you were to ask me now, in view of that decision, what was the legal relationship between the Philippine Archipelago and continental America I would answer that I did not think fourteen Philadelphia lawyers could answer the question. But if you asked me what the ethical relationship between us and those islands in our occupancy—temporary, I hope in God's name—my answer would be that a child with common attributes in its heart could tell you what the ethics were—the duty to give them equal opportunities, the duty not to allow our Government to be solely a burden upon them, but to let it be, in as far as it naturally may be, a benefit as well as a burden. The Supreme Court decision could not change the right, it could not change plain duty, it could not change manifest duty, it can only make or change law. It ought to confine itself to declaring law; but under the pretense of declaring it does sometimes, and in my opinion did in this case, make law.

Now, I expect some of you will be surprised to hear me say that I am glad they gave the decision. If they found that in their conscience they could do it—it is not a conscience burden of mine, I was not one of them—I am glad, because when they failed to decide that the Philippines were eternally and forever and under all circumstances and conditions altogether and exclusively domestic, because we can not hold colonies; when they decided in words almost that Congress had the right to do anything that Congress would as regards the relationship between us and them, they in substance decided also that Congress had the right to get rid of them whenever Congress chose. This power, in my opinion, it would have had anyhow. The power under treaty to acquire carries with it the power by treaty to release, unless the territory has in the meantime become a State. But many did not agree with me about that. Get rid of them? Why? For their sake? Yes, but not mainly, but for our sakes more than any other. Gentlemen, I speak with feeling upon this question. All of us in the cotton States, where there is an overwhelming population of another race, speak with feeling upon it. The American who can read American history and can not discover that almost every great national trouble we have ever had, every great problem seemingly unsolvable that we have been faced with, has grown out of the presence in the same country of two different, unassimilable races, and races are never assimilable except by legal intermarriage and by a recognition on the part of one of the absolute equality of the other; the man who can read American history and not discover that the landing of the first ship freighted with Africans at Jamestown was the beginning of all our woes, or nearly all of them, is too weak in his intellect to be required to read history at all, too weak to be expected to learn any lesson whatsoever from it.

It is one thing, when a common negro selling Yankee ancestry and a common negro buying Southern ancestry have given you the problem, to deal with it bravely and well with a first and just regard to the integrity of your own race and the ethics which underlie the civilization of that race, but it is a different thing to go across the sea, to do this of your own accord—of your own accord, with eyes opened by past experience, to annex and permanently nurse by retention another race problem. Not of God's accord. Curse the hypocrisy of the fellow who tells us "God put us in the Philippine Islands." [Applause on the Democratic side.] Nobody but a hypocrite says it. There is nobody but a fool who believes it. We had 10,000 men at sea going to the East before we signed the treaty which took them because we knew we were going to take them, and we knew we would need soldiers for them when we did. We bought them and knew we were buying a war when we did. "The devil came out of his study, and, quoth he, 'the best way to do my will is to call it the will of God.'" American greed sent us there; American appetite for prestige and conquest sent us there; American pride and appetite to go "world-powering" sent us there. We went there of our own accord. There was not a moment after we went there, even the very moment after the blessed sun shone upon the victory of Manila that we could not have left, and the first opportunity was the best. I am glad the Supreme Court has left us a way to get rid of them at some time. You can get rid of them at some time. There are a hundred ways. Any one of them is better for us and our children than staying. If you gentlemen, whose special industries are faced with real or fancied injury, want to defeat this legislation, if you want to defeat legislation like it in the future, get rid of the Philippine Islands and you will always find when you come to the Democratic doctrine that it is un-American to hold crown colonies, a solid Democracy over here to help you, including cane sugar, beet sugar, rice, tobacco, and everything else. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When I say get rid of them, I do not mean the "scuttle doctrine," as the gentleman from Pennsylvania called it. If I want to leave a house I would not leave the house with all the doors wide open and all the windows wide open without finding a proper man to take my place to handle the keys and see that burglars did not enter. There is no trouble about the way to get rid of them. We have ourselves shown the way in the case of Cuba.

Something has been said about the function of a minority. I will tell you what in my view is the function of the minority, and especially in a House like this, where the minority can initiate nothing, can accomplish by its own votes nothing, and can only vote. Whenever anything comes from the other side of the Chamber that is wrong, oppose it. Whenever anything comes from the other side of the Chamber that is right, vote for it. There is no way to serve the minority better than to remember the good old adage, that he serves his party well who serves his country best, and he serves his country best who serves the right whatever the right may be. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I mentioned a moment ago——

Mr. KEIFER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. KEIFER. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's discussion, and I only want the gentleman to give the credit of that which he has attempted just now to quote. Will you please tell us who is the author of it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not remember, but I think Edmund Burke, while he was not the author of the exact words, was the author of the sentiment. I have not attempted to quote the exact words.

Mr. KEIFER. The first time it got into our history and politics was when it was put into an inaugural address by President Rutherford B. Hayes, of Ohio.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that so old a sentiment coming from such a distinguished source as Edmund Burke received the approval of Rutherford B. Hayes. [Laughter.] In the opinion of everybody acquainted with both historical characters it adds immensely to the value of the maxim.

My friend Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts was asked while upon his feet: What will the Republicans do about the tariff? He replied, as I am informed—because I was not in the Chamber at the time and have not read the RECORD—"I am not a prophet." Now, my friends, I am not a prophet, either, but I believe from the clouds now in the skies, the direction of the wind, and all the balance of it, that a man need not be a weather prophet to answer that question. You are going to do nothing about the tariff. The Republican party in its present decadent condition has neither the brains nor the intelligence to remedy tariff abuses. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the reason why you are going to have a Democratic House of Representatives after the next election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Oh, a few stand-patters, with absolute contempt for popular sentiment and absolute trust in the omnipotence of the Committee on Rules, and in the Committee on Ways and Means, and in our little legislative coteries here in Washington, may imagine there is no outside world. There is an outside world in Michigan, in Wisconsin, in Iowa, throughout all the great Middle West, whose world market for their wheat and corn and meats and agricultural implements is being menaced by the initiation of a commercial warfare by the Emperor of Germany in retaliation for our spirit of commercial exclusiveness. There is an outside world up in Massachusetts, although, as the gentleman from Ohio said this morning, Massachusetts was "brought up by hand" on the tariff. There was a bottle of governmental pap given to her early, and all she had to do was to suck. She owes her predominance in the Union, so far as wealth is concerned, to the fact that her statesmen all had the shrewdness to mold tariff schedules to suit Massachusetts and to suit New England.

Mr. McCALL. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just one word more and then I will.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it so happens in this world that no patient can exist long in a healthful condition upon the same medicine, no matter whether it be governmentally administered or not. The time will come when the thing that was formerly a medicine will become a poison. Massachusetts now is crying out for a revision of the tariff. Changed conditions have brought it about that she feels the burdensomeness of her part of the payment of tariff taxes. It is not nearly as nice as having the other fellow pay the tax while she collected. God bless her! I am glad to see her back shoulder to shoulder with old Virginia, as she was early in the history of this country,

and once more recognizing Democratic principles. Massachusetts did not go into the tariff willingly. It was forced upon her by the West. Her great statesman, Daniel Webster, made a speech against it, a speech which even he, the "godlike Daniel" himself, could never subsequently answer and which nobody yet has answered. At that time Massachusetts was a navigating State, and desired to remain one. But when they put this iniquitous system upon the statute books, Massachusetts, amidst her rock-ribbed hills, with her magnificent intelligence, her superb courage, her excellent adaptiveness, said "All right; that is the law of the country and we will proceed to take advantage of it, and when it comes to molding schedules we will mold them to suit New England. Let the southerners, with their sentiment and their oratory, go; let the westerners, with their patriotism, loud-mouthed, pass by; we will pay attention to schedules."

And New England paid attention to schedules and for a long time had her way about them, no matter what party was in power. Now some of them have come to be awfully inconvenient, and she wants to get rid of such of them as are inconvenient. Pennsylvania and the West got to "fixing things." Very well; may God bless you to our ranks. We will help you to get rid of them; we have been robbed, too; but "when you come into a court of equity you must do equity." There is one power in the world that can rid you of the inequity of your part of the burden, sharing even in present conditions, and that power is the Democratic party.

But Massachusetts has helped to take some of the tax off the Kansan's mower and reaper—they are his raw material, his tools—off the blacksmith's hammer, the carpenter's saw and nails, the steel rails necessary for the development of our internal commerce, and the Mississippian's cotton gin, bagging, and ties.

Massachusetts says she wants "free hides." I have offered a bill reducing the duty on hides to 5 per cent, a reduction of two-thirds; the duty on sole leather to 7 per cent ad valorem and to reduce the balance of the leather and harness and shoes schedule and leather-glove schedule 50 per cent. Surely you are willing if the duties on your raw material be reduced 66⅔ per cent to reduce the duty upon the finished product 50 per cent. I have, with the view again of trying your Republican friends, introduced another bill, to put hides on the free list, provided you will reduce the balance of the schedule a little more than 50 per cent. When you come into a court of equity, do equity. If you are to get a reduction on your raw material, in the name of Justice let the millions who must wear shoes and whose wives and children must wear them get them for a less part of a day's wage. There is no more honest, no more intelligent part of this Union than the young Democracy of the State of Massachusetts; and it is going to win its fight because the Republican party has not the courage—I said brains a moment ago; I believe I will take that back—it has not the courage to disturb this protective chain-armor suit. Why not? Because your several pocket receipts from the system are all banded together like one of those old-time sets of armor that the knights wore, plate by plate, riveted together, and the minute one chain broke the whole armor fell to pieces.

That is what you are afraid of; and yet a certain Sir Robert Peel in England, who was a protectionist and found himself in such a situation, had sense enough and courage enough to go at it, and go at it gradually, not to dynamite the whole thing, but gradually to bring about a successful issue out of a false position. You say that you are afraid that we Democrats, if we try it, will dynamite and blow up the house in order to build up another house. Well, if so, then for God's sake, if you think as you speak, revise this tariff yourselves. Remove its excrescences, remove its injustices, fix it so that no American manufacturer under its ægis and shelter can longer sell goods cheaper to the foreigner at a good profit while he exploits the American consumer at an unreasonable profit. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] Do that; do it yourselves, I say. I am so much an American rather than a Democrat I would rather see it done by you than that it should not be done at all; and if it be true that we can not do it without dynamiting all the industries of the country—that proposition I deny—but if I believed it, then I would rather see you do it than to see us do it. You say you are the party which "does things." Do something. You are afraid. You are afraid of finding yourselves in the attitude of freebooters at daggers' points about an equitable division of the spoils. We used to say about the Republican party that it might be guilty of every sin in the world, but that it did not lack courage and it did not lack brains. That was when you called yourselves "the party of moral ideas." Now you have only schedule ideas. Now you have got down to the point where you lack courage, and I begin to mightily suspect that you lack brains.

It is one of God's ordinances that people who know they are wrong and yet are held back by thoughts of profit and worldly welfare from remedying their wrong are generally lacking in both.

Some of the arguments made in connection with this question amuse me a bit. I beg pardon; I promised a moment ago to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL].

Mr. MCCALL. That would involve the gentleman's returning to a part of his argument that he has left, and he afterwards corrected the impression which he gave my mind in the statement that he made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was about New England having originated the protective policy. New England did not do it.

Mr. MCCALL. Yes; it was the statement in which he referred to New England as practically the originator of the protective tariff.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; New England was not; but New England took advantage of it after it was originated and devoted her attention to schedule making for several generations, much to her own enrichment, until it is strictly true, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] said this morning, that she "was brought up by the hand" of the Federal Government.

Some of these arguments amuse me by their own inconsistency. A gentleman gets up and says that if we let sugar in from the Philippines cheaper than it is now the Philippine producer will get nothing by it; that the American consumer will get nothing by it; that the American sugar trust will get everything by it. Then, in the very next breath, the same gentleman says if we let sugar in from the Philippine Islands at a reduced tax it will encourage and "develop the sugar industry in the Philippine Islands" to such an extent that virtually all of their arable lands will go into sugar.

The next man tells you that the Philippine tobacco farmer will not get anything out of the bill; that it will be of no benefit to him; that the tobacco trust will get it all; and then, in the next breath, he tells you—forgetting about the necessary small plats of land that are due to be put down in sugar by the prophecy of his colleague—that virtually the whole arable land in the Philippines will go into tobacco, so much more money will be made in the archipelago out of that product. And, by the way, some of my friends seemed to be frightened the other day for fear all the arable lands in the Philippines would go into rice "to the ruin" of Texas and Louisiana rice planters. Great heavens! Mr. Chairman, picture the two things, will you—the Filipino, half naked, suffering with anæmia, driving a water buffalo as his motive power, with a sharpened stick for a plow, 6,000 miles away, with freight rates to pay, and a Texas or Louisiana planter with the most magnificent supervising intelligence that the agricultural world has ever known, with all modern machinery, upon an immense great place! Picture my friend the Texan or the Louisianian driven out of business by the half-naked Filipino with the water buffalo and sharp stick!

But that is not all. If they placed it upon that basis alone we might "sort o' stand for it;" but he is not to do it directly, but to do it indirectly, by shipping out his own rice, half fed as he is, with no money in his pocket, shipping out his own rice to America while he buys from China and Japan the rice to feed himself and his family and keep alive while he is waiting for the remittance for his own rice that has to be sold. What a wonderful industrial foresight and ingenuity is attributed to this poor half-naked Filipino, who is not fit to govern himself or to go to the dickens by himself, whichever you choose, in the opinion of the Republican party. He grows rice to eat, and he makes so little of it that he has to import some, and yet he is to be such a modern financier on the rice question as to be entitled to a diploma to serve as a president of a great life-insurance company. He is going to send his rice here, over 6,000 miles, and pay all the freight on it, after it has cost him more to make it with his water buffalo and his sharp stick, to compete with this rice, raised in this beautiful country, in Texas or Louisiana, with the magnificent intelligence there for its supervision and with magnificent machinery for its cultivation, and meanwhile he is to do without something to eat until he can get his rice sold or else is to negotiate a meantime loan at oriental rates. That little brown fellow lives on a farm of about 6 or 8 or 10 acres and raises his rice in the water; not the way they raise it down here, but trusting in Providence for the water to come; not by means of irrigation canals upon which thousands of thousands of dollars have been expended. And he is frightening my friends from Louisiana.

Why, take courage from us—the cotton planters of Louisiana and Mississippi and Texas and the Carolinas! We have never had a dollar of protection from any human being in the world, and I do not want my children and my grandchildren to work under the ægis of any protective tariff, even if I could make

more money in my lifetime by it or some of them make more in theirs. Why? Because they would become accustomed to a protective-tariff margin of doing business, and any set of politicians at any time could withdraw the margin. Having contracted a different habit of doing business and a different standard of living, when the withdrawal time came, although it *ought* not to ruin them, it *would* ruin them. The very cotton business of this country to-day, if we were doing business under a protective tariff, would be ruined to-morrow by the withdrawal of the protective tariff. Why? Because part of our standard of living, perhaps, would be a month or two in the summer at the seaside or in the mountains and a week or two at the St. Charles, in New Orleans, in the winter, and our wives and daughters could not get used to the change of régime in time to keep us from being ruined.

Thomas Jefferson was right in saying that "pride costs more than hunger, thirst, and cold."

I say, take courage from us. We have faced in competition the fellaheen of Egypt; we have faced the Hindoo—

> Who for pants makes his skin do—
> God bless the poor Hindoo.

Both work for very little money. Through the supervising intelligence that has brought the cotton-raising industry to the highest point of perfection we have faced them all successfully, and will continue to do it until the crack of doom. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] said yesterday, "Find a man who has nothing and produces nothing and you find a man who is by nature a free trader." Let us analyze that a bit. The man who has nothing can buy nothing, and therefore he does not care a cent what it costs. It is the man that has something to buy with that is interested in getting his goods at a fair price. The man that has nothing does not care, and it does not pay him to care, because he is reduced either to stealing or to begging, and either one of these processes is a free process. I can give the gentleman something that will reply to that, and it happens to be true: Find a man that is not willing to stand up alone and fight the world in fair competition and without governmental prop or assistance, relying upon the rich soil and the neighborhood of a great people and a magnificent area of a free trade among communities hitherto unequaled in the history of the entire world, stretching from Canada to the Gulf and from the Atlantic to the Pacific; find me a man who is unwilling, who is afraid, who is not brave enough, relying on his own intelligence, industry, and courage, to stand up without governmental prop, without governmental crutch, or governmental shelter, but who wants to be made prosperous at the expense of other people, by governmental assistance, so that he can make other people pay him a tax for the product which he raises, and I will find you a man that is a natural-born protectionist. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That definition is not a joke; it is true.

But, Mr. Chairman, how pitiable is the obtrusion of all these little selfish pocketbook interests in connection with the solution of a great question of humanity on trial in the forum of the mother country when that question is, Shall we do justice by the colony? Why, even Great Britain does not exploit her colonies for the benefit of Great Britain any more. Her own bone and sinew—and, thank God, they were ancestors of nearly all of us that wore the colonial uniform which reenforced the argument—her own bone and sinew taught her better than that in the war beginning in 1776. And the very people who taught Great Britain that lesson are now to follow foolishly, if not wickedly, in the current of the policy which she pursued.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah. Is it not a fact that every country in Europe producing beet sugar places a duty upon cane sugar imported from its own possessions?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know whether that is so or not, but if it is, it is a demonstration of the folly of misdirected energy. Whenever any country undertakes to bring into existence an industry which is not naturally prosperous, purely by the taxing power, and keep it dependent on the taxing power, they have taken that much capital and that much labor out of some other channel in which it might be more wisely directed. This is especially true if under the same flag there is land which will raise sugar cheaper for the consumption of all the people to whom the flag belongs. In addition to the unwisdom of the proposition is the unrighteousness of it, because the other fellow, who is pursuing the natural profitable avocation, has to pay the bill. I know Great Britain puts no duty on cane sugar made in her colonies. I do not know that Germany has any colonies that raise cane sugar. France has some. There is nothing, by the way, more absurd than the war that Europe has had for I do not know how long between different countries competing with one another in the raising of beet sugar until it absolutely got to this status: Austria-Hungary and Germany and France, raising beet sugar, encouraged it by a bounty on exports, which was, of course, deducted from the price of the purchaser in the foreign country to which the goods were exported, until they were selling to the great market of London sugar from all those countries at about 30 per cent less than their own people were getting it for in their own country; and, finally, having raised one another's bounties to a point of absolute absurdity, they had sometime ago to hold a beet-sugar convention and agree on reduction of bounties all along the line. In other words, Austria-Hungary, Germany, and France each was taxing itself to death in order to sell sugar cheap to the English market.

Now, that is an absolute historical fact. It is not a piece of irony; it is not a piece of sarcasm. It is not the plot of a comic opera. Men in some future age reading that may think somebody as a burlesque had written it, but it is a matter of history. My friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] had Clew's circular read, showing how this country had prospered under a protective tariff. I believe I noticed that he used the preposition "under," rather than the preposition "from," but I think he meant "from." That it has prospered under a protective tariff there can be no manner of doubt; that it has prospered from a protective tariff there is all sorts of doubt, and Clew's circular itself settles the doubt, because if you listened to its reading it went on to state the magnificent crops of cotton, the magnificent crops of wheat, the magnificent herds of cattle browsing upon all our hills, the great exports of agricultural products, unprotected, bringing to our American shores gold from every clime until it has made us a very rich country. But I am not one of those who are going to be absurd enough to deny that we and the balance of the world owe our chief blessings to the Dingley tariff. I am sometimes accused of being ironical. I remember, down at a little place in West Virginia, notifying a Democratic nominee for the Vice-Presidency, I had occasion to notice the peculiarity of the present Chief Executive which leads him to extol the arts of war while he regards peace as a sort of sloth breeder, and during the course of my remarks I took occasion, as I thought, ironically to agree with him, and said: "Who was the fool who said 'war is hell,' anyhow? He could not have been acquainted with any real war like the President and I are. He must have been an amateur in war. Whatever you do, Mr. Vice-President, urge the President who will be elected with you to pray for war as a manhood breeder and a preventive of sloth." Well, I did not know that I had overargued the matter so far, but some time after that I got a letter from an old Confederate soldier down in West Virginia, who said:

> I have been watching your career with some degree of interest, and I have liked you up to the time you made that speech, but when you say that war is not hell you do not know what you are talking about. [Laughter.]
>
> I was in the war for four years. It is hell on men, it is hell on women, it is hell on children, it is hell on business, it is hell on morals, and, my boy, do you not make the mistake to think it is not.

I wrote back to him and tried to explain I had not precisely meant all that I had said to go without any salt of humor in it at all, but I never did succeed, and I have been informed the old fellow does not admire me any more because I did not recognize the horrors of war. Now, then, having made that statement, I am going to show you, gentlemen, how much the Dingley tariff has benefited Canada during the same length of time that it has taxed us into prosperity, and I am going to show you that it has benefited Canada more than us.

I am not going to deny that the Dingley tariff is responsible for all the prosperity in the world. I am not going even to put God in the firm as the senior member, as the gentleman from Ohio this morning reluctantly did. I am going to admit that the Dingley tariff has not only made the United States, but Canada and the Argentine Republic and Mexico and pretty nearly all the balance of the world more prosperous right at this moment than they have ever been in their history, and has brought about in a period of a decade at least and something over an unparalleled march of industrial progress throughout the world. I know the Dingley tariff bill did it, because it did it here. I know the Dingley tariff bill is responsible for the fertility of the valleys in the Argentine Republic, because it has raised my cotton for me in Mississippi, while benefiting me all along the line by making me pay higher prices for the plows and machinery that raised it, for the gins that ginned it, for the clothes that my laborers wear while they pick it, and for the stuff I put upon my back while I was engaged in the industry, and for the nails and lumber of their cabins. Let us see. Just before us here is the Dominion of Canada, and in the November number of the Review of Reviews, year 1904, I find the things which I am going to read to you in an article

on page 574 by Agnes C. Laut. Listen to me. Oh, the wonders of the Dingley tariff just across the border. I read:

Ten years ago Canada was buying only $56,000,000 worth of American goods. To-day, despite the raise in the Canadian tariff, $125,000,000 worth of American imports yearly enter the Dominion. Canada's exports to Great Britain represent almost the same, doubling at a bound in ten years; and the entrance of 20,000 immigrants in 1894 has gone up to nearly 154,000 in 1904, of whom 50,000 are Americans, citizens of the United States.

What is the index of the comparative prosperity of two countries? That people with common sense leave the less prosperous of the two in order to seek prosperity upon the shores of the more prosperous of the two. Why is it that for a hundred years Europeans have been coming to the United States—Irish, Scotch, English, Welsh, Germans, Scandinavians, Italians, Hungarians, and Slav? Because they can find here the prosperity they could not find comparatively at home. And here are 50,000 immigrants of what sort? Loafers on the streets? No. Hoodlums? No. They are American farmers. Where from? The Dakotas, Iowa, and some of them from Missouri. The Dingley tariff did this for Canada. Let me go ahead:

A good feature of this immigration is that the settlers have money, and many of them are even American capitalists seeking fields of investment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it may happen now and then in the opinion of a financier that a farmer or laborer is simply a fool, and that he has gone to the wrong place because he did not know any better. But it never happens that a "capitalist" is a fool. He is going to the right place because he knows it is better.

Let me go on with this:

Receipts on the Canadian Pacific Railroad have almost reached the million-a-week mark and a second transcontinental road is being built.

Yes; and receipts upon the Canadian Pacific Railroad will go on and on and on, growing in comparison with American railroads, taking the same direction upon the other side of the border as long as your miserable steel schedule permits the steel trust to sell rails to Canadian railroads being built to compete with yours at $7 to $9 a ton less money. There is no longer any denial of the fact, from any Republican campaign orator even, that this has been done, that the Great Northern Railway itself bought for so much of its track as lay in America steel rails at $28 or $29 a ton, and for so much of its track as lay in Canada steel rails at $21 a ton; that the Mexican National Railroad bought steel rails for so much of its track as lay in Texas at $28 and for so much of its track as lay in Mexico at $20 a ton. In that far, at any rate, the Dingley bill did have something to do with Canadian prosperity in no Pickwickian sense. Let us go on:

For five years crops have been phenomenal; the phenomenal crops, with dollar-a-bushel wheat.

Oh, how fondly gentlemen rely upon the increased price of American agricultural products brought about by the Dingley bill, wheat among other things. Well, the Dingley bill increased the price of Canadian wheat just exactly as much as it did American wheat, and undoubtedly, therefore, is responsible for the wheat farmer's prosperity in Canada.

Mr. KEIFER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. KEIFER. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he knew how much less wheat sells for now in Alberta or Manitoba, or how much less it is than the wheat at the mills of St. Paul and Minneapolis?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, my heavens! the gentleman might as well ask me how much less cotton sells for in Yazoo City, Miss., than it does in New Orleans or New York, or Fall River, Mass. Of course it sells for less the farther off it is from the mills.

Mr. KEIFER. This is the point, Mr. Chairman. Does it not sell for substantially less in those portions of Canada—that is, measured by the 25-cent duty now upon wheat?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It sells for less in Manitoba and Alberta than it does in St. Paul or Minneapolis, of course. I do not know how much less it sells for. It sells for less in Manitoba and Alberta than it does in Quebec and Montreal, and cotton sells for less in central Mississippi than it does at Fall River, Mass.

Mr. KEIFER. But, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me, I desire to know how it is affected by the 25-cent duty on wheat on the bushel?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not a particle.

Mr. KEIFER. That is your claim.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not a particle, and for the simplest reason in the world.

Mr. KEIFER. One of the greatest mill men in this country or any other has recently testified exactly opposite to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The greatest mill man in the world might testify until he was blue in the face and he could prove just this, that wheat is worth more in densely populated countries and large cities and near flouring mills than it is in a remote farming country, with freight rates to pay and maybe bad roads; and he can not prove anything beyond that. The man who asserts that the price of wheat, which is an export article both from Canada and the United States, and whose price is fixed in the markets of the world, can be controlled either by a Canadian tariff or a United States tariff is too ignorant of economics to be heard to testify about anything. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me? I only want to get at the truth. The fact is that much of the wheat lies along the line of Canada much nearer to the Pillsbury mills in Minneapolis than the wheat that is brought there and paid a higher price for from farther west. It is not a question of distance, but a question of the 25 cents duty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is undoubtedly true, all except the reason you give; and it is also true that there is a great deal of American wheat lying nearer to Canadian mills than to any American mills and that the American wheat will sell for less where it is than the Canadian wheat will sell at the Canadian mill. Of course, when you say to a man across the border, 10 miles from a mill, "I am going to make you ship your goods a hundred miles to the Canadian mill," or when the Canadian government says to an American 10 miles from a Canadian mill, "I am going to make you ship 100 miles to an American mill," you do decrease that man's price for his wheat at the farm by the difference of the freight which he has to pay increased by the bungled influence of Government. But you do not raise the other man's price for his wheat one cent, nor do you raise the price of your own country's wheat in the Liverpool market one mill. The price of the wheat is the same in both places; but there has been a deduction from the price of the wheat for the higher freight to the distant mill than to the near mill.

Now, let me go on. I find here in this same review another article headed, "Western Canada in 1904," and it is written by Theodore McFarlane Knappen. Listen to this, on page 578:

In the last fiscal year the foreign commerce of Canada amounted to $473,000,000, an increase of $6,000,000 over the preceding year, and of $233,000,000 over 1894.

Two hundred and thirty-three million dollars increase out of a total of $473,000,000!

The imports were $253,000,000, of which $143,000,000 were from the United States.

This little country—little in population—now has a foreign trade one-fifth as large as that of the United States, which has fourteen times as large a population.

Even the old balance-of-trade men do not contend now that what you ship and sell to somebody else is not that much prosperity, though some of them deny that you are ever benefited by buying what you want. The total, at any rate, of the foreign trade of Canada is one-fifth as large as that of the entire United States, who have a population fourteen times as large. And that was all brought about by the operation of the Dingley tariff, because one of the curious things about a protective tariff is this: That it is put up as a barrier to keep foreign products out, and yet whenever the foreign products come the Agamemnon and the Ulysses and Achilles and the new knight of the Republican party discover that the importations come not in spite of the tariff, but because of it. The tariff is the only thing in the world that can work beneficially both ways. You put it on to raise the price, but if the price should happen to fall in spite of it, why then it is "a benefit of the tariff." You put it on to keep out imports, but if the imports should happen for any other reason to come, then it is "due to the tariff." Oh, what a remarkably consistent party you are here, you worshipers at the shrine of protectionism! You are putting up a barrier to keep the products of the earth from coming in and feeding and clothing our children instead of letting them come and adding nothing to their price except the necessary tax that would carry on a magnificent government on true American lines. You put up a tariff for this purpose, and then you go down to the Isthmus and spend $600,000,000, or whatever it will be before you get through, to cut a ditch in between the two oceans, so that these products you have purposely raised the value of can come in cheaper. Then you subscribe to a great project, to have something in the character of a great American commercial marine, not for the purpose of cultivating, but of defeating "the just and equitable and beneficent effects of the Republican protective tariff"—a merchant marine to let the

products that you have barred out come in cheaper, to carry the products that you have legislated against letting come in.

At one time you cry: "A bas the products of foreign pauper labor!" At the next moment: "Tax the people to build ships to bring them in, and to dig canals to bring them through. The more we can raise the tariff tax to keep them out the better. The more we can lower the transportation tax to let them in the better."

You give reasons for tariff taxing in the name of "national prosperity" and in the name of "labor." They are not your reasons, my friends. Your reason is that some one along the line puts money in his pocket by it. Do not ask too closely whom.

Sir Walter Scott says in one of his novels, The Antiquary, I think, that there was a Latin adage floating around among the deer stealers of the Scottish border. It is not very good Latin, but it is a very good adage. The adage was "Non est inquirendum unde venit venison." [Laughter.] Not to inquire too closely whence the venison comes. The secret at the bottom of your whole system is the secret of not inquiring too closely whence the money comes that goes into the pocket of the fellow that you make prosperous, not by his intelligence, not by his exertion, not by fair play between him and his fellow-citizens, but by a governmental crutch, by governmental hothousing at my expense and at the expense of the poor darky who works my cotton. Somebody said to me the other day, "But are not your darkies pretty prosperous now, and you too?" Yes, we are; but we are a good deal less prosperous than we would have been if you had left us comparatively unfilched. A man may have a hundred thousand dollars a year and be robbed of $25,000 and still be a pretty rich fellow, because he has got a very large plant and a very large income; but he is not as rich by $25,000 as he would have been if you had let him alone.

Rapidly as the railways proceed, they can not keep up with the settlers who come in ever-increasing numbers from the Old World, eastern Canada, and the United States. The most interesting feature of this population movement is the American contribution. Eight years ago some 46 Americans moved from the United States to Canada. These were the scouts of an army that now crosses the boundary in a force of approximately 50,000 a year. In the fiscal year of 1902–3 the invading Americans numbered 49,000, officially counted; for the fiscal year just past they numbered 46,000. Thousands of Americans cross into Canada without being counted. The picturesque prairie schooner still conveys land seekers in the West. Wanderers in prairie schooners have been seen at Calgary, in Alberta, 2,000 miles from their starting place in Iowa and Nebraska.

Some one has said:

Why do these Americans, the very cream of the farming population of the wealthy American West, seek homes in a foreign country? Briefly, the answer is to be found in the lure of free or cheap lands in western Canada and the inducement to turn the old farm into cash at high prices.

This man is a heretic. He don't see that is "all on account of Eliza"—the Dingley tariff. He shakes my faith because that is just exactly what made us prosperous in comparison with Europe, too. The cream of Europe came here, disposing of old lands if they had them, and if they had not, getting rid of old low wages and coming here to buy cheaper lands that were better, or if they were going to work on the place, to give equally as good work with higher pay; and as they began to give equally as good work with higher pay they soon got to giving better work with higher pay, because higher pay puts more soul in a man, more heart in him, and makes him work better. He does not work like a galley slave, looking forward merely to that day's return, but he works with the hope that some day he can rise above that and work for still more money in a still higher situation.

Another thing has made you rich. Go to any country in the world and let it have a large surplus population that leaves it every year, and what is the character of the men who leave? They are the brave, adventurous, enterprising, courageous, sometimes reckless men. We Americans are no better morally, we are no wiser mentally, we are no stronger physically than the average German or Frenchman or Hungarian, except in so far as we live in a higher situation and are better fed. But there is one thing we are. We are as a rule more enterprising, we are more initiative, we are braver, we are more ready to throw the whole thing upon the die. Why? Because the man who left Europe and begot his children here, from whose loins we came in the course of time, was that sort of a man, and like breeds like. The timorous of his class remained behind and bred their kind there. An immense free-trade area, new and fertile lands, the bravest and most adventurous population in the world, the most adaptive, capable of the most initiative, because it comes from forbears of that sort who left the old country because they were of that sort—of course they wrought out prosperity! And then you tell me it is all owing to taxing those of them who are pursuing naturally profitable vocations in order to keep or make prosperous those of them who choose to pursue avocations that would not be prosperous at all unless the Government kept them up. That is your rule. Now, let us go on a bit. I want to get one figure here, if I can find it. Ah!

All this rapid material advance in Canada raises the question, What will the future bring?

Listen to this:

Ten years ago the maximum wheat crop of western Canada was 20,000,000 bushels. In 1902 it was 67,000,000 bushels. The next bumper crop will take the total yield of wheat to 100,000,000 bushels. It takes 117 miles of cars to handle the grain grown on the Canadian Pacific alone.

Read the following to show how rich our Dingley tariff made each individual farmer in Canada in 1904. It must have been that, because we hear of nothing else as explaining what made our farmers' crops:

This year's agricultural round-up means nearly $90,000,000 for about 60,000 actual farmers.

Truly, I believe the farther off the Dingley tariff is and the less force of law it has, the more it "benefits farmers."

There is an increase in ten years of wheat production in Canada—this is my calculation; I am not reading from the book now—of 333 per cent. In spite of the glowing tribute paid our farmers by the Secretary of Agriculture some time ago, have we in ten years increased our wheat production 333 per cent? No; and the reason is because the Dingley tariff bill applies more intensely in Canada than it does in the United States. It applies there, I suppose, by common agreement. [Laughter.]

Ten years ago the acreage devoted to wheat in Canada was 10,000,000 acres, which is an increase of 350 per cent in acreage alone.

Now, gentlemen, I do not wish to abuse your patience. I have got here something I want to read about the Argentine Republic in an article headed "Argentine, the wonderland of South America," but I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. WEEKS. May I interrupt the gentleman, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. WEEKS. Does the gentleman know the relative amount of imports and exports of the United States to Canada ten years ago?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not.

Mr. WEEKS. Does he not know that they were about equal?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think in the main that that is correct.

Mr. WEEKS. Then does not the gentleman know the relative imports and exports to-day?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I read them a moment ago. I forget the exact figures.

Mr. WEEKS. Does not the gentleman know that our exports to Canada to-day are twice what our imports are from Canada?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That we buy from Canada twice as much as we sell?

Mr. WEEKS. No; the reverse. Does the gentleman consider that that is evidence that Canada is prospering at the expense of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah, Mr. Chairman, I thought that the last man that worshiped the old mercantile theory that buying things you wanted impoverished you and selling things you did not want made you rich had died. [Laughter.] Both make you rich, of course. My heavens! I stood upon my feet here—but what is the use of my standing on my feet? Adam Smith stood up and demonstrated the absurdity of this old theory to the intelligence of the universe. Everybody else has dropped it long ago. If a man were made rich by what he sold alone and made poor by what he bought, then how could you ever get anything you wanted? [Laughter.]

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi said on one of the first days of the session that he was not much of a business man. I thought he was speaking modestly of himself, but I want to say now that in what he said he spoke the truth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah, would not I be a fine business man if I pursued your theory? Is not the miser a fine business man who adds nothing to production of the earth, sells whatever he has got of labor, intelligence, or product, turns it into cash, buys nothing in turn, puts it in a box, and sits down on it? Even the miser buys bread. Bread to him even is worth more than the money it costs. The business man takes his assets and invests them in something. Because you buy a thing you have not

wasted the money. Why do you buy it? Because you would rather have the thing than have the money. Why would you rather have the thing than the money? Because it is more profitable to you to have the thing than it is to have the money. Why will I pay a Missourian $140 for a good cotton mule? Because the mule is worth more to me than the $140. I can make more money out of the mule than I could out of $140. This gentleman would have me to believe that the business man should sit down on his $140 rather than buy the mule that is worth more to him in raising cotton than three times the value of the mule.

There is no such thing as balance of trade in the sense that the gentleman is speaking of, except in the long run the true balance. If a man sells more than he has got, he has got to steal something to sell. If you buy more than you have got the money to pay for what you buy, you have got to steal the money, and there is a balance between what is sold and what is bought. I do not mean that there is a balance between me and the gentleman from Massachusetts in our mutual dealings, or between France and Germany. I do not mean that there is a true balance between him and me. He may buy my cotton and manufacture it into cotton cloth, and I may never buy a single thing from him. I may buy mules from the gentleman from Missouri to make my cotton, and he may never buy a single thing from me, but he must sell his cotton goods made out of my cotton to somebody, and he sells them for what he paid me for cotton plus a labor value on his time and help, interest on the plant, dividend on the business, and a fair profit.

A man no more loses by what he buys, unless he is a fool and buys foolishly, than by what he sells, and he can lose by what he sells if he is a fool and sells foolishly. Why, if that were true, what would become of the tight little island of Great Britain? She has bought in the last hundred years, I suppose, about fifty times as much as she sold in this senseless "balance-of-trade" sense, and, of course, according to the gentleman's theory, she would be the multiple of fifty on the other side of insolvency. And what in the world would become of Holland, where the people are the most prosperous, where wealth is more equally distributed than any country in the world, where the people are well educated, shrewd, smart, and happy?

Holland has not seen a day for two hundred years when she did not "buy more than she sold" in this senseless "balance of trade" sense, yet in any true sense she has not bought more than she has sold. When I buy a mule from the gentleman from Missouri at $140 which he bought from a farmer when it was a colt for a hundred and ten and which he maintained for $15, making a hundred and twenty-five dollars, he has made $15 out of me, and a simpleton might imagine I had lost the $15, yet that mule may be worth to me in its productive capacity in the cotton field so much more than a hundred and forty dollars that if I could not get it for less than $200 I would pay that and still make money; so I have made money by buying the mule, he has made money by selling the mule, I have made money by selling my cotton, and you have made money by buying my cotton, and people who want to wear the goods have made money by buying the cotton goods. I thought that miserable old mercantile theory of the "balance of trade" was too dead even to smell bad in public. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I started to read to you about the Argentine Republic, and, Mr. Chairman, I am going to do it, but I have been lately by no means well——

Several MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will ask permission to insert in the RECORD so much of this article in the Review of Reviews for July, 1905, entitled "Argentina, the Wonderland of South America," by John Barrett, formerly American minister to Argentina and Panama and now minister to Colombia, and a great Republican, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the matter to which he refers. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The article referred to is as follows:

The Argentine Republic, as it is commonly called, is to-day one of the most prosperous and progressive countries. Its foreign commerce for 1904 reached the immense total of $451,463,000 in gold. This was greater than that of any other Latin nation, not excepting Mexico and Brazil. It exceeded the foreign trade of Japan, of whose marvelous progress we now hear so much, and it went far beyond that of China, concerning which there is general discussion. In other words, Argentina, with only 5,000,000 people, showed a buying and selling capacity in excess of Japan with 40,000,000 people and China with 400,000,000! My comparison is no reflection on these latter countries, and I have always been an earnest advocate of the importance of our commercial and political interests in the Far East, but these should not overshadow or hide what we have at stake in South America.

That Argentina is moving ahead with proverbial leaps and bounds is proved by the fact that her foreign commerce, the best thermometer of a country's prosperity, increased $90,000,000 in 1904 over the total for 1903, which was $360,000,000. Estimating her population, as before stated, at 5,000,000, she has in the present total of $451,463,000 the remarkable average of nearly $90 per head, or a far greater average than the United States or any of the principal European countries.

* * * * * * *

Argentina boasts of splendid railway facilities. It has now nearly 20,000 miles of trunk lines. Numerous new roads, branch routes, and feeders are being constructed or planned.

* * * * * * *

The transcontinental trains that convey travelers across the broad pampas and climb the Andes to connect with the road on the Chilean side are solid and vestibuled, with up-to-date dining cars. The tourist or business man can now go from Buenos Ayres, on the Atlantic, to Santiago in Chile and Valparaiso, on the Pacific in seventy-two hours.

* * * * * * *

In conclusion, I wish to epitomize some of the foregoing facts to be remembered by the passing reader: Argentina is as large as half of the United States proper, and covers 1,200,000 square miles; it has a growing population of only 5,000,000, but an annual foreign trade of $450,000,000, or $90 per head.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This immense development in Argentina is, of course, due to the Dingley tariff. Argentina had a worse panic in 1893 than we had. This was, of course, due to the anticipation of the passage of the Wilson-Gorman bill by the Congress of the United States. I had some figures about Mexico, its progress under Diaz, still more remarkable, but I have lost them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without taking up the time further with Argentina, something was said about what a Democratic tariff is. The Democratic faith upon the tariff question can be expressed in a few words. First, a tariff is a tax. That is no longer disputed by anybody. There used to be some Republicans, who, at campaign time, used to say it is a tax, but it is a tax on the foreigner. It is not disputed now that the tariff is a tax. Secondly, it is a tax upon the consumer of the goods. Well, wherever a tariff fails to enable the producer of the article taxed to get a higher price and thereby to make the consumer pay more for the thing upon which the tariff tax has been imposed, then the tariff has simply, for some other reason, failed of its purpose. The natural result of the tariff is that it raises prices and thereby taxes the consumer.

The third Democratic idea that follows that up is this: All taxes ought to be, as nearly as possible, equal in proportion to the burden-bearing capacity of the taxpayer. In other words, there is no reason why the consumer of tea should not pay a tax while the consumer of coffee does pay a tax, or vice versa. There is no reason why the mill that consumes cotton should not pay a tax while the mill which consumes wool does, or vice versa. There is no reason why the man who wears shoes should pay a tax while the man who wears a cravat or a hat does not. The tariff is a tax upon the consumer; ought to be as nearly equal as possible, with the conditions that it is adapted to the burden-bearing capacity of the taxpayer—his ability to pay. Now, what grows out of that? The genuine ideal Democratic tariff, if one could be constructed upon a tabula rasa—unfortunately we have not a tabula rasa, and a wise man will be controlled always in urging any ideal result to a certain extent by confronting conditions—but the Democratic ideal tariff with a tabula rasa to write it on would be to divide all sorts of imports into about three classes.

First, necessities, and by necessities I mean the necessaries of life and the necessaries of industry. The necessaries of industry are raw materials of various sorts; the necessaries of life are food and clothing of the plainer and cheaper kind. Other necessities, like agricultural implements for the farmer, books for schools, the tools of the commoner, and indispensable sorts for the blacksmith and carpenter, will suggest themselves.

Such a bill would levy upon the necessaries, everything in that class, a very low tax, so that the poor man who used necessaries, or industries that had to have them, would pay a slight tax in order to get them. This tax ought to be uniform or nearly so for all articles in that class, and as low as possible. That tax might be 5 per cent, 10 per cent, or 15 per cent ad valorem, but not necessarily prescribed by ad valorem expression in form of language. And some of the prime necessaries of life such a bill would put upon the free list, but not many. And, fellow-Democrats, remember that the Walker tariff, which came nearer than any other tariff we have ever had to being an ideal Democratic measure, and under which this country throve immensely, progressing by leaps and bounds, so much so that Mr. Blaine, as the gentleman from Missouri quoted him as saying, said that in 1857, when the Whigs came into power, there was no desire on anybody's part to disturb the existing tariff tax; remember that that tariff, if I remember right, did not put but one thing on the free list, and that was salt, so far in that day did the Democratic idea go that consumers ought to pay their share, but in proportion to ability to pay, in carrying on the Government.

Then there would be another class, composed of luxuries—diamonds, fine wines, high velvets, distilled liquors, anything that is a luxury, anything that is not necessary to the life, or industry, or comfort of humanity, purely a luxury, consumed by rich people, or else by thriftless people, or else by reckless people. How would you tax them? Tax them up to the smuggling point. Make them bear all the tax the traffic can bear, because the man who consumes them is able to pay the tax. Rockefeller does not pay much more tariff tax under the present system than one of the darkies on one of my places. The poor fellow is making a tolerably good living now, but God knows that from 1890 to 1891, and up along there, he did not make much of a living.

And then, in between these two classes, one of necessaries and one of luxuries, would come the intermediate articles, which you might call "comforts." Make them pay a reasonable tax. How are you going to determine how much tax you make all of them pay after you have got them classified? Classify them as high tax, reasonable tax, low tax. But how are you going to determine how much money you want? Find out how much money you need—revenue to carry on your Government honestly, economically, and effectively, a government improving the water courses, a government giving public buildings, a government doing everything else that a strong, effective government ought to do, a government giving justice to people seeking justice, a government giving abundant governmental protection to life and limb and property, and giving it in an abundantly effective way—and then, when you find out how much you need, add a little margin to it for fear of unexpected contingencies. A little bit of a surplus is a good thing to have. Thus you would not regulate your tariff system by the desire of Tom to put money into his pockets, by the desire of Dick to put money into his pockets, by the desire of Harry to be hothoused at somebody else's expense. You would levy your taxes, not according to the necessities of the fellows who are knocking at committee doors to be hothoused into unnatural prosperity or to be hothoused into a greater prosperity than they would naturally enjoy, but according to the necessities of the Government; not according to the demand of graft, but in accordance with the demands of government.

Then what have you done? I will tell you what you will have done. You will have settled the tariff question. You will never settle it in any other way. Nothing is ever settled until it is settled right. You will never settle the tariff question, you will never have a stable system of tariff taxation, until you divorce private business from public business—the question of private demands from that of public needs—until you divorce graft from the governmental system which you administer, until you have rooted out of the mind of every American citizen the idea that the Government was made to support him, and supplant that with the idea that it is his duty to support the Government—that it costs everybody something to do it, and that therefore he had better watch it.

I said that any other sort of tariff is the mother of graft. I mean by that, of course, a protective tariff—protectionism—that is, a tariff levied for the purpose of enabling one man, by charging a higher price, to grow rich at the expense of other men. Now, answer me this, some of you——

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Such as the tariff on tin plate, I suppose?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, the tariff on tin plate cost the American people plenty of money until they discovered new processes of making tin plate in this wonderfully inventive country of ours, and then it went down below what it ever was before the tariff was levied. Does the gentleman contend that the tariff made it go down?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I contend that the increase in the volume of production brought it about.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me fasten that right there. What increased the volume of production, the tariff or cheapened processes? Under the operation of the tariff tin plate did go down in price, below the price at which tin plate was selling before the tariff was enacted. That is an absolute truth. But it has not gone down below the price to which it subsequently went and now stands in Great Britain. And it is now costing the American people more than they could buy it for if they were allowed to buy it in the markets of the world. And not only is the great reduction in the price owing to the discovery of new inventions for treating the stuff, but it is still further due to the fact that they substituted an inferior tin in the American market for the "old style tin we used to buy."

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Does the gentleman believe the price of tin, in Great Britain, for instance, went down because they were deprived of this market in a measure?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Suppose it did. Why should it have gone down more than ours? It is the world produce that makes world price. Laws may locally raise it.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Because they had no market for their tin, and we had a protected market for ours. That is the idea.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They had the world and we had the northern part of one continent, and that fenced off from competition. They had as good a market as we did.

Now, if it be true that tariff upon tin had the effect of driving the price of tin down below what it otherwise would have reached—mark that, now—not below what it was, but below what it otherwise would have reached, then one of two results follow, either that particular tariff, owing to some other reason, failed of its purpose, or else all of your arguments for protection fall to the ground, because the effect of that particular tariff was not to raise the price to the American producer, and, therefore not to bolster him up, crutch him up, or prop him up. If not, then he was not "protected," that is, did not get his share of the discriminating advantages of the system. Some other factor must account for the result. But as a matter of fact he did get his share—is getting it even now. Moreover he got it out of my pocket and yours whenever we put a tin roof on a house.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Now, I do not want to interfere with the gentleman. We claim that the purpose of the tariff, first, was to have tin plate made in America and to reduce the price, both of which have been achieved.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The purpose of the tariff was to enable the producer of tin plate in America, under the shelter of the protection of the tariff, to compete with the producer of tin plate in Wales or in Germany. In order to do that it had to raise the price of the tin plate to the American consumer. In order to raise the price of tin plate to the American consumer the American consumer had to pay more of his money, honestly earned, I hope, in order only to give more for the tin plate.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Only for a little while.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Only for a time? Even till now. Now, let us see about that. Of course, as humanity continues to progress, as industry develops, the amount of manual-labor cost in any given article becomes less and less, and the proportion of machine cost in it becomes more and more, and as cheaper processes come in vogue new inventions are applied to the protected article, and the article itself goes down in price. That is true of every manufactured article that does not depend upon disappearing raw material to such an extent that the cost of the raw material is increased beyond the decrease in the cost of producing the finished article. Of course, then, almost any manufactured article becomes gradually cheaper, even in a fenced-off market. But the fencing off did not make it cheaper.

Now, then, I will just say this: I am willing to take tin plate or any other thing. There is no way of protecting an American producer so as to enable him to compete with a cheaper producer somewhere else except by imposing a tax which enables him to charge and to get in the American market a higher price than the cheaper producer elsewhere can get after he has paid the duty and the freight. If the tariff does not accomplish that result, if instead of raising the price it reduces the price, then the tariff has failed of its purpose or else the price of the product has fallen, not because of the tariff, but because of some other reason. There is no answer to it, and there can be none. It is true that you can "hothouse" an unnecessary number of producers into a given industry, and you may get so many of them in there that they may be disposed to cut one another's throats, but we have passed that period now. We used to talk about the tariff working that way sometimes, but we have got to the point whereby the gigantic organizations or trusts—for the tariff is the mother of trusts as well as graft—they have been enabled to keep up the price in the home market, and whenever they do sell cheaper than they sell here they sell the foreigner, he having the benefit of the reduced price, the benefit of the temporary overplus of production—he, not we.

So that you are doing about what the beet-sugar bounty people did in Austria-Hungary and France—taxing all the people in order to allow some of your people to sell through the trusts cheaper to Great Britain than to you.

Now, then, let me go ahead with the Democratic tariff. The tax ought to be nearly equal, adapted to the ability of the taxpayer to pay, and therefore it ought to be lower on the necessaries than on the comforts, less on the comforts than the luxuries, and the total amount of tax to be levied ought to be determined by the necessities of the Government. Every tariff tax does carry with it some protection. There is no doubt about that. That is what I mean, and yet the power of taxation ought not to be exercised for any other *purpose*

except a public purpose. You have got no right to levy a tax upon me for a private purpose. You have got no right to levy a tax upon me in order to keep my friend from New York [Mr. RYAN] from "going out of business." If you want me to help him from going out of business, come to me and appeal frankly to my charity to help him, and to do so out of my own money, but do not bring the strong arm of the Government upon me and say that I shall help him under the pretense that what he gets out of me enriches me.

Now, one more thing and I am done. I was sorry to hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] talk about "the free-trade lesson" of the panic of 1893.

Now, my friends, are you not yourselves getting a little tired of this talk about there never being a panic except under a Democratic tariff, while history blazons in your eyes a panic in 1873, under a Republican tariff, a panic in 1819, under a very high protective tariff? Are you not getting tired of men's memories not running back far enough to know that the panic of 1893 began, on the farm at least, in 1890? You gentlemen from Kansas know that you were burning corn for fuel in 1891, weren't you? The country kept getting worse until the panic came to its acute stage, and the head of the boil broke in 1893. Is not the gentleman from Ohio aware of the fact that the panic of 1893 happened while the McKinley bill was in operation, and is he not aware of the fact that the panic was over its acute stage and business was on a rock-bottom basis for a start upward again before the Wilson-Gorman bill was enacted? Does he not know that the Wilson-Gorman bill was not enacted until 1894? And is he not aware of the fact that over there on that side of the Chamber at that time, whatever they tell us now, they said then that the panic was due to the fact that we would not hurry up and repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act—was due to a lack of confidence in our money?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. That is what Cleveland said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and that is what Tom Reed said, and that is what nearly everybody said over there. And, finally, is not the gentleman aware that the Wilson-Gorman bill was not a free-trade measure at all?

Mr. GROSVENOR. To which "gentleman from Ohio" does the gentleman from Mississippi refer as having spoken about the panic of 1893?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, I started to say the elder gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is myself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I referred to General KEIFER, the younger gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KEIFER. When did I speak of it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In your speech here upon the floor. The gentleman said that here at some prior time, in a twelve-minute speech, he had "predicted" to the American people that the way to get rid of free trade was to let the American people try it.

Mr. KEIFER. I did say that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And you added, if I am not mistaken—if I am, of course, the gentleman will correct me—that the panic came in 1893, and the people were seen stalking the streets, hungry, and all that. I can not repeat the gentleman's eloquent words in which he described their sufferings. And the gentleman said that since then the American people were not going to risk free trade any more. That is the way I understood him.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has just simply fallen into an imaginary notion about my speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman's speech has not been printed yet. Will he send me the stenographic notes of the official report?

Mr. KEIFER. I did not speak of a panic coming in 1893 by reason of the Wilson-Gorman bill that was passed August 27, 1894.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I apologize to the gentleman most deeply and most humbly. I so understood him. I have heard twenty gentlemen on that side say so, and I thought the gentleman was saying the same thing. The gentleman did say that he predicted that the only way to get away from free trade was to let them try it, and that they had tried it, and that in 1893 the country saw the result of it.

Mr. KEIFER. That I said, and I stand by it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How did they try free trade in 1893, when the McKinley bill was in existence in 1893, and until August 27, 1894? Was it free trade?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I know what you are going to say. You have told me that three times, and there is not a bit more sense in it now than there was the first time you told it. You said it was an anticipation of a Democratic tariff.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think the gentleman might let me make my own statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman says that what brought about the panic of 1893 was the anticipation of Democratic victory. Was it the anticipation of Democratic victory that brought about the panic of 1873? What brought about the panic of 1819? Was it the anticipation of Democratic victory? What brought about the panic in Australia and in Austria and in Great Britain in 1893? Was it the anticipation of a Democratic victory? What brought about the panic in Canada in 1893? Canada had as a bad a panic as we had that year. Was it the anticipation of Democratic victory in Canada? What has made Canada since then increase 333 per cent in wheat production? What has made her increase 250 per cent to 350 per cent in her wheat area, gathering herself up from the débris of 1893, when she suffered as we did, and making that gain in the next succeeding ten years, far surpassing in proportion the gain that we made in the same time? Was it the displacement of the Democratic party and the enactment of the Dingley bill in Canada?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from Mississippi is hardly fair. He occasionally interrupts me, and I have always yielded to him. Now I ask him the privilege of stating what I did say, and the gentleman goes on and pours out a thunderstorm of words about Canada, and this is the third time he has gone through that Canada business.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is the third time I have had to answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, if the gentleman will let me go on, I will put it in a sentence. There was the Democratic platform of 1892, upon which Mr. Cleveland was elected, in pursuance of which he wrote the celebrated free-trade letter declaring that all forms of protection were robbery; a Democratic party had got control of the House; a Democratic Senate had come into power, and the consequence of it was that a stampede took place in this country that was followed up and emphasized by the passage of the Wilson bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I knew what the gentleman from Ohio was going to say, and I answered by saying that exactly the same cause led to the panic in Canada and in Australia and all over the world. [Laughter.]

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MACON. The gentleman from Ohio has just said that the depression came from the anticipation of the Democrats coming into power. Will the gentleman explain why Kansas corn was burned in 1890 and 1891, before that Democratic declaration that all kind of tariff was robbery? I would like to hear him explain that.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, will the gentleman from Mississippi allow me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is it?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman think that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] assured the American people until long after the votes were counted that Cleveland was not going to be elected and was not elected, and is it not a fact that the revenues of the Government began to diminish months and months before the election of Cleveland? Is it not also a fact that Mr. Foster issued an order for the bonds ten days before the close of the Harrison Administration?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; all that is true. Now, Mr. Chairman, I might have put the question to the genial gentleman from Ohio as to whether he had not assured the American people for some time before and after the election of Cleveland that he would not be elected and was not elected, but I was afraid the gentleman from Ohio might respond by saying that the American people would not believe him, and that would have put us both in a bad attitude. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am both tired and sick, and I ask permission of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1. An act to incorporate the American National Institute (Prix de Paris) at Paris, France;

S. 64. An act for the extension of Seventh street and Franklin street NE., and for other purposes;

S. 951. An act to grant to the State of Minnesota certain vacant lands in said State for forestry purposes;
S. 979. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak.;
S. 1160. An act to correct the military record of John McKinnon, alias John Mack;
S. 1234. An act to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederate army and navy who died in Northern prisons and were buried near the prisons where they died, and for other purposes;
S. 1747. An act to authorize the Mobile Railway and Dock Company to construct and maintain a bridge or viaduct across the water between the end of Cedar Point and Dauphin Island;
S. 2106. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Vanburen, Ark.;
S. 2140. An act to authorize the Postmaster-General to dispose of useless papers in post-offices;
S. 2260. An act authorizing the extension of Meridian place NW.;
S. 15. An act granting an increase of pension to Lizzie E. Shehan;
S. 21. An act granting a pension to Mary G. Bright;
S. 23. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Bradbury;
S. 76. An act granting an increase of pension to Hartwell C. Keyes;
S. 82. An act granting an increase of pension to Curtis A. Carpenter;
S. 85. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Keaster;
S. 99. An act granting an increase of pension to Eugene P. Kingsley;
S. 113. An act granting an increase of pension to John D. McFadden;
S. 135. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter P. Chacey;
S. 137. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Wiper;
S. 144. An act granting an increase of pension to Minerva Briggs;
S. 147. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick McCue;
S. 149. An act granting an increase of pension to Cassius Leisk;
S. 150. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucius A. Lincoln;
S. 157. An act granting an increase of pension to Lizzie G. Reynolds;
S. 168. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Davis;
S. 182. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Smith;
S. 184. An act granting an increase of pension to Leyman Marsh;
S. 194. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Cowell;
S. 195. An act granting an increase of pension to John Pieper;
S. 202. An act granting an increase of pension to Allen Amburn;
S. 204. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Walter;
S. 205. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis Gee;
S. 217. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Breckenridge;
S. 327. An act granting an increase of pension to Walter Barney;
S. 336. An act granting a pension to Abraham M. Cory;
S. 386. An act granting an increase of pension to Orange G. Jones;
S. 471. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas McLaughlin;
S. 489. An act granting an increase of pension to Nelson B. Tool;
S. 525. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Brady;
S. 528. An act granting a pension to Robert M. McCormick;
S. 530. An act granting an increase of pension to Sophia A. Knapp;
S. 532. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Doty;
S. 559. An act granting an increase of pension to Seth M. Tucker;
S. 560. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Reed;
S. 571. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Knight;
S. 574. An act granting an increase of pension to Lee H. Buckland;
S. 626. An act granting an increase of pension to Allen J. Nash;
S. 627. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hiler;
S. 708. An act granting an increase of pension to Maurice Downey;
S. 713. An act granting an increase of pension to Ephraim A. Gordon;
S. 777. An act granting an increase of pension to Byron Lent;
S. 783. An act granting an increase of pension to Moses H. Sawyer;
S. 786. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick Garvey;
S. 844. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Ryan;
S. 849. An act granting an increase of pension to Horatio Carter;
S. 944. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Catterson;
S. 974. An act granting an increase of pension to David L. Wright;
S. 988. An act granting a pension to Russell A. McKinley;
S. 1036. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Beachey;
S. 1040. An act granting an increase of pension to James Sloan;
S. 1164. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Bedell;
S. 1201. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Preston;
S. 1214. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Oleson;
S. 1238. An act granting an increase of pension to John Christoff;
S. 1239. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. McGarvey;
S. 1269. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Smith;
S. 1310. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles S. M. Hooton;
S. 1340. An act granting an increase of pension to John Leavitt;
S. 1341. An act granting an increase of pension to Fred Preisinger;
S. 1342. An act granting an increase of pension to Morton M. Noah;
S. 1359. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Ingalls, alias Jeremiah Boss;
S. 1408. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia W. Estes;
S. 1431. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Lane;
S. 1444. An act granting a pension to Dora H. Huhns;
S. 1505. An act granting an increase of pension to Uriah D. Barrett;
S. 1737. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Blanchard;
S. 1826. An act granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Paine;
S. 1872. An act granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. White;
S. 1888. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Patton;
S. 2082. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth T. Carpenter; and
S. 2143. An act granting an increase of pension to Angelina Hernandez.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr ADAMS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the distinguished leader on the other side of this Chamber, has stated the old Democratic doctrine that has been heard over the United States for the last sixty or eighty years, that the tariff is a tax, and he says that nobody denies it. Of course nobody denies it, because there is hardly anybody in the United States to-day that believes it, except a certain portion of the Democratic leaders and some free-trade professors in the universities. It is pretty late in the

day to enter into a general discussion of the tariff question. It is almost a pathetic thing to see a gentleman standing up here on this floor and spending from one to two hours in rehashing the old Democratic doctrine of free-trade Democracy and in reading lessons to the Republican party of the United States, and calling attention to the fact that that party is a decadent party. It did pretty well in the last campaign. The same doctrines which the gentlemen have enunciated here were talked about in the last Presidential campaign, have been declared on every Democratic stump, talked of in all the newspapers, and argued in every legislative chamber, and the American people, by a majority more overwhelming than that which it gave to any Republican candidate, elected Theodore Roosevelt, and elected him because he was a protectionist. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Mississippi says that the Republican part of this Chamber will not do anything with the tariff, but will let it alone; that there is no sentiment among the party leaders for revision, but that we will "stand pat" because we are bound and riveted together. I want to suggest to him that before I get through he will find that some of us are not bound and riveted, and I want to suggest further to the gentleman from Mississippi that they had better get in a little work to bind and rivet together the scattered remnants of the Democracy, so that they can make a respectable appearance before the people of the United States. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

There is some division on this side of the Chamber about the tariff question. I come from the Mississippi Valley. I represent a State which is both agricultural and manufacturing, and I represent a part of the Republican party of Wisconsin, and I believe that that party in that State believes that it is the duty of the Republican leaders of this House and of the Republican Administration to revise the tariff system and adjust it to the conditions which exist to-day. Some of us on this side of the Chamber find ourselves in rather a peculiar position, not only upon this question, but upon other questions.

I was born of Whig parentage; all my life has been spent in the Republican party. No man can charge me with disloyalty to the principles of that organization which is represented in this majority; I am not a protectionist because I am a Republican, but I am a Republican because I am a protectionist. I want to say, further, to the gentleman from Mississippi that although we have divided judgment here you have any number of divided judgments upon your side of the Chamber, and there is more than one man sitting in his seat as a Democratic Representative who does not believe any more in the free-trade doctrine that he has enunciated than gentlemen on this side of the Chamber. It is only a few months ago that I had occasion to go down to the State of Virginia, to the beautiful city of Richmond, and address a large gathering of farmers from every State in the Union. I came in personal contact with many ex-Confederate officers, dyed-in-the-wool Democrats, good fellows, as we know them to be, and three out of four told me they were glad that Theodore Roosevelt was elected, because the election of a Republican President meant the continuation of the protective-tariff policy and greater prosperity, not only for the North, but prosperity for the South.

I do not want to make a stump speech upon the prosperous conditions which exist in the United States to-day in reply to the arguments of the gentleman from Mississippi. He talks about the theory of free trade and he talks about right and wrong, but does he forget that not only the Government of the United States is dominated by men and by a public sentiment which approves of a protective tariff policy, but that Russia, Germany, France, and every civilized nation on earth, except England, have protective tariffs, and even the colonies of Great Britain protect themselves against the mother country? Does the gentleman imagine that he alone has the moral sense, that he alone knows the distinction between right and wrong, and that nearly all the great governments of the earth are destitute of both morality and sound political judgment? Not only that, but there is a rising tide of protection—of protection sentiment everywhere—and increased duties are being levied for the protection of the business life and industries of every nation upon the earth, except the one that I have named. It is a little singular, but the people who are in favor of free trade are the gentlemen who think in their closets and write books on political economy and the leaders of the Democratic party, but the men who do business and raise revenues and run the governments and develop the industries of great nations all over the globe, all of them believe in the protective tariff policy that is defined and defended by the Republican party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, then, gentlemen, it has been my fortune all my life to be connected, more or less, with agricultural interests. If there is any class of men to whom the siren song of the free trader can go with more effect than any other it is to the farmer. He receives very little direct protection, but there is no class of men in the United States of large numbers and extent that received more benefit from this protective-tariff system than the American farmer. He has appreciated it, he has stood by the party, and favored that system. Why is he interested in it? Because protection diversifies industries, builds factories, opens up avenues for the exercise of human talent, human ingenuity, and human genius, because it tends to take a man from the farm and put him in a factory; it tends to take him from the farm and make him a consumer of the things the farmer produces. Away back in 1860 in the State of Wisconsin, where I lived, 80 men out of 100 were engaged upon the farms. Twenty men out of 100 in that State were buying the products of the farmer. To-day, under the growth of our manufacturing interests in that State, 49 men are producing upon the farm within the limits of that State and 51 men are buying the things that the farmer produces. Oh, we could tell you about tin plate and we could tell you about steel and we could tell you about cotton goods and woolen goods, shoes, and everything which enters into the needs of human life, cheapened to the consumer by the effect of the Republican protective tariff. But I do not want to take the time to do it. It is not necessary.

The American people have settled that question practically and properly, not only for now but for years to come, and the question which comes home to us in the consideration of this bill, we who believe thoroughly in this protective-policy principle, is what we will do in reference to a measure which proposes to open up the American markets to the unrestricted competition of the products of the Philippines. That is the question. It is not always pleasant to be considered an insurgent. Some of you know how it is; you know what sort of discipline you get; you know what you have to meet; you know the many things that are brought to bear; but I say that the men who oppose this bill are not insurgents, and I do say that we have the remarkable spectacle of the Republican leaders of this Chamber and the Administration going into the insurgents' camp themselves and leaving us without leaders.

The Republic will see the friends of this bill joining with the free-trade Democracy to diminish the protection which is to-day received by the men upon the farms of this country. [Applause upon the Republican side.] I want to say to you, gentlemen, that not for one solitary moment would I criticise the purity of the motives of the President of the United States or of the gentlemen who are leaders upon this floor.

I want to say to you that there are some Republicans favoring this Philippine tariff bill who are hurting their political interests in their districts, and I bow to them in respect because they are following their judgment, their conscience, and their convictions. But you must also understand that the rest of us do the same thing. If there were not one solitary pound of tobacco produced in my district or my State, if there were not one solitary pound of sugar produced in my district or my State, I would be opposed to the Philippine tariff law. Why? The question of plain duty has been raised here. We hear it every day, in every discussion, in nearly every speech. Do you not think it is getting to be a little bit overworked? What is our plain duty? Have not we done fairly well by the people of the Philippine Islands? What have we done? By the way, we have obtained those islands, and we got them properly. There is not time to discuss that fairly. But there was nothing else under heaven that the United States could do except to hold them and care for those people as we have done. What did we do in the interest of humanity? We declared war against a nation with which we were at peace. We went into that war and we saddled ourselves with expenses amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, issued the bonds of the Government, and are paying interest upon those bonds to-day and will for many years to come. We unsettled, to some extent, the business of this country. We raised an army, we sacrificed the lives of thousands of men, and there was mourning in many homes, both North and South.

We have given to those islands a stable government at the cost of money and the cost of men. We have established thousands of schools in which there are half a million of children. We are building railroads over those islands. We have established courts of justice there where justice can be had. And it seems to me we have done as our plain duty required us to do, to make the Filipino people good citizens, to give them liberty, to give them instruction, and to fit them for self-government. Why, the gentlemen have talked about the capacity of the island for sugar and tobacco production. They tell us what the census figures are, and every man in this Chamber who has read the testimony and the literature upon that subject knows that no

live man can tell the capacity of the Philippine Islands for the production of either sugar or tobacco.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I think that the gentleman is better versed on tobacco than I am. My district is a tobacco district; however, I never raised any. Can the gentleman tell me what effect the production of Porto Rican tobacco has had on his tobacco market?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. No, sir; I can not tell you.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. It has had such little effect upon our people that they do not know it has been introduced. I am glad that the gentleman has stated that his people are all happy and prosperous.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. I do not say that they are all prosperous, but——

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. You speak of the Filipinos as "our children." Does not the gentleman think that when his people are basking in the sunshine of so much glorious prosperity he should let those little stepchildren at least send a few of their things over here to sell to us when it will not hurt us?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. That is precisely what I think—"when it will not hurt us." The Philippine Islands contain seven and one-half millions of people and Japan, which has less fertile territory than the Philippines, contains 48,000,000 of people; and when these gentlemen say to us that because their ways are crude, because those people are lazy and shiftless and thriftless, there is no danger in their competition to American industry, they are simply disregarding the law which prevails when an enlightened nation gets hold of a fertile country and establishes law there and makes property safe and life and investment safe; and I want to say to the gentleman that beyond any question—and this is a question of judgment—so far as my judgment goes there is richness enough of soil and area enough of soil in the Philippine Islands when capital becomes assured of its safety to increase the sugar products of those islands and the tobacco products of those islands until they shall seriously compete with the sugar and tobacco interests of the United States.

Now, if the gentleman will wait a minute before he asks another question. I was interested in the speech of the gentleman from Ohio. I was rather amused by his statement that the cigars made in the Philippine Archipelago are not fit to smoke, and that they would never come into the American market and obtain any standing here. Then, on top of that the gentleman said he never smoked a cigar himself and did not know anything about it. [Laughter.] That struck me as being about as valuable as that literature contributed to the Lady's Journal by old maids who have been giving instructions to mothers how to take care of their children. Now, I have smoked these cigars—five or six brands of them—and I do not think my physical appearance is caused by smoking them. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I think you will find a great many things will go up in smoke before you get through with this.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Some of them are not very good, some of them are very poor, and one brand is exceedingly good, and every solitary brand that my friend, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, brought back from the Philippines and was kind enough to give to me would find a place in the market of every State in the Union, because, although they are not very good, they will be cheap.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Any number of suggestions from the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I wish here in the interest of truth to say that the one I tried on the gentleman from Wisconsin is the only one that worked well. I tried it on eight or ten other gentlemen and none of them said it was a good smoke, and said, "Have you not got something else besides this?" [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. I can say in answer to that, Mr. Chairman, that the reason for it is this: that I am a simple ordinary farmer, accustomed to smoke ordinary cigars, and the friends of my friend were mostly millionaires.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, why have you not kept on smoking those Porto Rican cigars?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. I have not smoked any Porto Rican cigars.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why is not the gentleman disposed to keep on smoking the Philippine cigars?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. I will smoke them just as long as Mr. COOPER gives them to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Ah, now; it is because he gives you something, that is the only advantage. There may be some force in that. Now, with the average cost and the insurance, etc., on these cigars, which can be brought here in twenty-six days from the Philippine Islands, are you disposed to think that those things will not make the price of these cigars rather higher than cigars can be bought for here?

Just a few minutes now. I am talking seriously of the matter, as I am a tobacco man myself. I think the Constitution follows the flag, and I am not going to follow the Supreme Court to the contrary. Now, while these cigars can come in twenty-one days from the Philippine Islands, paying the insurance on them and the expense otherwise—I do not know what the expense would be—and then putting 25 per cent tariff on top of that and hauling them over into the Mississippi Valley in which we both live, are you not disposed to believe that that will be very expensive traveling for that cigar to the man who imports it and that it will prove an embargo on its sale?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Oh, no. I will say to the gentleman I have only a few minutes and I can not answer that question in a moment.

Now, another thing. When you talk about the capacity of the Philippines for the production of tobacco you are treading on ground that you can not know very much about. Away back forty years ago in Wisconsin we began raising tobacco around the little village of Edgerton. They raised it for many years. It was generally claimed that it was the only place in the State of Wisconsin where it was possible to raise that kind of tobacco. Time passed along and they began the study of soils; they began to understand the matter. The industry began to spread.

It went over the county of Dane and into the counties of Rock and Richland and away up in the county of Vernon, and went all over one-half of the State of Wisconsin, because of the knowledge that came to them as time passed and scientific investigation came to their aid. I want to say to the gentlemen of that committee and to the gentlemen of this House that just as certainly as time passes and we make life and property safe in those islands you will find that there will come a gradual development of their tobacco interest, a development of their sugar interests, and American interest in those two things will be seriously interfered with. There is no nation on the globe but what protects its own sugar interests against the cheap sugar of tropical countries. It may be insisted here, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania came closer to the heart of this controversy perhaps than anyone on the other side of this question, that we are bound to do this thing because the Administration is committed to it, because the leaders of this House are committed to it.

But I want to say to you, gentlemen, that no man need fear to vote upon this question or any other which comes up in this House in accordance with his own judgment and his own conscience simply because of the position of the Administration. The distinguished gentleman who is now President of this Republic has won his way into the hearts and the affections of the American people because he has insisted that his obligations and the obligations of all men should be not simply to party, but to country, and that always they should remember the obligations of individual conscience and individual judgment. [Applause.] And I want to say to the Members of this House on the Republican side that if they want to be loyal to the preachings and the teachings of Theodore Roosevelt they will not vote for this bill simply because the Administration is for it. They will not vote for it simply because the organization of this House is for it, but they will vote in accordance with their own consciences and their own judgment, because when they do that they are men. They will remember that their responsibility is not simply to the administration of the House or to the Administration of the country, but to the people who sent them here.

I want to say one other thing, that day by day the lines are drawing closer, and day by day the membership of both parties are coming closer to a common platform. I want to say further that the Administration in the White House can not and will not permit its friends in this House to whip the party lash about our heels. It can not afford to do so when a Cabinet minister goes into a disputed State in a hot campaign and makes a speech which has the effect of turning down the Republican candidate for governor and electing the Democratic candidate.

Mr. JAMES. What Republican Cabinet officer made that speech?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. The gentleman can read the papers, and he knows perfectly well. I am not criticising the President, and I want to commend his independence, and I want to commend the rising spirit of independence that has come up in the Democratic party in the city of New York and in many

Southern States. Not only in the cloakrooms and on the streets and in the hotels, but elsewhere, I hear from Republicans and from Democrats this doctrine that we should stand together upon business questions; that we who believe we are right regarding the business interests of this country should not permit party labels to be put upon simple business questions.

Mr. JAMES. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. The gentleman is at liberty to ask me any question which is pertinent to this subject.

Mr. JAMES. Is it not true that the Cabinet officer to whom the gentleman referred was William H. Taft, and that he was speaking against ring rule and against Cox in Cincinnati?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. Do you say that caused the defeat of the Republican ticket in Ohio?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. It is so stated by the press of that State and by Democratic gentlemen on the floor of this House.

Mr. JAMES. Then the Republican party stood for ring rule there?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. No, sir.

Mr. JAMES. How did it defeat you there, then?

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin. I say it had that effect there—that the Republican President permitted a Cabinet officer to go into a State where a hot campaign was raging, and, to be more explicit than in my former statement, he did denounce ring rule—denounced the rule of men who were supporting the Republican candidate, and the effect of that unquestionably was to elect the Democratic candidate in that State.

I want to say to the leaders of this House and to the rank and file that there is a rising spirit of independence all over the land. There never was a time since I cast my first vote when the two political parties were standing so close together as they are now. The bitter questions raised by the war are being forgotten. The North and South are coming together in a closer union. You men of the South are beginning to find out that we of the North are pretty good fellows, and we are beginning to find out that you of the South are pretty good fellows. [Applause.] When we come into the discussion of a question of this kind we should disregard party lines and sectional lines and lines of every kind and stand up here as American citizens, exercising the faith that is in us and voting in accordance with that faith. For one I believe that the men who represent the $40,000,000 invested in sugar factories, the men who have the duty of representing here the owners of the hundreds of millions of dollars invested in sugar-beet farms, the men who represent the owners of the $100,000,000 invested in tobacco lands of the United States, the cigar makers and manufacturers of the United States, who manufactured last year $167,000,000 worth of cigars and cigarettes, all these great interests which have been built up under the protective tariff policy of the Republican party are right when they say that the opening up of these islands, with their wide territory and fertile soil and swarming population, will be a menace to those industries.

I believe that we are right, and I believe that our plain duty in the future and now, as it always has been, is for us on the Republican side to stand by the interests of our own people as against those of any other people on the face of the earth. [Applause.]

Why, the other day when the gentleman from New York made his speech, if I could have closed my eyes I could have imagined that it was a speech delivered by the eloquent gentleman from Mississippi. We heard the same old song that we have heard in many campaigns—a tribute to American genius, a tribute to American enterprise, a tribute to the industry and the spirit and productive power of the American people. And then he says: "How are they going to compete with us; how are the ragged devils on the other side of the world going to compete with such people as these?" Why, that is Democratic doctrine that we have heard from the Democratic side of this Chamber for the last forty years and in every campaign. The trouble is that they can compete; they have competed, and if it had not been for the policy of the Republican party, maintained in spite of the position of our Democratic friends, you would not have thirteen hundred millions of dollars in gold under the currency of the nation and you would not have exported within the last nine years over seven billions and a half of agricultural products; you would not have had enormous exports of manufactures; you would not have had an annual balance of trade in our favor of $450,000,000 since the golden days of McKinley, and you would not have to-day this country rich and happy with the splendid prosperity which we enjoy. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. McKINLAY of California. Mr. Chairman, I would hardly venture to participate in this discussion at this late hour if it were not for the fact that I was one of those who made the journey through the Orient, touching at the Hawaiian Islands, China, Japan, and visiting the Philippine Islands, with the Congressional committee who lately made that tour. Therefore, in these remarks I will confine myself chiefly to giving evidence as to what we saw. I am unused to this kind of work; nevertheless I am capable of forming just impressions and of reasonably detailing them to those who are willing to listen.

I do not know how the people on the eastern side of the continent viewed the situation when war was declared between the United States and Spain; I do not know how you viewed the situation of the Philippine Islands; but I do know that the people of the Pacific coast looked with much apprehension across the waters and saw the supposedly powerful Spanish fleet operating on the coast of Asia. I know that it brought relief to every man and woman in California when the news was flashed over the wires that the President of the United States had ordered Admiral Dewey to the bay of Manila to destroy the Spanish fleet. With the destruction of that fleet came relief to the citizens of California, because we knew that it would no longer be possible for that fleet to prey upon American commerce or, perhaps, descend upon and ravish the coasts of our State.

One of the gentlemen on the other side alluded to the fact that it was American greed for power and glory and the conquest of arms that took the flag across the Pacific and planted it over the walls of Manila. This is not the fact. When Admiral Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet in Manila, it was instantly apparent to the writers of the world's history that the power of Spain was ended in the Philippine Islands. Spain's ability to protect the civilization then existing in the Philippine Islands was destroyed at the same time. It did not take Admiral Dewey long to understand that the cosmopolitan bands under Aguinaldo, to the number of 60,000, gathered behind the city of Manila, could not protect that city. And so it became imperatively necessary that the United States should rise to the measure of its responsibility and protect that civilization, and she rose to that necessity, and the islands are ours to-day.

With that responsibility came the further one, the duty of establishing a stable government. I do not intend to recapitulate the history of the breaking out of the insurrection, I do not intend to say very much about the sending out of the Schurman Commission, but we all know the anxiety that was felt throughout the Republic and the hopes and prayers expressed that peace should soon be brought about. We know how in time Secretary Taft was sent over to the islands with a commission from President McKinley, his duty being first to endeavor to establish peaceful relations between the leaders of the insurrectos and the American Government. When these relations were established it was then his duty to form a civil government that should supersede the military. I do not need to trace the course of the work of the Secretary and of the splendid Commission which accompanied him. Suffice it to say that to-day the Philippine Islands are thoroughly organized with a splendid system of government. They have a great territory, if I may use that word, and reasonable consideration by the American Government at this time will guarantee them a useful and a prosperous future career.

They have rebuilt, almost, the city of Manila; they have improved her harbors; they have built warehouses; they have built a breakwater to guard the shipping; they have fitted, as it were, the city of Manila so that she may in a very short time become the great maritime city of the Orient. They have gone further. They have improved the harbors of Iloilo and Cebu. In fact the only criticism that might be made of the Taft Commission and the insular government as now established is that perhaps they have proceeded a little faster than the people of the islands were able to endure.

What is the result? On our visit to the islands, as we were supposed to do, we took a trip through the various provinces for the purpose of ascertaining the wishes of the people, for the purpose of studying the industrial and economic conditions, and I submit that any observing man could soon inform himself as to the absolute necessity that the United States at this time should hold forth a hand to help those people upon their feet. [Applause.]

For more than seven years predatory insurgent bands have traveled over their plantations, labor has been driven from its employment, homes have been destroyed, all organized industry has been displaced. Usurers from China and Japan have taken advantage of the necessities of the people; money is loaned at great risk, and the money lenders of China and Japan, taking advantage of these deplorable conditions, make loans to the

people of the Philippine Islands at the rate of from 1½ to 3 per cent a month. It is almost impossible for those poor people to rise to any civic dignity as a commercial section of the world without assistance from this country. The pledges of two Administrations have gone forth to them—the pledges of President McKinley and President Roosevelt—and the question before this House at this moment is, Are those pledges to be kept or not? The insular government has laid the foundation of prosperity in the Philippines. It has done the best it can do, and now all that is asked is that the United States shall do its part to bring these islands into closer relations with the mother country.

I yield to no man in this House in my devotion to the principle of protection. I personally have known what it was to lose my job because of a change of tariff, and I am devoted to the principle of protection, but I do not believe that my devotion to protection calls upon to support a measure that will perpetuate injustice to more than 7,000,000 people who to-day are trustingly living under the protection of the American flag.

Many in this House are anxious to extend American trade in the Orient. We hear a good deal on every side about oriental trade, and we hear more from the workingmen of the Pacific coast about excluding the Japanese cooly from our shores; American labor fears his competition, especially in California. Then we hear on the floor of this House the answer, that we must have the oriental trade, even if we disregard the wishes and interests of the laboring men of the Pacific coast. Why, gentlemen, in that trip through the Orient, we visited Japan as well as the Philippine Islands, and it seems to me that any reasonable person observing the preparations which Japan is making to-day for a great industrial career, must come to the conclusion that she will be as successful, commercially and industrially, as she has been in conquering the forces of Russia upon land and sea. We visited the principal cities of Japan, and found in every one of them amazing industrial activity. We found them making preparations for the manufacture of almost every commodity that is used in the oriental world. In the city of Osaka, which is called the "Pittsburg of Japan," we found buildings being erected almost upon every street corner and smoking chimneys upon every corner of those buildings. We found that the great statesmen of Japan, headed by Marquis Ito, were even then making preparations for the bringing back of the armies from Manchuria and Korea, and the training of them in industrial methods, even as they have been training them for the last fifteen years in the use of arms. I prophesy now, and it does not need the tongue of a prophet to tell you, gentlemen, that the result of Japanese development along industrial lines, within the next ten years, under the tutelage that is even now being given them, will be as startling to the world as the wonderful victories they recently won from Russia upon the bloody fields of Manchuria and Korea or the stormy waters of the Sea of Japan.

What will America meet in Japanese industrial competition? She will meet a people absolutely unscrupulous in trade, commerce, and productive methods. She will meet a nation with the lowest-priced well-trained skilled labor in the world. On our recent trip through the Orient we learned that Japanese laborers work for 20 cents a day, American money; Japanese mechanics of ordinary ability for 35 cents, while the highest skilled mechanical workmen receive no more that 1 yen per day, which is less than 50 cents in gold.

We found how they were equipping their plants. It might be a cotton industry, it might be a woolen factory, it might be a boot and shoe manufactory, but we found them installing in those plants American and European machinery. The great cost of establishing an enterprise in this country is the expense of up-to-date high-speed machinery. In the United States the manufacturer who contemplates establishing an industry must first estimate the cost of such machinery. He buys, of course, the latest improved inventions. It may take a dozen, twenty, or a hundred machines to equip that factory. The cost of a plant may be five times the actual cost of making the machinery. Why? Because every cog and wheel and crank of the machines he buys is patented under American and European patent laws, and so the buyer of machinery pays a royalty to the patentee, and the total cost of equipment is proportionally high.

But in Japan they buy American machinery for a model only. They send to this country, buy the latest-made machine, take it over there, and their skillful mechanics take it to pieces and make as many more like it as they require to equip their establishments, and by this method they furnish their industrial plants with machinery at one-fifth the outlay an identical equipment would cost in the United States. In Japan they simply pay no respect to the patent laws of America or those of European countries, and infringe upon all patents alike with absolute impunity. Thus they have a bed-rock capitalization added to their bed-rock labor cost. And, added to all this, these Japanese competitors of ours can buy their raw materials in the world's markets as cheaply as the manufacturers of the United States or Europe, and yet we dream of industrially exploiting Japan, Korea, Manchuria, or China—we dream of sending our ships to those oriental lands and secure such a great proportion of oriental trade that it shall build up the industries of the United States and make the nation great.

It is a vain dream. It will never be realized. We will never exploit, commercially or industrially, any territory under the flag of Japan or any nation under her guardianship, as China is to-day.

Read the reports which come from China. China—world-old China—slothful, prejudiced, and timid for a thousand years, at last rousing from her indolence of centuries under the tutelage of Japan, is developing, training, and disciplining an army which may astonish the world and bid defiance to all the powers of the white nations.

While on our return from the Philippine Islands we stopped at the city of Yokohama, and there I was told by one of the officers who accompanied General MacArthur through Manchuria that already Japan had on the way 30 American mills for the grinding of the grain of the fields of Manchuria. They were not 30 American mills made in the factories of the United States, but 1 American mill, used as a model, and 29 others manufactured in Japan, at one-fifth the American cost, and yet we dream we will compete with those people in securing the trade of the Orient. We desire trade with the Orient, of course we do, and we have a logical way to get the measure of oriental trade that should come to America. We have the Philippines upon our hands. God knows they are a great problem and it should be the desire of every honest American heart to aid the Government, the leaders of the Republican party, and President of the United States to work out that problem for the well-being and the glory of the American Republic.

We have a magnificent opening in the Orient now. The Philippine Islands, with their more than 7,000,000 of inhabitants, with a fertile soil, a people eager for education, ambitious to progress upward along the pathway of the world's civilization, anxious to buy, because they need the things America manufactures in such abundance—as soon as these people become more prosperous, as they surely will under the operation of a reduced tariff between the islands and the United States, they will become a great consuming market for the products of the farms and mills of the States and Territories of the East and West. I believe in protecting beet sugar, as I believe in protecting other industries. But fortunately in California we have something else besides beet-sugar factories to consider. We produce in California gold, as does the State of Colorado. California rejoices in some of the greatest forests in the world. Why, the counties of Mendocino and Humboldt alone can supply building material for half the United States for a hundred years to come, and we want to send lumber to the Philippines to be used in the construction of buildings and railways.

We raise cattle in California; we raise sheep in California, and we want to send meat products to the Philippines in refrigerator ships. California is one of the greatest wool-producing States in the Union, and we want to send our share of such woolen products as they consume to the Philippines.

California has the splendid plains of the San Joaquin Valley, where the food of a continent may be produced, and, above all, there is no section of the world equal to the valley of the Sacramento in the production of fruits, deciduous and citrus, vegetables, and farm products, and we hope to create markets for all this great variety of products in the Philippine Islands.

As we traveled through the islands we found their imports came from Europe and from all parts of the world except the United States. Poor as they were last year they nevertheless imported $30,000,000 worth of products, and yet the United States sold them less than $4,000,000 worth. We traveled over those islands from end to end, from Luzon to Jolo, and we could not find that California wines, California fruits, or California vegetables were sold anywhere. They brought their pork and their beef, as well as dairy products and flour, from Australia. They brought rice, a crop on which they were short at that time, from the French East Indies.

And so they are importing from the world. How much better policy it would be then to have this nation of ours pass such laws as would have a tendency to bring that people into closer relation with us and make them loyal to American sovereignty, contented with American occupation, and the consumers of American products. [Applause on the Republican side.] We would not then be passing class legislation. We would not then

be legislating for the beet-sugar interests alone, but rather would we then be legislating on broad lines for a great producing people and a great consuming market. I have a duty to my district which I recognize. My district is interested in beet-sugar production, but we are also interested in lumber and meat and dairy products and grain and fruits and wines; and my idea of legislation is to so shape my course and cast my vote as to do the greatest good for the greatest number. Therefore I am constrained to support the measure of the Ways and Means Committee. Why? First, as a measure of justice; second, because it is for the honor of the nation to support it; because it will carry out the pledges made by two Administrations, and the fulfillment of those pledges will help lift these people up in the scale of civilization and ultimately make them the consumers of the products of this great country; finally, because I believe that in supporting this bill of the Ways and Means Committee I will be doing more for the American workingman and the American producer than if I opposed it. These are the reasons why I unqualifiedly give my support to the measure. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I should not venture to take part in this discussion if it had been confined to the bill before the committee, for I am well aware that those who have spoken and others who may speak have had opportunities to give the subject a personal scrutiny which entitles them to speak with authority. I propose to very briefly refer to another phase of the tariff which has been injected into this debate, but before doing so, as I intend to vote for this bill, I wish to put on record my reasons for favoring its adoption.

We frequently hear repeated the statement that if Admiral Dewey, having found and destroyed the Spanish fleet, as he was ordered to do, had then sailed away, the Philippine question would have been settled then and there, but such a suggestion made as an afterthought does not do justice to the situation which we had to face. In time of war it is a duty to damage the resources of the enemy as well as the enemy himself, and I believe that it would have been bad tactics to have turned our backs on a captured dependency of the enemy which was a source of revenue and which might have been used as a base in future operations before the end of the war, and we should remember that the Spanish fleet was destroyed and Manila captured months before peace was made. Moreover, there was another vital reason why this course was not practicable. Admiral Dewey had been ordered to leave Hongkong, a neutral port, within forty-eight hours, so he could not have returned there or have gone to any other neutral port without being either warned away or interned; his only resource would have been to go to Hawaii, which if our Democratic friends had prevailed would not have been available, or to return to an American port, leaving Manila and all of the foreign interests there liable to pillage and destruction. I doubt if there is a Member of this House who, if he had had the responsibility of acting at that time, whatever might have been his judgment or wishes as to the future of the islands, would have taken any other course. There was then and is now a great diversity of opinion among the people of this country as to the advisability of retaining these islands, and while I would welcome any honorable and practical suggestion to get them off our hands, I see no such way at present, and I doubt if there has been a day since that eventful May morning in 1898 when we could have turned them over to others with honor or credit to ourselves or to the advantage of the Filipinos; furthermore, such policy as we have formulated indicates that we are likely to hold the islands for years, if not perpetually; therefore, whether we like them or not, whether they are a desirable acquisition or not, I believe that we have reached a stage in the development of this question when we should cease treating them as half American and half foreign, and, being in complete control, with peace prevailing throughout the islands, I can not see why they should not be treated as have been Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico.

If they are American territory there is no more reason for continuing duties in one case than in the others; we have long since removed all trade restrictions with the others and we have given one of them representation in this House. When this House legislates for those who have no voice here and at the same time for our own benefit it should be at least just and fair. Briefly, these are my reasons for supporting this measure, and the reasons for delay in adopting final free trade with the islands seem to me sound and wise and in no way can I see that this solution of this question affects or indicates the action which this House might take on tariff revision, reciprocity, or other tariff action with foreign countries, as has been suggested. I wish it did indicate on the part of my party associates a readiness to consider other and more important tariff matters and to dispose of them with the same dispatch which has marked and will continue to mark their action in this case. The modern up-to-date Republican party has framed two tariffs, which in an exceptional way have met the business needs at the times when they were enacted; it has to-day the same ability and power and I believe incentive, and it should in my opinion act once more. The gentleman from Missouri in his desire to show that the Democratic party had had, if it does not possess now, the faculty to perfect a businesslike tariff went back sixty years for his first and only example. It is true that the Walker tariff did produce adequate revenue for the necessities of the Government, but a man would be a very careless student of history not to see that this was due quite as definitely to the Mexican war and the expansion which followed it and to the unprecedented impetus given all industries by the discovery of gold in California as to the merits of the tariff itself. But even assuming for argument's sake that this law was adequate and effective, the fact should not be lost sight of that a change in it was recommended by a Democratic President, that the change was made by a Congress in which the Senate was Democratic and although the House had a Republican Speaker, he was elected as a compromise and that in no sense did the Republican party as then made up represent the tariff policy which has been consistently followed by it since the early days of the civil war, when it first came into complete control of the Government. As a matter of record only about half of the Republicans who from the first supported the successful candidate for Speaker, General Banks, supported the tariff, and for all essential purposes it was the work of the disorganized Democracy and approved by a Democratic President—Pierce; but the gentleman from Missouri failed to call the most competent witness to pass on the merits of this revised measure, James Buchanan, who in his first annual message to Congress, in December, 1857, spoke of the conditions produced by this bill as follows:

> The earth has yielded her fruits abundantly and has bountifully rewarded the toil of the husbandman. Our great staples have commanded high prices and, up till within a brief period, our manufacturing, mineral, and mechanical occupations have largely partaken of the general prosperity. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country, in its monetary interests, is, at the present time, in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty, in all the productions of agriculture, and in all the elements of natural wealth we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The revenue of the Government * * * has been greatly reduced whilst the appropriations made by Congress at its last session are very large in amount. Under these circumstances a loan may be required before the close of your present session.

A loan of $20,000,000 was made in 1857, another in 1858 of the same amount, and, in fact, a loan was required each year of Mr. Buchanan's Administration to make up the deficiency in the running expenses of the Government, the rate of interest increasing as the loans increased, until the last loan made by this Administration could not be obtained without paying 12 per cent for the money. The total appropriations these years did not exceed $75,000,000, so that a $20,000,000 loan would bear about the relation to the total expenditure that $125,000,000 would to the annual appropriations to-day.

The country has had one other example, has seen one other attempt, of the Democratic party to formulate tariff legislation, furnishing another illustration of the incapacity of a Democratic Administration to handle the tariff question intelligently, for it did exactly what its platform had repeatedly condemned in passing a high tariff bill which President Cleveland denounced as an act "tainted with perfidy and dishonor," and it was framed with so little regard for the needs of the country that it, too, failed to produce sufficient revenue, so that we once more resorted to borrowing money at exorbitant rates to pay running expenses, resulting in the general crippling of business enterprise which doubt and uncertainty always lead to.

It was with these historical facts plainly in view that the Republicans of Massachusetts met in convention last October and adopted their platform. However, before referring to the position of Massachusetts Republicans on the tariff, I wish to thank my colleague [Mr. SULLIVAN] for his speech yesterday. It was one of those speeches which does no harm except to the maker's party, and it removed any doubt which existed as to the real views of the Massachusetts Democracy relative to labor. The Democratic party of Massachusetts has for more than twenty-five years in its party platforms declared its allegiance to the fixed and immutable principles of the national Democracy. Imagine such a thing as the national Democratic party having a fixed and immutable principle! It has declaimed against the extravagance of Republican administration

in that State, and has pointed with pride to its record as the friend of the laboring man. Last year, by chance, aided by a liberal expenditure of money, they elected a Democratic governor, and it was anticipated that the extravagance and profligacy of Republican administrations, extending over a period of forty-five years, would be exposed without delay; but after months of searching the governor, an honest man, announced that he had hunted diligently for extravagance, but had failed to find it; that legislative appropriations had been kept to the lowest limit consistent with an efficient administration, and that, generally speaking, the State's affairs had been wisely and economically managed. Now comes my colleague and shatters another fixed and immutable principle—that of being the professional friend of the laboring man. It will give a shock to his constituents and to all the people of Massachusetts, where he has come to be considered a party leader, due to his recognized ability, that he now affirms that the laboring man in this country needs no protection. Therefore the only thing fixed and immutable left in the principles of the Massachusetts Democracy is their desire for office and incidentally to get the other party out. I can not leave this subject without recalling my colleague's impassioned appeal for the downtrodden farmer. It sounds like a cry from ancient history, and comes with peculiar appropriateness from my colleague, who represents a district in which there is not a foot of street, road, or alley which is not paved, a district which has not had a farmer among its residents since the Revolutionary war. His statement gave me a distinct shock, for it is a common and, I believe, a well-established impression that the farmers of this country have paid off their mortgages and are loaning money.

The tariff plank adopted by the Republican party of Massachusetts follows:

We believe that the policy of protection to American labor and American industry should be maintained.

The Republican party of Massachusetts reaffirms its devotion to the principle of protection, and is opposed to tariff changes tending to depress or destroy any of our industries, or to lower the wages of American labor. But we recognize the fact, as declared by the national Republican convention at Chicago, that rates should be changed when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands the alteration of schedules. The time at which revision of the tariff should be undertaken must be determined by the representatives of the party from all parts of our common country.

We approve the position taken by our Senators and Representatives at the last session of Congress in favor of present action, and we urge that they should continue to press upon their party associates in Congress from other States the wisdom of a consideration of the tariff for the purpose of revision and readjustment.

We further recommend for the consideration of Congress the enactment of a tariff provision which shall protect our exports against discrimination and secure to the United States the treatment accorded to the most-favored nations in all foreign markets.

If there is any straddle in that declaration it must be discovered by the man who uses language to conceal his intentions. To the Republicans of Massachusetts it means that we believe as firmly as ever in the policy of protection; but we believe that tariffs should be changed from time to time to meet conditions and we believe this is one of those times, so we are going to continue to call this fact to the attention of our fellow Republicans until action is taken.

But the fear of Democratic attempts to revise the tariff were only incidents among the reasons which prompted this action. It was taken notwithstanding a firm belief that the Dingley tariff was the most scientific and has proven the best tariff ever adopted by Congress, added to the knowledge that in many respects at least it is still, as a revenue producer and protector of labor, difficult to improve upon; but it is apparent to anyone in touch with the business affairs of this country that never in its history have there been such radical changes in the manner of conducting the public corporation or great transportation companies as have taken place in the last eight years, and that many of these changes have produced conditions which prevent the necessity for the continuance of the present schedules.

I shall be glad to take up this subject in detail at some more opportune time, but for the moment I will instance one example, the duty on hides, to illustrate the point which I wish to make. For twenty-five years there was no duty on hides, and if there were any necessity for it when the Dingley bill was enacted, I believe that necessity has passed; the control of the hide market has passed from the producer to the packer. I am doubtful whether the producer receives any benefit whatever from the duty, but in any case the tanners and manufacturers of shoes in Massachusetts believe that a removal of the duty will assist them to increase the exportation of shoes; and to remove any lurking fear that this is an entirely selfish move from which the consumer is to receive no benefit, I believe I am stating the substantially unanimous willingness of the shoemakers of Massachusetts in making the suggestion that they will gladly agree to a reduction of the duty on shoes equivalent to the amount removed from hides. In many cases the whole duty could be removed; in others, in the cheaper grades of shoes, less reduction should be made. This suggestion is not made in a haphazard way, but as the result of a canvas, and further it is believed that if the duty were entirely removed from hides and an equivalent amount from shoes that the shoemaker could easily continue to control this market and increase exportations in the next ten years from $8,000,000, exported last year, to $50,000,000, and as the labor item is about 25 per cent of the cost of shoes it follows that $10,000,000 from this source alone would be added to the wages of the laboring men of this country.

We have become, under the provisions of the Dingley bill, a great manufacturing nation, and such changes as the one I have mentioned will, in my judgment, secure what we have and provide an opening for a large increase.

The people of Massachusetts are not unmindful of the fact that there are now in this House, in the full strength of their capacity and possessing an experience which is invaluable, many of those men who were active, indeed vital factors, in framing the Dingley bill, and they want the benefit of the ripe experience of these men in the revised edition which would come from their hands.

The minority leader of this House stated on this floor the other day that the trouble with the people of this country was that they were tired of the Republican party and afraid of the Democratic party. I subscribe to the last part of that statement without hesitation or reservation, and I have a lurking fear that the first part may come true if we do not follow common business prudence and adopt ordinary business foresight in making repairs while they can be made safely and economically. The wise owner of a mill never delays replacing a doubtful piece of his machinery while his force is intact and competent to do the work, even though the necessary shut down may cause a temporary loss. He would be a fool to wait until his boiler had exploded, killing or crippling his engineer force and compelling him to resort to the inexperienced and inefficient to make his repairs or renewals. [Loud applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know whether there is any other gentleman who wants to get in a short speech. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3 and had come to no resolution thereon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, reference of the bill (H. R. 10847) to treat the findings of the Court of Claims in certain cases as judgments and to provide for the payment of the same, was changed from the Committee on War Claims to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 560. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 559. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Doty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 530. An act granting an increase of pension to Sophia A. Knapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 525. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 489. An act granting an increase of pension to Nelson B. Tool—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 471. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas McLaughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 386. An act granting an increase of pension to Orange G. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 327. An act granting an increase of pension to Walter Barney—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 217. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Breckenridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 205. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis Gee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 204. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Walter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 202. An act granting an increase of pension to Allen Amburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 195. An act granting an increase of pension to John Pieper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 194. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Cowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 184. An act granting an increase of pension to Lyman Marsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 528. An act granting a pension to Robert M. McCormick—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 182. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 168. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 157. An act granting an increase of pension to Lizzie G. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 150. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucius A. Lincoln—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 149. An act granting an increase of pension to Cassius Leisk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 147. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick McCue—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 144. An act granting an increase of pension to Minerva Briggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 137. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Wiper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 135. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter P. Chacey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 113. An act granting an increase of pension to John D. McFadden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 99. An act granting an increase of pension to Eugene P. Kingsley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 85. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Keaster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 82. An act granting an increase of pension to Curtis A. Carpenter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 76. An act granting an increase of pension to Hartwell C. Keyes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 23. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Bradbury—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 15. An act granting an increase of pension to Lizzie E. Shehan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2260. An act authorizing the extension of Meridian place NW.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2140. An act authorizing the Postmaster-General to dispose of useless papers in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

S. 2106. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near Vanburen, Ark.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1747. An act to authorize the Mobile Railway and Dock Company to construct and maintain a bridge or viaduct across the water between the end of Cedar Point and Dauphin Island—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1234. An act to provide for the appropriate marking of the graves of the soldiers and sailors of the Confederate army and navy who died in northern prisons and were buried near the prisons where they died, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1160. An act to correct the military record of John McKennon, alias John Mack—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 979. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak."—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 951. An act to grant to the State of Minnesota certain vacant lands in said State for forestry purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 64. An act for the extension of Seventh street and Franklin street NE., and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1. An act to incorporate the American National Institute (Prix de Paris) at Paris, France—to the Committee on the Library.

S. 1444. An act granting a pension to Dora H. Huhns—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1431. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Lane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1359. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Ingalls, alias Jeremiah Boss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1342. An act granting an increase of pension to Morton M. Noah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1341. An act granting an increase of pension to Fred Preisinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1340. An act granting an increase of pension to John Leavitt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1310. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles S. M. Hooton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1269. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1239. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. McGarvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1238. An act granting an increase of pension to John Christoff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1214. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Oleson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1201. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Preston—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1164. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Bedell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1040. An act granting an increase of pension to James Sloan—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1036. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Beachey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 974. An act granting an increase of pension to David L. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 944. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Catterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 849. An act granting an increase of pension to Horatio Carter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 844. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Ryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 786. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick Garvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 777. An act granting an increase of pension to Byron Lentz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 713. An act granting an increase of pension to Ephraim A. Gordon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 708. An act granting an increase of pension to Maurice Downey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 627. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 626. An act granting an increase of pension to Allen J. Nash—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 574. An act granting an increase of pension to Lee H. Buckland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 571. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Knight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 532. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Doty—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2143. An act granting an increase of pension to Angelina Hernandez—to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1888. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Patton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1872. An act granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1826. An act granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Paine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1737. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Blanchard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1505. An act granting an increase of pension to Uriah D. Barrett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. CHAPMAN, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Nancy Day, Fifty-seventh Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

CLOSE OF GENERAL DEBATE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew the request I made this morning to close general debate on the Philippine tariff bill at 5 o'clock on Saturday next and take up the bill on Monday under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BARTLETT. I shall object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I understand the request to be to close general debate at 5 o'clock on Saturday evening, and that the bill be taken up on Monday morning under the five-minute rule. The request involves nothing else.

Mr. PAYNE. That is all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So far as I am concerned. I am perfectly willing to agree to that.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I know that there are some gentlemen who were present this morning when the request was made who would object, and I suggest to the gentleman I will object at present. But he can bring it up in the morning before we go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PAYNE. What is the use of making a request in the morning if they are going to object? I do not understand that the gentleman objects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG. I object at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I renew the notice that I gave

this morning, that I will move on Monday to close debate on the bill. I now move that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for stenographers for judges in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for purchase of a target range at Boston—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting an estimate of appropriation for the electrical department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for lighting Ambrose channel, in New York Bay—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the satisfaction of the claim of Oscar Fulgham—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Postmaster-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for the relief of J. J. Cole and Frank W. Swanton—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6009) to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 182); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5976) to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 183); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 11485) to permit the owners of certain vessels and the owners or underwriters of cargoes laden thereon to sue the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11486) to authorize the maintenance of actions for negligence causing death in maritime cases—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11487) for the relief of soldiers and sailors who served under assumed names, while minors or otherwise, in the Army or Navy during the war with Spain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 11488) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMYSER: A bill (H. R. 11489) to define felonies and misdemeanors and prescribing practice in criminal cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 11490) granting the Edison Electric Company a permit to occupy certain lands for electric power plants in the San Bernardino, Sierra, and San Gabriel forest reserves, in the State of California—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 11491) appropriating money for the protection of the easterly bank of Mississippi River—to the Committee on iRvers and Harbors.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 11492) to authorize cities and towns of the Indian Territory having an assessed valuation of $250,000 or more to issue and sell bonds to raise revenue for the construction of public school buildings—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 11493) for a public building at the city of Bainbridge, Ga., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11494) for a public building at the city of Albany, Ga., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11495) for a public building at the city of Thomasville, Ga., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 11496) for the enlargement of the United States post-office building at Frankfort, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11497) for the enlargement of the United States post-office building at Lexington, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11498) for the erection of a public building at Paris, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 11499) to provide for the merging of the fourth class of domestic postage into that of the third class—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 11500) to amend section 29 of chapter 106 of the act of the Thirty-eighth Congress entitled "An act to provide a national currency secured by pledge of United States bonds, and to provide for the circulation and redemption thereof," approved June 3, 1864—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 11501) to amend an act to provide for circuit and district courts of the United States at Albany, Ga.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 11502) to repeal part of paragraph 3, section 4693, Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11503) to extend the provisions of the pension act of June 27, 1890, to the Enrolled Missouri Militia and other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that cooperated with the military or naval forces of the United States in suppressing the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 11504) for an appropriation for enlarging the Government building at Sheboygan, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 11505) to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and the Pennsylvania and Newark Railroad Company, or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 11506) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the importation of impure and unwholesome tea," approved March 2, 1897—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 11507) to amend section 54 of chapter 106 of the act of the Thirty-eighth Congress entitled "An act to provide a national currency secured by pledge of United States bonds, and to provide for the circulation and redemption thereof," approved June 3, 1864—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NORRIS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 69) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 11508) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 11509) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Hoornbeck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 11510) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Larrance—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11511) granting an increase of pension to Volentine Rowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11512) granting an increase of pension to William Whitlock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 11513) granting an increase of pension to John Ripperdan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 11514) granting an increase of pension to William Locust—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11515) to correct the military record of William A. Persons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 11516) granting an increase of pension to Marquis D. L. Staley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11517) granting an increase of pension to Jane James—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11518) granting an increase of pension to Rebbecca J. Stamm—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11519) granting an increase of pension to David Blosser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11520) granting an increase of pension to Julia Fern—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11521) granting an increase of pension to Burrel M. Mullins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11522) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin McEbeoy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11523) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Hamill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11524) granting an increase of pension to James D. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 11525) granting a pension to Mary E. Hines—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11526) for the relief of Robert H. Semple—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11527) granting a pension to L. H. Boyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11528) for the relief of H. S. Day—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11529) for the relief of Benjamin H. Frisbie—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 11530) granting an increase of pension to G. J. Shaffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11531) granting an increase of pension to Esek B. Chandler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11532) granting a pension to Andrew J. Speed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11533) for the relief of John Albright—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11534) granting a pension to Isaac M. Ashford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11535) granting a pension to Margarette R. Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11536) granting an increase of pension to James D. Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11537) granting an increase of pension to David Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11538) granting an increase of pension to Eli Duvall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 11539) granting an increase of pension to James McMahon—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 11540) for the relief of John Murray—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11541) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Robert McMurray—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11542) granting a pension to George S. Loomis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 11543) to correct the military record of Benjamin F. Graham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 11544) granting an increase of pension to Henry Butler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11545) granting an increase of pension to Julius T. Williamson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11546) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin F. Myers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11547) for the relief of the heirs of Hugh McGavock, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11548) for the relief of the estate of William J. Thomas, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 11549) granting an increase of pension to James Devirs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11550) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Livsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11551) granting an increase of pension to John Daly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 11552) granting an increase of pension to Abraham G. Leiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 11553) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Horsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11554) granting an increase of pension to William K. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEPBURN: A bill (H. R. 11555) granting an increase of pension to Butler Mote—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11556) granting an increase of pension to Almarin Peck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOAR: A bill (H. R. 11557) granting an increase of pension to Clinton A. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11558) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter Tatro, alias John Goodro—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 11559) for the relief of Peter H. Donohew—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 11560) granting an increase of pension to John W. McAdams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: A bill (H. R. 11561) granting an increase of pension to Egbert P. Shetter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11562) granting an increase of pension to Adam Wiles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11563) granting an increase of pension to John Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11564) granting an increase of pension to James Morrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11565) granting a pension to Sarah A. Brinker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 11566) granting an increase of pension to Alexander H. Rowland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 11567) for the relief of Mrs. Mary English—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11568) for the benefit of the Christian Church of Cadiz, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11569) for the relief of J. C. Peeples—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11570) for the relief of the estate of John M. Higgins, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11571) for the relief of the estate of John Allred—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11572) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Wilson, deceased, late of Fulton County, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11573) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Chandet—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11574) for the relief of William H. Calvert—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11575) for the relief of S. E. Gallemore—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11576) authorizing Suis Sis Kin, or Loupe Loupe Charley, an Indian allottee, to sell his allotment—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 11577) for the relief of George W. Pearson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 11578) granting a pension to Crissa J. Whitlaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 11579) to refund legacy taxes illegally collected from the estate of Virginia R. Osborn—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEPPER: A bill (H. R. 11580) granting a pension to John Nixon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11581) granting an increase of pension to Haywood W. Weathington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOPF: A bill (H. R. 11582) granting a pension to

John McAlpin, alias Joseph Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 11583) for the relief of Noah King, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11584) for the relief of the estate of J. W. Marshal, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 11585) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence P. Frederick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCARTHY: A bill (H. R. 11586) to grant an extension of certain letters patent to Ezra N. Dunwiddie—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McGUIRE: A bill (H. R. 11587) to reimburse Ulysses G. Winn for moneys erroneously paid into the Treasury of the United States—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11588) granting to the University Preparatory School of the Territory of Oklahoma section 33, in township No. 26 north, of range 1 west of the Indian meridian, in Kay County, Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11589) granting to the University of Oklahoma section No. 36, in township No. 9 north, of range No. 3 west of the Indian meridian, in Cleveland County, Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 11590) granting an increase of pension to Martha H. Ten Eyck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11591) granting an increase of pension to John B. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11592) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11593) granting an increase of pension to Evans Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11594) granting an increase of pension to Charles Northup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11595) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Glover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11596) granting a pension to Marion H. Long—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11597) granting a pension to George M. Apgar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11598) granting a pension to Laura McNulta—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11599) granting a pension to Lewis Isbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11600) granting a pension to Mary W. Sherburne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11601) for the relief of Julius Frank—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11602) granting an increase of pension to Orrin L. Mann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11603) granting an increase of pension to Francis Haner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11604) granting a pension to Margaret M. Best—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL: A bill (H. R. 11605) granting an increase of pension to Milo B. Morse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 11606) granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Bixby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: A bill (H. R. 11607) raising the rank of Chief Engineer Robert Potts on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11608) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Keen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11609) for the relief of Mary Jane Pollard—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 11610) granting an increase of pension to George F. Woods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11611) granting an increase of pension to David Frazier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11612) granting an increase of pension to James Weller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11613) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Schreoes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 11614) granting a pension to Carl W. Barroth—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 11615) granting an increase of pension to Josiah F. Staubs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11616) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11617) granting an increase of pension to Caroline A. Bloom—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 11618) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus K. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11619) granting an increase of pension to T. A. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 11620) granting an increase of pension to John J. Quimby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11621) granting an increase of pension to Hollis Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 11622) granting a pension to Martha A. Remington—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 11623) granting an increase of pension to Simon Motz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11624) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Painter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL: A bill (H. R. 11625) granting a pension to William C. Robison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11626) granting a pension to Carrie Keefer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCROGGY: A bill (H. R. 11627) to amend the military record of Capt. Thomas M. Elliott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11628) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Choate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11629) granting an increase of pension to Philip P. Farnham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNAPP: A bill (H. R. 11630) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. H. St. John—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11631) granting a pension to William E. Fuller—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11632) to correct the military record of James Gleeson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 11633) to pay the claim of Samuel O. Randall, administrator of the personal estate of Richard Ralph Randall, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 11634) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11635) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Lundsford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11636) granting an increase of pension to Lawrence Hogan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11637) granting an increase of pension to William Cody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 11638) granting a pension to John N. Vivian—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11639) granting a pension to George L. Steward, alias George Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10578) granting a pension to William McCall and others—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10892) for the relief of William B. West—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 10935) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. J. L. Boone—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10892) granting a pension to Philene Burns—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10353) granting a pension to Thomas B. Davis—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10921) for the relief of Joel Glover—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Association for Advancement of Science, for preservation of American forests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chicago Historical Society, for a historical commission and building at Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lawrence County, Pa., against sale of liquor in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. AIKEN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Summer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of Civil Club of Allegheny, Pa., against spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Civic Club of Allegheny, Pa., for a pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. P. Winower Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce, relative to certain modifications of the immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of citizens of Lawrence, Kans., for repeal of the duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas J. Ingraham—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of Minisink Grange, No. 907, Patrons of Husbandry, of Unionville, N. Y., against tax on alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petitions of Vanare and Greenville Councils, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BUCKMAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John J. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Civic Club of Allegheny County, Pa., against spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Civic Club of Allegheny County, Pa., for a pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Winower Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Maine, for the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Valentine Rowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Whitlock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of W. W. Elam—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Eureka Council, No. 38, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of J. P. Winower Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Laurel Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Christ Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pittsburg, Pa., for prohibition in Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Christ Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pittsburg, Pa., to protect no-license towns—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry Pittsburg manufacturers, against tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Civic Club of Allegheny, Pa., for pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Pittsburg Post-Office Clerks' Beneficial Association, for a new classification for postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Christ Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pittsburg, Pa., against sale of liquor in Government buildings—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: Petition of the New Orleans Board of Trade, for a law to improve the condition of American shipping—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Audubon Park Association, against commercial spoliation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Board of Underwriters of New Orleans, La., against any Federal legislation inimical to the pilotage system of the port of New Orleans—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of the Ministerial Association of Muscatine, Iowa, favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the city council of Sioux City, Iowa, against Russian atrocities on the Jews—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSON of Illinois: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Margarette R. Bacon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Melvina J. Swiger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John A. Logan Council, No. 95, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Benton Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, for consular reform—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Chicago Historical Society, urging support of bills S. 5797 and 4181—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of United Gold Beaters' National Union, for an increase in the tariff on gold leaf—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, for a law requiring a statement to a member of the Board of Appraisers of charges against him before removal—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLACK: Petition of Deer River Grange, No. 702, of Lawrenceville, N. Y., against tax on alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of the Trades League of Philadelphia, favoring modification of immigration law relative to better classes of Chinese—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, against tax on wood alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of General Stark Council, No. 35; Lincoln Council, and Newport Center Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and Minnehaha Lodge, Knights of Pythias, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Order of Railway Telegraphers, No. 45, of Littleton, N. H.; Otter Creek Division, No. 347, and Bellows Falls Division, No. 106, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Rutland, Vt.; St. Albans Division, No. 24, and C. M. Clement Division, No. 296, Order of Railway Conductors—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the National German-American Alliance of the United States, for reciprocity treaty between Germany and the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Arizona Anti-Joint Statehood League, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of S. R. Taber, against bills H. R. 47, 145, and 440—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of W. W. Randolph, administrator of estate of Mrs. I. H. Randolph—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Julia Moorman-Hill, heir of Charles W. Moorman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Andrew R. Humes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Hugh C. Jackson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of J. P. Winower, Etna and Pleasant Valley councils, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Civic Club, of Allegheny County, Pa., for a pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Civic Club, of Allegheny County, Pa., against spoliation of Niagara—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Pittsburg Chamber of Commerce, relative to certain amendments of the immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Petition of citizens of Three Oaks, Mich., asking for removal of internal-revenue tax on ethyl alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Spencer & Barnes Company, of Benton Harbor, Mich., for removal of internal-revenue tax from domestic alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of General Stark Council, No. 35, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Springfield, Vt., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Minnehaha Council, No. 5, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAYS: Petition of the Water and Forest Association of California, relative to administration of the forest reserve—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the International Printing Pressmen's Union, for a foreman of the press room in the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of the California Water and Forest Association, for legislation against destruction of forest trees—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the California Water and Forest Association, for making national forest reserves game preserves—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Santa Clara, Cal., for adoption of the Gallinger amendment to the statehood bill—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, for a Federal judicial court in the Orient—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, urging necessity of changing certain regulations of Germany as to dried fruits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, for full consideration for the dried-fruit industry in any reciprocal treaty with Germany—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, for appointment of six commercial attachés in Asia and the same to come from the Pacific coast—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOAR: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Clinton A. Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: Petitions of Bolivar and Painterville Councils, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Knights of Pythias Lodge No. 505; Westmoreland Council, No. 840, and Scottdale Council, No. 885, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Adam Wiles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Egbert P. Shelter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John Henderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of May Colcord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: Petition of the Chicago Historical Society, for a United States historical commission and an appropriate building at Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the Board of Trade of San Francisco, Cal., for a further appropriation to carry on work at the Presidio of San Francisco—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of San Francisco, Cal., for an appropriation for the Yosemite Valley Park—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, for a foreman of press-work at the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KNAPP: Petition of Natural Bridge Grange, No. 497, against tax on alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Petition of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, for a foreman of press work in the Government Printing Office—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of Colonial Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of York, Pa., favoring restriction of Immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 316, of McSherrytown, Pa., against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMB: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Cassandra C. Hicks—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAW: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Patrick H. Corrigan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah H. Milvenry—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring bill S. 1345, reorganizing the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring an amendment to section 12 of the administrative act—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, against joint statehood—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of M. F. Nason—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Lawrence P. Frederick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Waterford, for legislation substituting gymnasiums for canteens at military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: Papers to accompany sundry House bills granting an increase of pension to George M. Apgar, Marion H. Long, John B. Hall, Evans Blake, A. J. Fuller, Charles Northrup, Laura McNulta, Laura E. Glover, Lewis Isbell, Mary W. Sherburne, Martha H. Ten Eyck, Francis Hauer, and Margaret M. Best—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Augustus Joyeux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRELL: Petition of Frankford Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of citizens of Pennsylvania; William Valley Lodge, No. 446, Knights of Pythias; Tremont Lodge, No. 245, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, and Washington Camp, No. 62, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Gordon, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of various churches of Wolcott, N. Y., against liquor sales in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Brandt, of Bedford County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Annie S. Jones, of Altoona, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Gurdon B. Hotchkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of Bismarck (Mo.) Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: Petitions of Stroth Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and citizens of Palmerton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Sarvis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of D. L. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Harmon Modlin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of citizens of Michigan, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Petition of Lenawee County (Mich.) Grange, favoring removal of duty on alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the National Casket Company, of New York, against tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of William Fowler Council, No. 64, of Milford, Conn., and Camp No. 8, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of New Haven, Conn., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of Cigar Makers'

Local Union No. 98, against bill H. R. 3—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the St. Paul Board of Trade, favoring a law for adequacy of rolling stock for safe carriage of freight on railway lines—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of George A. Sanborn and 26 other citizens of New Hampshire, asking for a modification of postal laws and limitation of power of Postmaster-General in issuing fraud orders—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of citizens of Sterling, Mass., for consolidation of third and fourth class mail matter and postal check currency—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of Wyandotte Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEBB: Petitions of Gastonia, Dilworth, and Hot Springs councils, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of the Republican Club of New York City, against pernicious discrimination in railway rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chicago Historical Society, favoring a Hall of Records and History at Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of citizens of Alaska, for representation in Congress—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petitions of Evelyn, Treed, Chapel, White Plains, and Palestine Councils, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *January 12, 1906.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2159. An act authorizing the Jasper and Eastern Railway Company, its successors and assigns, to construct and operate a railroad bridge across the Sabine River, in the States of Texas and Louisiana.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2159. An act authorizing the Jasper and Eastern Railway Company, its successors or assigns, to construct and operate a railroad bridge across the Sabine River, in the States of Texas and Louisiana—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3; and pending that, I again ask unanimous consent that all general debate close to-morrow at 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to close all general debate on House bill No. 3 to-morrow at 5 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I just want to state that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Democratic leader, told me that he was satisfied with that.

Mr. PAYNE. He stated so on the floor of the House yesterday.

Mr. YOUNG. Reserving the right to object, I suggest to the gentleman that he make it 12 o'clock on Monday, giving an opportunity, if it were thought wise, for the House to convene at an earlier hour than 12 o'clock on Monday. That would give a little more time.

Mr. PAYNE. I have no objection to making it 12 o'clock Monday; that all general debate close at 12 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have not either.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he knows whether that will permit all those who desire to speak on the question to be heard?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I do not know how that would be.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that I desire to make a few remarks on this matter before debate is closed. I have no objection to expediting the matter as much as possible, but still I would like to have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman, who has the disposition of the time, knows more about that than anyone else. A greater opportunity to have a reasonable hearing in the time might be obtained if gentlemen limited their remarks to argument and not give so much time to politics.

Mr. NORRIS. I would have no objection to the matter being expedited.

Mr. PAYNE. And I would be willing that the House should meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow as well as on Monday.

Mr. NORRIS. I know not whether this will give time sufficient to gentlemen who ought to have a hearing, and I would dislike that agreement to be made by unanimous consent.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman that the other alternative will be the motion on Monday to close all general debate as soon as the House meets. We would not have an hour to-morrow morning or Monday morning. If the gentleman desires to be heard he would have a much better opportunity for a hearing if we make that kind of an agreement.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to it, if I could be heard. I would like the chairman of the committee to state, if he can, what opportunity there will be.

Mr. OLMSTED. The number of gentlemen who will be heard will depend very largely upon the length of time which the committee itself, by unanimous consent, gives to those who are recognized.

It is absolutely impossible for the gentleman in the chair to control that, and if a gentleman on the floor asks the Chair for twenty minutes and is recognized for twenty minutes, and then at the expiration of the twenty minutes the committee extends his time indefinitely and he occupies three hours it is absolutely impossible for the occupant of the chair to tell how many other gentlemen will have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire how many are on the list and about what time they have asked for, and how it corresponds with the time remaining under this proposed arrangement.

Mr. OLMSTED. There are twelve gentlemen desiring to be heard against the bill and about twenty-five gentlemen desiring to be heard in favor of it.

Mr. NORRIS. This is a question which affects me directly. There are a number of sugar-beet factories in my State, and I desire to be heard on this question.

Mr. OLMSTED. I will state that the time asked for by the opponents of the bill amounts to about seven hours.

Mr. YOUNG. And how much for those in favor of it?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill, but I want to ask that my colleague [Mr. NORRIS] who probably is opposed to the bill, be allowed to be heard on this subject. He has in his district quite a large sugar industry, and I think it is nothing but fair, considering the fact that this debate has taken a long time and some gentlemen have talked two and three hours apiece, that he be allowed the time that he desires.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] modifies his request for unanimous consent, that all general debate close on this bill on Monday next at 12 o'clock and that to-morrow and on Monday the House meet at 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I desire very much to be heard for a few minutes upon this bill. I am away at the foot of the list of speakers, and it seems to me that if consent is given to close debate on Monday at 12 o'clock I shall not have an opportunity to say one word.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me suggest that there is more likelihood of the gentleman being heard under this arrangement than there will be if I am compelled to make a motion to close debate.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is possibly true, but would it not be possible to extend the time until Tuesday?

Mr. PAYNE. That will be for the House to say. I shall make the motion on Monday, and gentlemen understanding that that course would be taken have gone away and will return on Monday with that end in view.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will suggest to the gentleman that the motion might be defeated, but I do not desire to place myself in the position of opposing the leader of the House, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. OLMSTED. The gentleman can get in unless unani-

mous consent is given to extend the time of other gentlemen who will speak before he does.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] informs me that I will get in under the arrangement suggested by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee if time is not extended to other speakers beyond that which they have already been promised; but unanimous consent to extend time is very easily obtained from the committee.

Mr. PAYNE. I shall object to any extensions of time from now on while I am in the Hall of the House. If it is done, it will have to be done while I am momentarily absent. I think in justice to gentlemen who desire to speak and who have stated to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole what time they want, I shall have to object to any extension of time hereafter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to say, speaking for myself personally, that I should like to see every man who wants to make a speech about this bill have an opportunity to be heard. The debate has taken such a wide range and the House has been so very kind to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and myself, and the other Members on that committee, that we have, five or six of us, monopolized a great deal of time, and it will hardly give these other Members a fair deal unless they have what they wish in the way of time. That is my private opinion of it, speaking for myself. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota objects.

Mr. PAYNE. I renew the notice that I shall make a motion on Monday immediately after the reading of the Journal, to close debate on this bill, and shall press that motion to a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 3.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3—the Philippine tariff bill—with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. Chairman, the proposition submitted is to reduce the existing rates on sugar and tobacco coming into this country from the Philippine Islands to 25 per cent and to permit the free entry of sugar and tobacco grown in the United States into the Philippine Islands free of duty. There are provisions in the bill to which I shall make no reference for the reason that it is my purpose to deal only with the effect such reduction of the pending tariff rates will have upon sugar both coming into this country from the Philippines and going into the Philippines from this country. The Philippine tariff act of March 3, 1905, establishing tariff rates for the Philippine Islands provides that the tariff on raw sugar, gross weight, shall be $1.62 per hundred kilos, or $14.73 per ton, and upon refined sugars, net weight, $3 per hundred kilos, or $27.30 per ton. This tariff applies as well to sugar produced in this country as to sugar produced elsewhere in the world entering the Philippines. Under the existing tariff in this country, as fixed by what is known as the "Dingley tariff act," the duty on sugar imported into the United States, not above 16 Dutch standard and not above 75 polariscope, is 0.95 of a cent per pound, and an additional 0.035 of a cent per pound for every additional degree of the polariscope.

This would, therefore, make sugar not above 16, Dutch standard, of 96 polariscope test, $1.68½ per hundred, or $33.70 per ton. This 96 sugar corresponds with the "raw sugar" referred to in the Philippine tariff act, and upon which we placed, in the Philippines, a tariff of $14.73 a ton. The proposition, therefore, to reduce the tariff on sugar coming into this country from the Philippines to 25 per cent of the tariff rates on the same grade of sugar would be a reduction of that rate from $33.70 to $8.42 per ton. So that 96 test, or raw sugar coming into the United States from the Philippines after the passage of this bill, shall pay $8.42 per ton, giving that sugar an advantage over the same grade of sugar produced anywhere else of $25.28 per ton. It follows that if a ton of Philippine sugar landed in the United States costs a tariff of $8.42 a ton, and the $8.42 after being collected by the Government of the United States is turned over into the treasury of the Philippine Islands, that the Filipino sugar producer has the advantage over the world in the American market exactly equivalent to the entire tariff on that grade of sugar; that is $33.70, of which $25.28 is his advantage in the market, and $8.42 is a contribution by the people of the United States toward the maintenance of his government. He will then find it profitable to manage his output of sugar in the following way: Ship it to the United States, secure $8.42 in the shape of revenue for his government, secure an advantage of $25.28 for himself, replace the same ton of sugar with a corresponding grade of sugar from Java or Santo Domingo or South America, pay $14.75 a ton duty into the Philippine Islands on this latter sugar, get this sum again into his treasury to relieve him of taxation, and by that transaction have the same quantity and the same quality of sugar for his own consumption as he had originally, he will have cleared a profit for himself of $10.53 a ton, and will have placed in the treasury of the Philippine government $23.17, which will go to relieve him of taxes to his government. Or a Java sugar producer could ship into the Philippines an equal quantity of sugar to that produced by the Filipino sugar producer, pay the tariff of $14.75 into the Philippine treasury, exchange that sugar for Philippine sugar, import it into the United States, pay the $8.42 duty and clear $10.53 per ton on the transaction.

It will pay the Java producer to make this trade, because he clears over and above any other profits he may have in the production of sugar $10.53 per ton. And it will pay the Filipino sugar producer to make the trade, for the reason that he will lose nothing, having the same quantity of sugar of the same grade as that which he gives in exchange, plus $8.42 and $14.75, into the treasury of the islands, which to that extent relieves him of the burden of taxation to administer the affairs of the islands.

No one, therefore, can doubt but that with these advantages no producer of sugar in the Philippine Islands would be foolish enough to consume a pound of his product, but that every pound produced there will find its way into the United States and all sugars consumed in the Philippine Islands will be bought in the markets of the world outside of the United States.

This argument is predicated upon the correctness of the position of the gentlemen who are advocating this measure. But they are entirely wrong in their calculations, and no such result will be reached. The only advantage that will accrue to the Filipino sugar producer out of this measure will be his release from taxation to administer the affairs of his government to the extent that $8.42 a ton on the number of tons produced in the islands will be to the entire amount necessary to properly run his government, and the further advantage that he will not be burdened with the collection of this tax, but that the American people will not only pay the tax into his treasury but defray the expense of the collection. That the Filipino sugar producer will get no more advantage and the American consumer will get no more advantage is apparent from the following facts: No sugars come into this country above 96 polariscope, and no other consumer is found in this country for that grade of sugar except the American sugar refiners.

Now, it is a well-established fact that a person will always buy where he can buy cheapest and will always sell where he can sell dearest. He will no more voluntarily pay more than the cheapest price for what he needs than he would sell what he has to dispose of at a less price than the highest figure obtainable. It follows if the American refiner is the only purchaser of imported 96 sugar, he is also the only seller of refined sugar, barring, of course, the production of beet sugar in the West, which when manufactured is a refined sugar.

The intent of the Dingley Act was to give the American refiner what is known as a "differential," and that differential consists of the difference between sugar testing 96 and what is known as "refined sugar." That amounts to the difference between $1.68½ and $1.82½, which is the difference between 96 sugars and 100 sugars, or 14 points, or $2.80 a ton. And the difference between 100 sugars and what is arbitrarily called in the tariff act "refined sugars," which pay a duty of $1.95, is 12½ points, or $2.50 per ton, making a total differential of $5.30 per ton. The purchaser of raw and refined sugars must pay the world's price for raw and refined sugar plus the tariff imposed upon raw and refined sugar by the country wherein it is consumed.

I eliminated in that statement the cost of transportation and marine insurance, for the reason that all 96 sugars coming into this country must pay transportation and marine insurance, and therefore it can be taken out of consideration for the purposes of this argument. The purchaser of all the raw sugar is the American sugar refiner, and the seller of all refined sugar in this country is the American sugar refiner. So that if conditions were permitted to continue as they were originally intended in 1897, what is known as the "differential," or the profit of the American refiner, is the difference between the tariff on raw and on refined sugar, or $5.30 for every ton brought into this country by the American refiner refined and sold to the American consumer.

It follows that if the tariff on refined sugar remains as it is, and

the tariff on raw sugar is reduced, the differential is increased, and the profit of the American sugar refiner is likewise increased. And the greater the difference between the tariff on the raw and the tariff on the refined, the greater the profit of the American sugar refiner. It is true that reducing the tariff on raw sugar coming from the Philippines from $33.70, as fixed in the Dingley law, to $8.42 as it is proposed to fix it in this bill, makes a reduction of the raw sugar of $25.28 per ton. So that to that extent the American refiner finds additional profit in buying that sugar, refining it and disposing of it on the market in this country. His differential on that sugar will not be $5.30, but his differential will be $5.30 plus $25.28, or $30.58 for every ton of sugar produced in the Philippine Islands. A differential almost equivalent to the entire tariff on 96 sugars entering this country.

Now, I have shown that it will not pay the Philippine sugar planter to consume a pound of his sugar, so that by this bill you compel him, in order to get the advantage of the tariff you are conceding him when you give him $8.42, which you charge to the American people for the benefit of the Philippine Government, to sell his sugar to the only purchaser of his grade of sugar in the United States—the American sugar refiner.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen advocating this bill on this floor have repeatedly expressed not only a willingness but a desire to remove the differential on sugar, and, in the event of a successful effort to so remove that differential, to vote against this proposition. But they contend that they can not remove the differential, and they conclude that they will vote for the passage of this bill. The logic of that argument is that if they can not remove so insignificant a sum as $5.30 a ton differential on sugar, to kill the sugar trust, they are willing to concede them a further differential of $25.28. And from that argument they can not get away. But if, Mr. Chairman, the Filipino sugar producer is not permitted to consume the sugar he has himself produced, so also by a committee amendment will he not eventually be permitted to consume any other sugar, except that purchased from the same American sugar refiner. The amendment reads as follows:

That in consideration of the rates of duty aforesaid sugar and tobacco, both manufactured and unmanufactured, wholly the growth and product of the United States, shall be admitted to the Philippine Islands free of duty.

Now, when the committee put that amendment in this bill, it knew full well that not a pound of American-produced sugar would find its way to the Philippine market. And the reason of that is this: Porto Rico and Hawaii, producers of 96° sugars, will not ship their sugars to the Philippine Islands, because they bring their sugar free into the markets of the United States, where it receives the protection of $33.70 per ton against the sugars of the world.

To ship it into the Philippine Islands would be to ship it into a market which affords only $14.74 a ton tariff duty. This applies to the Louisiana producer as well as to the Porto Rican and Hawaiian sugar producers. Neither will the beet-sugar producer ship his sugars there because he sells it on a market where it is produced, affording him $39 a ton tariff, and to ship it to the Philippines would be to place it on a market affording him only $27.30 a ton of tariff duty. And these are the only sugars that are the product and manufacture of the United States contemplated in this amendment. It would seem, therefore, on its face, that this is a harmless proposition. But not so. The purpose of the amendment is that whenever the production of sugar from the United States proper, from Hawaii, Porto Rico, the Philippines, and Cuba shall exceed the quantity of sugar consumed in the United States the American sugar refiner should have an additional profit, as follows: The American sugar refiner would then take the surplus of the cheapest sugar he buys, which is the free sugar of Hawaii and Porto Rico and Louisiana, refine it, send it to the Philippine Islands without duty and sell it on a market with $27.30 tariff protection against the world, and to the extent of the consumption of sugar by the Philippine people this refiner will have an additional market, without a competitor in the world, for the surplus sugar over and above the production of those islands as compared with the consumption of the United States. It is, therefore, the laying of a foundation for a new market for the sugar trust which is bound to happen in the near future with the great impetus that is being given in Porto Rico, Hawaii, Cuba, and the Philippines by such legislation as this.

In other words, the American sugar refiner operates in this way: He first takes the cheapest sugar he can buy, which is 96° sugars on which there is no tariff for entry into the United States—the Louisiana, Hawaii, and Porto Rican production. He will then take the next cheapest sugar, which is the Philippine output, with a tariff of $8.42, and will then take the Cuban sugar, which is the next cheapest sugar, with a 20 per cent reduction under the treaty between this country and the Cuban Republic, or a tariff of $26.96. And when these sugars shall have supplied more than is necessary to meet the consumption of the people of the United States, he will be in a position to compel the Philippine people to buy only his sugar by refining the cheapest sugar he gets, placing it on the Philippine market, supplying the deficiency by additional draft on Cuba at a reduced rate and get the differential growing out of the 20 per cent reduction under the treaty. Under this bill he secures both markets in advance of a surplus production for the American people.

Our friends on this side of the Chamber who are so solicitous and emphatic in their desire to rid themselves of the Philippine Islands are now engaged in an effort to so better the conditions there, supply the treasury of those islands, relieve the people thereof of all taxation, tax the American people to carry on their government, giving them the protection of this great Republic, furnish its Army and Navy for its protection, all in the hope that when all of these things shall have been granted they will chafe under this pampering treatment and become very solicitous of being freed from the domination of this Republic. They know that in this country men vote their commercial advantages, as a rule, and yet they seek to establish commercial relations between the people of this country and the people of the Philippine government that will make it not only not desirable by a great number of the people of this country to be rid of the Philippines, but make it a distinct advantage to hold on to them.

But, Mr. Chairman, some time ago a proposition was presented to this Congress to permit the President of the United States to negotiate a treaty with Cuba, under which the tariff on sugar coming from the island of Cuba into this country should receive a reduction of 20 per cent on the tariff imposed on a like grade of sugar coming into the country from elsewhere. In order to permit this treaty to be negotiated it became necessary to pass an enabling act, and on December 19, 1903, Congress passed such an act, in which the following appears:

Provided, That while said convention is in force no sugar imported from the Republic of Cuba, and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba, shall be admitted into the United States at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon, as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897, and no sugar the product of any other foreign country shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States while this convention is in force at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897.

Under this enabling act and the treaty growing out of it, the Cuban producer receives the advantage of 20 per cent reduction on 96° sugar shipped by it into the United States. So that instead of paying $33.70 a ton, it is paying only $26.96. Now, Congress committed itself and this Government committed itself to the policy, by the provision above cited, not to change the tariff on sugar coming from any foreign country pending the existence of that treaty. The clear purpose of that policy was to assure the American sugar producer that if permitted to negotiate this treaty it would thereafter be the policy of the Government not to further interfere with their business by changing the tariff on sugar. And it was an assurance to the Cuban Government that if it negotiated such a treaty it would be permitted the advantage which the bill provided against all other competitors in the world growing the same grade of sugar.

The Philippine Islands at that time belonged to this country. The Supreme Court had decided that it was foreign territory to the United States for all purposes of taxation. The Cuban producer therefore had a right to expect that good faith should be kept both by the Congress and by the American Government, to continue the advantage which it secured in the reciprocity treaty just referred to. Your reduction under this bill of the tariff on sugar that is a competitor to Cuban sugar to $8.42 grants the Filipino sugar producer an advantage of $18.54 over the Cuban producer in the markets of the United States. The Cuban producer has a right in law and morals to expect at the hands of Congress and this Government an equal treatment to that you propose to grant the Filipino people; and at the next session of Congress—nay, perhaps at this session of Congress—the Cuban producer will be found here clamoring for a like advantage to that given the Filipino sugar grower in the American market by the passage of this act.

I have been here not so very long, but I have never attended a session of Congress that these gentlemen were not here asking some reduction on raw sugars. I have seen a demand made by Congress for reduction of the tariff on refined sugar but once, and the host that was behind the proposition to reduce Cuban 96 sugars 50 per cent of the existing rate disappeared in an instant the moment the differential was taken off. With the regularity of the taxgatherer, at every Congress since this sublime doc-

trine of manifest destiny became fashionable, a cry of distress has been heard from some dark fastness and charity solicited as the cure for the distress. Then some disciples, conceiving themselves especially anointed to relieve the distress by dispensing charity, have appeared upon the floor of the House, and, Mr. Chairman, with what magnanimity have these dispensed this charity! They heard this cry of distress when Hawaii sought annexation to this country, and some of us, acquiescing in their charitable inclinations, denying the genuineness of this cry of distress, said: "If it be charity you are bent upon, take the wherewith out of our common purse, but do not dispense this charity at our exclusive expense."

But, Mr. Chairman, they said: "Oh, it won't hurt you; they produce little sugar there; it is not a drop in the bucket." And they dispensed the charity at our expense.

They heard it when Porto Rico sought a reduced tariff to obtain a superior market, and later when it sought free entry to our ports. And some of us, acquiescing in their charitable inclinations, denying each time the genuineness of the cry of distress, said: "If it be charity you are bent upon, take the wherewith out of our common purse, but don't dispense this charity at our exclusive expense."

But, Mr. Chairman, they said each time: "Oh, it won't hurt you; they produce little sugar there; it isn't a drop in the bucket." And they dispensed the charity—at our expense.

They heard it in 1902 when Cuba sought a 50 per cent reduction on its sugar into this country. And some of us, acquiescing in their charitable inclinations, denying the genuineness of the cry of distress, said: "If it be charity you are bent upon, take the wherewith out of our common purse, but don't dispense this charity at our exclusive expense."

But, Mr. Chairman, they said: "Oh, it won't hurt you; they produce little sugar there; it isn't a drop in the bucket." And we took off the differential on sugar, and, in a moment of forgetfulness and absent-mindedness, they forgot to dispense charity that year.

They heard it in 1903 when Cuba sought a 20 per cent reduction on its sugar into this country. And some of us, acquiescing in their charitable inclinations, denying the genuineness of the cry of distress, said: "If it be charity you are bent upon, take the wherewith out of our common purse, but don't dispense the charity at our exclusive expense."

But, Mr. Chairman, they said: "Oh, it won't hurt you; they produce little sugar there; it isn't a drop in the bucket."

And we did not take off the differential on sugar, and in a moment they dispensed the charity—at our expense.

They heard it when the Philippines sought a reduction of 25 per cent on their sugar coming into this country. And some of us, acquiescing in their charitable inclinations, denying the genuineness of the cry of distress, said: "If it be charity you are bent upon, take the wherewith out of our common purse, but don't dispense this charity at our exclusive expense."

But, Mr. Chairman, they said: "Oh, it won't hurt you; they produce little sugar there; it isn't a drop in the bucket." And they dispensed the charity and we bore the burden.

They hear it now when the Filipinos seek a reduction of 75 per cent on their sugar coming into this country. And some of us say to them: "We acquiesce in your charitable inclinations; we deny the genuineness of the cry of distress, but if it be charity you are bent upon let's take the wherewith out of the common purse, but don't dispense this charity at our exclusive expense."

Will they hear us, Mr. Chairman? If we take off the differential on sugar they must; otherwise I fear that charity will be dispensed and the burden will be borne by only a few of our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen of honorable intentions, of charitable proclivities, and of superb liberalities must stop and learn that some of us are countrymen indeed. But we have attended our first circus. We have met the fakir man, the mountebank, and the gold-brick man, and we may have perhaps paid the price to learn, but we have learned. We don't object to being buncoed even now and pay the price provided the game is smart. But we are tired, oh, Mr. Chairman, so tired, of being continually, regularly, annually buncoed in the same old game with the same old paraphernalia.

We would like a new game, and if we must have the game and pay the price, let the game be at least smart and entertaining and instructive.

We are tired of this old game, for the reason that while we all seem to play it, only a few are made to defray the expenses of the game.

But perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I am all wrong in this. It may be a mere coincidence that since "manifest destiny" has obtained possession of the national soul, and we dispense charity, some of us must put up the charitable fund while others do the dispensing.

This may be a mere coincidence. I am reminded of what I believe was first said upon the floor of this House, that if a person throws five sixes once, it is a strange performance; if he throws it twice in succession, it is unusual; if three times in succession, it is suspicious, and if he throws it four times consecutively, the dice are loaded. If we are going to divide our cake with some people who it is claimed have not any, let us all put up equally, but do not take it out of mine and then try to demonstrate that I have as much left after as I had before you divided mine. It is bad enough for you to do the deed without reflecting on my intelligence by attempting to prove to me that I have lost nothing by the transaction. Perhaps, who knows, Mr. Chairman, but that at night as he retires, this dispenser of charity at other people's expense may not find reason to pray, "O Lord, I thank Thee that I am not as other men." Mr. Chairman, in this discussion I have sought to show what advantages would accrue to the Filipinos as a result of the adoption of the pending measure.

I think that I have demonstrated that he will receive nothing beyond this $8.64 which the American people will have to pay in order to help him run his government and to relieve him from taxation; that all the balance of it will fall into the hands of the sugar manufacturers of the country. I think I have shown that under our treaty relations with Cuba and under the act enabling the President of the United States to enact the treaty with Cuba that Cuba will be at the doors of this Congress at the next session—nay, perhaps at this very session—asking that we live up to our treaty obligations and give her equal chance in the markets of this country, and that while we will gain nothing by this transaction except the privilege of shielding the people of those islands with our Army and our Navy—while we gain nothing but the poor privilege of taxing ourselves for the purpose of maintaining their Government—we turn around and give additional profits of many times that value to the only individual interested in the purchase of cheap raw sugar, the American sugar refiner. I think I have shown these things, and, having shown them, I believe it becomes the duty of this body, legislating for the people of this country, to call a halt to this charity business, which, after all, is charity which does not go to help either the producers or consumers of this Republic, but falls into the coffers of those who make money without producing anything at all, but thrive most upon other people's substance.

I think that it is time that those who are engaged in the production of sugar in this country, those who are engaged in the production of beets, those who are engaged in the production of cane in this country should get a hearing at the hands of Congress. I think that those who come at every session of Congress seeking to reduce the price of the raw sugar which enters into the manufacture of the refined sugar, should call a halt. And this Congress, for once, should legislate on this question in behalf of the American man engaged in the production of sugar instead of, under the guise of charity, legislating for the savage or semicivilized man in the Tropics, but in reality in behalf of the sugar trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now rise.

[Mr. SMITH of Arizona addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I renew my motion that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had instructed him to report that they had further considered the bill H. R. 3—the Philippine tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3, and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be closed on Monday at 5 o'clock, and that the House meet on Saturday and Monday at 11 o'clock for debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all general debate be closed on House bill No. 3 on Monday next at 5 o'clock, and that on Saturday, tomorrow, and on Monday next the House meet at 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to understand this thing now. Does the gentleman say that debate is to run

until 5 o'clock Monday, and in the meantime the House is to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow and on Monday, instead of at 12?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then it is taken up under the five-minute rule?

Mr. PAYNE. On Tuesday morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3—the Philippine tariff bill—Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

Mr. BROOKS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, after a week's debate upon this subject, perhaps it might well be asked, of what advantage is it to prolong further discussion, and what useful purpose can be subserved by the argument? Judging, however, by the remarks which have been heard upon this floor, we who are opposed to this bill at this time have signally failed to remove some of the misapprehension that seems to be current. We have also failed, I think, to make our position entirely clear.

In 1896 it was my pleasure to travel for two days in the West, with an expert from the German Government. He represented an association of German sugar-beet growers. He was a highly cultured, widely travelled Alsatian gentleman, and he seemed to be admirably adapted to the work he had to do. He was a chemist and a soil physicist, and he was evidently particularly apt in matters of practical science. He was vouched for by the German Government, whose commission he bore. He was just returning from California, where he had been, as well as through the rest of the country, on a mission from his employers for the purpose of investigating the American beet-sugar situation. And he was going back to his people with a story about like this: That outside of Los Angeles County, Cal., Conejos County, Colo., and a little section of the Pecos Valley, New Mexico, there was no area in the United States where sugar beets could be grown sufficiently successfully, on a commercial scale, to become a feature in the world's production or to appear as a factor in competition with the German output.

The gentleman had about the same broad, far-seeing, sympathetic view of the American industry that some of the gentlemen upon this floor seem to have, who would now subordinate it to the interests of some wards of ours on the other side of the globe; wards who, if we may credit the statements which have been made, are hardly emerged from barbarism and are engaged in a moribund industry that must fail, without we give them the heritage of our own children, access to the best markets of the world. We are asked in their behalf to menace, or, at least, to retard, and, in my judgment, to seriously injure, an industry which means more to the economic welfare of great areas of the United States than does any other single form of agriculture.

We are asked to do this by a committee consisting of gentlemen who are among the most able, the most conscientious, the most distinguished in service in this House. They are, doubtless, thoroughly conscientious and thoroughly devoted to the public interests in the position that they take. They, or the majority of them, come from districts wherein are located industrial enterprises, which have grown strong and prosperous because of the wise and prudent fiscal legislation which we have inaugurated in this country. They themselves have played a prominent part in building up the wonderful prosperity that has marked and has been characteristic of our industrial system. They are vastly proud of the growth of their iron and of their steel industries, of their factories, and of their hundreds of thousands of contented and prosperous employees, and we join with them in their pæan. But they seem to have no place in their hearts for the beet and cane sugar industries or for the tobacco culture of a dozen States.

Filled with an exquisite compassion for the Moro and the Tagal, for the Igorrote and the Visayan, their hearts are steeled to the planters of Louisiana and the tobacco growers of Pennsylvania, of Wisconsin, and of Connecticut; steeled also to the sugar-beet grower of Michigan and of Colorado. They are very careful lest through any slip of theirs in the drafting of this bill, any of the products of the manufactories of England and Germany shall find access to our market through a Philippine byway. They are very careful to protect their own interests in our markets, but they are entirely willing that there shall be sacrificed on the altar of what they call "national duty," and righteousness, the interests of these great American agricultural communities. They are extremely willing, are these gentlemen, to pay their debt of conscience to the little brown brother in the coin of beet sugar and tobacco. But I hear no suggestion of a compensating advantage to these industries, however much their own individual feelings may be relieved. I do not question their good faith and I do not question their devotion to the whole country, but I do question, and seriously, question, their breadth of view.

I do not believe that the American people want this done. I do not believe that this House for one moment would take this step if they appreciated the real conditions. It is our fault that you do not, but even if this were not the case, it would be small compensation for the beet-sugar growers that we could charge you with the responsibility for it. There would be small compensation in that for ruined industries, blighted prospects, and arrested industrial development.

When the German expert I spoke of was in this country there were then but four experimental beet-sugar plants in operation in America. Their output was comparatively hardly more than a laboratory test. There are now fifty-three factories in operation (I think my figures are exact) and three closed, a total of fifty-six. Their output this year was over 300,000 tons, approximately 325,000 tons of beet sugar, more than half of our total sugar production. The value of that output was more than $30,000,000.

I do not want to speak locally only, or to present the interest of a single section; but twelve of these factories are in the State which I represent, and therefore, so far as this industry is concerned, Colorado is a type of a very large area which is very much interested in the culture of sugar beets; practically of all that country that lies west of the one hundredth meridian. What can be done in Colorado can be done in every other part of this arid or semiarid region, with the possible exception of the land that lies in the extreme north; and whatever vitally concerns that great section of this country vitally concerns the whole country.

There is one phase of this subject that has been very little touched upon thus far. This Government is now carrying on a great work and expending a vast accumulating fund, now amounting to over $30,000,000, in the development of that region, in providing homes for the coming millions, a safety valve for, and a refuge from the overcrowded cities of the East. It is doing this through the work of the Reclamation Service.

I am well within the bounds of fact when I say that, in a large portion of the region covered by the operation of this Service the beet-sugar industry is the most certain guaranty of the success of the experiment. Outside the region of the Pacific slope it is absolutely necessary that some intensive product readily convertible into money be grown on this irrigated land, a product the cost of production of which is reduced to a minimum, and with regard to which the handicap of distance from market is eliminated to the greatest degree possible.

Very many of the reclamation projects now under contemplation, when completed will represent an acre cost of from $25 to $35; add to this the expense of ditching, clearing, and preparation of the land and its initial value, and you have an investment of from $40 to $50 an acre, and in some places more. Such land can not successfully compete, in such amounts as the Hydrographic Survey proposes to reclaim, with the prairies of Iowa, Illinois, and the Central West if it has to rely on the great staples alone. This is a very serious feature of this subject.

At present the local market consumes enough of the crops so that, with the very limited areas available under present irrigating facilities the irrigated lands are highly valuable, and the prices are well maintained. This will not be the case when the irrigated areas are multiplied ten, twenty, or fifty fold and it becomes necessary to find a market for the wheat and the oats and the potatoes in Chicago and New York.

I speak in all seriousness when I say that I am thoroughly convinced that the hope of the work of reclamation lies in the farming of small tracts with highly productive crops, readily convertible into money in the immediate vicinity of their production.

For instance, to-day, in the Grand River Valley, in Colorado, with the small areas valuable for irrigation, fruit land has a market value of from six to twelve hundred dollars per acre. But when the few thousand acres at present irrigated become one or two hundred thousand, as they easily may become, this high-cost land must seek other sources of income. There will be no adequate market for the fruit raised, and you can not grow corn, wheat, or other staples on this ground with success, with a market one or two thousand miles away. Beet sugar is ideally fitted for this work, and the 3,000,000 tons of sugar annually consumed in this country offers a safe and sure market. Every irrigated valley in the arid region can and should support from three to half a dozen factories, with an equal number of prosperous, progressive, and intelligent communities. If you simply let this industry alone for a while, there is not only a

probability, but almost a certainty, that in another ten years the intermountain region alone, will supply an annual demand for more than 1,500,000 tons of refined sugar.

In the six years that the industry has been in operation in Colorado it has grown so that to-day there are more than 85,000 acres under cultivation, but this is only 132 square miles, only a tithe of the land available in that State alone. It supports about 10,000 employees, and it distributed to the farmers this year nearly four and three-quarter millions of dollars. It produced in that State, in the year just closed, 95,000 tons of refined sugar. The fourteen other States and Territories of the intermountain region, west of the ninety-eighth meridian, need only to equal this record and a full half of the present domestic consumption will be supplied, and they can easily do it.

What this new enterprise means can not be appreciated unless one sees the actual results. In more than one place in my State the factories have been built in what was entirely unoccupied territory, and upon the bare and uncultivated plains have grown up ideal, prosperous communities, with all the concomitants of rapidly developing American civilization.

Where five years ago there was little but sagebrush and buffalo grass, and the herds roamed at their will, to-day there are banks, libraries, schools, and churches, and all that marks our best industrial development in the older localities. This result has been wholly due to the beet-sugar industry, and there is no wonder that our people are interested in it.

The growth of the beets is fairly remunerative to the farmer; but not by any means to the extent that you have been led to believe. It is an expensive crop to grow. It represents an acre cost of from $30 to $35. The average yield in beets last year was 11 tons, making an average value, at $5 per ton, of $55; but that average is made up of a few startlingly successful instances, very many cases of moderate profits, and quite too many failures. It can not, as a rule, be carried on by individuals on a large scale.

The average unit of cultivation in Colorado per individual owner is about 15 acres, and the proportion of profit seems to decrease as acreage increases. It is essentially for the great majority a supplemental, money-raising crop, affording excellent opportunities for crop rotation, and stimulating intensive cultivation in small areas.

The fifty-six factories already built in this country have paid to the districts represented by the gentlemen from Ohio and Pennsylvania a round $30,000,000, and if the gentlemen from Ohio and Pennsylvania will keep their hands off, ten years more will see $50,000,000 additional spent in the same direction.

It is mildly interesting to note in this connection that all our vaunted trade with the Philippine Islands reached in imports this year a total of about fifteen millions, and five millions in exports, only a fraction of the value of this single industry annually.

I can not say that I believe that the proposed measure will destroy it. I do believe, and am thoroughly convinced that I am justified in believing, that, if this bill becomes a law, we shall see no new beet-sugar factories in this country for many years, and that only those at present built which are most favorably located, and are operated under the best possible conditions can survive. Those who should know better than I go further and say that the injury will be much more serious, and that the industry will be ruined.

In this connection I want to call attention to a statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in opening this debate. You will recall that he called careful attention to the fact that a gentleman from Louisiana was absent; that that gentleman, named Hill, knew more about the cane-sugar industry than any other man in the United States; that he had always been present before the Committee on Ways and Means when hearings on this subject were in progress; that he was thoroughly reliable and thoroughly responsible; that he had been the great spokesman of the cane-sugar industry, but that this time he was not here, although he had been one of that pleasant party that had gone to the Philippines and enjoyed that delightful outing and had come back shouting for the Moro and the Tagal. And the impression was rather left on our minds that Mr. Hill of Louisiana had been converted to the cause of Philippine sugar or else had no facts to meet the statements that were made in behalf of it.

I have in my hand the copy of a telegram from that gentleman:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *January 5, 1906.*

D. D. COLCOCK,
Arlington Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Colonel Hill has just come to the office and requested me to send the following:

"Am more opposed to Philippine tariff reduction to-day than last January, as I foresee the certainty of the islands being exploited and developed to the ruin of our home industries."

C. A. FARWELL.

[Applause.]

Now, the only reason for which I introduce this message is because the honorable chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PAYNE] seems now to count Mr. Hill as an authority, by inference, for the proposition he is advancing.

We have had a good deal of the deadly parallel in this debate, and past records have been drawn with something of embarrassment to gentlemen who have been long in public life. Now, it is entirely true, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] says, that consistency is a jewel that men who have been long in public life must sometimes dispense with; but the gentleman in his speech yesterday alluded to the fact that there was another gentleman interested in the beet-sugar industry who was also supposed to have perhaps recanted. He made long extracts and quotations from a speech of Mr. Oxnard, in which he said in effect that the Philippine product never could become an important competitor with the American product, and that the beet-sugar industry and the cane-sugar industry had nothing to fear from the Filipinos.

The gentleman might have gone further, and he might have stated, if he chose, that at the time that speech was made it was the Porto Rican tariff and not the Philippine tariff that was under consideration, and that at that time the full Dingley rates obtained against the Philippines, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] were loudest in their protestations that the Philippine tariff never would be reduced and never should be reduced if they could help it.

Then you will recall that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] made some very interesting comments about some experiments which the Department of Agriculture is conducting in developing unicellular or single-germ beet seed, and he talked much about the report of a gentleman named Palmer, drawing from it the conclusion that the unicellular beet seed was an established fact. He was trying to show that because of this supposed fact the cost of producing beet sugar would be so much reduced that it needed no protection. Now, if he had read from page 166 of the same little book that he had, "Condition of the Beet Sugar Industry for 1904," he would have seen the latest authoritative governmental expression about unicellular beet seed. You remember that they take selected unicellular seeds from a great many ordinary samples and then plant them, and they then select out the plants which produce unicellular seed, and this is the result:

> The seed from each of these plants was kept separate and the percentage of single-germ seeds produced by 10 of these plants has been determined by actual count and found to lie between 8.2 and 25 per cent, with an average for the 10 plants of 14.3 per cent. * * *
>
> It is apparent, therefore, that the percentage of single-germ seed has been greatly increased in one generation by selecting single-germ seeds for the production of seed beets. It is the expectation of those having the work in charge to continue along the same line with the hope that by careful selection for several generations it will be possible to produce plants bearing only single-germ seeds.

Does that sound very much like the painting of the rose and adorning the lily that characterized the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] on this subject? There is simply the hope that after many years science may help the farmers in this respect, but it is all a prospect as yet.

But this whole argument strikes me as rather unique. I can imagine the gentleman from Pennsylvania going before some Ways and Means Committee of which he is not a member and making a plea for an adequate measure of protection for the iron and steel industries. I can imagine, also, some sugar-beet man coming and saying: "My dear sir, you don't want any protection; you are one of the dominant American race that will never yield to the competition of the nerveless inferior. With your restless energy you will never allow yourself to be outstripped in the contest for supremacy. You need fear no competition; but go and invent a unicellular boiler and attach to it an automatic device for self-cleaning flues, put in sets of tandem turbines, utilize your by-product, use your scrap iron and put on a smoke-consuming device that will utilize the surplus carbon, and you won't need any protection. What you need is improved methods." [Laughter.] I can imagine the reply of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to an argument of that sort. [Laughter.]

It is a critical situation that confronts us. A great industry of the American people is being threatened, and the only excuse they make, the only apology they make, is that the Philippine competition is so small that it never can be a factor. That is a matter of inference from some very conflicting data.

It is very true, as my colleague stated, that these hearings would prove anything; that you could read them in every con-

ceivable way, and make out anything from the testimony in them. It is also true, as the gentleman from New York said, that a declaration against interest is the highest kind of testimony. Again, it is true, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, that it is our duty as legislators to weigh this testimony and see what it really means. I want, therefore, very briefly to call your attention not to what the enthusiasts for beet sugar say, not to what the Filipino says, but to the declarations against interest that appear in these hearings.

As I have already said, first of all they start out with the proposition,—and the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Connecticut elaborated it extensively and with considerable effect,—that there is no fear of Filipino competition, because there is not land enough there. They said there were 7,000,000 acres only, of agricultural land out of 73,000,000 acres in the islands, and they cited in support of that proposition the Philippine census, at page 181.

Ordinarily such a statement would not be particularly important, but these gentlemen have made it the basis of rather fundamental claims in this discussion.

The deduction, however, is not warranted by the census, upon which they rely. The totals furnished in the Philippine census in the fourth volume, beginning at page 181, do not refer, according to their own language, to arable land as distinguished from nonarable areas. They cover simply agricultural farming land, held as such by farmers, without discussing the possibility of extending the arable areas in the remainder.

The figures given show that approximately 10 per cent of the 73,000,000 acres of the islands is such agricultural and farming land.

If the gentleman from Connecticut while he was learning that lesson which he taught to us so admirably had troubled to turn over to the next page of the census he would have seen that there was no attempt to state total arable lands, for this same total of 7,000,000 acres is given as the total of the 815,000 individual farms, held and occupied by farmers as such; the only difference being that in one place the area is given in hectares and in the other in ares.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Does the gentleman claim that the totals represent the land under cultivation?

Mr. BROOKS of Colorado. I claim that it represents the farming land held and occupied as such and has no reference whatever to the agricultural lands,—the arable lands, except those occupied as farming lands. If the gentleman had gone further and read the text he would have been in no doubt about it. Now, I do not care to rest this on my own deduction, but I have here in my hand a letter from the Director of the Census, which I will read:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,
Washington, January 10, 1906.

Hon. F. E. BROOKS,
House of Representatives U. S., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your personal request of yesterday afternoon, with reference to Tables 1 to 18, Volume IV of the Philippine Census, I beg to advise you as follows:

Table 1, page 181 of the said volume, and the totals therein mentioned refer to, first, the total area of the islands, 29,791,734 hectares; second, the area in farms and occupied as such, 2,827,704 hectares. The succeeding tables referring to agricultural lands have reference to the same total farm area.

The friar lands, so called, and the Government lands are not included in the total agricultural lands, nor are the figures for agricultural lands supposed to include the entire area of arable lands in the islands.

Very respectfully, S. N. NORTH, *Director.*

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Now, if the gentleman from Colorado will pardon me a moment, if he will read the reference on page 199, where, on the same year in which this census was taken, the total agricultural area is given, and then in the next column is the amount under cultivation, the gentleman from Colorado will see that he is mistaken about that. The area in farms is so small that they have included in agricultural lands the kitchen gardens.

Mr. BROOKS of Colorado. They have, and they have included the forested farms, but they do not include the friars' land.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. They must have included so much of the friars' land as was agricultural, for they have reported the entire amount of the land under cultivation.

Mr. BROOKS of Colorado. The gentleman must be in error in regard to that. I think we will let the census rest where the men who made it put it.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think we had better.

Mr. BROOKS of Colorado. And we will leave the condition of the Philippine Islands just as nature left them. Great, splendid, tropical islands, boundlessly fertile, admirably adapted to culture of cane sugar, with nobody knows how much agricultural land there; and as to the possibilities for sugar, we will leave them where the Secretary of War left them:

I have no doubt there is land enough there, if sugar is properly cultivated, to raise,—well, I don't know how much Cuba can raise, but if conditions favor us, we are going to be a great sugar-producing archipelago.

That is what the Secretary of War said to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and he knew what he was talking about and he meant what he said. Now, I cite these facts not by any means to question the good faith or absolute fairness of the gentleman from Connecticut or anyone else who has advanced that proposition, but simply to show the absolute worthlessness, for the purpose sought, of the figures they have cited to sustain their proposition.

However, I would prefer to leave it right where they left it, with 7,000,000 acres of arable land, and then admit more of their claims and say that there is only one-tenth of that amount adapted for cane sugar and only one-half of that, which can be cultivated in any one year. That will be 750,000 acres of adaptable land, and then dividing that figure by two, we will say that the amount that will be cultivated in any one year is 375,000 acres. The amount before dividing is about the admission of the remarkably fair, the remarkably candid, and remarkably disinterested (?) witness, Mr. Welborn, the head of the insular department of agriculture, who has sufficient interest in this problem to come 11,000 miles to see that it does not go awry. He admitted that in 1903 there were 180,000 acres under cultivation, and then in response to interrogation he said that that amount could be increased twofold, threefold, and fourfold, which would make 720,000 acres, nearly 750,000 acres. Now, I wish the questioner had gone a little slower and had not jumped to tenfold at once, which Mr. Welborn refused to admit, because I think further interesting disclosures would have been made if the examination had proceeded more cautiously; but we will let it stand at 750,000 acres.

Their next statement is that the possible production is only some 300,000 tons, and entirely too small to injure the American producer.

Now, this same Mr. Welborn says that the island of Negros produces eight-tenths of the crop, therefore that can be pretty fairly taken as a type of the islands for the purpose of sugar cultivation. The testimony at Iloilo, given by the Filipinos themselves, is pretty nearly unanimous that that land yields about one and three-tenths to one and a half tons of sugar per acre, and some witnesses put it higher. That, you may remember, is under conditions of cultivation and manufacture that the gentleman from New York so eloquently described, where two carabaos and one man work alternating shifts, vibrating between the mudhole and the sugar plantation, scratching the ground to the depth of 3 to 5 inches; where the land is unfertilized and where no modern machinery or methods are used. Making no allowances for any improvements in culture or extraction, that acreage at 1.3 tons per acre would yield 487,500 tons of sugar per annum.

There remains only the question of extraction. Now, we can not assume for one moment that the planter of Negros, be he Filipino or be he foreigner, will continue the same methods of operation after this bill goes into effect which obtain now. He will not go on using two carabaos to crush one stalk of cane. He will have new methods and new machinery, and the extraction will be about the ordinary normal extraction, where the ordinary result with reasonable facilities appears to be 90 per cent instead of 55 (which is the average of 50 per cent and 60 per cent which they admit now). Now, that extraction would result in about 800,000 tons instead of 487,500 tons, and I believe that this is a more than fair, more than moderate, and more than conservative estimate of the production of the Philippine Islands, both as to extraction and acreage, and this amount, which is more than two and a half times the 300,000 tons that that they allow would, with any such tariff differential as proposed, certainly drive large importations into this country.

One of the witnesses speaks of a probable million tons as the ultimate production of the islands, and earlier estimates were larger still. I call to your minds the fact that we are legislating not for 1903 or 1904, but, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has told us, for the generations to come, during which time, we are told, we are to hold these islands. The fact is, what we are really to expect is what has happened in every instance where production under tropical conditions has received the benefit of northern capital, energy, example, and governmental protection; the growth will be tremendous in both acreage and extraction, and we shall not have 375,000 acres but more than twice that amount, yielding not 800,000 tons but more than double that amount, with a

million tons for export, all forced into the United States by means of the tariff differential.

Then they say that the price of Philippine sugar will be so high that it can not compete with our own.

The gentleman from New York very adroitly developed the proposition that the Philippine sugar reaches New York at a cost of $4.13 per hundred pounds. Now, I want to consider this statement a few moments. Mr. Welborn says the sugar of the islands at Iloilo sold in 1903 at $1.25 per hundred on the general market. Mr. Welborn, of course, disputes the conclusion and claims that the product was sold at a loss, but the selling price may be well taken as a maximum cost of production. This is pretty nearly elementary. That statement was in a measure confirmed by the hysterical telegram read in the Senate the other day, in which the selling price was put at $1.35. Again we have the statement of Mr. Luzuriaga, of the Philippine Commission, in the same Philippine census, who stated that they can, and for the last few years have produced Philippine sugar in the island of Negros for from $2.50 to $3.50 per picul Mexican, the average of which would be about $1.08 gold per hundredweight, so I think $1.25 gold is a very liberal estimate.

We will now take the figures of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] again, and we will add 25 or 30 cents for freight to New York and for insurance and transportation, which seems to me pretty high, and then we will add another dollar to this because of the fact that we pay that amount for refining it, and that makes a cost of refined sugar in New York of $2.55. Now, they have put on another absolutely arbitrary dollar; and there I decline to follow. They say that, because of the grade of Philippine sugar and because of the fact that for the last few years difficulties in production and extraction, due to bad methods and machinery, have resulted in an inferior product, making Philippine sugar worth a cent a pound less in New York than the standard grades, therefore we should add this sum to the cost.

Now, I submit that the gentlemen have no right, in discussing the conditions as they will exist after the tariff barriers have been removed and after profitable exploitation under improved methods has been made possible, to base their conclusions for the future upon facts as they exist to-day, with all the crudities and all the limitations that the gentlemen describe; and that there is no reason, in fact or in probability, why Philippine sugar should not and will not reach New York in as marketable a condition, well up to the general average, and in as high a grade of purity as unrefined sugar which comes from the island of Java or from Porto Rico or from the smaller importing countries.

I submit, therefore, that the 1 cent differential added because of the present poor condition of the Philippine product is not fairly or properly considered in estimating the future values of the Philippine output. Leaving this out of consideration, therefore, and adding the maximum tariff of 42 cents, which is 25 per cent of the Dingley rates at 96 per cent purity, the total value which can be ascribed to Philippine sugar on the New York markets is $2.97 per hundredweight. Add to this, if you will, 20 cents for freight rate from New York to Chicago, and the Philippine product meets the Rocky Mountain product at the markets in Chicago at the gross cost of $3.17 per hundredweight.

The Colorado sugar this year cost, sacked in the factory, without any allowance for loading or shipment, $3.71 per hundredweight. Add to that 27 cents for freight to Chicago, and the Philippine product of the little brown man meets the product of the American farmer with a differential in its favor of 81 cents per hundredweight.

And let me say here that in estimating the cost of the Colorado sugar there *is* considered and deducted, the value of the by-product and the amounts received from the sale of pulp. Even if we should allow 50 per cent of the lower prices due to present inferior quality and adjust the tariff proportionately, the difference in favor of the Philippine product would be nearly 0.4 cent per pound. That this reduction is abundant is shown by the fact that much of the time even now the difference between Mascavado, which is about the same as the Philippine product, and standard sugar in New York has been only 50 cents.

No one can believe for a moment, it seems to me, that the differential will be even so small, but that is enough to be prohibitive.

But our friends say that the Philippine product can not be a factor in the American markets because they say that the competitive price will be fixed by the volume of sugar which pays the full tariff duty; and that the Philippine sugar can not compete seriously with the American product until it has displaced importations paying the full duty. Now, I suppose that is a correct statement, and we may admit it, but what are the facts in regard to that? Why, they are simply this: We imported during the last year, in addition to the sugar coming from Hawaii and Porto Rico without tax, and Cuba with 80 per cent of the Dingley rate, about 650,000 tons of sugar which paid the full tariff rates, and that is the sugar that is going to fix the price of competitive sugar in our market. Well, what is going to become of that full-duty importation? Naturally, if there is a portion of the sugar that pays the highest tariff, that which pays no tariff is going to increase comparatively by leaps and bounds; that which pays a reduced rate will also increase, but less rapidly, and this increase will reduce relatively the amounts coming from the countries paying the full rates, and that is just what has happened. Porto Rican sugar since the tariff has been taken off has increased in production 180,000 tons, and the Cuban sugar has increased in the aggregate much more than that, and the Hawaiian has also increased phenomenally. The result inevitably must be that more and more the high-tariff importation is going to yield to the low-tariff importation, and the increase from Porto Rico and Hawaii will more and more meet and displace sugar coming from Java, the Straits Settlements, and the other full-tariff countries, which must relatively decline. More and more therefore, year by year, the domestic product will meet in the domestic markets the Philippine sugar with a differential of more than 25 per cent of its cost in favor of the latter.

They say the normal increase of consumption in this country takes care of the increase in the countries favored by tariff concessions. Well, again they are very much in error in the figures. The increased production since 1903 in Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Cuba was about 450,000 tons, by Willet & Grey's figures. All of the exports from these countries come to the United States, and the local consumption is only a negligible factor in their total crop which for 1905 was over 2,100,000 tons. The increase in the consumption in this country for the same time was only about 93,000 tons; and if you should go back one year further you will find it was still less; that it was only about 75,000 tons. In other words, the increase in domestic consumption, without any allowance for increase in domestic production, not only does not equal the increase in production in countries enjoying tariff advantages with this country, but is only a little over one-fourth of that increase; and what is true of Cuba, Hawaii, and Porto Rico will be equally true of the Philippines.

The conclusion is irresistible. You describe in glowing terms the degraded condition of the people, the crude and inefficient machinery, the untoward conditions under which the Philippine sugar planter labors; you teach him the possibilities of the business, and still argue that results will remain as they are with regard to the volume of his production and the seriousness of the menace resulting therefrom.

You admit that under almost impossible conditions he has reached a maximum of 280,000 tons annually. You propose to throw over him the ægis of American power and protection, to allow him to maintain his own tariff barriers against the rest of the world, and to support him therein; to practically remove the barriers between him and the most splendid market the world has ever seen; to afford him the mighty stimulus of American example; to give him the full benefit of American capital, enterprise, machinery, and methods, and you still figure the results in terms of carabao plow and Spanish misrule. If, under such conditions, he will raise 280,000 tons, what, in heaven's name, can he raise under the conditions you propose?

Never before has a northern government proposed to bring its own labor and its own industrial conditions in direct competition with tropical labor and tropical conditions, and, in addition thereto, protect the latter in the competition.

You say that the tropical planter will not avail himself of his opportunity and that tropical industry will progress at a snail's pace, and you figure twenty years as the period necessary for the development of the industry in the Philippines to a maximum even of 300,000 tons. The conclusion of all this, if true, is that you are not playing fairly with the Filipino; you are leading him to believe that he will reap some immediate benefit, but you tell us it will not harm us because it is too small a concession to injure, and therefore too small to help. On your own confession, your bill is an emasculated affair, which you protectionists, you Republicans, support, because there is not enough free trade in it to hurt, and you Democrats who accept it do so because there is not enough protection in it to hurt. [Applause.]

So far as the Filipino is concerned you—

> * * * palter with him in a double sense,
> And keep the word of promise to his ear,
> But break it to his hope.

The Filipino asks for bread and you give him a stone. Somewhere in the dim recesses of my memory there comes something from a Biblical source, and it runs something like this:

> I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot.

So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth.

That is what some of us would like to do with this Philippine bill. [Applause.] It is neither one thing nor another. It does not help the Filipino, and you say neither does it hurt the American. If you mean what you say, and of course you do, if you are genuine, and of course you are, why do you not do something that is substantial for the Filipino? Why do you not turn your energies to some other source where there will be no competition with an American industry? Why do you not develop his coffee plantations, that paid at one time $2,500,000 annually, and at one time was the fourth article of importance in export? Why do you not turn to the rubber industry?

Turn your attention to some other noncompetitive form of production. Again, if you are genuine, as I have no doubt you are, why do you not amend this bill so that it will accomplish every purpose? We who are desirous of protecting the sugar industry in this country are sincere in our statements when we say that it is not the 100,000 or the 200,000 tons of Philippine sugar that we fear, but it is the seven, eight, nine, and ten hundred thousand tons which is coming that will destroy our industry.

Why don't you amend your bill providing that 200,000 tons of Philippine sugar and a proportionate amount of tobacco be admitted absolutely free, and that thereafter imports shall pay the Dingley rates? That will give a substantial help to the Filipino, and that will give to the American producers the protection and assurance that they need.

If the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber are sincere, and of course they are; and if they support this measure because it is a step in the right direction, and not because, in the language of the minority report, they hail with joy evidences of dissension in our ranks; and if they believe that the Philippine product will be inconsiderable, as they seem to, then they, too, should accept this suggestion, because it is a longer step in the right direction; and we then may have the edifying spectacle of the gentleman from Mississippi taking the arm of the gentleman from New York to take this longer step, and we will all fall in.

The records have not, however, sustained your views as to the probable increase. When the industry was first introduced in the Philippines, under conditions very similar to those which you now propose, stimulated by American and English capital, with easy access to American and English markets, the industry increased from 1855 to 1860 sixfold, or 600 per cent, and in the fifteen years from 1855 to 1870 it increased 2,000 per cent. Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Cuba have increased in the last two years over four times as much as our domestic increase in consumption.

In Porto Rico, with a vastly higher labor wage cost, under the stimulus of a free trade with the United States, the increase from 1901 to 1905 has been about 180,000 tons, and its possibilities are by no means exhausted. You say that there will be no competition. I should like to cite you an instance.

A few hundred miles south of the archipelago lies Java. It is bathed by the same tropical seas. The sun and the shade, the wind and the rain have done for Java what they have done for Luzon, and no more, probably hardly as much. Java has a little larger area than Luzon, but no more arable land. It has been cursed with the most complicated system of land tenure the Dutch brain could invent. Every kind of misrule laid its heavy hand on the country for generations. It has only about 250,000 acres in sugar plantations, not the amount of available land in Mindoro and Cebu alone.

Under Dutch rule, without tariff advantages in its trade with this country, the production of sugar in 1890 was only 350,000 tons; under the stimulus occasioned by release of government control in the island in 1891, the withdrawal of bounties in Europe, and later by the diminution of the Cuban product, the Javanese increased their production, by 1896, to the tremendous total of 600,000 tons. In 1904 they had reached 950,000 tons, and in 1905 it exceeded a million tons, of which 450,000 tons was imported to this country, paying full tariff rates. In 1903 this export sugar, according to the most careful estimates that I can find, was produced in the island of Java at a cost of about 1 cent to 0.125 cent per pound, eliminating from the computation the sugar product on the smaller estates not for export. This is shown also by the fact that in 1903 the average selling price over the entire island, including therein domestic sugar made on the native plantations by obsolete and very expensive methods, was 1.71 cents per pound.

I am quite aware of the difference in labor conditions between the two islands, but these are apparent rather than real. The latest statistics obtainable from Java show an average wage of the whole island, on the sugar estates of 11 cents per day, and in this estimate there is again included the comparatively backward development on the interior lands, where labor is employed which is far below the average, and where, as I have stated before, the export sugar is not produced in large quantities. If one should confine himself, as he properly might, to the leased lands and the Government holdings, where the largest amount of the export sugar is grown, and where the class of labor is much better than elsewhere, there would be little, if any, difference between the Philippine figures and the Javanese.

And what Java has done, the Philippines certainly can do. The Dutch colonies have no advantage over our own, many conditions are not so favorable, and the artificial stimulants to Javanese production from legislative and governmental action, at home and abroad, do not compare with the benefits you propose to shower on these islands.

Right in this connection I wish to say one word with reference to the advance of the cost of labor in the Philippine Islands. When the Philippine census is favorable, it seems to be freely quoted; when not, there seems to be some disposition to rely upon that ever-present help in time of trouble, Mr. Welborn.

At page 487, Volume IV, of the Philippine census, the total number of laborers on sugar estates is given at 45,247, and the total monthly wage at 388,817 pesos, or an average rate of 17 cents gold per day. The latest authoritative statement from a governmental source is found in the report of the Department of Agriculture, under date of August 31, 1904, where this same rate is given as 16 cents per day gold, in money and food combined. And this is the class of labor which you propose to protect against, and bring into competition with the laborer in the mountain States who receives, in the beet fields, from $2 to $2.50 per day for the lowest grade of labor.

But I do not care whether in the Philippines the wage is 15, 16, 17, 18, or 19 cents per day; it is a miserably underpaid labor. And are you going to legislate with regard to it so that the American laborer in our beet fields, as he goes home at night and see the house his industry has built, his children to whom he has given the advantage of American citizenship, and the comforts that he has given them, must necessarily stop and think of his own condition. He will think that over on the other side of the globe the sun is just rising; that the American flag is floating there, and there is a fellow crawling out of his bamboo hut, without doors, without windows; who dresses himself in a waistcloth and gets his breakfast from the trees and his dinner out of the stream, and he is going to work in the Philippine sugar fields for 15 or 20 cents a day, and bring his work in competition with our man here at one-tenth of the sum per day which the American is paid. You are going to make that man think, too, that the Republican party is responsible for that competition, and, gentlemen, it will be pretty hard to convince him that he is wrong.

There is another phase of this subject to which I want to call your attention very briefly. We are Republicans on this side of the Chamber. As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ADAMS] said yesterday, we are Republicans because we are protectionists, not protectionists because we are Republicans; and he stated it truly, because it is a matter of principle with us. And yet we are Republicans, and party men, and we believe in, and we glory in the Republican party, and we believe that it has, that it can, and that it will direct and govern this country better than any other party ever has, ever can, or ever will. [Applause on the Republican side.] And because we believe that, we have once and again appealed to the great backbone of our country for our tenure of party power, and once and again they have not said us nay. The men who made the Republican party and have kept it in power almost uninterruptedly for fifty years in this country, are the tillers of the soil. They are the men who made possible in the last twelve years a balance of trade in our favor of something like $5,000,000,000; who have not only done that, but who have, by the value of their product, wiped out an adverse balance against us of five hundred million dollars.

These men claim and should receive some measure of consideration. I admit, nay, I do not admit, but I claim and maintain and contend, that the farming industries share in the benefits of the protective policy in full measure with every other industry. I maintain and claim that the condition of the agricultural laborer advances as the condition of every other wage-earner advances. We all understand and contend that the condition of agriculture advances as general industrial conditions advance; that the farmer's markets have extended as the commerce of the nation has grown, and yet a concrete example is always better than an abstract illustration. We have talked protection to the farmers and we have talked to them about the tariff on wheat, and some Democratic brother has risen and called attention to the fact that we were the great-

est wheat-exporting country on the globe. We have talked about the tariff on dairy products, as we had a right to, and we have been reminded that we are so far beyond competition, except on the Canadian border, that the tariff can have no direct tangible effect on the price of those products.

Then somebody has cited the fact that down in Argentina they buy the same kind of a reaper for $60 that the American farmer here pays $100 for. We have met those arguments legitimately, properly, strongly as we could, and rightly, and yet they have had their effect. Here is one case where the farmer does receive a direct, tangible, definite, absolute benefit. And can we, who have been pledged to the support of this industry by our platform utterances, by the declarations of our leaders, by the truths of our economic principles—can we gainsay it now? If we do, may not "weighed, wanting, divided," well be written on our standards?

I said before that, in the language quoted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, consistency was indeed "the terror of feeble minds," but that suggestion does not apply to parties. That is for individuals. Parties are based on economic principles, and economic truths do not change. They tell us it takes ten years to develop a Philippine sugar plantation. It takes more than ten years to change an economic truth. What was true in 1896 is true now (reading):

We—

The Republicans—

condemn the present Democratic Administration for not keeping faith with the sugar producers of this country. The Republican party favors such protection as will lead to the production on American soil of all the sugar which the American people use, and for which they pay other countries more than $100,000,000 annually.

That is from the Republican national platform of 1896. That was true then. It is true now. That is what we want to do, and that is what we will do, with God's help, if you will give us a chance. [Applause.]

Gentleman, the protective tariff is a unit. The protective system is one great structure. You can not attack one of its foundations without weakening it everywhere, and you can not assail it in one spot without opening it to attack in other spots. It must stand together, and it should, for the interests of this country are not diverse. The interests of Colorado and of Montana and of Wyoming and of Idaho are not inherently different from the interests of Pennsylvania and Ohio and New York and New England. Every principle of protection, every argument that we can possibly make in favor of any protected industry, applies with double force to beet sugar. It is new; it is intensifying; it stimulates every line of activity. The value of the output is represented by a labor element of not less than 80 per cent, and that labor is skilled, intelligent, progressive, and well paid. It is the labor of our own people, of our own brothers; they are our own citizens; they are working for the upbuilding of our own country, and they are asking at our hands protection against an alien race; labor paid almost as cheaply as any on the globe and favored by tropical conditions of food, clothing, and necessary expenditures.

I appreciate as thoroughly as anyone the force of a moral argument. I think an appeal to plain duty does not fall unheeded on my ears. I think I understand in some small degree what should be the generosity, the forbearance, and the breadth of outlook of a great nation, but to me the plain duty that I see arising, is my duty to those whose commission I hold, whose interests I in part represent; who are working along the same lines that I am trying to work, for the upbuilding of great and prosperous commonwealths; and the generosity which appeals to me is the degree of generosity we should show to the best class of immigrants who ever came to our shores, to the men of Sweden, of Denmark, of Belgium, of Germany, and the better class of Russians, the men who mingle with us and in an economic sense, become bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh; who become units in our industrial communities, factors in our civic life, and carry their full share of the burdens of citizenship.

The Rocky Mountains are far from the seaboard, but they are no farther than was the Ohio from the Philadelphia of Washington's day.

The founders of this Government stretched their gaze southward and westward. They saw great cities, thriving communities, and growing wealth where then there was only a wilderness. Our restless Saxon blood still carries in its channels their ideas, their hopes, and their aspirations; but they saw more, dreamed of more, worked for more, and accomplished more.

It was not only national prosperity they desired. They have builded a state upon a foundation of civic righteousness, consecrated to liberty, whose cornerstone is the individual, his rights, his future, his development, and his home.

They made this nation great, not only in its wealth and its military prowess, not only in its vast stretches of great States, but along the higher lines, in education, in art, in literature, in philanthropy, and in every feature of an enlightened Christian civilization.

Talk of duty! What duty have we more sacred than to carry on the work they initiated and remain faithful to the ideas and ideals they stood for; to carry into our newer States the standard of civilization and national life they raised on the frontier of their day?

Right? Is it not right to do this? Were they not right in the toil and self-sacrifice the fruits of which we now enjoy?

The people of Colorado and of the other mountain States are our own people. Out there we hark back through a hundred lines to other origins blending with your own. Now it is the green-clad Berkshires, now the valleys of New York, again the stretches of the sunny South that rise in our minds when we think of home. Again, it is the great reaches of the Central West which call to us with the love of our childhood days, but with it all, and because of it all, we are one people.

Saxon, Norman, and Dane we may be, but Americans all, in our devotion to our American ideas of home, of freedom, and of national unity and growth. In the name of that unity, in the name of our own people, of our past, of our present, and of our glorious future, we of the West ask that you should not put this cup to our lips; we plead with you that this unnecessary, ineffective, un-Republican, and unjust legislation shall not pass. For me, with all my strength, whatever it may be, in the name of duty, in the name of plain duty, if you will, and of the rights of these people and of all the people I shall vote and I shall work against this measure. [Applause.]

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman, if this bill should pass this House, or a similar bill should pass Congress, then the tobacco farmer and the tobacco manufacturer in my State will look upon this legislation as another of the aftermath curses of acquiring the Philippine Islands by the United States Government. I tender my profound sympathy to the beet-sugar men in this House who arraign their party for breaking its pledges, but do not dare to go to the extent of denouncing it.

I desire to express my opinion, in a parliamentary way, I hope, about that great party and its attitude on this question. That it is a great party is unquestionably true. You can get the amplest testimony upon this side of the House to that fact when we have been overrun and overslaughed by it for nearly half a century. But, Mr. Chairman, there is something about this party that I arraign here to-day upon this legislation. I arraign it as a Democrat; I arraign it upon its long-continued policy and upon a departure from it, of the very foundation stone of it, which is its professed protection to American industries. And yet here is a bill that palpably repudiates that policy.

Eminent gentlemen upon the floor of this House, members of the Ways and Means Committee, to escape the charge of direct inconsistency within recent years in utterances, were driven to the expedient of saying, in effect: "Wise men change their opinions." The Republican party moves in a mysterious manner politically. It has adopted for its motto, for it is a worldly-wise body, and acts upon it: "Assume a virtue if you have it not." This party has inscribed upon its banners the words "God and morality," and it moves almost invincibly forward to its triumphs with the honest poor and the predatory rich fighting side by side. It is allied with the trusts and the corporate wealth of this country, and yet it despoils and exploits mankind in the name of humanity. If it covets its neighbor's land, this Republican party denounces "criminal aggression," and then, with flaming rifle and fixed bayonet, it moves into its neighbor's possessions and "benevolently assimilates" them. Eloquent gentlemen upon the other side of the House have arraigned their own party for breaking its pledges. Is not that arraignment true? I desire to read an extract from the campaign Republican text-book of 1900:

That duty [Porto Rican] was small, but it was an explicit declaration by the Republican party that it proposed to retain the power to fix such tariff as it might deem judicious against the product of cheap tropical labor wherever located and under whatever conditions. In other words, it was a distinct promise to the farmer that he need not fear that the Republican party would permit the cheap labor and cheap sugar of any tropical territory to be brought in in a manner that would destroy the infant industry of beet-sugar production which the farmers of the United States have, under the fostering care of the Republican party, been building up during the last few years.

Now, sir, I contend that that pledge was a pledge in principle, and that this Republican pledge went out to every infant industry that related to the farming industries of this country. I desire to arraign the Republican party for their broken pledge to the American tobacco farmer and tobacco manufacturer, the value of whose products will be lowered by competition with cheap oriental labor if this bill passes. More particularly I

speak of the Florida tobacco farmer and the Florida tobacco manufacturer, whose interests are identical, so far as this bill is concerned. The Republican party is in supreme control of this Government. They are responsible for legislation. This bill is of Republican origin. They are responsible for its effect upon the American tobacco farmer and American tobacco manufacturer. It is unnecessary for me to discuss what the tobacco duty would be in amount were the Democrats in control of national legislation. It is sufficient to say that they are not in such control. The Republican party has built up largely by the McKinley and the Dingley tariff duties upon tobacco a prosperous and rapidly growing tobacco industry in the State of Florida. This is the testimony of tobacco planters and of the manufacturer. The tobacco farmer and the tobacco manufacturer are alike prosperous. Now, the political party that built up this tobacco industry proposes to throw it down. It proposes to reduce three-quarters at once the tariff duties upon Philippine tobacco, and in a few years to abolish the tariff duties entirely upon importations of tobacco from the Philippine Islands. And this is done upon two flimsy reasons; two impertinent reasons. First, that such removal will not injure the tobacco interests of this country; second, that the American people owe this legislative concession and benefit to the people of the Philippine Islands, whom the controlling Republican leadership are pleased to call the "wards of the nation."

It seems to me that I have heard those words used in past years by leading Republican statesmen in alluding to the negroes of the Southern States. Many of these negroes are now raising tobacco in the State of Florida upon lands owned by themselves. Some are getting good wages paid for their labor in the tobacco fields of others. Still others are engaged as laborers in tobacco factories in that State at profitable wages. Far back in the years gone by the Republican party promised to these negroes that long looked for but never possessed "40 acres and a mule." If the promise was not made by the party itself, still it was conveyed to these simple folk by that horde of Republican adventurers poured out from the North upon the Southern States, that robbed the white and black alike.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this question of testifying in the House by Members of this House as to the effect of this legislation and what they saw in the Philippine Islands is largely a matter of speculative, theoretical guessing of Congressmen upon the effect of proposed legislation upon industries. Opposed to these guesses and these speculations is the testimony of business men in the professions and businesses to be affected by this legislation. What is the testimony of Mr. G. W. Perkins, president of the Cigar Manufacturers' International Union? I am not vouching now for these statements. They are in the testimony, they are embodied in the record before the Ways and Means Committee, and I give them to you merely for what they are worth:

STATEMENT BY G. W. PERKINS.

The bill proposed to reduce the tariff on the cigars manufactured in the Philippine Islands and to have absolute free trade within four years from now is solely in the interest of the foreign corporations and the American Tobacco Company, which is largely controlled by the Standard Oil interests.

When W. C. Whitney, the ex-Secretary of the Navy, a Standard Oil man, died, he left to his estate between $6,000,000 and $7,000,000 worth of stocks in the American Tobacco Company. About one-half of the cigar factories in the Philippine Islands are controlled by the Chinese manufacturers, and with the number of Chinamen (to be ascertained at Washington) now in the island will monopolize the cigar trade as they did prior to the exclusion act in San Francisco.

Prior to the passage of this Chinese-exclusion act in 1882 the cigar factories of San Francisco employed only 40 American citizens and over 6,500 Chinamen.

The bill proposed means that the Chinese-exclusion act, so far as it relates to the cigar industry, will be nullified completely by now reducing the tariff and ultimately establishing free trade.

Here is the statement of J. W. Upson, who represented the tobacco growers of the State of New York. What is the occasion of this legislation? Speaking for those he represents, he said:

They believe if this bill were to be introduced without the prestige of the Administration, without the insular government, without Secretary Taft putting the whip and spur, and the members of this outfit were to go on the floor, each and every man voting, you would not have enough votes to accomplish anything. That is what they wanted me to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you not think that is rather a low estimate of the House of Representatives?

Mr. UPSON. Well, it is an absolute fact. I do not believe there is a man in this house, or anywhere, that knows it any better than you do.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sorry that I can not agree with you.

Mr. UPSON. I believe you are one of the pattest tariff men naturally that there is around this board. You know this is only my guess.

I suppose he has a right to guess on this subject, as he has a very great interest in the matter.

I have a printed letter sent to me from Davenport, Iowa, of date December 30, 1905, addressed "To the honorable Members of the Fifty-ninth Congress," and signed "Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 172."

A paragraph from that letter reads as follows:

Gentlemen, if this bill successfully passes your honorable body, you are playing into the hands of the American Tobacco Company, who are the promoters and beneficiary of this bill.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] made the point that if the protected manufacturing interests of Pennsylvania and other great interests of the North and East were in danger from competition from the Philippine Islands, we would have no House bill No. 3. It does not require a Congressman to say that. It is evident to every intelligent mind in the country.

I desire to read an extract from the testimony of the statement of Mr. D. A. Shaw, of Quincy, Fla., before the Ways and Means Committee, representing the Florida Tobacco Company. He says:

It is argued that the Filipino operates in such a crude way that their development will be so slow as not to affect us. Suppose they had vast coal and iron fields there that would compete with us here, do you suppose for a moment that our coal barons and coal-road magnates would not consider their interests in great danger? No; they would marshal their brightest intellects and their untold millions to exclude this competition.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Do you think that they have not coal there?

Mr. SHAW. Then let coal and iron be put on the free list. Let steel rails be put on the free list. I am supposing a case. Coal and iron, of course, have to be contiguous to be profitable. Suppose the two were combined in one nice place like this at Birmingham.

The CHAIRMAN. Everything is put on the free list after 1909.

Mr. SHAW. I am showing that if they could export these things out of their country it would hurt the Americans. That is my supposition.

The CHAIRMAN. We have had people here talking about sugar, and we have had the tobacco men here, and now you are bringing in the iron and steel manufactures. Another dream.

Mr. SHAW. We think that we are wide awake. We may be doped to such an extent that we do not know whether we are awake or dreaming, but we think we are wide awake.

Now, Mr. Chairman, whose opinions on the floor of this House are worth the most, the speculative, guessing opinions of Members of this House or of men who for years and years have had their money employed in tobacco raising and tobacco manufacturing, and who in some cases have inherited through direct descent, for half a century or more, these tillable farms and these valuable manufacturing plants?

Here is a statement of Mr. Joseph H. Pierce, of Connecticut, before the Ways and Means Committee:

Mr. PIERCE. I am a tobacco raiser, and I have been one for fifty years, and have made my bread and butter that way. I have very little to say, but I want to say one thing, that I am totally opposed to any reduction of the duty on tobacco as it stands to-day. I have got that much to say, and I know it will be of great detriment to us if the duty is reduced.

Here is the testimony of Mr. Phelps, of Connecticut, before the Ways and Means Committee:

Now, I have been a grower of tobacco for the last sixty years or sixty-five years, and we have had jeopardies to conted with, and we do not want at this time any introduction of foreign wrappers to compete with us. It is as much as we can do to compete with the production of wrappers in our own country. We have to-day a large amount of money invested in buildings and tools and appurtenances for the growing and curing of tobacco, and we do not want the business to be menaced by a bill that will introduce any foreign wrappers at a less rate than under the Dingley bill of $1.85.

I most heartily agree with all that my friend Mr. Upson has said. He is a coworker with us in the Connecticut Valley. We know him from away back—truthful, honest, and well-meaning from beginning to end.

I do not wish to engage your attention for any length of time. I wish to be very brief, and in being brief I wish to report again that our people are unqualifiedly opposed to any reduction of the Dingley bill.

But I say those wrappers, in spite of the 46½ cents duty, would come here in competition with our wrappers. What is the reason those wrappers would not come here? I say they would.

Mr. Chairman, it is the testimony of business men, not the testimony of guessing, speculating Members in this House, as to what their opinions would be upon the growers and tobacco manufacturers of this country if this duty is reduced in part or altogether in the States for a few years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what has been the history of tobacco manufacturers in this country under this protective policy? I will read a short statement from Mr. Walter A. Schiffer's testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. He represents the united cigar manufacturers of New York City. He says:

The cigar-manufacturing industry of this country has been built up to its present magnitude mainly through the protective tariff that has been in operation since the close of the civil war. To absolutely prove this assertion I beg to refer you to the statistics of the internal-revenue department. Previous to the year 1864 there were manufactured in this country less than 200,000,000 cigars per annum. Within the next ten years the industry increased to 1,779,000,000. In each decade the trade under a protective tariff has increased as follows:

1880	2,367,000,000
1890	4,087,000,000
1900	5,963,000,000

During the fiscal year 1905 the cigar-manufacturing trade of the United States produced 7,589,337,206 cigars, paying the Government $20,976,091.95 internal-revenue tax and $20,482,809.99 import duties on tobaccos.

And it suggests itself to me that an industry which pays this Gov-

ernment such a large amount of money should be seriously considered before taking any action that would affect its interest.

This wonderful development has been possible for the reason that our industry has been directly fostered by a protective tariff.

I desire to read also a paragraph from the statement of Mr. J. L. McFarlin, of Quincy, Fla. He is largely interested in tobacco culture in Gadsden County, of that State. He is a man of fine general information, and his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee is entitled to much consideration. He says:

In Florida there are in four counties more than $10,000,000 invested in the culture of tobacco, giving employment, including those who are engaged in it, to no less than 100,000 people. The annual production from this State alone is over 4,000,000 pounds, and the value is more than $1,000,000. This industry is now in its infancy, for I am speaking more particularly of what you might term an "artificial" tobacco, or that grown under cloth or slats. For years the people of Florida in these counties have experimented and battled, with success, to grow a tobacco that would compete with Sumatra, and just as it has passed the experimental stage, and as they can now see the dawn of success, to have this industry crippled and perhaps totally destroyed by legislation and for the benefit, not of our equal or our fellow-man, but for a lower class of cheap and worthless mongrel labor, seems to me an injustice.

If given the same protection that we have enjoyed in the past in a few years these three States that I have mentioned above will produce enough tobacco of the finer grades, comparing with the Sumatra, to supply the United States. This will mean the taking place of 37,000 bales of Sumatra annually imported and valued at more than $6,000,000.

So I might read, Mr. Chairman, the views of others. Coming to this practical point, I wish to direct your attention to the development of that industry in Florida. In 1894 the people of that State raised but one-half acre of shade-grown tobacco. The past year they had the large area of 3,000 acres grown in the shade and a product of more than 12,000 bales. All this goes to show, Mr. Chairman, that the tobacco industry of this country has grown and prospered under a high protective tariff.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the results of all this protection are to be jeopardized, if these experts who grow this tobacco and manufacture it are to be believed and are thought to be sincere. Then the industries on the farm and in the shop are to be ruined if this bill gives such opportunity of free competition to the importation of foreign-grown products. I decline to treat the Philippines, as a Democrat on the floor of this House, other than as my party says, as political outsiders. They are here in the body of this Government as a mere political asset. If the Democrats to-day had possession of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and the Presidency, and were true to their platform utterances, they would part with these islands, and wish them godspeed, with a reservation possibly of enough land for a naval base and coal-supply station for this country. Therefore, if that is the attitude of the Democratic party, why, as American citizens, should we throw down the barriers which the Republican party has erected heretofore between foreign tobacco products and those of the United States?

It will be time enough when the Democratic party wins a battle in this country sufficient to control its Presidency and the two Houses of Congress to discuss what this industry in my State shall suffer by way of reduction of tariff duties under what we call the Democratic doctrine of a tariff limited to the raising of revenue. That question is not before this House at this time. I take the Republican party upon its own declarations, upon its pledges to the people of the United States, that they would protect this industry if they would go into it. That brings me to the point that many of the Republicans of this body—those who have lately visited the Philippine Islands—have made. It is idle for them to say that that country is not fertile and that the labor there is in such a condition that it will never compete with this country. Who is able to say that the output in sugar cane and tobacco in those islands, under the influence of capital, with improved methods and better cultivation, can not successfully compete with and break down the American raised and manufactured products?

Now, the very same gentlemen, Members of this body, who visited these islands in the last year, have testified on the floor of this House; and I know of nothing more amusing than to witness such amateur expressions of opinion in opposition to the testimony of those familiar by experience with the subject, and in opposition also to the testimony of Government experts. It may be very ingenuous, but yet it is not very interesting to those whose industries will be adversely affected by this legislation. Mr. Chairman, there is no better judge of the fertility of the Philippine Islands and their adaptation to raising tobacco and their capacity to raise it than the Government experts sent to that country. They are presumably sent there by this Government because of their technical knowledge—their expert knowledge—and it is idle for Members of this House to interpose their jests and their jokes about the virtue or excellence of Philippine cigars against the testimony of these Government experts. Here is a pamphlet sent out, marked "Farmers' Bulletin No. 5," upon the cultivation of tobacco, by Clarence W. Dorsey, soil physicist, in charge of soil investigations, and dated Manila, P. I., April 22, 1903. He was sent there by this Government. I have here his letter transmitting his report to the Bureau of Agriculture. In that letter occurs this language, in writing about tobacco:

The cultivation of this profitable crop deserves more widespread attention, for the soil and climatic conditions in many parts of the Philippines are favorable for growing tobacco that can successfully compete with the finest grades produced in the world.

Again he says in his report:

Philippine tobacco has long been held in high esteem in the Orient, and Manila cigars maintain the same rank in Eastern countries that Habana cigars occupy in Europe and America. To-day tobacco stands third among the exports from the Philippines.

And again here is his language:

The markets of the United States offer every inducement for the improvement and spread of the Philippine tobacco industry. This becomes all the more evident when we consider the vast sums of money annually expended by the United States for foreign tobacco. During the year ending June 30, 1900, the United States, according to official statistics of the agricultural imports of the United States, paid for Cuban tobacco $7,615,991 United States currency and $4,569,271 United States currency for Sumatra tobacco. During the same year the Philippines exported to the United States only a few hundred dollars' worth of tobacco, or less than one-hundredth of 1 per cent of the tobacco importations of that country.

Now listen. This testimony in Mr. Dorsey's report has much significance to the American tobacco raiser and manufacturer:

While it may be true that Philippine tobacco may never entirely supplant Cuban and Sumatra tobacco in the United States, there is certainly every inducement to encourage and improve the industry until modern cultural methods have realized to the fullest extent the highest perfection of the crop.

Now, in conclusion, this Government expert (not an amateur Congressional witness), whose opinion is valuable from the simple fact that he knows what he is talking about, concludes his report with this language:

The author is of the opinion that the Philippine Islands can and should produce cigar-filler tobacco that is fully equal to the finest product of the famous Vuelta Abajo district in Cuba and a cigar wrapper equal to Sumatra tobacco. With careful attention to soil and climatic conditions, it is believed districts can be found that will raise tobacco similar in flavor and aroma to that grown in the best districts of Turkey. These results can only be obtained, however, by persistent, intelligent, well-directed efforts on the part of the planters.

Now, Mr. Chairman, within the past ten years this tobacco industry—tobacco grown under shade, the Sumatra tobacco—in the State of Florida was in its most crude condition. The tobacco farmers labored under this disadvantage—the want of improved up-to-date cultural methods. But home capital and capital from the North and from the West have invested in my State, and the consequence is that in a statement issued last year the Department of Agriculture of this Government made this declaration:

Florida tobacco growers have experimented with methods of shading, cultivating, fertilizing, harvesting, and handling cigar tobacco and have developed an industry of vast importance. To-day they are producing the highest class tobacco grown in the United States, employing methods they have originated and put into actual practice.

Now, Mr. Chairman, partly under the stimulus of the McKinley protection and the stimulus of the Dingley rates, under Republican protection, my State has built up an industry which the Department of Agriculture calls one of vast importance. And yet you Republicans, taking your own Government expert's testimony as correct, propose to do that which your party leaders said a few years ago you would not do, namely, to put twelve millions of Malays in competition with the American tobacco grower and the American manufacturer.

I do not believe that the tobacco farmer in my State or in any other State in this Union believes that the Filipino himself could produce that tobacco in the next five years that would sacrifice his interests. But they know very well that with soil and climatic conditions favorable, with the cheap labor there, money from the United States and from foreign states will enter that fruitful and fertile country, and there manufacture the raw article which, imported into this country free of duty, will strike down these Florida industries and these interests throughout the United States, built up under the McKinley and Dingley rates—a policy against which I enter my protest, and I do it as a Democrat. I do it without in any way committing myself to the policy of protection. I impeach the sincerity of the Republican party which makes a pledge to the American tobacco farmer and the American tobacco manufacturer and then deliberately breaks it.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. LAMAR. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Does the gentleman doubt that the Philippine Islands now constitute part of the United States?

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman, I decline to go into any constitutional or technical discussion with reference to those islands, their occupancy, control, possession, or ownership by this Government. It is sufficient for me to say to you, my distinguished friend from Kentucky, and every other Democrat on the floor of this House, that if you had the power to-morrow you would say to them "Go in peace," for that is the practical effect of your political attitude; it is mine, it is Mr. Bryan's, it is the platform declaration of the Democratic party, and I decline as a practical question on the floor of this House to sacrifice the interests of the people of Florida on this bill because the Republican party desires to break its pledges to the tobacco grower and manufacturer.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. But will not the gentleman concede that if the Philippine Islands constitute a part of the United States, then it is not within the authority of Congress to impose a tariff against the import of their product to the United States proper?

Mr. LAMAR. I am willing my friend shall entertain what opinions he pleases about the islands and their relation to this Government. I have expressed mine. Whenever the Democratic party gets into power—if it ever does get into power—and gets the President and the Senate and the House, then when this proposition to make a tariff bill, whether a duplicate of the Wilson bill or a better bill, comes up, and it is proposed to cut down protected industries, then it will be time enough for the tobacco growers and manufacturers in Florida to appear before that committee and say what will be such a reduction, if any, of the McKinley or Dingley rate as will put them on a fair footing with other industries in this country. I am taking it as a practical question now, and am addressing my remarks to the House from a Democratic standpoint, and arraigning the Republican party for withdrawing the protection to the people of Florida which they have guaranteed. They have permitted an industry to be built up partly under the shelter of the McKinley and Dingley bills, and now they propose to withdraw that protection, to withdraw the shield, and allow the Philippine Islands, with their fertile soil, with their own cheap labor, with American and foreign capital training and directing it, to produce a raw product of the finest tobacco and ship it in here and break down the industries that have grown up in the State of Florida largely under a Republican tariff bill. I protest against it and will vote against it. I am addressing my remarks to the Republicans of this body.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Will the gentleman allow me a question? I know he is thoroughly familiar with tobacco growing.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. LAMAR. Certainly.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Why has not that splendid tobacco come into the United States during the past three years when it has had a preference of $170 a ton?

Mr. LAMAR. I will say to the gentleman frankly——

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. The gentleman recognizes that it has had a 25 per cent preference over any other tobacco?

Mr. LAMAR. I will say frankly that, reading the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, I believe that the tobacco industry in the Philippine Islands has declined in the last few years. Why? When the Spanish masters had them by the neck they made them work; they demanded a better material.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Does the gentleman expect that the American people are going to do the same thing that the Spanish masters did—take them by the neck and make them work?

Mr. LAMAR. They won't be the Spanish masters in the same way or in the same sense, but wherever and whenever the American Tobacco Company, with its capital and other American and foreign capital besides, puts its money into the Philippine Islands, buys these fertile lands, and works, trains, and makes experts of its cheap labor, then they will be the complete masters of the Philippine Islands and of the American market as the steel-protected industry here to-day is master of the American market, and that to such an extent that you can buy articles manufactured by them cheaper abroad than you can buy them in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. LAMAR. I will conclude, Mr. Chairman, in five minutes, if there is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks five minutes. Is there objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAMAR. Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the reduction upon importation of tobacco from Porto Rico and the effect on the tobacco trade in this country from that small and unfertile isle, here is the testimony of Mr. Perkins before the Ways and Means Committee, as to cigars imported from Porto Rico. He is the president of the Cigar Makers' International Union. He says:

> Of the cigars imported from Porto Rico, which competition is now felt severely and will be felt much stronger during periods of trade depression, the American cigar trust controls over 40 per cent.

It runs through all this testimony, like a scarlet thread, that the American Tobacco Company—the American tobacco trust—and the Standard Oil interests are the real interests to be benefited in the Philippine Islands and in the American market.

It will not help the Filipino people directly. They will be merely an adjunct to this foreign and domestic capital in their own country, competing against the Florida tobacco grower and the Florida tobacco manufacturer, and against the American tobacco farmer and manufacturer everywhere. That is why the Florida farmer protests and the Florida manufacturer protests, and that is why the tobacco interests all over this country, with but few exceptions, protest against the passage of this bill. This bill from our standpoint is not a bill to help the Filipinos. It is a bill to exploit and despoil the Filipinos. It is a bill that substitutes in lieu of Spanish rule American and foreign money rule—that money rule which seeks to exploit that fertile isle; which seeks to take its fertile soil that needs no fertilizer, and with its cheap labor added, to overwhelm the American tobacco farmer and the American tobacco manufacturer. That is why I protest on the floor of this House as a Democrat against the passage of this Republican measure. It is a breach of the faith that the Republican party entered into with the tobacco raisers of Florida and the tobacco people of every other State when they shielded those infant industries a few years ago with almost prohibitive tariff duties—industries in the State of Florida declared by the Agricultural Department to be already of vast importance. Just as they are getting upon their feet and prospering you Republicans propose to knock their supports from under them. It is that, Mr. Chairman, to which I object, and I rest my objection just upon that point. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah. Mr. Chairman, the prolonged discussion on the bill now before the House has already brought out a great deal of valuable information on the subject of cane and beet sugar and tobacco, both here at home and in the Philippines. I might correctly say that the ground has been completely covered by those who have spoken here, whether for or against the measure. I desire, however, to briefly state the reasons that impel me to oppose this bill.

It is with considerable regret that I find myself in this position of opposition. I am particularly distressed by the knowledge that my views on the subject at issue are at variance with those of the leaders of my party on this question. I do not forget that the veteran members of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means who have reported this bill occupy a place, a very important place, in the galaxy of leaders of the great Republican party. Some of them for almost a generation have been leaders in that grand party and as such have ably done their part in proclaiming and championing the doctrine of protection to American labor and industries. Their speeches and expositions of political principles have crystallized into party declarations and have formed the text-books for handing down the traditions and teaching the principles of Republicanism.

I had my training in the school of Republicanism and my text-books were the teachings of these leaders, and because of this training I am convinced that my opposition to this measure is amply justified.

Having the honor to represent here on this floor a State in which beet sugar is produced in large quantities, I shall devote myself entirely to a consideration of the effects of the present measure on this particular industry, leaving to others better posted regarding cane sugar and tobacco the task of detailing the consequences to them.

I sincerely believe that this present measure is a serious menace to the beet-sugar industry of the United States. Without doubt it will check and retard its further development and threaten its very existence.

The origin of the beet-sugar industry in the United States is directly traceable to the protective policy that has long char-

acterized our Government under Republican administration. That patriot and statesman, the beloved William McKinley, as chairman, in his time, of the Ways and Means Committee of this House, reported the wise tariff measure that ever afterwards bore his name. This measure provided for a governmental bounty of 2 cents on every pound of beet sugar raised within our borders. Under the stimulus of this bounty and the confidence inspired by it the first six beet-sugar factories in the United States were established, and thus was inaugurated an industry which has since grown to wonderfully encouraging proportions.

But this wonderfully encouraging growth did not go on uninterruptedly or without hindrance. Just as the stimulus of the McKinley bill had begun to be felt in the erection of beet-sugar factories the American people, allured by the siren voice of the free-trade party masquerading as tariff reformers, intrusted to that party the control of the Government, with the result that the withering blight of its administration fell upon the country during the years from 1892 to 1896. The beet-sugar industry, like all others, was seriously affected and passed through an exceedingly critical period of its existence. During these distressing years no new factories were projected or erected, as the following figures will show:

[Quantities in tons of 2,240 pounds.]

Year.	Factories in operation.	Sugar produced.
1892	6	12,018
1893	6	19,550
1894	5	20,092
1895	6	29,220
1896	7	37,536
1897	9	40,399
1898	15	32,471
1899	31	72,944
1900	34	76,859
1901	39	163,126
1902	44	195,463
1903[a]	53	208,135
1904	51	209,000

[a] The last year before Cuban reciprocity took effect.

But after this severe object lesson, with a return to sanity of those who had gone astray and with the Republican party once more at the helm, confidence was again restored, the Dingley bill was speedily enacted, and the wheels of industry began to hum as they had never hummed before. It is only since the beginning of this last era of confidence and prosperity that the beet-sugar industry has really had a fair chance to grow and develop and show its possibilities.

It is interesting to note in this connection that when the Dingley bill was under consideration in the House the schedules were vehemently assailed by the Democratic minority, but their attacks were as vigorously met by the gentleman from New York, the able chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as others. On that occasion he said:

> Now, we went at the sugar question with the idea in view to put sufficient duty to give us enough revenue and at the same time to enable us to raise sugar in this country. We want to build up the sugar industry in the United States.

Again, during that discussion, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], in the course of an eloquent speech upon the doctrine of protection—and I will say his speeches are always able and convincing—expressed himself as follows:

> We will give to the sugar producer of Louisiana an opportunity to enlarge its products and to turn over some of the splendid lands of that beautiful State to the production of sugar instead of corn, cotton, and other products of the soil; and so, Mr. Chairman, throughout Nebraska, through Kansas, and all of the States of the Union the Republican party comes and offers this boon. We will protect the industries of the country in all directions from further demoralization, and we ask you to turn aside hundreds of thousands of acres of the splendid lands of all of these States from the production of corn, oats, wheat, potatoes and cotton, to put into an already over-stocked market, to the production of sugar, and give to the farmers upon farming lands of the country a better market with less competition than they now have.

These are some of the characteristic expressions of the leaders of the Republican party at that time, and clearly indicate their attitude and determination to foster and protect the beet-sugar industry.

I mention here, and take great pride in the fact, that my own State was in the forefront of this movement and has the distinction of building the first factory to be equipped entirely with American-made machinery.

We have now five factories in operation, with an annual capacity of about 50,000 tons of sugar and a capital of about $8,000,000. We are not only supplying our home requirements, but export about three-fourths of our production to other parts as far east as the Missouri River. [Applause.]

No industry in our country ever responded more promptly to or more completely justified the wisdom of the policy of protection than did the beet-sugar industry. [Applause.] With rare exceptions, wherever it has been undertaken in the United States it has proved eminently successful. So that the production of sugar has so greatly increased in the short space of five years that about 50 per cent of the total sugar output of this whole country, leaving out our insular possessions, is now credited to sugar beets. This fact alone demonstrates conclusively that beet-sugar production in this country is a commercial success, a success which, in my opinion, will be entirely overcome if this bill becomes a law.

Three million acres out of a total of half a billion acres of improved land in the United States, or 1 acre out of every 170 of our improved lands, if devoted to sugar would supply all our home needs; not only would it do this, but the withdrawal of such an acreage from the production of the ordinary farm crops would tend to improve the market for other crops by removing that surplus of production over actual needs which the farmer now has to contend with.

I have shown that from 1897 up to 1902 no cloud was on the horizon to darken the seemingly bright future of this new and vigorous infant industry; to all appearances it had become the settled policy of the Republican party to hasten the time when our country should produce a large portion, if not all, that it consumed of sugar, and the hope was that such a time would speedily arrive. The national irrigation law was everywhere hailed, not only as a means of creating homes for the homeless, but also as vastly enlarging the possibilities and hastening the development of the beet-sugar industry. The whole course of legislation denoted on the part of the Republican party a pride and satisfaction in its success and a guaranty for the future.

I feel confident that the production of beet sugar in this country would have been vastly greater even than it is to-day if the question of Cuban reciprocity and free trade with the Philippines had never been agitated; but since both these propositions have been brought forward and supported by hitherto champions of protection confidence in the future of this industry has yielded to uncertainty and is now giving place to anxiety.

It would be difficult to estimate the many benefits which have resulted to the agricultural communities where these factories have been built. Not only is the farmer who raises a crop of sugar beets assured of a ready cash market for his crop, which is one that does not enter into competition with other products of the farm, but also does it enhance the value of his land and induces him to adopt more scientific methods in his agriculture and adds to the diversity of his crops. Further than this, it gives an impetus to every branch of business, which is reflected throughout the entire community. [Applause.]

A majority of the majority of the able members of the committee who reported this bill have, I believe, recommended its passage. They profess to believe, and undoubtedly do believe, that the development of the cane-sugar industry in the Philippines which will follow the removal of the present tariff does not portend any injury to the competing beet-sugar industry of our country.

The arguments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] along the line of sustaining their position singularly harmonize with those of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] against all forms of protection. [Applause.]

The position of the minority, however, in the light of past history, is much more consistent, for they are free traders by tradition and principle. They would go much farther, even to the extent of greatly reducing the tariff on coal, iron, steel, glass, and other important manufactures, so that the industries engaged in the production of these things would be exposed to world competition, regardless of the disastrous effects of such action. The interests affected by this proposed legislation have never for a moment counted on any assistance or special consideration from the free-trade minority, but have in perfect good faith, I maintain, counted on the necessary protection from the majority. If there ever has been one principle more than another of the Republican party that was basic and fundamental, it is that of protection—that principle which says that the higher level of the intelligent and well-paid labor of America must be maintained and guarded against the lower level of industrial Europe, and particularly the swarming millions in the Orient. [Applause.] On the other hand, the Democratic party from time immemorial has taken the opposite view.

It has been the persistent argument of the tariff reformer and free trader that the American laborer by reason of his superior

intelligence and greater efficiency can successfully compete with the labor of the whole world. But this plausible argument of our free-trade friends has been vigorously and successfully met and disproved, as, of course, it could not prevail against the cold logic of facts.

The pending measure leads, however, to a reversal of the hitherto uniform course of legislation on this subject; it involves a departure from that principle of government which has done so much for the industrial developement of our country that its commerce is now become the wonder of the nations. It means that the farmer engaged in the growing of sugar beets will have now to compete with the cheapest labor and lowest level of living on the globe. One can not forbear the question, What becomes of the promises made by leaders in this House, in party platforms, and in public messages?

Why are we so concerned and gravely apprehensive as to the consequences of this proposed legislation? I will tell you. The situation that confronts us is the certainty that the inducements of low-priced productive lands and an abundance of cheap oriental labor in addition to the bounty amounting to about $1.40 per hundredweight will so stimulate the production of sugar in the Philippines that it, entering our ports, will precipitate a contest with our own sugar, with the results that our markets will be totally demoralized and the beet-sugar industry finally wiped out. A crushing blow will thus be dealt to the intelligent American farmer, for this industry has benefited him directly and indirectly more than any other.

In the extended hearings that have been held apropos of this measure the Committee on Ways and Means have listened to a great mass of conflicting testimony and argument. Some things, however, have been established beyond controversy. It appears that the total area of the Philippine Islands is 73,000,000 acres; that about 50,000,000 acres of this is forest land, leaving of arable coast and uplands about 23,000,000 acres. Approximately 30 per cent of the latter, some 7,000,000 acres, is now in private ownership, leaving 16,000,000 acres to be disposed of in tracts of 2,500 acres for sugar production. But there are vast areas of public lands much easier of reclamation than our western sagebrush prairies which can be converted into excellent and profitable cane plantations.

Now, let us consider for a moment the results of this policy in the light of past experience. Since 1875 we have had free trade with Hawaii. What has been the result? In 1875 Hawaii produced 11,197 tons of sugar. Under the stimulus of free access to our markets she now produces from 350,000 to 400,000 tons upon an area of only 100,000 acres, which is merely one one hundred and sixtieth part of the arable public lands in the Philippines adapted to sugar. Cuba, since obtaining a preferential of 34 cents per hundredweight, has doubled her production of sugar. Porto Rico has done likewise. Now, what is to hinder a vast increase of production in the Philippines? It is generally conceded that the natural conditions are ideal—soil, climate, and so forth—and that with up-to-date methods and machinery the industry will be enormously profitable. Where great profits are in sight the history of the world is that difficulties melt away and all obstacles are overcome. [Applause.]

Again, Japan, exultant over her success in her recent contest, is ready to begin a struggle for commercial laurels. On the Pacific coast are already heard mutterings of anxiety over the influx of Japanese to this country. Here is an opportunity for them to go to the Philippines, right at their doors, as it were, and reap the rich harvest resulting from free trade with the United States, the best market that the world affords.

Sugar cane is raised by Philippine labor at from 17 to 20 cents per day, while American farm labor ranges from $1 to $2 per day. The present tariff rate on sugar from the islands is $1.26 per hundredweight for 96° sugar, with a proportionate decrease for every degree of less purity. This bill proposes to take off all but 25 per cent of this duty, which will give importers of Philippine raw sugar a further reduction of about $12.60 per ton, or 63 cents per hundredweight, on all sugar brought from the islands to the States until 1909, and then absolute free trade. With a restoration to normal conditions and modern methods it is impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy the extent to which production of sugar will increase.

The adoption of the policy embodied in this measure means, in effect, that we insure the Philippine producers of sugar against every other country a bounty to the extent of $1.68½ per hundredweight for every hundredweight they raise of 96° purity, and against Cuba's production to the extent of $1.32 per hundredweight. In other words, the policy is one of fostering and encouraging by a most liberal bounty the cane-sugar industry in the Tropics into competition with our own beet-sugar industry, a policy wholly unique and contrary to that of every other beet-sugar country in the world.

Now, it is claimed by some of the advocates of this measure that while it is intended to and undoubtedly will stimulate the production and raise the price of sugar in the Philippines, our home industry need have no fear of injury to its own markets thereby; that the mere potentiality of free entrance to our ports will enable the Philippine producer to control the oriental markets of China and Japan to the extent of obtaining for his product the United States price, less transportation and insurance charges, without this free entrance ever becoming actual. At the same time it is frankly admitted by the advocates of this bill that they expect to export to the United States vast quantities of sugar. This argument is so palpably absurd and fallacious that a moment's investigation will make it plain. The buyers of China and Japan will buy according to their needs in the world's markets. If sugar is quoted higher at Iloilo than at Java or elsewhere, then Iloilo need not expect to sell. The mere potentiality of free entrance of Philippine sugar to our ports will not raise the price of sugar produced in other countries to any appreciable extent, and the result will be that the entire Philippine product above that consumed at home will be disposed of in this country, and our own market will be depressed to an extent dependent upon the total Philippine production. It has required a hundred years of protection to develop the beet-sugar industry in Europe to its present state of perfection. It is now firmly established, as the following figures on European production will show:

Total beet-sugar production.

Country.	1900-1901.	1901-2.	1902-3.	1903-4.	1904-5.
Europe:	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*
Germany	1,984,187	2,305,013	1,762,461	1,927,681	1,575,000
Austria	1,094,043	1,301,548	1,057,692	1,167,959	893,000
France	1,113,893	1,123,545	883,210	804,308	625,000
Russia	918,898	1,098,983	1,256,311	1,206,907	240,000
Belgium	333,119	324,960	224,090	203,446	173,000
Holland	178,081	203,193	102,411	123,551	125,000
Other countries	367,919	393,236	325,082	441,116	240,000
Total Europe	5,990,080	6,750,478	5,531,257	5,874,968	4,681,000

It has required time and experience to establish this beet-sugar industry in these countries; no European nation has thought to risk the fate of this beneficent industry to unrestricted competition with the cane sugar of the Tropics. Holland, though possessing Java and the Dutch East Indies, imposes the same duty on sugar from her tropical possessions as from other parts of the world; and in spite of this Java produces 1,000,000 tons of sugar annually to add to the world's supply.

Why can not the people in the Philippines be taught the same lesson of self-reliance instead of being coaxed and pampered in the most unwise and unreasonable way and to the menace and injury of our sugar industry here at home? [Applause.] This policy of unrestricted competition in the production of similar products between an alien oriental race and our own people in the end is bound to produce an intense racial antagonism.

The Philippines came into our possession through the fortunes of war, and until this present time we have been legislating for their immediate welfare and future good. We have assumed the responsibility of guiding them to a higher plane of civilization. They have been a very unfortunate people in the past, but we have given them a system of education, as also the widest opportunity to develop the resources of their country. We have sent them men of high character and great ability—men who are singularly devoted to their interests. No greater proof of this devotion can be cited than the effective intercession of these same men on behalf of the islanders for the legislation embodied in this bill. With such a body of men as has been sent them there—conscientious, powerful, intelligent, and able—with all that goes with experience and wisdom, more has been accomplished and is being accomplished than under any other colonial government in the history of the world.

The honorable Secretary of War, with other powerful allies, has seen fit to enlist himself in the cause of the Filipinos; in the present matter he has brought to bear in favor of this measure his strong personality and forceful ability.

The important duties which he has been called on to perform in connection with the pacification and rehabilitation of the islands has naturally awakened within him a sympathetic interest on account of the unfortunate condition of the inhabitants. But in the consideration of this matter he has approached it from the standpoint of the benefits accruing to the isalnds, while, in my view, the interests of American citizens is the paramount consideration. [Applause.]

It is contended by the advocates of this measure that the sugar and tobacco industries are at present in a languishing condition, while the other industries are doing well. But this is easily accounted for in the light of the successive calamities that have swept over the country, for which we are no wise responsible. The serious consequences of the insurrection were not overcome before an epidemic of "rinderpest" decimated their carabao; then followed successively and devastatingly surra, drought, typhoons, and ladronism, all combining to bring about the unfortunate conditions in these industries now prevailing there. But with the dawn of a brighter day and with an orderly administration affording protection to life and property we will soon be better able to determine what are the normal industrial conditions and capabilities of the island people. Time is the only thing seemingly now needed to a proper working out of their destiny.

In New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, for instance, this industry has not yet been established or tried to any great extent; but the products of the mills and factories of those States—the manufactures of iron and steel, glass and textiles, and all the varied manufactures of those great States are all wisely protected against the cheaper similar products of other countries. In the equipment and construction of our beet-sugar factories we patronize the mills and tool works of the East, all of whose product is protected, while it is here proposed to let this promising industry of ours shift for itself. In other words, the proposed bill discriminates against a new and struggling industry by lowering the tariff which protects it against the Philippines and the sugar trust, but "stands pat" on industries which, by all logical reasoning, are infinitely better able to meet the competition of the world.

This bill is in the interest of, not the natives, the real owners of the islands and the ones entitled to our sympathy, but speculators, exploiters, and capitalists, who alone will profit by it, while the beet-sugar men suffer a corresponding loss, if indeed their industry be not entirely wiped out.

If Pennsylvania or Ohio, and other manufacturing States, for example, were situated as are the beet-sugar sections, I feel certain that not one of their Representatives would have any hesitation in voting to maintain the protection vital to their material welfare. Can not we then confidently and with perfect propriety appeal to the Representatives of these powerful States, which have been the greatest beneficiaries of the principle of protection, to unite with us against this legislation which veils a menace and possible destruction to the beet-sugar industry? Can they expect to escape unscathed when the very fundamental principle which upholds their industries is ruthlessly set aside? If the agriculturist can successfully compete with an alien race in a state of semicivilization, what excuse can be offered for maintaining the tariff wall around those industries which involve a competition with the generously, by comparison, paid labor of Europe?

The legislation now before us for consideration and action defines a policy with respect to these islands that has the elements of permanency; it is not for one, two, or three years only, but for a generation. The future development of the Philippine Islands can not now be foretold. Fifty years ago our domain west of the Missouri was accounted of but little value by great statesmen of that day.

No person, I believe, now opposing this legislation anticipates any phenomenally rapid development of the sugar industry in the Philippines, but there is no escaping the conclusion that in the future, whether immediate or remote, the producers in the United States will have to meet a competition such as no other beet-sugar producers in the world have had to meet before. [Applause.] The prospects presented by these conditions will, in my opinion, retard the development of our industry and place its future absolutely in the power of the sugar trust.

I trust that my apprehensions of this gloomy future will prove to be unfounded. I regard the encouragement of the beet-sugar industry as of vital importance to the welfare of the United States, not alone from an economic standpoint, but also from the fact that its growth in this country means a multiplication of farm homes. And while the farmers of our country have some of the frailties of humanity, it must be conceded that from the farm comes, in large portion, the physical strength, intellectual vigor, and moral stamina that distinguish us as a nation. [Applause.]

I know of no industry where there is less danger of monopoly or unfair division of profits than in that of beet sugar. The manufacturer whose capital is invested in a factory is absolutely dependent on the farmer for his raw materials; any injustice or unfair treatment toward the latter will soon work his undoing.

The farmer of to-day is an intelligent and reasoning man, but he will not be imposed on by the beet-sugar manufacturers, for he has recourse to a variety of profitable crops. He thus compels fair treatment of himself.

The farmers of our land have faith in the patriotism and wisdom of the Republican party. That party has always been true to its declaration of principles. Let us in this case make no exception. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that I shall not be able to add anything to the discussion upon this great public question, but I should feel that I had been derelict in duty, representing as I do upon the floor of this House as intelligent, as patriotic, and as enterprising a constituency as is represented in this great House of Representatives, if I did not give some reason for the faith that is in me, and that will impel the vote that I shall cast upon this question. I shall vote, Mr. Chairman, against the bill proposed by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and I shall likewise oppose, reluctantly as I shall do it, the substitute proposed by the minority of that committee. I dislike at all times not to be able to follow such distinguished Representatives of my party as constitute the minority of that committee; but as a Democrat, believing in the principles of my party, believing in the principles of that party as declared with reference to the Philippine Islands, I can not consistently advocate the doctrine which makes the Philippine Islands a part of American territory, giving to its inhabitants the same privileges that are accorded to our own people.

It has been well said that the Philippine Islands are either wholly foreign or wholly domestic. The distinguished leader of the minority, for whose opinions I have the highest respect, said in his speech on yesterday that it would take seventeen Philadelphia lawyers, who are proverbially smart and learned in the law, to determine exactly what the Supreme Court of the United States had decided with reference to the status of the Philippine Islands. I have heard no Republican declare that status. If I understand the position of the Republican party on that question to-day, it is that they are not yet ready to say what shall be the permanent status of the Philippine Islands with reference to the United States. Taking into consideraion, then, the uncertain position occupied by the United States with reference to the legal status of the islands, the doubtful status in the minds of the Republicans themselves, I prefer as a Democrat, following the principles of my party, following its declared principles on this subject, and that is to treat the Philippine Islands as foreign territory, at least until the time shall arrive when its permanent status shall be irrevocably fixed. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this bill. I am not voting against the minority proposition or the majority bill on the ground that I am in favor of a high protective tariff, for I am not. So far as the industries of my State are concerned, if I believed that the Philippine Islands were a part of this great Republic, I would vote for the minority substitute, because I hold that every citizen of this great Republic wherever the flag floats is entitled to the same rights, the same privileges, the same powers, and the same duties should be exacted of him as of any other citizen wherever he may live. But I do not believe that. It is not true. The Republican party itself does not say it is true. So, for that reason, following Democratic precedents, following the declared purposes of my party, adhering to those principles as they have been declared, I shall vote against it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to one other proposition before I take my seat. Republican Member of Congress after Republican Member of Congress has stood upon his feet on this floor and has referred to the Democratic party as a free-trade party. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and from him on down, every one has declared the Democracy to be a free-trade party. I want to straighten that record, if I can, now. The Democratic party, and I assert it without fear of successful contradiction by even so able, astute, and strong a special pleader as is the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, has never declared for free trade. It is not now for free trade. It never has been for free trade in all of its history. What is the test? Not the declaration made by a member of the party in the heat of debate, however distinguished and able he may be, not the declaration of two or more members of a political party, but the true test, the only test, to determine the faith of any political party is its platform declarations and its legislative enactments when it has the power to make law. If that is a fair test, then I want to invite your attention for a moment or two to what the Democratic party has declared on the subject of tariff.

I go back to the time when the Democratic party as a national organization made its first platform declaration on this subject,

and that was in 1840. From then until now the Democratic party has stood consistently, "in season and out of season," for a tariff as the best means of raising revenue for the support of the Government. In 1840 they said this:

That it is the duty of every branch of the Government to enforce and practice the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government.

In after years, from 1840 down to 1868, they reaffirmed that declaration. In 1868 they said this:

A tariff for revenue upon foreign imports, and such equal taxation under the internal-revenue laws as will afford incidental protection to domestic manufactures, and as will, without impairing the revenue, impose the least burden upon and best promote and encourage the great industrial interests of the country.

In 1872 the convention that nominated Mr. Greeley made this declaration:

We demand a system of Federal taxation which shall not unnecessarily interfere with the industry of the people and which shall provide the means necessary to pay the expenses of the Government, economically administered, the pensions, the interest on the public debt, and a moderate reduction annually of the principal thereof; and recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their Congressional districts and to the decision of the Congress thereon, wholly free from Executive interference or dictation.

The convention in 1872 which nominated Mr. O'Conor said this:

That we favor a judicious tariff for revenue purposes only, and that we are unalterably opposed to class legislation, which enriches a few at the expense of the many, under the plea of protection.

In 1876 we said this:

We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue.

In 1880 our declaration was:

A tariff for revenue only.

In 1884 they said this:

Knowing full well, however, that legislation affecting the operations of the people should be cautious and conservative in method, not in advance of public opinion, but responsive to its demands, the Democratic party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. But in making reduction in taxes it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and the capital thus involved. The process of reform must be subject in the execution to this plain dictate of justice: All taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government. The necessary reduction and taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country. Sufficient revenue to pay all the expenses of the Federal Government, economically administered, including pensions, interest, and principal of the public debt, can be got under our present system of taxation from the custom-house taxes on fewer imported articles, bearing heaviest on articles of luxury and bearing lightest on articles of necessity. We therefore denounce the abuses of the existing tariff, and, subject to the preceding limitations, we demand that Federal taxation shall be exclusively for public purposes and shall not exceed the needs of the Government economically administered.

In 1888 we said:

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by the reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operation.

In the interests of American labor, which should in no event be neglected, the revision of our tax laws contemplated by the Democratic party should promote the advantage of such labor, by cheapening the cost of necessaries of life in the home of every workingman, and at the same time securing to him steady and remunerative employment. Upon this question of tariff reform, so closely concerning every phase of our national life, and upon every question involved in the problem of good government, the Democratic party submits its principles and professions to the intelligent suffrages of the American people.

In 1892 the Democratic party declared:

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud—a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of a few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

In 1896 this was the declaration of the Democratic party:

We hold that tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country and not discriminate between class or section, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the Government, honestly and economically administered.

In 1900 they said:

We condemn the Dingley tariff law as a trust-breeding measure, skillfully devised to give the few favors which they do not deserve and to place upon the many burdens which they should not bear. Tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free list to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection.

In 1904 here is the declaration as to robbery, about which so much has been said:

We denounce protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few, and we favor a tariff limited to the needs of the Government, economically administered, and so levied as not to discriminate against any industry, class, or section, to the end that the burdens of taxation shall be distributed as equally as possible. We favor a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses and for the common weal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions, and its discriminations, keeping in view the ultimate ends of "equality of burdens and equality of opportunities," and the constitutional purpose of raising a revenue by taxation, to wit, the support of the Federal Government in all its integrity and virility, but in simplicity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that was not a denunciation of protection in the abstract, but it was a denunciation of the principle of protection as practiced by the Republican party, making it possible for goods manufactured in this country to be shipped thousands of miles from here and sold to the foreigner at a very much less price than the American farmer could buy them, so that in that platform the denunciation as "robbery" is not of the simple abstract question of protection. We can not have a tariff for revenue, no matter how slight, but that it will in some degree afford protection to somebody. They did not denounce this question of protection per se in the abstract, but they did denounce it as practiced by the Republican party, and by the aid of which they had fostered and built up the great trusts of the country which are now sapping the very lifeblood of the people.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, I am against this proposition. I want to put the Democratic party right. We are not a free-trade party, never have been, are not now, and never will be. The Democratic party has always stood for a tariff on imports, but they have demanded that the tariff should be so levied as to weigh lightest upon those who could least afford to carry the burden and heaviest upon those who could best afford to carry it; that that tariff should be so levied as not to build up a few favored industries at the expense of the entire American people; that that tax should be so levied as to produce a revenue, not to prohibit the importation of goods; that that tariff should be so levied as to raise sufficient revenue for the honest, economical, ample administration of the affairs of this Government. A tariff beyond that, a tariff levied purely and simply to enrich the few at the expense of the many is a robbery, and it can not be denominated anything else.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote, as I said in the beginning, against the bill proposed by these gentlemen. They talk about consistency. They twit us with being inconsistent. Why, in 1896, I believe it was, the Republican party which now proclaims to the world that it has always been the consistent and unflinching advocate of the gold standard, in its platform denounced the Administration of Mr. Cleveland for what they said were his efforts to demonetize silver. And yet they talk of consistency!

Why, the Democratic party has been consistent on that question as on this. The Democratic party has always stood for bimetallism, the use of both gold and silver as the money of the country. The Democratic party has always stood for a tariff as I have stated it, and stands there to-day; and, occupying that position, I can not vote for a bill which, while claiming to be in the fatherly interest of the Filipinos, and framed on the assumption that they are the wards of this people, undertakes to do what this bill will do—deliver the islands wholly into the hands of the sugar and tobacco trusts for exploitation. If I were not impressed with the view that the Philippines are not a part of this country, I do not hesitate to say if this bill came here and it was purely a question of standing by the sugar planter of Louisiana, the beet-sugar men of Colorado, Michigan, and Wisconsin, or the little brown man in the Philippines, I should stand by my own blood and bone in Louisiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin. I should stand by the American farmer, and I would not support this bill, because I believe it is not meant for the Filipino, but it is meant to allow the sugar trust to exploit the Philippines to their hearts' content.

I thank you. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, the objections to the policy of free trade with the Philippine Islands could easily have been foreseen before those islands were annexed to the United States. The policy involved in this bill is no surprise to the country. It was ordained seven years ago, when the treaty of Paris was ratified, and unless we are to suppose that the American people should prove false to the fundamental principle of their political gospel, which was in existence before they were and which they had religiously observed until that time, it was inevitable that sooner or later we should have free trade with the Philippine Islands. I do not have any sympathy with those gentlemen who were the original advocates of annexation and who are now viewing with alarm the threatened destruction of American industries. I think they should manfully recognize that they are simply going to pay the price for hav-

ing indulged in some beautiful rhetoric about the flag, how it should never be hauled down no matter for what purpose it had been run up, and also for the pleasure of standing upon the mount of prophecy and seeing dazzling visions of an illimitable trade destined never to exist. They are paying the penalty to-day for having contributed toward making the Philippine Islands American territory.

My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who is one of the most genuine orators I have ever listened to upon this floor, in a burst of piety and eloquence yesterday credited the providence of God with the responsibility or the glory for our possession of the Philippine Archipelago. This observation of my friend reminded me of a remark credited to Mr. Henry Labouchere concerning a celebrated British statesman. He did not find fault, Mr. Labouchere said, that that statesman should now and then be found with an ace up his sleeve, but he did object when he claimed that it was put there by Divine Providence. [Laughter.] Horace, in his Art of Poetry, has said that you should not introduce a deity upon the scene unless there were some very hard knot to untie, which it would require a deity to do, and it seems to me gentlemen who have defended our Philippine policy here have acted strictly within the rule laid down by Horace. They have a hard knot to untie, and they have frequently introduced Providence into this debate. It is a convenient refuge to fly to when one is hard pressed for argument.

The policy of free trade was established, to my mind, when we annexed the Philippine Islands, and my action was determined for me by others in spite of my opposition when annexation was decreed, and I feel constrained to support free trade as a necessary result of annexation. It was ordained when we bought from Spain the bloodiest foreign war in which this Republic ever engaged. I say foreign war, because those people never owed us any allegiance whatever, and the war was purely one of conquest and subjugation. It was a war aptly characterized by the fine line cited by Mr. Mead:

Cursed is the war no poet sings.

Imagine, if you can, an American poet singing and the American schoolboy declaiming the most glorious exploit of that war, the capture of the Philippine chieftain by American soldiers in Philippine uniforms at the very moment when he was extending to them succor from impending starvation.

The bill before the House illustrates, to my mind, one of the inherent vices of our Philippine policy. Whom do we represent here to-day? The Secretary of War was in doubt whether he primarily represented the people of the Philippines or the people of this country. A great banker may at the same moment of time—because it has been done—represent an insurance company which buys and the banking firm which sells securities. [Laughter.] Another Napoleon of finance at the head of an insurance company may in his wisdom and benevolence disburse the trust funds in his hands for the conversion of the political heathen in the United States. [Laughter.]

But we are sitting under peculiar sanction. We are the trustees of the American people and can have no divided allegiance. We are bound strictly to the duty that we owe our people. It is hardly for us to indulge in self-congratulation over our benevolence. In the first place, it is a purely obtrusive benevolence. The Filipino people have not asked for it. We have forced it upon them at the cannon's mouth. In the next place, we are not a missionary society, but the chosen servants of the American people, and to my mind it appears hypocritical self-palaver and repugnant to all sound notions of official responsibility for us to congratulate ourselves, when we are using powers we hold in trust, on the benevolence we are showing the people of the Philippine Islands.

Who represents the people of those islands to-day? Suppose that they had the power that we have, and were making tax laws to-day for both themselves and for us. I am not saying what they might think best to give us in their benevolence, but some might think it well for them to have peculiar trade relations with the great group of nations which nature had given them as neighbors. Has that fact any consideration to-day? When one attempts to represent both sides in a trade, he is not apt adequately to represent either.

I believe that when the Philippine Islands became American territory they were entitled to that uniformity of duties prescribed by the Constitution, and it was their constitutional right to trade with other portions of American territory. I know the Supreme Court has decided differently from that by a majority of one in the Porto Rico case. There were two cases decided in one day, involving two apparently contradictory positions. There were two groups of four justices, and one justice rendered the opinion of the court in one case and then he joined the other group of four justices and rendered the opinion in that case. One of the other justices, who upheld the constitutionality of that act, said the two positions were absolutely irreconcilable. The circumstances of a decision have very much to do with the weight that it receives with a member of the political department of the Government bound by his own oath to defend the Constitution. Four of the justices, notwithstanding that decision in the Porto Rico case, in a subsequent case decided still that that policy was unconstitutional. Now, if the decision of the court does not bind even the justices themselves—and how could a decision ever be reversed if it did bind them—how can it be said to bind Members of Congress, members of a coordinate branch of the Government?

The Supreme Court, for instance, has decided that an income tax is not constitutional. Suppose a proposition for an income tax were submitted to this House, would any Member on the other side be able to vote for that tax in the face of the decision of the court? In that view of it the income-tax question was settled by a majority opinion for all time.

I believe that the policy of taxation against people inhabiting American territory is not only contrary to our Constitution, but if we had only an unwritten constitution it would be contrary to the very genius of our institutions. That was the position I took in the Porto Rican case when I opposed the passage of that bill.

But if I did not feel impelled, Mr. Chairman, to vote in favor of free trade with the Philippine Islands, upon the high political grounds I have referred to, I confess as a purely economic question I should hesitate to vote for this bill. I am for judicious revision of the tariff, but I am not in favor of a change of tariff by grafting upon our body politic tropical parasites which may absorb the vital forces of the American commonwealth. [Applause.] I am unable to see—speaking now from a purely economic standpoint—I am unable to see any economic ground that would support free trade with the Philippine Islands that would not more strongly support free trade with almost any other portion of the earth's surface.

They are at the antipodes, and are not more remote in distance than are their civilization and their social system different from our own. In their standard of living, their scale of wages, their climate, and their soil they differ almost as radically from us as do any people upon the globe. It is said they can not raise sugar in competition with our American farmers because their methods of production are antiquated and their sugar low grade, and the soil adapted to the raising of it very limited in amount. But suppose some American with skill and capital, like Mr. Atkins, the great Cuban sugar planter, should go there, or suppose that Germans or Englishmen should go there with modern machinery, and equip mills and raise sugar as they raise it in Cuba, do you fancy we should have on our hands simply the question of sun-dried sugar made with carabaos? We should have 96° sugar, and, in my opinion, be likely to have sugar made there as cheaply as in Cuba.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said: "Why, the American capitalist will not go to such a remote place as the Philippine Islands; he will choose territory where there are railroads and schools and facilities for business," but I say to you, gentlemen, the American capitalist is emphatically a pioneer. He loves to plant his money in a mine upon a distant mountain side; he loves to go into an empty territory and to places remote from civilization, in the hope that some time his own will return to him a hundredfold. The Philippine Islands with free trade is the very spot that the American capitalist would seek.

Take the Sandwich Islands. I think we are likely to have reproduced the same condition that we had after we made the treaty with those islands. I have heard it said in debate on this floor that before the making of the treaty the Sandwich Islands were producing only about 11,000 tons of sugar a year, and I have also heard it said upon good authority that it was urged at that time that the limit of their production was about 70,000 tons, and yet this last year I believe they produced 400,000 tons. Suppose we have three-quarters of a million acres of the 70,000,000 acres in the Philippines devoted to sugar culture. If, as Governor Taft said, the Philippine Islands have more arable land, more rich soil, than Japan, with her 50,000,000 of people; if, as Governor Wright said, the Philippine soil will raise more sugar to the acre than that of the Sandwich Islands; if, as our officers in their reports have repeatedly said, the Filipino laborer is superior to the Chinese laborer, it seems to me that we are willfully closing our eyes and we are making ourselves the victims of a self-delusion if we do not see that we are perhaps sounding the knell of the sugar industry in this country.

In my opinion, the present sugar duty might have been made somewhat lower than it is, but I believe there should have been a very substantial duty. I believe that the effect of that duty

has been to stimulate the production of sugar in this country, and if the farmers could be assured that it would be stable we should see still greater quantities produced here, and ultimately a lowering of the price. It is a great thing for the farmer, because it aids in diversifying agriculture and giving him a new profitable crop, and in justice we should remember that the farmer has been compelled to bear the brunt of the burden of the policy of protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.] So I say, Mr. Chairman, and I wish to state this case precisely as it appears to my mind, if I felt free to treat this question purely as an economic question and if I did not feel impelled by the views I have upon the constitutional and great underlying political questions, I should vote against this bill. The farmer is paying the penalty because some of our statesmen at a critical time in the history of the nation saw fit to "think imperially."

Now, that is all that I intended to say upon this bill, but certain allusions to the Commonwealth that I have the honor to represent in part lead me to add a few words more. I shall indulge in no eulogy, because I do not wish to offend some sensitive gentlemen who in this debate have alluded to her with perhaps something approaching asperity. My friend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], as I understand it, said that Massachusetts had been brought up by hand from infancy upon the pap of protection, and this taunt was echoed by the leader of the minority. Well, Mr. Chairman, if she was brought up by hand upon that diet she was brought up by a more powerful hand than hers, because she was torn by force from the breast of her natural mother, which is the sea. I think I shall not be accused of exaggeration when I say that Massachusetts in a far higher degree than any of her sister colonies inherited that instinct which made the mother country the mistress of the ocean.

She went into commerce and grew rich, and after the war of 1812, when she sat among the ruins of her commerce, destroyed by embargoes and by war, with a sublime patience and courage went to work to build it up again, and then a new obstacle was thrust between her and the sea in the shape of high tariff duties imposed in spite of and against the protest and votes of her Representatives, and imposed upon her by the Representatives from the South and the West. Is she to be sneered at to-day because she gracefully acquiesced in that policy forced upon her—acquiesced as she always has in any decreed policy of this nation? And so she embarked in manufacture, and, under this system of protection if you will, but largely by her thrift and the skill of her mechanics and the happy genius of her people, she became rich, although she is not to-day, relatively to the rest of the country, so preeminent in wealth as she was when this policy was adopted.

And she has not lagged behind the other States, I think you will pardon me for saying, in other respects. She has contributed to education, to art, to literature, to the prevention of grinding up the souls of young children in workshops, and to those other noble things which, far more than your wealth and your wars and your crusades undertaken to force "education" upon reluctant peoples at the point of the bayonet, will tell for your real and abiding glory. [Applause.]

What is her fault to-day? It is that under her system of untrammeled freedom of speech and of public discussion a great and increasing number of her people have dared to think and to say that the whirling changes of the nine years that have elapsed since the passage of the Dingley Act have thrown some of those great schedules out of gear with existing conditions, and that some duties, just, or at least harmless at the time they were enacted, have, by reason of industrial combination to stifle internal competition, and from other reasons, become exorbitant, and instead of protecting the people they are shielding monopoly and aiding it to pick the pockets of the people. [Applause.]

And they are somewhat weary of seeing that ancient friend of ours paraded upon ceremonial occasions, namely, "If the tariff is to be revised, let it be revised by its friends." If the tariff can ever be revised by its friends, can it not be revised by a Congress two-thirds of whose members in both the Senate and the House are Republicans? [Applause.]

I think that our noble governor never said a truer word—that a truer word never was spoken—than when he said that upon a "stand-pat platform" last fall the State would have been lost to the Republicans.

Now, the people of Massachusetts are only thinking a little in advance of some of the people—not all of the other people—of this country. Soon this idea will invade New York and Illinois and Ohio, gathering force as it moves; and I say to you that if we do not treat protection as a rational principle instead of a cast-iron, immutable set of schedules, we are liable to have the Democratic party, and then possibly the deluge. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I confess that it is with some diffidence that I rise to speak upon this bill, because it is hard to think what can be said that has not already been said on this subject. The question with which this bill is at all concerned and many questions with which it is not at all concerned have been argued ably upon this floor. And it is almost impossible that I shall be able to say anything instructive or interesting upon this subject. I am further overwhelmed with embarrassment at having at the outset to differ with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, upon some of his opinions as to the brilliant future of the Philippine Islands and as to the noble character of the Filipino people. I can not bring it to my mind that there is any brilliant future for the Philippine Islands, and with the sole exception of the love for the family and the home that the average Filipino possesses I can see nothing to admire in his character. I am glad to say I can vote for this bill with absolute conviction that its passage can not damage one iota any American industry or any American labor employed in that industry.

I do not profess to be an expert upon sugar or tobacco, but I can not bring myself to think for a moment, concerning the sugar question, that one small island in the Philippines, the island of Negros, the only place where sugar has ever been grown in the Philippines, an island without a port or a harbor, surrounded by such shoal water that nothing but barges and canoes can land upon it, can ever produce enough sugar to have any effect upon the price of sugar in this country. And all the more am I convinced of this fact when I am told that the labor that is employed on that island, at least the majority of it, must be imported from other islands; and those who have seen the Filipino imported laborer know that we have not much to fear from him. So far as the tobacco question is concerned, I will simply say to anyone who is afraid that Philippine cigars will ever compete with American cigars, "Smoke them and you will be convinced."

But, in my opinion, the question involved in the passage of this bill, the great principle underlying it, is not a question of expediency, but a question of national honor. In passing it we shall only be doing that which the Filipinos rightfully expect from us and that which we owe to them and to ourselves to do for them. We have gone too far now to honorably withdraw.

We owe it to the Filipinos that so long as we shall be in possession of the Philippine Islands we will do all we can to give them the comforts and the blessings inherent in American citizenship. We owe it to them to assist them in every way possible to build up their industries, to improve their condition, and to educate their children. For one I am not in favor of holding the Philippine Islands as a part of the territory of the United States a moment longer than we absolutely have to. [Applause.] I am in favor of turning those islands over to the Philippine people to govern for themselves at the first moment that they have proved to us that they are capable of governing themselves, but I am not in favor of turning them over a moment before that time. How soon that time may come Providence alone knows; but I say the sooner the better for them and for us [renewed applause]; and the way to speed that moment is to do everything that this nation possibly can for their material benefit and for their mental and moral uplifting.

There are two prime characteristics in the Filipino people that render them to-day, in my opinion, absolutely incapable of self-government. The average Filipino mind can form no conception of the duty of a public officer to the people. The average Filipino mind can form no conception of the dignity of labor. Until the Filipino mind shall have proved itself capable of forming these two conceptions, it would be, in my mind, nothing short of a national crime to turn the islands over to them, for it could do nothing else, even with all the safeguards of an international treaty of neutrality, but condemn them to almost immediate anarchy and bloodshed. We can not blame the Filipino for not understanding the obligation of a public officer to the people. Until the occupancy of those islands by this Government, for hundreds of years under Spanish rule, the Filipinos had hardly ever seen a man in public office who was animated by any other motives save purely the exploitation of Spanish interests and the filling, incidentally, of his own pocket.

I was told by a gentleman who has resided many years in the Philippines, and who has acted on very many occasions as an interpreter, that when he was first called upon to translate the

phrase "Public office is a public trust" he could find no words to make that plain to the Filipino mind. That phrase seems to be simply untranslatable into Tagalog or Spanish.

I have frequently heard it said in this debate that the Filipino is lazy and will not work any more than he absolutely has to; and small blame to him for that, for I am prepared to say that if the hardest-working Member of this House were to live for many years in that outrageous climate he would be lazy too. [Laughter.] But there is something of much deeper root in the Filipino character than mere laziness, and that is that he thinks it is dishonorable to work; and with these conceptions at the very root of Filipino character, how can we imagine for a moment that they could form a republic which could live for a week?

I desire to quote briefly at this point from the memorial presented to the members of Secretary Taft's party by those Filipinos who argued in favor of immediate independence. I might add that they came before us under the chaperonage of a Filipino patriot from Boston. [Laughter.] So it is apparent that some Boston people are for free Filipinos as well as for free hides. [Renewed laughter.] I will only quote a very few sentences, but this I desire briefly to call attention to, because this was the great argument they advanced to show that the Filipinos are now in a position to govern themselves. This was mentioned by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], but I would like to quote the exact language. They say:

It is undeniable that there exists in the Philippines, in sufficient numbers, the so-called "directing class," a small portion of which is employed by the present government in all the branches of administration, cooperating actively and effectively with the government in its gubernatorial labor.

If the Filipino archipelago has a governable popular mass, called upon to obey, and a directing mass in charge of leading, it then has conditions to govern itself by itself. These are the only two factors, without counting the casuals, who determine the popular capacity of a country. The directing class is the entity that knows how to lead and the popular mass is the entity that knows how to obey. The grade of culture in which the directing class and the popular mass of the Filipino people find itself is strictly and relatively comparable between itself, from one to the other class.

That is the foundation upon which they propose to build a republic modeled after the American Republic. They refer quite casually to the fact that there are a number of languages spoken in the Philippine Islands—some one hundred, I believe. They all sounded a good deal alike to me, so that I can not be accurate on that point. They say:

The unity in a language is a condition, yes, but not necessary to enjoy self-government. Spain, Switzerland, Germany, Russia, and other free States do not possess it, and nevertheless they govern their own destinies. The plurality of dialects which are spoken in the Philippines is not an impediment to the progress of a government.

I would like now to read a sentence. I think it ranks with Mark Twain's celebrated story of the "jumping frog" as a literary gem:

The fact that there lacks the immortal figure of Washington and the insignia of Jefferson in the Philippines does not impossibilitate it for its own government. Nations who are to-day independent, many prodigious in civilization, have constituted themselves in political liberty without having possessed personals of its stature. Cuba and Panama, declared republics yesterday by the same North America, neither was addicted to the memory of such great men.

And upon this evidence they ask us to confer upon them the blessings of self-government.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print the English translation of this memorial in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The document in question is as follows:

[Copy of the memorial asking for the independence of the Philippines. Presented to Taft's party in its visit to these islands by Filipino citizens.]

To the honorable Secretary of War of the Government of the United States of North America and the honorable Congressmen that compose his illustrious party. Honorable gentlemen, greeting:

The inhabitants of this archipelago who, yesterday, directed affectionate and cordial salutes of welcome to you in various forms of signs of jubilee, shall soon bid you good-by with the hopes that this visit, with which you are honoring them, shall be fruitful in benefits for this country and cause another stamp of glory to be added to yours. Before you abandon these shores we, the subscribers to this document, having the belief of interpreting the popular opinion because we believe in reflecting the true and unanimous feeling of the country, we take the liberty, in our country's name, to address ourselves to the Congress of the United States, authorized by the same, and through you, as a dignified channel, to forward our petition, which is unique and exclusive and which we express in a solemn form as a conclusion of the following considerations:

Neither have the epochs of great prosperity and abundance nor the hard times which this country benefited and suffered have succeeded in dissipating from it the constant desire to be, some day, master of its own actions.

Historical facts affirm that before the Spanish domination the Filipino people had their own culture and civilization derived from the purity of customs, the morals in the acts and natural conditions of its inhabitants. It is evident that there existed a government of order in the Philippines at that time. The rights of property were not then violated nor the personal privileges were profanated. Slavery, in its social sense of the word, was not known in this country, as well as cannibalism, alcoholism, socialism, anarchy, nihilism, or communism, nor was there any knowledge atrocious and hair-raising crimes.

Aided by such happy circumstances, the Filipino people have been assimilating the occidental civilization gradually, little by little, without any pressure or violence, and the assimilation has been so perfect a labor of more than three centuries, that it results that the extreme Orient is the country in which the influence of the Occident terminates.

Its present culture being occidental, its characteristics and popular feelings shall overfloat in all orders of life. It did not loose it, nor ever shall.

In spite of its undoubtful political capacity resulting from its present grade of culture and civilization, we, the Filipinos, are refused, in various tones and forms, conditions for self-government when precisely acts, experiences, and considerations speak for themselves, among which the following deserve to be cited:

A. It is a fact that the Filipino people is indisputably governable. The period of the Spanish domination and that of the present American sovereignty have demonstrated it. The political condition of a country principally depends upon the grade of its being governed. From a higher grade of governing the popular masses depend upon for its higher political condition. When a country like the Philippines does give marked proofs of knowing how to obey for a period of more than three hundred years without any serious disturbances or deep political commotions, it should humanely be supposed, as all shows that it is progressive, that it is in possession of the art of leading, ever so much more when it has, among other faculties, assimilations which distinguishes it from the rest of the other countries of the extreme Orient.

B. If the mass of a country is governable, a part of it should necessarily have to be that termed as the directing class, such as in the journey of progress, the same in the moral order as in the material, the nations do not progress in comparison, some go forward and others behind, this can be observed in the inhabitants of a country.

It is undeniable that there exists in the Philippines, in sufficient numbers, the so-called "directing class," a small portion of which is employed by the present government in all the branches of administration, cooperating actively and effectively with the government in its gubernatorial labor.

C. If the Filipino Archipelago has a governable popular mass called upon to obey and a directing mass in charge of leading, it then has conditions to govern itself by itself. These are the only two factors, without counting the casuals, who determine the popular capacity of a country. The directing class is the entity that knows how to lead and the popular mass is the entity that knows how to obey. The grade of culture in which the directing class and the popular mass of the Filipino people find itself is strictly and relatively comparable between itself, from one to the other class.

It is not feasible to compare the inculture of the Filipino popular mass with that of the American, as an example, which has less of the popular mass, but more of the directing class, or again, the culture of the Filipino directing class to that of the American, which, of course, is greater, compared to that of its popular mass, this same rule being applicable in respect to the numbering quantity of one class with relation to that of the other, a theory which should not be lost sight of, remembering that there exists maxim, half, and smallest grades indistinctively in the Saxon kind from that of the Latin than in the general scale of self-government.

D. Due to this same comparedness of the grade of culture in which the directing class of the Filipino people finds itself with relation to that of the popular mass, it can be foretold without any fear of mistake that, when the time comes when the country rules its own destinies, far from being tyrannical, scrupulous as harbored by some, a model of justice shall be the government that should establish itself, because neither the culture of the directing class should be so superior as to make itself be obeyed tyrannically, nor the inculture of the popular mass should be so great as to allow itself to be tyrannized. In a case of notable disequilibrium between the culture of a class and the inculture of another is when the tyranny of a country could take place, which does not exist in the Philippines, where, in this respect, it is completely relative.

E. The conditions of the Filipino people which govern it politically, derived from its secular connivance with a race from which it inherited wise principles of government, which, although be it from the Latin class, are recognized by common consent by the civilized nations, dating much before the American domination, a political capacity which the Filipinos gave gallant proofs of during the ephemerous life of the late Filipino republic, in whose territory, in spite of all that took place over the hot ashes of the revolution against that which had been its metropolis, there then reigned complete tranquillity; the orders issued from high spheres were executed without any pungency by the low ones. There was no complete economical welfare then, because of that abnormal state, it is true; neither is there now.

As a fact which proves the culture that the Filipino people possessed before the Star-Spangled Banner waved over its dominions can be cited the statistics of its then intellectual movement. In the academical course from 1896 to 1897 there was in that university a registered list of students in the following form: Fifteen in theology, 7 in canonical law, 1,298 in civil law, 357 in medicine, 169 in pharmacy, 244 in the notarial profession, 160 in philosophy and letters, and 54 in sciences.

F. If the Filipinos did not have beforehand conditions for self-government they would not have been able to aid America with the efficacy with which it has until now been doing in the implantation in these islands of a government which is completely new. It would have stumbled with unsurpassable difficulties and produced deep disturbances in all the order of administration, much more when the institution of the present government was rapid, nearly instantaneous, surprising the natives who, without being previously prepared, soon assimilated, however, new theories and doctrines in matters of government and administration. This affirmation is not denied. In the six years that the country has carried under the present régime, the Filipinos, scarce in numbers who took part in the same, over whose shoulders weighs the greatest part of responsibility, did not give signs of inaptitude. On the contrary, their conduct is of a happy result, as is shown and more profoundly in that of the branch of municipal government, completely in charge of the native element.

G. The American people, upon taking upon themselves the tutoring of this archipelago in virtue of the protocol signed in Paris, contracted the responsibility of aiding the Filipino people in establishing a sound government in these islands. It will not, undoubtedly, draw itself from this responsibility if, in spite of the wise recommendation of

McKinley, which consist in procuring to respect our habits, customs, and laws they should implant in these islands a government which would be not adaptable to our way of being, giving clearly to understand that the government that should be established has to be a government of a strictly Filipino character.

H. The caciquism of which there is made a pretext in order to deny the political capacity of the Filipinos shall never exist in this country, where the slavery, which is a minimous term for it, has also never existed, given to its special customs, apart from that there has not yet been found the case in which one race rules over others of the same race, and presuming that if later this should exist, precisely when the country should be independent, goes to show that in other free states the same is known to exist. In this case it would be but little humane to attribute it particularly to the Filipinos only as a motive to deny their political capacity, a defect which is peculiar in humanity in general.

I. The unity in a language is a condition; yes, but not necessary to enjoy self-government.

Spain, Switzerland, Germany, Russia, and other free states do not possess it, and nevertheless they govern their own destinies. The plurality of dialects which are spoken in the Philippines is not an impediment to the progress of a government. This plurality of dialects already existed when Spain governed this country, and during these centuries of domination it did not disturb Spain in its affairs of government, because Spain would make use of the two common dialects in this archipelago, which were Spanish and Tagalo, and indistinctively making use of one or the other of these dialects. America is now governing the archipelago without being impossibilitated in the discharge of its mission by the plurality of dialects, which have not disappeared. On the contrary, that has increased with the English language, which is also spoken to-day.

J. The riches that form the vitality of a country as one of its principal resources is regulated by the importance of the products that are exported from it. The exportation from the Philippines—not that of to-day, which is more, but that of former years—was then, if not equal, a little less than the exportations of many oriental countries and much more than that of North America when that country was declared independent.

The fact that there lacks the immortal figure of Washington and the insignia of Jefferson in the Philippines does not impossibilitates it for its own government. Nations who are to-day independent, many prodigious in civilization, have constituted themselves in political liberty without having possessed personals of its stature. Cuba and Panama, declared republics yesterday by the same North America, neither were addicted to the memory of such great men.

L. It is improper and out of place to assay the conditions of this country for a free and independent government by comparing them with those of other countries of the extreme Orient, such as Japan, for example, for if when superiority partly exists on their part and inferiority on the part of the Philippines it is precisely through the fact that those are independent, and as such they agitate and unfold themselves with entire liberty, without any fetters, while those whose inhabitants are of an intellectual level much superior than those of the free states, in the judgment of authors of indisputable authority, controlled in all organs and institutions, they hardly have adjective life.

Such precedents being enunciated, it must be admitted that the Filipinos are capable for an independent government, and among the variety of forms of this class of government they choose an immediate independence, with a declaration of perpetual neutrality, in preference to another with a protectorate, because this form results in the most honorable means and more economical for America, and more sure to affiance the integrity and soundness of that which shall be a Filipino state, while the independence with a protectorate would be expensive as well to the protector and the protected and liable to conflicts for the first.

Whereas all that we have stated, and depending upon the justice of the American nation, we ask of the Congress of the United States of North America, in the name of the Filipino people, for the immediate independence of the Philippine Islands, with a declaration of perpetual neutrality.

Manila, Philippine Islands, August 28, 1905.

Dr. Simeón A. Villa; Baldomero Aguinaldo, agricultor; Dr. Justo Lukban; José M. a de la Viña, médico; M. Cuyugan, propietario; G. Apacible, médico; Vicente Ilustre, abogado y propietario; Miguel Zaragoza, profesor de pintura; Alberto Barreto, abogado; Pablo Ocampo, industrial; Antonio E. Escamilla, profesor de idiomas; Enrique Mendiola, licenciado en jurisprudencia y propietario; Andrés E. Rivero, periodista; Francisco Laksamana, periodista; Félix Ferrer y Pascual, abogado; Donato Teodoro, propietario; M. P. Leuterio, maestro superior; Macario Adriático, abogado; Cirilo B. Santos, propietario; Francisco Dominguez, abogado y propietario; Tomás B. Umali, abogado director del Ateneo Filipino; Roman Ongpin, comerciante; Pascual Ledesma, marino y propietario; Dr. Dominador Gomez, licenciado; Manuel Ramirez, director del semanario "La Justica;" Marcelino Gómez, litógrafo y propietario; Higino M. Angeles, propietario; Teodoro Sandiko, propietario; Vicente Lukban, industrial; Antonino Guevara, agricultor; Gregorio Flores, farmaceútico.

Mr. LONGWORTH. When I say that there are no Filipinos to-day competent to hold public office, I absolutely except such men as Tavera or Legurda or Luzuriaga, members of the Philippine Commission, and Arellano, justice of the supreme court of the Philippines. Those are all men who would be honored and respected citizens of any country, and there are a few others like them. Judge Arellano would adorn the bench of any court in the United States. But such men are the exception and not the rule. I am frank to say that for the average Filipino, the kind we are sometimes pleased to call the "little brown brother," I have no love whatever. I liked him a great deal better when I read of him than I like him now when I have seen him. I liked him far better in the abstract than I do now in the concrete. This is where I differ with my friend the gentleman from Ohio when I say that for the very reason that he is so shiftless, so incapable, so untrustworthy, and so helpless, is not that all the stronger reason why this nation should reach out a helping hand to him, both as regards his material benefit and his moral and mental welfare?

We will do the first by passing this bill. The second we are already doing in the schools. And that is one of the greatest works that has ever been done by any nation in the history of the world. All honor to those American teachers who have left their friends and comforts at home and are giving up the best years of their lives to the educating of those Filipino children. It is the most important of all the work that we can do for the Filipinos, because it is to those children and to their children and children's children, perhaps, that we must look for those who shall in the future accomplish a regeneration of the Filipinos. It is to them that we must look for the formation of a national character and for a high conception of public morals. It is to them that we must look for men, honest and capable of holding public office. This national regeneration may come within a comparatively few years or it may not come for decades; but until the day shall come when the Filipinos as a people shall grow to be honest and industrious, when they shall have developed a national character and an understanding of public duties, we must, for the sake of our national honor hold those islands as a part of our possessions, for to surrender them before that would be a crime. In the meantime, what shall we do for them?

Shall this nation, which is now carrying on the greatest charitable work in the history of the world, take a backward step? Shall we govern them as England governs her colonies, for the purpose of exploitation and for our own interests, or shall we consider them in the light of a trust turned over to us temporarily by Providence and govern them in the interest of the Filipino people? We must do one thing or the other. We can not treat them for some purposes as a dependency to be used for exploitation and for other purposes treat them as a part of our own people. We can not draw them to our breast with one hand and repel them with the other. We can not treat the Philippine Islands for some purposes as foreign territory and for other purposes as territory of the United States. We are about to apply to them our coastwise laws. We are going to compel them to ship their own products in American ships between their own ports. Shall we then deprive them of the privileges of American ports? We have done this deliberately. If we are treating the Philippine Islands for almost all purposes as a part of the United States, how then can the principles of protection or free trade have anything to do with this bill? We are under a high moral obligation to treat the Filipino people fairly. How, then, can we stop to haggle over the question of a few imports? The Filipinos expect, and they rightfully expect, that we shall treat them fairly. The great nations of the world expect it. Our national honor demands it. This bill should be passed as an earnest of the performance of the duty that we have promised and owe to the people of the Philippine Islands. [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has fifteen minutes.

Mr. McCALL. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the pending bill. I indorse the arguments and the sentiments so well expressed by my young friend from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] who has just taken his seat.

This measure is an act of simple justice to the people of the Philippine Islands, and it ought to receive the unanimous support of both branches of Congress. I have always been of the opinion that all territory under the control of the United States should be upon terms of absolute equality in their commercial and civil rights and privileges. If we can not govern territory upon this just and humane principle, we have no right to undertake to govern it at all.

The debate upon this measure has been able and exceptionally interesting, but in some respects it has not been altogether creditable to the American sense of justice and fair play. Gentlemen have spoken in opposition to the bill, in behalf of special interests, and have insisted that if the bill shall become a law the sugar and the tobacco industries particularly will suffer from competition with the products of the Philippine Islands, and, therefore, that the bill is in conflict with the traditional policy of the Republican party for the protection of American labor. Gentlemen upon the Democratic side of the House have announced their purpose of supporting the bill because it is a large step toward ultimate free trade and bespeaks the final overthrow of the policy of protection. Both of these contentions are manifestly illogical. The policy of protection which

is so conspicuous a principle in the creed of faith of the Republican party implies, necessarily, that there is something to protect. What is that something? It is the American market. The Republican party stands for the protection of the market created by the 75,000,000 inhabitants of the United States against invasion by foreign producers. That party believes in preserving this splendid market for American producers in all competitive lines, and insists upon absolute free trade among our own people throughout the length and breadth of our own land.

It has been truthfully asserted that an average American consumes as much of the products of sweat and toil as ten of the average of the world's population outside of this country. The market created by the 75,000,000 people in the United States "proper," as my friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] aptly termed it in his speech a few days ago, is equivalent to a market created by 750,000,000 of the average of the world's population outside of this country; and it is the best and the richest market enjoyed exclusively by the producers of our nation that exists on all the earth. The purpose of this bill is simply to enlarge our zollverein and include the Philippine Islands, with their six and a half million population, within our free-trade Union and to protect them as well as ourselves in the enjoyment of the market made by our own inhabitants against disastrous competition by foreign producers.

In our legislation for the development of interests and our administration of the affairs of the Philippine Islands we have, in the main, been eminently successful. We have established civil government there granting to the inhabitants of the archipelago a larger share of participation in their own affairs than they ever enjoyed before. We have established a splendid school system and a system of sanitation and internal improvements that must go far toward the permanent advancement of the welfare of those hapless people. In the enactment and execution of these measures all interests in this country have been in practical accord, but when it comes to the extension of commercial privileges to those islands we are met by the stubborn opposition of special interests at home.

The Philippine government a number of years ago imposed an export tax of $7.50 a ton on hemp. This tax was purely for revenue. The hemp produced in the archipelago finds a ready market in all parts of the world, and the imposition of the export tax in no manner affected the industry. By an act of Congress several years ago this export tax upon hemp was repealed upon all hemp brought to the United States and allowed to remain upon all hemp that was sent to foreign countries. This legislation took from the revenues of the Philippine Islands about $550,000 a year, and what did they get in return for it? Not a thing. It was purely in the interest of the cordage industry in this country. Hemp is the chief article of production and export in the Philippine Islands. Last year they produced 128,564 tons, of the value of $22,146,241. Of the amount produced, 72,196 tons were brought to the United States. This large importation to this country was induced by the fact that our cordage manufacturers were given an advantage of $7.50 per ton over their foreign competitors. That legislation was clearly not in the interest of the people of the Philippine Islands, but was solely in the interest of certain special industries in our own country.

About two years ago Congress passed a law extending the coastwise laws of the United States to the Philippine Archipelago, to become operative on the 1st day of July, 1906. After that law goes into operation every pound of freight and every passenger between the United States and the Philippine Islands must be carried in an American boat. It is admitted on all hands that the effect of the law will be to increase substantially the rate on commerce and travel between the United States and the Philippines. It is now generally conceded by those who are familiar with the situation that the law will operate disastrously upon the commerce and the prosperity of the people of the islands. That law was clearly not in the interest of the people of those islands, but was for the sole benefit of the shipowners and shipbuilders of the United States.

And in the consideration of the pending bill we are confronted by the bitter and determined opposition of the beet-sugar and tobacco industries in this country. They insist that this act of palpable justice to the Philippine Archipelago shall not become effective, because they contend it might increase competition in those industries. That aspect of the question has been unduly emphasized in the debate on the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] in his splendid speech delivered a few days ago upon this question, said with much eloquence and some degree of unction that while the Constitution did not follow the flag into the Orient, the people of the United States with practical unanimity had decreed that "justice and fair play" should follow it. This is a beautiful sentiment, but shall justice and fair play follow the flag only upon condition that it involves us in no cost or sacrifice? Shall money and commerce be placed above common everyday justice in our dealings with a people entirely under our control? Shall selfishness be the guiding principle of our administration of the affairs of the Philippine Archipelago? Mr. Chairman, if we fall short of the expectation of a just people in discharging our solemn duty toward those islands it will be because of the narrow and blind selfishness and greed of special interests in our own country.

It has been conclusively demonstrated in the debate upon this bill that no industry in the United States can suffer a particle if it should become a law. We import from foreign countries upward of 1,700,000 tons of sugar every year for our own consumption. The entire sugar product of the Philippine Islands in their palmiest days never exceeded 300,000 tons a year. The entire tobacco product of the islands last year was $1,999,000 in value, of which only $6,820 worth was brought to the United States. We sold as much tobacco in the Philippine Islands as was brought from those islands and sold in this country. Labor and culture conditions are such in the archipelago that industrial development there must necessarily be slow. There never will come a time in the existence of this country when the intelligent, efficient, and capable laborers of the United States can possibly suffer by any competition on the part of the inefficient, unintelligent, and indolent inhabitants of these islands. The common and natural market for the sugar and tobacco of the islands is in the Orient and always will be, but if every bit of their export product of sugar and tobacco should be brought to the United States it could not possibly affect in any degree either the sugar or tobacco industries in this country.

But there is a higher question involved in this measure, one affecting the honor of the nation. Underlying it all is a principle of political morals that the people of this country can not afford to overlook. We justly impose trade restrictions upon foreign countries for the protection of our own commerce. Those countries are sovereign and independent and are free to negotiate treaties of amity and commerce with each other and to take steps to retaliate against this and other countries for what they conceive to be unjust restrictions against their commerce. We treat with them upon an equal footing, and the contest for supremacy in the commercial world is a fair and manly one, but this is not the case with the Philippine Islands. They are not a foreign country. They have no sovereign authority. They can negotiate no treaties of trade with foreign powers; they can enact no laws of retaliation against what they conceive to be unjust commercial restrictions imposed by this country. They are utterly helpless and absolutely within our power. Imagine a great, generous, and wealthy country like this absorbing the sovereignty of a weak and defenseless people and enacting laws that will protect its own industries against the industries and the interests of the people whose destiny it controls. Interests between the United States and the Philippine Archipelago may occasionally conflict. If in such conflicts we shall make it our business to protect our interests, who in the name of Heaven will protect the interests of the Filipinos? All this talk about the danger of competition, against this measure of common justice and humanity, is unworthy of the high character of American citizenship, and is a reproach to our common sense of justice. The Filipinos are said to be our wards, and we are their guardians. It is a universal rule of morals in the Anglo-Saxon civilization, observed everywhere and in all instances, that if the interest of the ward and the interest of the guardian shall conflict those of the ward must always be paramount. No man is permitted to put himself in a position where his individual interests will conflict with other interests that he may have in trust; and the the nation certainly can not afford in its policy toward the Filipinos to establish a lower standard of morals than it exacts from its own citizens in their dealings with each other.

The humblest court in all this land would not permit a guardian to set up his own interest as an excuse for not doing justice to his ward. It is our solemn duty to administer the affairs of the Philippine Islands for the benefit and welfare of the people of those islands, and if we can not do this we ought to have the grace to surrender our guardianship and turn it over to a government that will do it.

Mr. SMITH of California rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. For a question.

Mr. SMITH of California. Speaking from a purely moral standpoint, how do you justify the 25 per cent that is retained in the bill?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The bill is progressive in its character. It provides for ultimate free trade. It is the best measure proposed, and it has been explained that the 25 per cent duty on sugar and tobacco is for revenue purposes, and the proceeds will be turned into the Filipino treasury, and if there is anything those people are in need of under existing conditions it is revenue. Of course, they will have to pay it themselves, but it is perhaps a convenient way to get it, and I am for the bill notwithstanding it contains provisions for a temporary imposition of 25 per cent upon the two commodities.

Mr. SMITH of California. Then, if you will just permit one question more, you admit that the United States can afford to do an immoral thing for the sake of about $250,000 a year?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, no; the gentleman misunderstands my position altogether. The 25 per cent provision is intended for the benefit of the Philippine government and not for protection to our industries. If I had the power to rearrange the whole business I would provide absolute free trade from this time and restore the hemp export tax as a source of revenue. That tax was removed in favor of American exporters by an act of Congress, and there is no prospect of its being restored. Therefore I think the tax provision in this bill may be justified on the ground that they need the revenue. The gentleman is doubtless aware that the bill provides for absolute free trade both ways upon all articles after April, 1909.

Our own industrial interests, powerful in politics and society, are always on the ground to protest if any legislation is attempted that seems to them to be inimical to their welfare. The Filipinos are 10,000 miles away. They have no social or political influence in this country, and our solicitude for them under these circumstances should require greater vigilance and care than if they were within our sight and contact and could wield a direct influence in politics and trade.

The flag of this country has been planted in the Orient, perhaps to remain for all time, and it ought to stand as the symbol of complete and absolute justice toward the territory and the people over which it floats. It ought to be the token of a high sense of justice on the part of the American people toward that weak and helpless race that is so completely at their mercy. If our policy toward the Philippines shall not be characterized at all times by the most enlightened sense of justice and fair play, our administration of that trust will be a disgraceful failure. I am led to make these criticisms in view of the character of this debate. I feel that the moral side of this question ought to be emphasized and impressed upon the notice and attention of the country. I have no doubt that the people of the United States are in favor of full and complete justice to the people of the Philippine Islands, and when the matter is called to their notice they will see to it that no concerns of selfish interests shall stand between us and our plain and simple duty.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, from present appearances it would seem that this House is hopelessly divided. One gentleman from Massachusetts told us the other day that he favored free trade between the United States and Canada. Why? Undoubtedly because it would, in his opinion, help his State. Again from the far South comes a strong protest against the reduction of the duty on sugar. Why? Because that section produces sugar. Again from the manufacturers from the North comes a plea for free hides. Why? Because they use hides to make shoes, and they wish to make shoes as cheaply as possible. And so it seems that General Hancock was not so far from right after all when he said the tariff was a local question. In one sense it undoubtedly is, but in the larger view it is not.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see if there is not common ground upon which we can all stand.

It is a matter of common knowledge that ours is a trust-ridden, monopoly-cursed country. Prosperous as we are, this is the unvarnished truth. Great corporations have grown up under our system of raising revenue. At first they claimed that they were infants and could not stand alone; so we built a high wall which largely shut out competition. Now they have become so powerful that they openly defy the law, and without hindrance violate the law every day in the year. The American people are the prey of these powerful giants. The American consumer has made them largely what they are; and now in return for his beneficence they punish him, for every day they are shipping their goods abroad and are selling those goods cheaper to the foreigner than they are to us. The man never was born smart enough to defend such a practice successfully. Logic can not make right out of wrong.

Every good man in this Republic, from the President down, would be glad to find a way to put an end to the iniquitous practices of the American trust. How to reach the criminal trust is a question which has so far puzzled the best intellect of the land. But, Mr. Chairman, in the dilemma in which we are, I humbly submit that the very first tariff schedule which should be reduced is that schedule which shuts out competition with the products of the monopoly. Who will deny that the United States Steel Corporation has a practical monopoly of the steel industry of this country? Who will deny that this monopoly is selling its manufactured product cheaper to the foreigner than the American? Then why not reduce the import duty upon such articles to that point which will, if possible, force this trust to sell at least as cheaply to Americans as to foreigners?

Let me say this, Mr. Chairman. I am not a free trader. I favor a moderate but just revision of the tariff. If the farmer and wealth producer receives any benefit from our system of taxation, then the last duty which I will vote to reduce is that which helps these men. We do know that we can make goods cheaper to the consumer by removing part of the duty on trust-made articles. Then why not take those schedules in hand?

Ah, Mr. Chairman, why? That $1,900,000 which the Republican national chairman had in the last campaign did the business. [Laughter.] That $2,800,000 which he had in 1900 did the business, and the almighty dollar will always do the business as long as political parties are willing to elect their Presidents and their Congresses with money contributed by corporations and individuals made rich by laws passed by these very men.

Four years ago I attempted to sound a note of warning. It was a feeble attempt indeed. I sound it again here to-day. The use of money in our elections is a damnable curse. The wretched creature who sells his vote should be put in stripes, and the still more dangerous creature who buys that vote should be put in stripes also and sent along to the penitentiary for a term twice as long.

Never has our country and Congress been more boss-ridden than they are to-day. It is true that there is a healthy indication here and there of an attempt on the part of good men to break up ring rule, but so far as I can see there is absolutely no hope of the passage of any act which will tend to remove the consumer from the clutches of the trust. All agree that something should be done—yes, all from the President down. All agree that we are in the power of monopoly. All admit that they are making us pay more for their goods than foreigners pay. No one will deny that a reduction of the import duty will make goods cheaper to the consumer. Not a solitary Member on this floor will, I venture, insist that the steel trust, for example, needs any protection at all. Then why not reduce the duty upon articles which come in competition with the steel trust? I would like to know just how much this corporation contributed to the campaign fund of the Republican party in 1900 and 1904.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will not be misunderstood. I do not pretend that my own party is free from blame. As I have stated before on this floor, the guilt of either party is probably limited by the amount of money its agents can raise. Each party can say to the other, "Et tu quoque;" but that reply never justified wrongdoing since the world began; but it is time the practice were stopped by law, and good men of both political parties should join hands to make our elections clean and pure in the future.

For one I honestly believe that a majority of this Chamber favors a reduction of the duty on trust-manufactured articles, but the will of the majority no longer rules in this body. Why? Because you have tied yourselves hand and foot and delivered yourselves into the hands of three men. This is true. Will anyone dispute it? The Constitution contemplates, as I understand it, that every Member of this body should be the peer of every other Member and enjoy the same rights and privileges; and this would be true had we not voted ourselves in slavery. More than once we have seen petitions circulating around this Chamber asking permission of the Speaker to be allowed to vote on some bill which a majority desired brought before the House. Just think of that, if you please. [Laughter.] Honorable gentlemen, Members of the American House of Representatives, elected and sent here by the sovereign people, actually forced to beg for the privilege of voting. Do you wonder that your President pays little or no attention to your recommendations? Do you not feel humiliated? This is bossism run to seed. Gentlemen, let us put an end to it. If we must have a Committee on Rules, let each side of this Chamber elect its members. Let us put back into the hands of each Member that power which the Constitution intended he should exercise. Your Speaker should be your servant, not your master, just as you are the servants of your constituents. When the ridiculous and arbitrary rules of this House are changed there will be a chance to vote on measures which ought to become laws. Then, and not till then, will this body properly rep-

1 Fe 33